

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 366

SP 031 728

AUTHOR Thompson, Jay C., Jr.; Cooley, Van E.
 TITLE A Comparative Longitudinal Analysis of State
 Education Agency Staff Development Programs in the
 Fifty States 1983-89.
 PUB DATE 89
 NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
 Midwestern Research Association (11th, Chicago, IL,
 October 18-21, 1989).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
 Descriptive (141)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Cost Effectiveness; Elementary Secondary Education;
 Expenditure per Student; Financial Support; Program
 Costs; *Resource Allocation; *Staff Development;
 *State Aid; *State Departments of Education; State
 Legislation

ABSTRACT

This study is a replication of a 1983-84 study involving state activity in the area of staff development. Responses to a survey were received from the Chief Educational Officer in each of the 50 states. A comparison is made of changes since the 1984 study, focusing on four basic objectives: (1) Which states through law or accreditation currently mandate staff development or inservice programs for local school districts? (2) Which states are currently planning or have pending legislation regarding staff development? (3) What effect does per pupil expenditures have on state mandated staff development programs? and (4) Which states provide funding for staff development or inservice programs? (JD)

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

ED314366

**A COMPARATIVE LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS OF STATE
EDUCATION AGENCY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS
IN THE FIFTY STATES
1983-89**

**Jay C. Thompson Jr.
Professor of Curriculum
Center for Lifelong Education
Teachers College
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306**

**Van E. Cooley
Assistant Superintendent
Westfield Washington Schools
322 West Main Street
Westfield, Indiana 46074**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.C. Thompson Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

**A Presentation
at the
Eleventh Annual Meeting
of the Midwestern Research Association
October 18-21, 1989
Chicago, Illinois**

SP 031728

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



A COMPARATIVE LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS OF STATE EDUCATION AGENCY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN THE FIFTY STATES: 1983-1989

One of the many responsibilities of state education agencies is to provide local school districts with direction and resources. State education department representatives and state legislators have been extremely active since the "A Nation at Risk" report in 1984. Staff development is an area in which many states have taken a leadership role in both support and delivery of services. This study is a replication of a 1983-84 study involving state activity in the area of staff development. Survey questionnaires were mailed to the Chief Educational Officer in each of the 50 states. Responses were received from all states with a number of state officials returning additional supporting data.

The study will compare changes since the 1984 study and focus on four basic objectives:

1. Which states through law or accreditation currently mandate staff development or inservice programs for local school districts?
2. Which states are currently planning or have pending legislation regarding staff development?
3. What effect does per pupil expenditures have on state mandated staff development programs?
4. Which states provide funding for staff development or inservice programs?

STATE MANDATED STAFF DEVELOPMENT

In the 1983-84 study, staff development was mandated by 25 states (See Table 1). Results from the 1989 study revealed staff development was currently mandated in 31 states. This is an increase of 6 states since the 1983-84 study. Nine states have added mandates since 1983-84 and three states have dropped mandated staff development since the 1983-84 study.

Table 1- State Mandated Staff Development Programs and Funding for Staff Development in the Fifty States 1983-89.

State	Mandated 1983	Mandated 1989	Funds 1983	Funds 1989
Alabama	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Alaska	No	No	No	No
Arizona	No	No	No	No
Arkansas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
California	No	No	No	Yes
Colorado	No	No	Yes	No
Connecticut	No	Yes	No	Yes
Delaware	No	Yes	No	Yes
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hawaii	No	No	Yes	Yes
Idaho	Yes	No	No	No
Illinois	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indiana	No	No	No	No
Iowa	No	Yes	No	No
Kansas	No	No	No	Yes
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Louisiana	No	No	No	No
Maine	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maryland	No	No	No	No
Massachusetts	No	No	Yes	No
Michigan	No	No	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	No	No	No	Yes
Mississippi	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Missouri	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Montana	Yes	Yes	No	No
Nebraska	Yes	Yes	No	No
Nevada	No	No	Yes	No
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
New Jersey	Yes	No	No	No
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	No	No
New York	No	No	No	Yes
North Carolina	No	Yes	No	Yes
North Dakota	Yes	No	No	No
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oregon	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Rhode Island	No	Yes	No	Yes
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Dakota	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Tennessee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Texas	Yes	Yes	No	No
Utah	No	No	Yes	Yes
Vermont	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Washington	No	No	Yes	No
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	No	No
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	No	No
Wyoming	Yes	Yes	No	No

Examination of the data by region revealed the greatest increase in staff development was in the East with 4 states (Maine, Delaware, Rhode Island, and Connecticut) now mandating staff development for local school districts. At the present time four states in the East, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, and Maryland, do not have mandated staff development for local school districts.

