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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Purpose of the Study

The ultimate purpose of this study was to develop an evaluative instrument and suggested procedures which could be used by state directors or supervisors to assess and evaluate the services of the business and office education division. This evaluation could give definite direction in program planning and program development at the state level.

Specific Objectives

The following specific objectives were identified in order to provide further direction and to facilitate the study:

1. Develop and validate a set of goals for the division of business and office education in the state department of education which were acceptable to those persons in the divisions of vocational-technical education at the state level.

2. Structure data gathering instruments, both quantitative and qualitative, which were key indicators of success in accomplishing the accepted goals of the
business and office education division and which would signal the possible need for program redirection.

3. Formulate a suggested set of procedures for state personnel of the business and office education division to use in carrying out an evaluation using the instrument developed in this study.

**Basic Assumptions**

The following fundamental assumptions underlying this research are believed to be consistent with the opinions of the leaders in the profession:

1. State directors or supervisors of business and office education have duties and responsibilities which differ from those of directors or supervisors in general education but are not significantly different from those of directors or supervisors in other vocational-technical education service areas.

2. Self-initiated evaluation is one of the more desirable means of program improvement and development in all areas of education including business and office education.

3. State directors or supervisors of business and office education are interested in the improvement of their leadership programs.

4. The investigator, assisted by the state directors or supervisors of business and office education
and other selected leaders in the field, could generate an effective evaluative instrument and a suggested set of procedures for its use.

5. The influence of the juror's differing perceptions in reacting to the evaluative instrument developed may be susceptible to criticism.

Need for the Study

There seems to be a desire and a need for the development of evaluation instrumentation, criteria, and procedures which would assist state directors or supervisors of business and office education in assessing the effectiveness of their leadership programs. Rapidly changing conditions in business and industry are constantly creating the necessity for change in educational programs. It is apparent that major decisions should be made regarding program planning and development to meet the changes in business and industry. An effective evaluation instrument and set of procedures for its use can assist state personnel in business and office education in continually evaluating and making decisions for program improvement.

With the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, business educators at all levels have
apparently become increasingly aware of, and interested in, the importance of evaluation. Byram states that:

At least three major factors have been identified as related to this increased interest: larger dollar investments in education, stronger demand by employers for highly-skilled and technically-trained workers, and unemployment and underemployment of a portion of the labor force.¹

The concern and interest in the evaluation of state-level programs of business and office education is shared by William Selden, Chief, Bureau of Business Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Following a state-wide evaluation of local business and office education programs in Pennsylvania, Selden states, "it would be an interesting project . . . to evaluate the effectiveness of business education supervision and administration on the state level."² Any attempt to develop an effective instrument to evaluate state level programs of business and office education, as well as other educational programs, should be accompanied by the realization that it is of utmost


importance to acknowledge the fact that "the basic justification for evaluation lies in its relationship to improvement."\(^3\)

A review of the writings of accepted leaders and well-known authors in the field of educational supervision and administration disclosed the fact that there is a lack of evaluative instruments, criteria, and procedures for state level programs of practically every service area, including general education. This review of literature reveals the lack of evaluative instrumentation and procedures available to state staff personnel in all service areas and a complete void in business and office education programs at the state level. It would appear that "supervisors and administrative officials seem, in general, to have been more interested in the development of programs of activities than in their evaluation."\(^4\)

However, Burton and Brueckner go on to supply an apparent solution, or at least an aid, to the problem when they state, "educational leadership today is decidedly hampered in many respects by traditional practices which


would undoubtedly be eliminated with the introduction of more effective means and methods of evaluation."\(^5\) They further state that "if the methods of educational leadership are to be constantly improved, steps must be taken to develop more accurate instruments for the continuous evaluation of their effectiveness."\(^6\) The research and writings of these authors confirm that a need exists for evaluative instruments, criteria, and procedures for state leadership programs.

