

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 729

CE 028 185

AUTHOR Banta, Trudy W.; Boser, Judith A.
 TITLE Evaluation of Tennessee's State Plan for Career Education 1979-80.
 INSTITUTION Tennessee Univ., Knoxville. Bureau of Educational Research and Service.
 SPONS AGENCY Tennessee State Dept. of Education, Nashville.
 PUB DATE Feb 81
 NOTE 90p.; Best copy available. Not available in paper copy due to print quality.
 AVAILABLE FROM Bureau of Educational Research and Services, University of Tennessee, 2046 Terrace Ave., Knoxville, TN 37916 (write for price).
 EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Advisory Committees; *Career Education; Inservice Education; *Needs Assessment; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Social Bias; Social Discrimination; Staff Development; *State Programs; *Statewide Planning; Technical Assistance; *Workshops
 IDENTIFIERS *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

This report presents an evaluation of the career education leadership activities conducted in Tennessee in 1979-80, the first year of operation for Tennessee's five-year State Plan for Career Education. Section 1 addresses the relationship between the activities in the State Plan and a state-wide needs assessment. Sections 2-7 focus on assessment of the six elements of the State Plan: (1) administration/coordination activities of state coordinator, (2) advisory council, (3) technical assistance workshops, (4) workshop to reduce bias and stereotyping, (5) counselor workshops, and (6) summer career education festival. Final reports from twenty local projects funded under provisions of the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207) are summarized in Section 8. Findings are organized under these headings: prior needs assessment data, project organization and support, needs assessment conducted 1979-80, staff development, other project activities, project evaluations, funding and expenditures, recommendations for the state-wide leadership effort, and achievement of state objectives. Section 9 summarizes major findings and recommendations. Suggestions are offered in the areas of objectives, involvement of teacher preparatory institutions, advisory council functioning, evaluation, project selection, and proposal guidelines. (Twenty-three tables and listings of responses display results of the various evaluations.) (YLB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED 201729

EVALUATION
OF
TENNESSEE'S STATE PLAN
FOR
CAREER EDUCATION
1979-80

Prepared by
Trudy W. Banta
Judith A. Boser

February, 1981

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bureau of Educational Research and Service
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
2046 Terrace Avenue
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Banta

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 028 185

DISCLAIMER

This program is funded in part under an agreement with the Tennessee State Department of Education. However, points of view or opinions expressed do not necessarily represent policies or positions of the Tennessee State Department of Education.

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

EE Title IX/Section 504

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, shall not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, handicap, or veteran status in providing educational opportunities or employment opportunities and benefits.

UTK shall not discriminate on the basis of sex or handicap in the educational programs and activities which it operates pursuant to the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Pub. L. 92-318; and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Pub. L. 93-112; respectively. This policy extends to both employment by and admission to the University.

Inquiries concerning Title IX and Section 504 should be directed to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration, 525 Andy Holt Hall, Knoxville, TN 37996-0391. Charges of violation of the above policy should also be directed to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CONGRUENCE BETWEEN IDENTIFIED NEEDS AND STATE OBJECTIVES.	1
LIMITATIONS	2
ORGANIZATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	2
SECTION 2. ADMINISTRATION/COORDINATION ACTIVITIES OF STATE ADMINISTRATOR	3
SECTION 3. COUNCILS/COUNCIL	5
SECTION 4. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS	11
SECTION 5. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS	11
SECTION 6. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS	11
SECTION 7. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS	11
SECTION 8. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM LOCAL PROJECTS.	11
IDENTIFIED LOCAL PROJECTS.	41
PRIORITY PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA	41
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION AND SUPPORT.	42
NEEDS ASSESSMENT CONDUCTED DURING 1979-80.	46
STAFF DEVELOPMENT	46
OTHER PROJECT ACTIVITIES.	51
PROJECT EVALUATION	51
FUNDING AND EXPENDITURES.	55
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PROJECT REPORTS.	55
ACHIEVEMENT OF STATE OBJECTIVES THROUGH LOCAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	PAGE
SECTION 9. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	65
SUMMARY	65
Needs Assessment	65
Leadership/Coordination Activities	65
State Advisory Council	65
Technical Assistance Workshops	66
Workshop on Bias/Stereotyping.	66
Workshops for Counselors	66
Career Education Festival.	66
Final Reports from Local Projects.	66
RECOMMENDATIONS	68
Objectives	68
Involvement of Teacher Preparation Institutions.	69
Advisory Council	69
Evaluation	69
Project Selection.	70
Proposal Guidelines.	70

EVALUATION OF TENNESSEE'S STATE PLAN FOR CAREER EDUCATION

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

In the final month of operation for Tennessee's 1979-80 Career Education, the Bureau of Educational Research and Service at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville was awarded a contract by the Tennessee Department of Education to conduct an external evaluation of the activities carried out in support of the State Plan.

Congruence Between Identified Needs and State Objectives

In the year prior to the writing of the 1979-80 State Plan, the evaluation director conducted a state-wide needs assessment which included a mail survey of a stratified random sample of Tennessee's superintendents, principals, teachers and community leaders. Both school personnel and community leaders provided a strong indication that they considered career education goals to be compatible with their own ideas about what should be going on in the State's schools.

When superintendents, principals, teachers and community leaders were presented with a set of career education goals and objectives and asked how much emphasis each should be given in the curriculum of the local schools, an average of 96 percent of all respondents indicated that all the objectives deserved "some" or "much" emphasis. No group was dissatisfied with the extent to which the student objectives were being achieved in the schools, however. Community leaders were least satisfied with the extent of achievement, but even among school staff 20 percent felt the career education objectives should be given more emphasis than they were achieving. Responses of superintendents, principals and teachers indicated that at most 60 percent of Tennessee's schools had attempted career education in some way; and according to principals of the survey, only 20 percent had formal programs for infusing career education into the total curriculum.

Survey respondents indicated that the chief obstacle to implementation of career education programs was lack of funds. Lack of curriculum materials and resources for staff training were other critical problems. When asked what actions the State Department of Education could undertake to expedite career education implementation, all groups of respondents gave top priority to the provision of curriculum materials and staff training in career education.

Federal funds allocated to Tennessee under the provisions of PL 95-207 have helped to alleviate the principal career education needs identified by survey respondents. The following objectives contained in the 1979-80 State Plan provide clear evidence that the critical needs for staff training and provision of curriculum materials have been addressed by developers of the plan:

Goal A

- Objective 2.4 Provision of staff development activities for Central Office Personnel.
- Objective 2.5 Identification of consultants capable of providing staff development for LEAs.
- Objective 2.6 Dissemination to LEAs of a listing of such consultants.

Goal

- Objective 1.1 Conduct of in-service institutes for LEA personnel.
 - Objective 1.2 Conduct of training for local career education coordinators.
 - Objective 1.5 Conduct of a state-wide leadership conference.
 - Objective 1.6 Conduct of a state-wide conference involving education, government, private employers and community agencies.
 - Objective 1.7 Conduct of a state-wide awareness session for representatives of teacher education programs.
 - Objective 1.8 Conduct of regional workshops for counselors.
-
- Objective 1.2 Provision of awareness sessions for local boards of education.
 - Objective 2.4 Adoption or development of infused curriculum guides in basic skills.
 - Objective 2.7 Establishment of career education resource centers.
 - Objective 3.2 Purchase of instructional and career guidance materials.