In the 1983-84 study, 10 states in the South mandated staff development for local school districts. Results from the 1989 study revealed three states (Arkansas, Mississippi, and North Carolina) have added mandated staff development with all southern states with the exception of Louisiana now requiring staff development for local school districts.

State mandated staff development has increased in the Midwest. Since the 1983-84 study, two states, Illinois and Iowa, now require local school districts to provide staff development programs. Officials from North Dakota reported the staff development mandate for local districts was no longer in effect.

Staff development in the West has decreased since the 1983-84 study. Staff development is no longer required in Idaho.

Examination of the four regions revealed staff development was most prevalent in the South with 11 of 12 states mandating staff development. In the East 8 of 12 states mandated staff development, and in the Midwest 8 of 13 states required staff development for local school districts. In the West, only 4 of 13 states mandated staff development for local school districts.

STATES PLANNING STAFF DEVELOPMENT/PENDING LEGISLATION

Results from the 1983-84 study revealed that officials from 17 states reported legislation pertaining to staff development was being planned, reviewed or modified. In 1989, respondents from 6 states reported staff development changes or mandates were being considered. These included: California, Indiana and North Dakota, states that did not have mandated staff development. North Dakota required staff development in 1983, subsequently the mandate was removed, and currently is being reconsidered. Rhode Island, Ohio,

and Vermont, states that have mandated staff development, reported legislative and/or State Education Department activity in the area of staff development.

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES

Per pupil expenditures provide interesting insight into the ability of states to finance staff development and other educational programs. Table 2 outlines per pupil expenditures, increases, and the percentage of increases in state funding over the six year period for the four geographic regions.

Table 2- Per pupil Expenditure, Percentage Increases, Mandated States and Gain/Loss for State mandated Staff Development from 1983-89 in the Four Geographic Regions of the United States.

Area	1988-89 \$ Amt.	1983-84 \$Amt 1	Increase \$ 1983-89	Percentage Increase	Mandated States (N)	Gain/Loss States 83-89
East	5708	2787	2921	104.8%	8	+4 -1
South	3610	1921	1689	87.9%	11	+3 -0
Midwest	4079	2358	1721	72.9%	8	+2 -1
West	4322	2686	1636	60.9%	4	+0 -1

In 1989, 10 southern states ranked 26 or below in terms of per pupil expenditures with only Virginia (15) and Florida (20) ranked above 26. Respondents from the 1989 study reported staff development was mandated by 11 of 12 southern states. The mean for per pupil expenditures for all southern states was \$3610 for 1988-89. Per pupil expenditures were highest in the East with the mean of \$5708 based upon 1988-89 figures. In the East, 8 of 12 states mandated staff development for local school districts. The Midwest ranked third in terms of per pupil expenditures with a mean of \$4079 and 8 of 13 states mandating staff development for local school districts. Western states ranked second in terms of per pupil expenditures with a mean of \$4322 with 4 of 13 western states mandating staff development for local school districts. From 1983-1989, increases in per pupil expenditures were highest in the East with a 104.8 percent increase. The per pupil expenditure increase in the South was 87.9 over the six year period. This was the second largest increase by region.

State mandated staff development was most prevalent in the South and Midwest where per pupil expenditures are lowest. Based upon the data there was no correlation between per pupil expenditures and state funding for mandated staff development. A complete breakdown of per pupil expenditures for each of the fifty states for 1983 and 1989, dollar amounts, and the percentage of increase over the six year period is listed in Table 3.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT FUNDING

Staff development was funded by 23 states in the 1983-84 study with 12 of 25 states that mandated staff development providing funding for staff development. Of the 31 states that mandated staff development in the 1989 study, 17 provided financial support for staff development to local districts. Eight states not mandating staff development provided funds for staff development activities. Nine states that provided funding in the 1983-84 study dropped funding in the 1989 study.