Even though little has been done in the area of evaluating supervisory and administrative programs in general, there appears to be increased interest in the value of such activity as evidenced in the literature by such statements as, "One of the most significant trends in supervision today is the inclination of those in instructional leadership positions to establish procedures for evaluating their own effectiveness."\(^7\) It would appear that interest in this area of evaluation is on the increase, but evidence of practical instruments and procedures is lacking. The need for these tools to be developed and

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 656.

\(^6\)Ibid.

made available to supervisory and administrative personnel is also confirmed by Morphet, Johns, and Reller who indicate that "a good part of the inadequacy of evaluation ... stems from failure to recognize the significance of such work." Often times these state staff personnel do not have the time to develop instruments for evaluation. However, this is not to imply that they are not aware of the need for or significance of evaluating their leadership programs. State personnel would undoubtedly use developed instruments to assist in state program improvement if they were available.

The Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education reported to the late President Kennedy that:

A study of vocational education is severely handicapped by inadequate statistical reporting and lack of sufficient evidence to make an adequate evaluation of its methods or achievements. Very little research evidence in vocational education is available to justify many of the practices in instruction or supervision.  

---


Based primarily on the findings and recommendations of The Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, Section 12 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 mandates periodic evaluation of vocational education.10 The mandate for evaluation further points up the need for evaluative instruments and procedures to be developed. The Act implies that this activity shall be the responsibility of the several states and not rest with the Federal Government. The evaluation called for by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is to be of a continuous nature and not a one-time activity. It would appear that failure on the part of state leadership to conduct and report the results of evaluative efforts was the primary reason for this mandate being included in the law.

The need for effective evaluative instruments and procedures and the value of these is well documented in the literature and through personal conversations with state directors and supervisors of business and office education. Hicks states that "in considering the role of supervision in education, therefore, one must take an evaluative look at the supervisory program. . . ."11

11. Hanne J. Hicks, op. cit., p. 412.
However, printed material related to the evaluation of state level programs of supervision and administration in any educational service area is lacking. It seemed apparent that the development of an evaluation instrument and a set of procedures for its use could possibly be a valuable contribution to business and office education and to the profession of education.

Scope of the Study

The evaluative instrument developed was designed to assist in the evaluation of the total state administrative and supervisory program in business and office education. The instrument for evaluation was deliberately designed in such a manner as not to evaluate the individual staff members or any specific job title. It was designed to evaluate a "program."

Primary emphasis should be on the concept of self-initiated evaluation on the part of state directors or supervisors of business and office education. It is not intended that the evaluation instrument be used as a means of "rating" a state's program. Furthermore, the evaluative instrument was not to be used as a basis for comparing state level administrative and supervisory programs. Rather, it was intended to provide a framework of criterion statements and key indicators of successful accomplishment, or lack of it, which may be used in
program planning, improvement, development, and continuous appraisal of business and office education.

**Limitations of the Study**

This research study was limited in accordance with the following factors:

1. Only state directors or supervisors of business and office education were asked to aid in validating the proposed goals, the evaluative instrument, and the procedures. Assistant directors or supervisors and other consultants in business and office education at the state level were not contacted for this phase of the research.

2. All state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of the other vocational service areas were asked to aid in validating the goals, as perceived by them, in an effort to assure the compatibility of these goals with the overall purpose or aim of vocational education, of which business and office education service is a part.

3. Only the state directors of vocational education were asked to assist in reacting to the evaluation instrument and none of the state directors or supervisors of other vocational education service areas were involved in this phase of the study.

4. Although business and office education serves the needs of both general and vocational students, the
The evaluation instrument developed was designed primarily for the vocational aspects of the state program.

5. Adapting the specifics of the evaluation instrument to heterogeneous state settings was not considered.

**Definition of Terms**

To minimize misunderstanding arising from differing interpretations, a number of terms used in this research are defined.

**Self-initiated evaluation**—The process of a state staff appraising their progress toward program goals. This term implies an evaluation to be conducted not only by the state staff within the department of education but to include an involvement of invited outside evaluators to assist in assessing progress toward program goals.