Limitations

The limited time (three months, following the last month of project operation) specified for the evaluation of leadership activities handicapped the evaluators in three ways:

- 1) The evaluation could not be considered external in the strictest sense since all data-gathering instruments had been designed by others. There was no overall evaluation plan, so the fragments of data made available to the evaluators on a post hoc basis had to be patched together to form a sometimes less than coherent picture of leadership activities during 1979-80.
- 2) The evaluators were not able to attend a State Advisory Council meeting or visit a local project. Thus the State Coordinator was the only person associated with the project with whom the evaluators had face-to-face contact.
- 3) The evaluators were not able to provide the State Coordinator with management information based on evaluation findings throughout the project year.

The wisdom of designating only 15 percent of a relatively small base allocation for state-wide leadership activities in a state as geographically spread out as Tennessee is questionable. The State Coordinator needed all of her limited leadership funds for programming and travel. She is to be commended for her efficiency in saving for purposes of funding an external evaluation even the small amount which eventually was awarded.

Organization of Evaluation Report

The evaluation report contains nine sections. The first is an introduction, the last a summary and list of recommendations. Each of the seven intervening sections includes an assessment of one of the elements of the State Plan:

- Section 2. Administration/Coordination Activities of State Coordinator
- Section 3. Advisory Council
- Section 4. Technical Assistance Workshops
- Section 5. Bias/Stereotyping Workshop
- Section 6. Counselor Workshops
- Section 7. Career Education Festival
- Section 8. Final Reports from Local Projects

SECTION 2

ADMINISTRATION/COORDINATION ACTIVITIES OF STATE COORDINATOR

Evaluation of the accomplishment of some of the Career Education Coordinator's activities was based primarily or solely on information supplied to the Coordinators by the Coordinator herself through verbal or written communications or through her final report.

In the area of administration and coordination for the planning and evaluation of career education within the State (Goal A), data cited in the final report verified that:

- .the State Plan met the requirements of PL95-207 (Subgoal A1),
- .the State Plan had been implemented in accordance with State and Federal regulations (Subgoal A2) with the exception that the list of consultants was not yet finalized for distribution to LEAs (this was accomplished during January 1981, however), and
- .a time-line for project activities had been developed (Subgoal A3).

In providing leadership and coordination for the awareness and promotion of career education within the State (Goal B), one activity was deferred--involvement of teacher preparation institutions in a one-day awareness session (Subgoal B1). The Career Education Advisory Council was organized as specified and appropriately utilized in the development, implementation, and revision of the State Plan (Subgoal B2).

Several objectives included in the State Plan specified a criterion against which to judge success of implementation. The criterion was, in most cases, the percentage of local projects accomplishing the objective. The State Coordinator's review of local projects in her final report indicated that the criterion level specified for 1979-80 was reached for all criterion-based administration/coordination objectives (see Table 1).

With respect to her administration/coordination objectives, the Career Education Coordinator's efforts met or exceeded criteria set for her objectives in all except two activities--one of which was in progress at the end of the project year and the other of which had been initiated but delayed in order to achieve greater effectiveness. The participation of local projects in achieving the stated objectives reflected the extent to which the Coordinator made local project directors aware of the need to exert their own energies to promote career education.

TABLE 1
ACCOMPLISHMENT OF STATE COORDINATOR'S CRITERION--
BASED ADMINISTRATION/COORDINATION OBJECTIVES

Objective	Subgoal	Per Cent of Projects Accomplishing the Objective																			
		0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95
Sent representative to workshop on bias/stereotyping	A4	-----> *****																			
Sent State Department the results of a local needs assessment	B1	-----> *****																			
Sent from the local Board of Education a policy statement or letter of support for Career Education to the State Department of Education	C1	-----> *****																			
Had local plans reviewed by district team of Career Education Specialists	C1	-----> *****																			
Provided training for part or fulltime career education coordinator employed by participating system	C2	-----> *****																			
Developed a curriculum guide in a basic skill area	C2	-----> *****																			

10

Legend
-----> Criterion Level
***** Level of accomplishment

SECTION 3

ADVISORY COUNCIL

The establishment and operation of the State Advisory Council were responsibilities of the State Career Education Coordinator. How, when, and if the Council functioned were at the discretion of the Coordinator. The stated role of the Advisory Council in Tennessee was to provide "advice and assistance to the State Coordinator on matters related to management and implementation of the State Plan for Career Education."

The Coordinator related impressions about the functioning of the State Advisory Council, but it was felt by the evaluators that views of the Council members themselves should be obtained. While it would have been preferable to meet with the Council members to determine their perceptions of the functioning of the Council, this was not possible due to financial limitations and to the fact that the Council was not scheduled to meet prior to the time the evaluation was to be completed. Information was obtained from State Advisory Council members by means of a survey conducted by mail in December 1980.

Replies were received from 19 of the 24 Advisory Council members. Table 2 contains a summary of members' responses. Council members indicated that in general the State Coordinator's objectives had been met. Council members, almost without exception, supported the stated role of the State Advisory Council and felt that it accurately described the role they had played during 1979-80.

In addition to reviewing proposals, Council members actively participated in developing goals and objectives, establishing time lines, making decisions, and reviewing and revising the State Plan (84% or more of those responding indicated such involvement.). Ten of 17 (59%) respondents reported that they had been actively involved in disseminating the State Plan to local education agencies, while 10 of 18 Council members responding (56%) reported having actively participated in publicizing career education activities on a local or regional basis.

The mean effectiveness rating given the Advisory Council by the members was 7.7 on a 9-point scale, with 9 defined as "Very Effective", 5 as "Ineffective", and 1 as "Detrimental".

Council members expressed positive assessments of the guidelines used for reviewing proposals (mean=6.6 on a 9-point scale where 9="Very Good", 5="Adequate", and 1="Very Poor"). The State Coordinator indicated that some dissatisfaction had been expressed and that efforts to revise the guidelines had already been undertaken.

Comments on the survey form indicated that in general Advisory Council members endorsed the way in which the Council functioned during 1979-80. Two suggestions, each of which was offered by more than one person, were for regional meetings and for more meetings and/or more time to meet (Item 10).

The members of the Advisory Council seemed to feel that they had been effective in fulfilling the role assigned to them and that the role was the appropriate one for the State Advisory Council. Few changes were suggested.

In most respects the State Advisory Council functioning was consistent with the relevant Subgoals (A3 and B2) and often exceeded the criterion levels which had been established. Subgoal B2 was specific with reference to various functions of the Advisory Council. Members reported that the Council did function in accordance with the stated objectives. Although 65% participation in reviewing proposals was the criterion, 18 of the 19 responding (94%) reported being involved in this activity. Ten of 18 publicized career education activities on a regional basis, greatly exceeding the three-member criterion. Ten of 17 Council members participated in the dissemination of the State Plan to LEAs (there was no stated percentage of Council members set as a criterion for this activity).