Examination of funding changes by region in 1989 indicated funding increased in the Midwest (4 states), East (4 states), South (1 state), and West (2 states). Of the states in 1989 providing funding for staff development for the first time, only New York, Kansas, Minnesota and California did not mandate staff development for local school districts. When funding for staff development in each of the four regions was examined, funding was most evident in the Midwest and South with 8 states from each region providing fiscal support. In the East 5 states provided funding and in the West 4 states provided funding for staff development.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Based upon data the following conclusions have been drawn in reference to state mandated staff development between 1983 and 1989:

- Staff development is most entrenched in the South with 10 of 11 states mandating staff development for local school districts.

- Three states have dropped mandated staff development since the 1983-84 study.
- Since 1983, 9 states have implemented state mandated staff development for a net gain of six states.
- Aggregate per pupil expenditures were lowest in the South and Midwest. State financial support for staff development was most likely in these areas.
- Percentage increases in per pupil expenditures in the South since 1983-84 were second only to the East.
- Legislation in 1989 was being considered by 6 states with 3 of the states currently mandating staff development.

Staff development has been recognized by a number of states as an educational improvement mechanism. Although state activity in staff development has grown since 1983, financial support provided for staff development to local districts has not kept pace. Based on the data from the study, staff development activities have continued to grow. This staff development growth has paralleled the educational reform movement.

To determine the impact of state mandated staff development, research needs to be conducted on the effectiveness of the various forms of staff development as prescribed by the states.

**TABLE 3 - CURRENT PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES¹
AND RANKING FOR THE FIFTY STATES**

1989 Ranking	State	\$	1983 Ranking	%Increase in \$ 1983-1989	Rank
1	NEW JERSEY	7,571	3	130.5	4
2	NEW YORK	7,338	2	94.7	13
3	CONNECTICUT	7,199	16	168.3	1
4	ALASKA	7,134	1	32.9	50
5	RHODE ISLAND	5,939	8	98.2	8
6	MASSACHUSETTS	5,818	9	96.3	11
7	PENNSYLVANIA	5,621	10	97.9	9
8	DELAWARE	5,506	5	76.2	28
9	WYOMING	5,462	7	82.2	22
10	MARYLAND	5,391	6	79.8	25
11	WISCONSIN	5,117	11	85.5	19
12	VERMONT	5,057	22	113.8	6
13	MAINE	4,845	41	144.1	2
14	OREGON	4,818	4	53.9	46
15	VIRGINIA	4,744	31	116.3	5
16	COLORADO	4,633	14	71.1	32
17	MINNESOTA	4,577	15	69.6	33
18	MICHIGAN	4,576	18	72.5	30
19	ILLINOIS	4,513	13	65.9	38
20	FLORIDA	4,487	26	97.1	10
21	KANSAS	4,404	28	95.6	12
22	WASHINGTON	4,339	17	62.0	40
23	NEW HAMPSHIRE	4,334	27	92.1	15
24	IOWA	4,289	23	83.1	21
25	MONTANA	4,259	12	56.2	44

¹Based upon Average Daily Attendance as reported by National Education Association; Estimate of School Statistics, 1988-89.

**TABLE 3 - CONTINUED -
PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES FOR FIFTY STATES**

26	GEORGIA	4,143	48	140.7	3
27	OHIO	4,138	24	78.3	27
28	CALIFORNIA ^A	4,075	21	67.9	36
29*	HAWAII	4,034	19	54.9	45
29*	NEW MEXICO	4,034	32	85.2	20
31	NEVADA	3,974	34	92.07	16
32	ARIZONA	3,904	25	69.4	34
33	WEST VIRGINIA	3,879	33	78.5	26
34	NORTH CAROLINA	3,872	35	90.5	18
35	INDIANA	3,858	38	92.2	14
36	TEXAS	3,842	37	91.0	17
37	MISSOURI	3,838	30	74.7	29
38	NEBRASKA	3,732	20	52.6	47
39	KENTUCKY	3,655	45*	99.2	7
40	SOUTH CAROLINA	3,465	42	80.8	23
41	NORTH DAKOTA	3,447	39*	72.2	31
42	LOUISIANA	3,352	39*	67.4	37
43	SOUTH DAKOTA	3,329	36	65.1	39
44	TENNESSEE	3,305	47	80.5	24
45	OKLAHOMA	3,212	29	43.6	48
46	IDAHO	2,946	43	56.9	43
47	ALABAMA	2,915	45*	58.9	41
48	MISSISSIPPI	2,846	50	68.9	35
49	ARKANSAS	2,698	49	57.5	42
50	UTAH	2,574	44	39.7	49
	U.S. AVERAGE	4,509		84.7	

^AFigures ADA different than others

*tie