**Program goal**—Specific areas of program effort and concern which states what is to be accomplished. Each program goal is general or broad in nature so as not to state how it will be done.

**Key indicators**—The subjective or objective evidences of administrative and supervisory activities which indicate successful implementation of the program goals of state administration and supervision, or the lack of successful accomplishment.

**State director of vocational education**—The state official designated by the state board of education to
direct and coordinate the various state programs of vocational-technical education administered under the provisions of Federal and state legislation.

State director or supervisor--A person in the state department of education who is responsible for the administration and supervision of a statewide program of education for a specific service area or subject content area. This is construed to mean members of the state staff who have responsibilities for supervision of local programs throughout the state in a specific area of education.

Administrative and supervisory program--All professional activities in which state administrative and supervisory personnel engage to improve the education program in their state.

Method of Investigation

A review of literature was conducted to ascertain the findings of other relevant studies. This review of literature extended into the other service areas of vocational education and into general education so that the investigator could have a greater exposure to the problems and procedures of evaluation in the total field of education.

An extensive review of the literature and related research indicated a dearth of information relative to this research study. Therefore, the information relating
to the study, as found in the literature and related research, was incorporated into Chapters III and IV. This lack of information necessitated the omission of the usual type of report on related research.

Pertinent literature, including state and Federal legislation, as well as ideas of the investigator and other professional persons, suggested the tentative goals which were formulated as a basis for a normative survey instrument. The survey instrument listed the tentative goals formulated by the investigator and was then submitted to all directors or supervisors in business and office education at the state level. At the same time, these goals were submitted to state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of all the other vocational education service areas in an effort to ascertain whether or not the goals perceived by business education leaders were the same goals perceived by their immediate superiors and by their counterparts within the state department of education.

Administrators were asked to respond to the tentative goals in terms of whether or not they accepted the tentative goals and whether or not they would make changes in these goals and what these changes would be.

Following the validation of the program goals by this jury, and using these goals as a common reference
point, the investigator developed a tentative evaluative instrument to include both quantitative and qualitative data which contained criterion statements and key indicators of successful implementation of the program goals.

The key indicators were designed to indicate success or achievement of a state administrative and supervisory program in business and office education or the lack of achievement which would possibly signal the need for program redirection.

The data gathering instruments were developed to include data which appeared to be needed for making decisions in program planning and development. Data presently being required by the U.S. Office of Education and state departments of education were reviewed and selected data, along with other essential data which were not presently being gathered, were incorporated into the evaluative instrument.

A jury of all state directors or supervisors of business and office education and state directors of vocational education was asked to assist in validating the evaluative instrument. The evaluative instrument was submitted to this jury in an effort to validate its functional value and so that general content and design would be kept in line with the thinking of the education field in general and business and office education specifically.
Suggested changes, additions, or deletions were requested of the jury as they reviewed the evaluative instrument in relationship to the accepted program goals.

Suggested procedures for using the evaluative instrument were developed in accordance with accepted evaluative procedures used in education in general.

The suggested procedures were submitted to a jury of state directors or supervisors of business and office education for the purpose of determining whether or not the procedures were workable under varying circumstances.

**Organization of the Study**

To facilitate the reader's understanding of this study, the first chapter states the objectives, fundamental assumptions, limitations, and method of investigation used in this study. The place of evaluation in education is discussed in Chapter II, and Chapter III is concerned with the development and validation of program goals for state administrative and supervisory programs in vocational-technical education. Chapter IV presents the development of the evaluative instrument for state level programs of business and office education, and Chapter V reports the suggested procedures for using the evaluative instrument. Chapter VI contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study. The appendixes and bibliography follow.
CHAPTER II

EVALUATION IN EDUCATION

General Nature and Scope of Evaluation in Education

The process of promoting and providing for continuing, planned educational change is needed throughout our educational system. However, educational leaders do not simply make changes in educational programs on the basis of their personal biases. They do not proceed in the process of changing established programs or designing new programs without first making some value-judgments relevant to existing circumstances and available data. These value-judgments are based upon data collected concerning existing programs in relationship to collected data which indicates needed changes.