In summary, the State Coordinator established and operated an effective Advisory Council during 1979-80. The Advisory Council membership had only one recommendation for improvement: More Advisory Council meetings. If funds could be committed, more Council meetings should be held in 1980-81.

TABLE 2
RESPONSES TO ADVISORY COUNCIL SURVEY

ITEM

The Tennessee Coordinator of Career Education, Mrs. Sadie Chandler, has defined the role of the Career Education Advisory Council as one of providing "advice and assistance to the State Coordinator on matters related to management and implementation of the State Plan for Career Education."

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. As a member of the Career Education Advisory Council, do you agree that this <u>should</u> be the role of the Advisory Council for Career Education in Tennessee? If not, please describe the role <u>you</u> think the Advisory Council should play. This is one role. In addition, to advise the State Board of Education on the direction, etc.; of Career Education in Tennessee.	18	1	19
2. Does Mrs. Chandler's statement accurately describe the <u>actual</u> role of the Advisory Council during 1979-80? If not, how has the role actually played by the Advisory Council differed from that described above by the State Director of Career Education? Plus screening proposals, gave opinions and evaluation.	19	0	19
3. Did the Advisory Council <u>actively participate</u> in developing <u>goals</u> for the Tennessee State Plan for Career Education?	19	0	19
4. Did the Advisory Council <u>actively participate</u> in developing <u>objectives</u> for the Tennessee State Plan for Career Education?	18	1	19
5. Did the Advisory Council <u>actively participate</u> in establishing timelines for the Tennessee State Plan for Career Education?	16	3	19
6. Did the Advisory Council <u>actively participate</u> in disseminating the State Plan to LEAs?	10	7	17
7. Did the Advisory Council <u>actively participate</u> in decision-making?	16	3	19

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

	Yes	No	Total																												
What kinds of decisions should have been made by someone else, in your opinion?																															
A panel of readers should be utilized on project proposals rather than advisory council members since some advisory council members submit proposals from their school system.																															
This involvement seems at the correct level for decision-making.																															
Only in an advisory capacity.																															
8. Did the Advisory Council <u>actively participate</u> in reviewing and revising the State Plan for 1979-80?	16	3	19																												
9. On a scale of 1 to 9, rate the effectiveness of the Advisory Council (as a group) in developing, implementing, and revising the 1979-80 State Plan for Career Education in Tennessee.																															
Rating	<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">Detrimental</td> <td colspan="3">Ineffective</td> <td colspan="2">Very Effective</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number</td> <td colspan="4"></td> <td>7</td><td>11</td><td>1</td><td colspan="2"></td> </tr> </table>				Detrimental		Ineffective			Very Effective			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Number					7	11	1		
	Detrimental		Ineffective			Very Effective																									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9																						
Number					7	11	1																								
Mean=7.7																															
10. In what way(s) could the effectiveness of the Advisory Council be improved?																															
Opportunity to meet more often and subcommittee meetings.																															
Hearings could be held on a regional basis by the council to determine items of priority for career education. Findings could be reported to the State Board and be included in the revision of the State plan.																															
More time together.																															
Format to recognize and help expand efforts from all agencies.																															
Regional meetings																															
Develop a better instrument/method to evaluate proposals																															
In the future, more involvement in the review of existing project evaluations in order to make better decisions on upcoming proposals and dissemination of funds.																															
Possibly more time to meet so meetings would not need to be so long when we do meet.																															
Members of Council work well and hard together in minimum length of time to accomplish duties.																															

14

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

	Yes	No	Total
11. Were you involved in reviewing proposals?	18	1	19

How many proposals did you review?

18 all submitted

1 no

12. How would you rate the guidelines for reviewing proposals?

	Very Poor			Adequate				Very Good	
Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number	1			2	1	2	7	4	2

Mean=6.6

13. Have you actively participated in publicizing Career Education activities on a local or regional basis?	10	8	18
---	----	---	----

SECTION 4

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS

During 1979 three regional-technical assistance workshops were planned and conducted by the State Career Education Coordinator to provide an overview of career education for LEAs and to assist them in understanding how to develop a proposal for a local career education project.

A total of 92 persons attended the three technical assistance workshops: 29 in East Tennessee, 24 in Middle Tennessee, and 39 in West Tennessee. Over 47% of the participants completed evaluation forms at the conclusion of their workshop.

The first 11 items on the evaluation form (See Table 3) pertained to characteristics of presenters/speakers, on which they were rated as truly outstanding; superior; good; fair, average; below average; poor. Almost without exception, the majority of participant responses to these items were positive. It should be noted that the rating categories provided greater differentiation in the positive direction than in the negative since there were three above-average options and only one below-average option.

Speakers/presenters were rated highest on knowledge of subject matter (Item 4), with 98% rating them as "superior" or "truly outstanding"; and lowest on flexibility and responsiveness to problems and needs of participants (Item 1), on which 36% rated them "good" or "fair." Respondents generally viewed the speakers/presenters as tolerant, interested in subject matter, having clear workshop objectives, agreeing between objectives and what was discussed, and keeping participants involved. Eighty-three percent of the respondents rated the overall conduct of workshop "superior" or "truly outstanding."

The second part of the evaluation form consisted of eight items that described aspects of the workshop other than the speakers/presenters. Responses to items in this section also were generally positive, although both workshop facilities (Item 17) and opportunity to interact with other workshop participants (Item 13) were not marked positively by 30 percent of the participants (See Table 3.).

Item 21 (See "Responses to Item 21") asked respondents to list one or two things done especially well in the workshop. The responses can be classified in three general categories: workshop organization, content, and presenters. Workshop organization was most frequently mentioned as one of the things done well. Discussion of the proposal was specifically mentioned by eight people, the handout materials and use of audiovisual materials by four each. The interest and enthusiasm of the speakers, the State Coordinator in particular, were also commended by the participants.

For Item 22 (See "Responses to Item 22"), "Comments or Suggestions", there was much less duplication of responses. Some positive comments reiterated those given in response to Item 21, particularly with reference to the organization for the workshop itself. Some suggestions could be applied to future projects (listing the site in advance publicity notices, having shorter sessions) while others were more relevant to the technical assistance workshop itself or to other workshops on the same topic.

Since there was not much duplication among responses to Item 22, there is little indication that many changes were desired by the participants. The responses to the whole evaluation instrument were primarily positive in nature and indicated participant approval of the way in which the technical assistance workshops were planned and carried out.

Through the technical assistance workshops, the State Department of Education provided technical assistance for the development of career education program proposals which subsequently received financial assistance (Subgoal C1). Perhaps more indicative of effectiveness than the positive tenor of the ratings given on the evaluation forms is the fact that of the eighteen workshop participants who developed and submitted proposals, all received funding. Three additional LEAs sought and received individual assistance from the State Coordinator to develop proposals which also received funding. The efforts of the State Coordinator with respect to Subgoal C1 were shown to be quite effective since LEAs that participated in the workshops and later developed career education program proposals were successful in their attempts to gain funding.

TABLE 3

PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES TO EVALUATIVE QUESTIONS CONCERNING
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS

	Truly Outstanding	Superior	Good	Fair Average	Below Average Poor	Missing
1. Flexibility and responsiveness to problems and needs of participants.	14%	50%	32%	4%		
2. Tolerance: Participants feel free to ask questions, disagree, express their ideas, etc.	34%	45%	16%	5%		
3. Interest in subject matter of workshop sessions.	41%	50%	9%			
4. Knowledge of subject matter of workshop sessions.	48%	50%	2%			
5. Organized presentation of materials and subject matter.	32%	50%	16%	2%		
6. Clarity of interpretations and explanations of subject matter.	23%	57%	20%			
7. Emphasis on important materials and subject matter.	18%	68%	14%			
8. Clarity of workshop objectives.	34%	55%	11%			
9. Agreement between objectives of the workshop and what was actually discussed.	32%	50%	18%			
10. Ability to keep me involved in workshop learning activities.	16%	50%	29%			5%
Overall conduct of workshop.	23%	59%	18%			

TABLE 3 (Continued)

(Response alternatives consisted of a series of faces with negative, neutral, and positive expressions)

	--	-	Neutral	+	++	Missing
12. Opportunity to participate in active learning.	2%		14%	52%	32%	
13. Opportunity to interact with other workshop participants.	2%	5%	23%	45%	25%	
14. Opportunity in interact with project staff.		5%	2%	57%	36%	
15. Advance information about workshop.		5%	14%	45%	34%	2%
16. Orientation during opening sessions.			9%	57%	34%	
17. Workshop facilities.			30%	38%	32%	
19. Organizational details.		2%	2%	64%	32%	
20. Usefulness of information.		2%	5%	45%	48%	

N = 44

Responses to Item 21

21. List or describe one or two things you thought were done especially well in this workshop.

Workshop Organization

Organization and timing of workshop - 12*

Handouts, resource materials - 4

Films, audio-visuals - 4

Structure and content

Content

Introduction of many facets of Career Education (overview) - 5

Definition of Career Education

Explanation of subject matter, forms - 3

Walking through proposal format - 2

Organization of application

Technical data

Specific information to include

Discussion of proposal preparation

Explaining state guide

Useful information - 3

Types of projects that can be funded

Sex stereotyping

What is being done elsewhere

Not giving a definite amount of money, especially to larger systems

Presenters

Guest speakers - 4

Presentations - 3

Willingness of staff to answer all questions - 2

Presenters (continued)

Sadie's presentation, enthusiasm - 2

Attitude of presenters - 2

Enthusiasm of staff - 2

Interest and enthusiasm of participants

*The number of participants giving this response if given by more than one person.

Responses to Item 22

22. List any comments or suggestions about workshop details.

Positive comments

Good overview

Well planned to meet needs of those present

Well organized and presented.

Very positive

Sadie's enthusiasm

Good workshop

Good meeting

Presentations

Too much lecture, needed probing questions asked of participants to generate discussion and interaction

More direct answers about questions concerning career education and how to begin

Do not read objectives when presented on overhead, give important facts in own words

Organization and Facilities

More opportunity to interact with staff over proposal development

More time to talk with others in the group

Shorter sessions

Later starting time

Invite practitioner rather than only supervisors

More sales representatives to familiarize participants with existing career education materials

Better parking

The building in which the workshop was to be conducted should have been included in Advance Information Announcement

Content

The only new information was on project writing

More time on a more thorough study of the manual

Unsure about needs and objectives in the application

General

Amount of money suggested as a top limit caused our system to decide not to submit

The amount of money for salaries to put the plan together would exceed the grant

Added personnel needed

SECTION 5

BIAS/STEREOTYPING WORKSHOP

Leadership at the state level to sensitize project personnel and to initiate progress toward eliminating bias and stereotyping based on race, age, sex, economic status, handicap, and national origin was shown in the organization of a state-wide workshop. The workshop, entitled "Combating Sex, Age, Race and Handicap Bias/Stereotyping in Career Education", was conducted April 8, 1980 in Nashville under the joint sponsorship of the Tennessee Department of Education and the American Institute for Research (AIR).

Twenty-three of 46 individuals in attendance at the workshop completed an 18-item instrument prepared by AIR personnel both at the beginning of the workshop and at its conclusion as part of an effort to measure change in attitudes. The original presentation of data from the evaluation instrument compiled by AIR (See Table 4) listed pretest item frequencies and means independent of posttest item frequencies and means. The evaluators were not given sufficient information to determine whether the same 23 persons completed the instrument both times. Even if that were the case, there was no way of matching the responses of individuals given on the two occasions, which would have resulted in a greater chance of detecting significant changes than was possible when the two sets of data were considered to be unrelated. Another factor which cannot be overlooked is that respondents completed the same instrument on both occasions. Having taken the pretest may well have sensitized participants to items of content, causing them to attach greater importance to those items when presented and to remember them on the posttest.

The instrument consisted of five statements related to the disabled, five concerning sex differences, and four each focusing on the elderly and on racial differences. Each of the 18 items was rated on a five-point Likert scale with 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree. The greatest change in rating was recorded on Item 4 ("There is relatively little in the women's movement for men."). From a pretest mean of 2.3, the posttest mean of 1.4 showed almost a full rating point gain in the direction of greater disagreement. Item 8 ("There is too little concern for the mental health of the elderly") increased by .80 from pretest to posttest, while increases of .70 were found for each of three statements: Item 3 ("The main point of the women's movement is to build trust and new kinds of partnerships among men and women"), Item 7 ("Educational opportunities are increasing for older people."), and Item 16 ("Schools still do not offer equal academic preparation to students of all races.").

Application of statistical tests to pretest and posttest scores (independent t-tests) for individual items showed significant changes for the five items previously listed and for Item 9 ("Older people are increasingly being seen as capable workers"), which evidenced an increase of .60.

Three of the four items related to the elderly manifested significant change, while none of the items related to bias due to handicapping conditions showed significant change. Whether this is a reflection of the emphasis given the various topics during the workshop, or the extent of previous knowledge in the various areas, cannot be determined from the results obtained by administering this instrument. The summary of instrument responses which was provided to the evaluators by AIR included no information regarding reliability or validity of the instrument, so it must be assumed that neither had been established.

Information supplied by the State Coordinator indicated that 75% of the funded projects (15/20) sent representatives to the bias/stereotyping workshop. This exceeded the criterion level of 60% stated in Subgoal A4 for 1979-80. In terms of effectiveness, analysis of pretest-posttest scores indicated a tendency toward reduction of bias and stereotyping behavior among participants, with the most noticeable changes occurring in the areas of age and sex discrimination.

TABLE 4 (Continued)

	Pretest ^a							Posttest ^a							Diff.	p
	n	1	2	3	4	5	\bar{x}	n	1	2	3	4	5	\bar{x}		
Disabled individuals tend to miss a lot of work.	22	14	6	0	1	1	1.6	21	17	2	2	0	0	1.3	-0.3	
Disabled people do not have equal job opportunities.	22	2	1	2	11	6	3.8	21	1	1	2	9	8	4.0	+0.2	
Race discrimination on the job is less of a problem than in the past.	23	2	3	5	10	3	3.4	22	2	5	4	7	4	3.3	-0.1	
Schools still do not offer equal academic preparation to students of all races.	23	4	4	7	7	1	2.9	23	0	2	9	8	4	3.6	+0.7	.021
Race is still a factor in career tracking of students.	23	1	4	5	11	2	3.4	22	1	1	5	12	3	3.7	+0.3	
Schools have lessened race stereotyping substantially in recent years.	23	0	1	6	14	2	3.7	23	1	2	8	10	2	3.4	-0.3	

^a Respondents rated each item on a five-part scale; 1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree.

^b Two-tailed probabilities for independent t-test significant beyond .05.

TABLE 4 (Continued)

	Pretest ^a							Posttest ^a							Diff.	p
	n	1	2	3	4	5	\bar{x}	n	1	2	3	4	5	\bar{x}		
Disabled individuals tend to miss a lot of work.	22	14	6	0	1	1	1.6	21	17	2	2	0	0	1.3	-0.3	
Disabled people do not have equal job opportunities.	22	2	1	2	11	6	3.8	21	1	1	2	9	8	4.0	+0.2	
Race discrimination on the job is less of a problem than in the past.	23	2	3	5	10	3	3.4	22	2	5	4	7	4	3.3	-0.1	
Schools still do not offer equal academic preparation to students of all races.	23	4	4	7	7	1	2.9	23	0	2	9	8	4	3.6	+0.7	.021
Race is still a factor in career tracking of students.	23	1	4	5	11	2	3.4	22	1	1	5	12	3	3.7	+0.3	
Schools have lessened race stereotyping substantially in recent years.	23	0	1	6	14	2	3.7	23	1	2	8	10	2	3.4	-0.3	

^a Respondents rated each item on a five-part scale; 1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree.

^b Two-tailed probabilities for independent t-test significant beyond .05.

SECTION 6

COUNSELOR WORKSHOPS

Three regional career education workshops were sponsored for counselors by the State Department of Education in an attempt to further develop their knowledge about career education. Attendance was 40 in Middle Tennessee on November 16, 1979 at Murfreesboro; 51 at Reelfoot Lake Park on November 16-17, 1979 for East Tennessee; and 52 at the West Tennessee workshop, which was conducted February 15-16, 1980 at Maryville. Topics presented to the 143 counselors who attended the three workshops included sex equality, activities to eliminate stereotyping, and career education assessment and techniques. Although evaluation activities were conducted, no data were made available to the State Coordinator or to the evaluators.

Evaluation might have provided some insight into the lack of attendance at the counselor workshops. Since not all funds available to pay expenses for participants were expended, cost to participants was not a likely cause for lack of attendance. In order to determine why the Coordinator's criterion level of participation by 25% of the State's approximately 1,000 counselors was not reached, some type of follow-up would have been necessary. Since this activity was not to be continued in the State Plan, there seems little point in further investigation at this time.

SECTION 7

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL

Introduction

A state-wide leadership conference, the Career Education Festival, was organized and conducted by the State Career Education Coordinator to provide information about funded projects in the State; to inform conferees about current developments in career education on the national level; and to stimulate greater involvement of other LEAs, community agencies and professional organizations in career education in Tennessee.

The Career Education Festival was sponsored by the Tennessee Department of Education on July 15, 16, and 17, 1980 at Gatlinburg, Tennessee. One hundred and fifty persons attended. In addition to speakers on general career education topics, 19 of the 20 funded state projects shared information about their projects. Three types of evaluation were utilized during the Career Education Festival: A "Pre-conference/Post-conference Assessment", individual mini-session rating forms, and evaluation of the general session speakers.

Career Education Assessment

Participants were asked to complete a checklist (the "Pre-conference/Post-conference Assessment") that contained ten items designed to indicate whether they felt they possessed adequate or inadequate knowledge with reference to various workshop objectives. Nine people checked each item on both pre- and post-conference bases, while an additional eight responded only in terms of pre-conference knowledge. Those who checked pre- and post-conference knowledge did so on the same form. The total of 17 represents 11% of those attending, although it cannot be determined how many of the total of 150 were present throughout the Festival.

According to the responses received, the greatest lack of information before the conference was in knowing where career education projects were in operation in Tennessee (Item 8), on which 10 of the 17 participants felt their knowledge was inadequate (see Table 5). In contrast, only two people initially felt they could not adequately define career education (Item 1). Six of the 17 felt they lacked sufficient knowledge to use the Dictionary of Occupational Titles as a reference to identify jobs (Item 3). Of the ten items, only Items 8 and 3 were checked by one-third or more of the participants as those about which they had insufficient knowledge. If the ten items represented the objectives of the Festival, the pre-conference data indicated that a different audience might have gained more from the Festival than the one that attended.

Those who completed the Pre-conference Assessment represented various groups and levels of knowledge. Among the participants who responded were three teachers, three counselors, three project directors, three state department employees, two advisory council members, one local educational agency representative, one county representative, and one higher education representative. Two of the project directors, two state department employees, and one advisory council member indicated that they felt they had adequate knowledge on all items before the conference. The needs of the others, by position, are presented in Table 6. Although the numbers were too small to be representative, information of this type would be helpful in planning future conferences with regard to which populations to serve and what needs to address.

On the Post-conference Assessment the only item for which all nine participants checked "adequate knowledge" was Item 7 (offering suggestions to teachers for implementing career education activities). One person did not

Table 5

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL
PRE-CONFERENCE/POST-CONFERENCE ASSESSMENT
KNOWLEDGE OF GOALS

	Pre-conference Knowledge (n=17)		Post-conference Knowledge (n=9)		
	Adequate	Inadequate	Adequate	Inadequate	Missing
1. Adequately define Career Education.	15	2	8		1
2. Design appropriate learning experiences for career education activities.	12	5	8	1	
3. Use the Dictionary of Occupational Titles as a reference to identify jobs.	11	6	6	3	
4. Offer suggestions to teachers for implementing career education activities.	13	4	9		
5. Identify the 15 Occupational Clusters defined by U.S.O.E.	12	5	8	1	
6. Compile a resource file of persons who might be willing to share an occupational experience.	13	4	5	2	1
7. Assist in designing hands on activities which involve the student directly in learning experiences.	12	5	7	1	1
8. Know where Career Education projects are in operation in Tennessee.	7	10	8		1
9. Aware of current literature and attitudes about the changing role of women and men in the work force and the home.	13	4	8		1
10. Assist in designing values classification activities for students based on the premise that individuals differ in their interests, abilities, attitudes and values.	13	4	7	1	1

Table 6

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL
PRE-CONFERENCE/POST-CONFERENCE ASSESSMENT
RESPONSES BY POSITION OF RESPONDENT

	Number	Number indicating inadequacy	PRE TEST									
			Number indicating inadequate knowledge by item									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teacher	3	3		2	3	2	3	1	1	3	1	1
Counselor	3	3	1	1		1		2	1	3	1	1
Project Director	3	1	1	1					1	1		
State Department Employee	3	1			1		1		1		1	
Advisory Council	2	1			1							
Higher Education	1	1				1			1	1	1	1
County Representative	1	1		1				1		1		1
Local Educational Agency	1	1			1		1			1		
TOTAL	17	12	2	5	6	4	5	4	5	10	4	4

POST-TEST

	Number	Number indicating inadequacy	Number indicating inadequate knowledge by item									
			ITEM									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teacher	3	2		1	2		1	1	1			
Counselors	2	0										
Advisory Council	2	0										
County Representative	1	1						1				1
State Department Employee	1	1			1		1					
TOTAL	9	5	0	1	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	1

respond to Item 1 (adequately define career education), but all eight who did respond felt they had adequate knowledge. One-third (3 of 9) still felt inadequate in using the Dictionary of Occupational Titles as a reference to identify jobs (Item 3), so that the percentage of those who felt a need in this respect remained about the same at the end as at the beginning of the conference.

Of those who completed both Pre- and Post-conference Assessments and indicated feelings of inadequacy on one or more items on the Pre-assessment, 62 percent expressed feelings of adequacy on the Post-assessment (See Table 7).

Table 7

PARTICIPANTS' CHANGE AND LACK OF CHANGE DURING CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL

Item	Pre-conference Inadequate- Post-conference Adequate	Pre-conference Adequate- Post-conference Inadequate
1	0	0
2	2	1
3	2	3
4	2	0
5	2	1
6	0	3
7	0	1
8	6	0
9	1	0
10	1	1
	TOTAL 16	10

N=9

Use of a binomial test for significance shows that the overall difference is not significant if the probability of change were 0 = .50, $p = .1587$). It should be noted, however, that all six participants who checked Item 8 as "inadequate" before the Festival gained competence. In contrast, none of the three who checked Item 6 as "inadequate" improved during the Festival to the point of feeling "adequate".

There is no way to determine which (or how many) Festival activities were attended by each of the participants. Therefore, what each learned or failed to learn may be due, in part, to their own selection of activities at the Festival.

The assessment instrument itself contained some items which related to specific knowledge and information, such as the use of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (Item 3), identifying the 15 occupational clusters (Item 5), knowing where career education projects were in Tennessee (Item 8), awareness of current literature and attitudes about the changing role of women and men in the work force and the home (Item 9). Other items represented knowledge of a "how to" nature: design appropriate learning experiences for career education activities (Item 2), offer suggestions to teachers for implementing career education activities (Item 4), compile a resource file of persons who might be willing to share an occupational experience (Item 6), assist in designing hands-on activities which involve the student directly in learning experiences (Item 7), assist in designing values classification (sic) activities for students based on the premise that individuals differ in their interests, abilities, attitudes and values (Item 10).

The relatively small number of people who completed the assessment instrument weakened the impact of any information derived from it. A pre-test/post-test design can be useful in determining the effectiveness of a program if it can be determined that the instrument measures changes which are likely to occur because of the program. With respect to two of the items (3 and 6), there might be some question as to the appropriateness of including them in the instrument since hoped-for changes did not occur in the percentages of people who felt knowledgeable in regard to them. There should be a correspondence between items on the evaluation instrument and stated objectives. Overall, the post-test results were positive, however many of those attending felt adequate before the conference.

The assessment forms were distributed during the first session and at registration. There was no control over when participants completed the forms, however, so it is possible that data coded as "Pre-conference" or "Post-conference" may have been marked at the same time. In addition, participants who submitted both Pre- and Post-conference data did so on the same form.

In light of these facts, any evidence of change obtained on this instrument is questionable since it cannot be determined when "Pre-Conference" and "Post-conference" Assessments were done by the individuals.

General Session Speakers

A total of 20 participants rated one or more of the four general sessions at the Career Education Festival. Included among the 20 were four counselors, two teachers, two advisory council members, three local education agency staff members, one project director, one state department employee, one librarian, and one county representative (see Table 8). The four general session programs included: an address by Dr. Sam Betances on the opening day, banquet speaker Dr. Sidney High, a panel discussion on the final day moderated by Carol Thigpen, and luncheon speaker Dr. Edward C. Mann. Evaluations of the four programs were completed by 19, 17, 16, and 14 people, respectively (see Table 9). Each program was evaluated individually on six items, and all four program evaluations were listed on a single form.

There were no negative ratings of Dr. Betances' presentation. Dr. Mann's address was not rated as positively, particularly with respect to Items 4 and 5 ("I was stimulated to think about the topic presented" and "The session met my expectations.") Unsolicited comments indicated Dr. Mann's speech was thought to be too long, applicable for those not already knowledgeable, and that he lacked knowledge of his audience.

Dr. High's banquet address was rated lower than Dr. Mann's on the same two items (4 and 5), although both speakers were seen as well informed on the subject (Item 3) and the content they presented was applicable to the development of career education (Item 6).

The panel discussion was rated positively, with the lowest mean being that of 4.0, which corresponds to "Agree" on the 5-point scale that was used.

A concluding comment by one participant stated that "most speakers contributed no new ideas, just a rehashing of ideas and information which is common knowledge among those of us involved in career education."

General reactions to the main speakers were positive, however the small number of completed evaluations is consistent with the other evaluation results from the Festival.

Mini Sessions

Reports on 19 of the 20 projects were presented during each of two different 30-minute time periods on Wednesday, July 16. Evaluation forms were provided so that those attending could complete a rating form for each mini session attended.

Seven of the 19 projects submitted no rating forms for either of their two sessions, three projects submitted one form, and three other projects submitted two forms (see Table 10). Of the 19 projects participating, only three submitted a total of ten or more rating forms for both sessions (Projects 12, 13, and 15). An additional three project directors turned in five or seven forms each (Projects 3, 4, and 8).

In general, the ratings given the mini sessions were favorable (see Table 10). Items 6 and 11 were worded so that a favorable rating was indicated by "Strongly Disagree" while all other items were favorable if the participants agreed with the items. The highest percentage of disagreement or unfavorable sentiment occurred on Item 9 (This session met my expectations), but even in this case, only nine percent of the participants indicated unfavorable reactions to the sessions.

Responses on the rating forms indicated that the presenters were relatively successful with respect to the 14 evaluation items (See Table 11). However, the low number of forms submitted leaves some question as to the extent to which the respondents represented the diversity of the group of participants who attended the sessions. The number of ratings probably is primarily a measure of the conscientiousness of the presenter in encouraging people to turn them in and bears little relationship to actual attendance.

In general, results of the evaluations carried out for the Festival were positive. There seems little doubt that it was a positive, constructive experience for those who participated. However, while various specific aspects of the Festival were targeted for evaluation as well as the overall project, the same low response rate characterizes all three evaluation efforts. It is unfortunate that the time and effort spent in planning the evaluation and preparing the forms did not produce enough data upon which to formulate conclusions which could be considered representative of the group.

The collection of evaluation data needs to be more systematic, and evaluation instruments must be designed in light of stated objectives. If a pre-test/post-test instrument is to be used, care must be exercised to insure that data are collected at the appropriate times.

Information from the State Coordinator indicate that all but one of the funded projects (95%) attended the conference. This considerably exceeded the 65% target established in Subgoal B1. The Career Education Festival, or a similar event, seems to have great potential for providing a stimulus for career education in Tennessee if more people, particularly those not already involved in funded projects, could be reached. Comments from participants indicated that presentations were good and would have been helpful for others, but those involved in funded projects were relatively well acquainted with the topics presented.

Table 8

GENERAL SESSION SPEAKERS

Participants Completing Evaluation Forms

Counselors	4
Local Educational Agency Staff	3
Project Director	1
State Department Employee	1
Librarian	1
Advisory Council Member	2
Teacher	2
County Representative	1
Unknown	4
	<hr/>
	TOTAL 19

TABLE 9
 CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL
 General Session Evaluations

JULY 15, 1980
 MAIN ADDRESS
 DR. SAM BETANCES

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Mean*
1. The objectives of the session were clear.	14	5				4.74
2. The purposes of the session were realistic.	17	2				4.90
3. The presenter was well informed on the subject.	18	1				4.90
4. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented.	17	2				4.89
5. The session met my expectations.	17	1	1			4.84
6. The content presented was applicable to the development of career education.	17	1	1			4.84

= 19

High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating.

General Session Evaluations (continued)

II. JULY 16, 1980
 BANQUET: MAIN ADDRESS
 DR. SIDNEY HIGH

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Mean*
1. The objectives of the session were clear.	6	8	2	1		4.12
2. The purposes of the session were realistic..	5	8	3	1		4.0
3. The presenter was well informed on the subject.	10	7				4.59
4. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented	2	5	3	6	1	3.06
5. The session met my expectations.	2		6	7	2	2.47
6. The content presented was applicable to the development of career education.	6	8	2			4.25

N = 17

* High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating.

General Session Evaluations (continued)

II. JULY 17, 1980
PANEL DISCUSSION
CAROL THIGPEN, MODERATOR

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Mean*
1. The objectives of the session were clear.	9	7				4.56
2. The purposes of the session were realistic.	8	7	1			4.44
3. The panel members were well informed on the subject.	11	4	1			4.63
4. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented.	6	8		2		4.13
5. The session met my expectations.	3	11	1	1		4.0
6. The content presented was applicable to the development of career education.	8	8				4.5

N = 16

* High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating.

General Session Evaluations (continued)

IV. JULY 17, 1980
LUNCHEON
DR. EDWARD C. MANN

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Mean*
1. The objectives of the session was clear.	7	4	3			4.29
2. The purpose of the session were realistic.	6	4	4			4.14
3. The presenter was well informed on the subject.	8	4	1	1		4.36
4. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented.	2	6	3	1	1	3.54
5. The session met my expectations.	2	7	3	1	1	3.57
6. The content presented was applicable to the development of career education.	6	7	1			4.36

N = 14

* High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating.

TABLE 10

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL

Mean Ratings by Item for Mini Sessions

Project ^a	Nb	ITEM													
		1. The objectives of the session were clear to me.	2. The purpose of this session were realistic.	3. The material presented was valuable to me.	4. The Presenter was well informed on the subject.	5. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented.	6. The information presented was too theoretical.	7. This presenter related theory to practice.	8. This session followed a logical and appropriate pattern.	9. This session met my expectations.	10. I have in mind a plan for future action.	11. The information presented was too advanced.	12. The content presented was applicable to development of Career Education.	13. Reference materials provided were appropriate.	14. This session will help me assist teachers in designing career education activities for students.
3	7	4.29	4.29	3.71	4.29	3.86	1.71*	3.71	4.0	3.71	4.14	2.14*	4.29	3.57	3.71
4	5	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4	4.6	1.8*	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.0	1.6*	4.2	4.4	4.4
7	1	4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0*	2.0	3.0	2.0		3.0*	4.0	1.0	1.0
8	5	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.6	4.5	2.6*	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.2	2.4*	4.6	4.2	4.2
9	1	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0*	2.0	2.0	1.0		1.0*	2.0	1.0	2.0
10	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	2.0**	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0*	4.0	4.0	4.0
11	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.5*	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	1.5*	4.5	4.5	4.0
12	12	4.08	3.92	3.83	4.58	3.83	2.45*	3.45	4.17	3.75	4.33	2.0*	4.17	4.03	3.58
13	15	4.47	4.67	4.5	4.8	4.67	1.86*	4.6	4.47	4.53	4.0	1.6*	4.67	4.0	4.2
14	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5	1.2*	4.5	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.5*	4.5	4.0	3.0
15	10	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.2	1.78*	3.88	4.33	4.11	3.89	2.0**	4.4	3.75	4.38
16	3	4.67	5.0	4.33	5.0	4.67	1.33*	4.33	4.33	5.0	3.67	1.33*	4.67	4.0	4.0
20	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	1.5*	4.5	5.0	4.5	3.5	1.5*	5.0	4.5	3.5

*High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating except for items 6 and 11.

^a Accompanying list of projects.^b Number of completed rating forms.

TABLE 11
 CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL
 MINI-SESSION RATINGS
 (OVERALL PERCENTAGES)

Item **	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Missing
1	38	56	5			1
2	45	45	5	5		
3	35	47	11	6		1
4	61	37	1	1		
5	41	44	8	6		1
6*	6	1	5	51	32	5
7	25	56	8	6		5
8	38	50	8	3		1
9	36	44	9	6	3	2
10	23	51	20	1		5
11*	5	3	5	48	39	
12	50	45	3	2		
13	21	50	17	1	3	8
14	22	50	20	6	1	1

N = 66

* Strongly disagree is favorable response.

** See preceding page for items corresponding to item numbers.

List of Projects

1. Alcoa/Maryville/Blount
2. Anderson
3. Claiborne
4. Cleveland
5. Greeneville
6. Humboldt
7. Huntington
8. Knoxville
9. Nashville
10. Oak Ridge
11. Overton
12. Putnam
13. Rhea
14. Scott
15. Shelby
16. South Carroll
17. Trenton
18. Washington
19. Wayne
20. Wilson/Lebanon/Watertown

SECTION 8

FINAL REPORTS FROM LOCAL PROJECTS

Identification of Projects

Twenty local projects were funded in Tennessee under provisions of the Career Education Incentive Act (PL95-207). The participating school systems were:

1. Alcoa/Maryville/Blount County
2. Anderson County
3. Claiborne County
4. Cleveland
5. Greeneville City Schools
6. Humboldt
7. Huntingdon
8. Knoxville City Schools
9. Metro Nashville/Davidson County
10. Oak Ridge City Schools
11. Overton County
12. Putnam County
13. Rhea County
14. Scott County
15. Shelby County
16. South Carroll
17. Trenton
18. Washington County
19. Wayne County
20. Wilson/Lebanon/Watertown

A complete final project report consisted of a structured checklist, a narrative section, and a financial report. All 20 project directors submitted a financial report, 17 submitted the checklist, and 17 provided the narrative section. While Project 5 did not include the checklist, and Project 19 did not contain a narrative section, in some cases it was possible to infer responses for one section from those included in the other. Thus many of the findings in the paragraphs which follow were based on data from 18 of 20 local projects.

Prior Needs Assessment Data

As part of the proposal submitted for the funding competition each local education agency was asked to provide data from a prior needs assessment which could be used as the basis for local project objectives. One-third of the 18 project proposals reviewed contained no objective needs assessment data, just the proposal writer's opinions about local needs.

The dozen project proposals which did show evidence of data collection for the purpose of establishing need employed a variety of needs assessment strategies:

- needs assessment surveys of students and school staff, parents, and community representatives

- . needs identification and priority-setting by school board or local career education advisory council
- . calculation of dropout or suspension rate
- . follow-up surveys of high school graduates
- . pretests of career education knowledge and attitudes for school staff
- . state proficiency test scores

Eleven of the 12 proposals citing objective needs assessment data focused first on the needs of students. Student needs most often identified included information designed to:

- . increase self-understanding
- . acquaint students with the vast variety of careers available
- . increase appreciation for the value of work, the interdependency of jobs
- . increase awareness of the relationship between basic skills and their application in the world of work
- . improve use of leisure time
- . enhance decision-making skills
- . impart job-seeking skills
- . increase participation in part time employment.

In order to provide for the student needs, seven proposals contained the suggestion that the school curriculum be infused with career education concepts. In order to prepare staff properly to perform infusion, staff development and career education materials were needed. These two basic needs identified by local proposal developers in 1979 were the same as those identified more than a year earlier by the evaluation director in her State-wide career education needs assessment.

Project Organization and Support

Eight of Tennessee's local career education projects employed a career education coordinator on a full-time or part-time basis (see Table 12). Sixteen of 17 reports indicated that a local advisory council had been established to give assistance and direction to the project. The councils consisted of from 7 to 33 members, with an average membership of 18 (see Table 13). Groups most frequently represented on the advisory councils were business and industrial representatives and parents (15 projects each), educators (14 projects), and labor (11 projects).

Fourteen of the reports listed a total of 382 groups which had cooperated with the school system in implementing or maintaining career education efforts (see Table 14). Part of this large total was due to the listing provided by Project 2, which included approximately 200 co-op businesses. In addition to this one large listing, 60 business and industrial groups, 48 government agencies, 27 civic groups, 25 educational institutions (public and private) and 22 professional organizations were involved in career education across Tennessee during 1979-80. Project 3 did not cite specific groups but reported cooperation from the total community. The actual numbers of persons involved could not be calculated since one group might have included many individuals representing different organizations. It is noteworthy that only three projects that completed the report reported no community involvement.

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Activity	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total	Percent of All Projects
Employed career education coordinator		✓				✓	✓	✓				✓	✓				✓	✓	8	40
Established career research center		✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	14	70
Purchased career education materials	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	17	85
Provided work experiences for students for purpose of career exploration	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓					9	45
Established comprehensive career guidance program	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓		13	65
Conducted career education needs assessment during current school year	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	14	70
Has conducted career education needs assessment within past two years		✓				✓		✓	✓	✓		✓					✓		8	40
Has schools in the system who were involved in 1978 statewide needs assessment						✓	✓	✓		✓							✓		5	25
Conducted an evaluation of career education efforts during current year	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	17	85
School Board has adopted career education as a goal or as a policy statement		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓	✓			✓	11	55
System has a career education plan	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16	80
Obtained television time to share information about career education program																			0	0
Obtained time on radio	✓				✓		✓						✓	✓				✓	6	30
Has a local advisory committee for career education	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16	80

TABLE 13. CAREER EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

PROJECT

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	19	20
Number of persons representing business and industry	2	11	1	3	5	7	1					2	4	5	2	3	5	6	6
Persons representing labor	11	1	1	2	1	2							1		1		2	1	3
Persons representing parents	1		2	9	2	5	1	11	1	1					1	6	9	10	2
Persons representing educators	5	2	2	5	5	10	8					7		11	13	5	4	14	2
Persons representing other groups	8	1	1	7	3	3	1					4		6	1	2	10	2	2
TOTAL	17	15	7	26	16	27	11	11	14	6	22	18	16	30	33	15			

TABLE 14. TYPES AND NUMBERS OF GROUPS COOPERATING WITH THE SCHOOL SYSTEM
IN IMPLEMENTING OR MAINTAINING CAREER EDUCATION EFFORTS

GROUP

PROJECT

	1	2	5	6	8	9	10	12	14	15	16	17	19	20	TOTAL
Civic groups	3	1		3	1	5	2	1			1	3		5	27
Professional groups	1	3		4	3						1	6		4	22
Government agencies	5		2	4	2	1			2	11	3	8	7	3	48
Business/Industry		200	16	5	1	6		1		22	4	4	1		260
Educational institutions	2		5		2	1				9	3		1		25
TOTAL	11	204	23	16	9	13	2	2	2	42	14	21	9	12	382

Needs Assessments Conducted During 1979-80

Sixteen projects reported conducting one or more needs assessments during 1979-80 (see Table 15). The groups most often surveyed were counselors (16 projects), teachers and administrators (15 projects each), others (9 projects), students (7 projects), and parents (5 projects). Consistent with the conclusion reached in prior needs assessments that staff development was a crucial prerequisite for meeting student needs, more concern was shown in 1979-80 for determining staff needs than student needs.

Total numbers of needs assessments conducted and persons providing the data were not calculated because there appeared to be some confusion among project directors about (1) the definition of needs assessment, and (2) the way to report numbers. Two project directors reported that they had conducted more than 100 needs assessments; one project report included percentages rather than numbers of persons providing information.

Staff Development

All 17 projects for which final checklists were provided included evidence that career education inservice training activities had been conducted. A total of 3,953 educators participated in these activities (see Table 16). The career education topic most frequently addressed in the inservice activities was understanding the nature and goals of career education, which was presented in all 17 projects (see Table 17). Developing a career education plan, developing competence to infuse career education into the curriculum, and learning ways to assist students in broadening career goals each were topics for 16 projects. Designing methods to overcome stereotyping/bias in career education (15 projects) and acquainting participants with changing work patterns of men and women (14 projects) were also discussed by most projects. All 17 projects had conducted inservice presentations which would acquaint their personnel with career education concepts and better equip them to develop and implement career education programs in their respective systems consistent with their unique program goals.

Evidence that the inservice programs and other staff development activities did encourage teachers to engage in career activities and infusion methodology was shown in 16 projects. More than 1,611 classrooms were involved in career education infusion activities (see Table 18). This represents an average of over 115 classrooms per project for the 14 projects detailing numbers of classrooms. In addition, one project indicated that infusion occurred in two pilot schools at each grade level but did not specify the number of classrooms involved, while another project report did not give figures but stated that the plan was being implemented.

Curriculum guides were developed by three projects (4, 9, and 15) as means of facilitating the infusion process. If the classrooms contained an average of 25 students, the estimated number of students being reached by the infusion process during 1979-80 would be approximately 40,275 for the 14 projects supplying data. In view of the lack of specific data from some projects, this must be considered a conservative figure.

Some projects devoted 1979-80 career education efforts primarily to preliminary activities such as needs assessment, procurement and organization of materials, and development of a plan rather than implementation. Others focused on a pilot group to develop quality programs before extending their efforts to others in their respective systems. The number of classrooms affected would, therefore, be expected to grow in subsequent years as more projects become fully involved in infusion. The large number of classrooms in which career education infusion activities were being conducted during 1979-80 casts a very positive reflection of the leadership shown at both State and local levels.