Evaluation has been defined as "the process of ascertaining or judging the value or amount of something by careful appraisal." Burton and Brueckner directed their definition more specifically toward value-judgments in educational programs when they said,

---

Evaluation, in the true and effective sense of the term as currently applied, is a process of making value-judgments on the basis of pertinent information that can be gathered about any significant aspect of the educational program.

Various other definitions of evaluation also reflect a somewhat negative reaction to the relatively narrow information-and skill-centered educational evaluations which have been used over the past several years. The definitions referred to above emphasize a broadened concept of evaluation which includes subjective judgments, as well as objective, in the evaluation process.

In the early writings concerning evaluation in education, there appears to have been an over-emphasis on objective and quantitative factors. Today, however, we need to take a long, hard look at the process of evaluation to ensure that evaluative instruments and procedures are developed as guides to directing, or redirecting, effective educational changes rather than just measuring past performances.

---


Reaons for Evaluation

For quite a number of years, educational leaders, particularly those in business and office education, have expressed confidence in the process of evaluation as an effective tool in improving their profession. The evaluation process is considered to be one of the basic aspects of modern education.\(^5\)

The American Association of School Administrators, in their Thirty-fifth Yearbook, describe evaluation as "the quality control of the educational program. It is more—evaluation is the means by which quality may constantly be improved."\(^6\) Making use of evaluative instruments to identify the strengths and weaknesses of educational programs is one of the important steps in making legitimate changes. Such adjustments or changes should be made only when careful evaluation demonstrates a realistic need for change.\(^7\) This, of course, can be accomplished through the proper use of effective evaluative instruments.

---

\(^5\)Hanne J. Hicks, op. cit., p. 414.


Davia feels that evaluation of existing programs is needed in order to identify both strengths and areas where possible improvements could be made, and implementation of new programs calls for feedback with regard to how changes are working. An effective evaluative instrument can provide this needed feedback of information.

Another important reason for evaluation is brought out in an article by Gordon Cawelti in which he discusses the need for evaluation in order to provide answers to critics of education. Cawelti points out that we must be able to say, "Look—this is what we believe in, this is how we intend to accomplish it, and these are our results."^9

The economic reasons for evaluation are strongly emphasized by business and industry. Educators must share this concern for the efficient use of time and resources because it is equally as important in education as it is in business and industry. Business executives have expressed their concern for evaluation as evidenced by the following:

There are various tricks which help managers relieve their time worries, but the only actual

---


cure comes when an executive rethinks his total function and its relationship to his company's objectives and then breaks his job down into its integral parts.\textsuperscript{10}

Several factors which affect business, industry, and education are the population explosion, our mobile society, both social and economic change, invention, discoveries, increased new knowledge and interpretation, and emerging needs. All of these present a challenge to business leaders and have implications for educational leaders. The future, as well as the present, can be characterized by the rapidity of change. The necessary evaluation or inventory process in education is both essential and valuable in modern society.\textsuperscript{11}

In viewing the process of evaluation, the question that confronts educators is not whether or not there will be appraisals, but whether or not the appraisals will be reasonably valid or only judgments made on the basis of inadequate data, or even rumor.\textsuperscript{12} Morphet, Johns, and


\textsuperscript{12}Morphet, Johns, and Reller, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 524-525.
Reller list what they consider to be the more important purposes of conducting appraisals as follows:

1. To secure the basis for making judgments at the end of a period of operation.
2. To ensure continuous, effective, and improved operation.
3. To diagnose difficulties and avoid destructive upheavals.
4. To improve staff and citizen ability to develop the educational system.
5. To test new approaches to problems and to conduct pilot studies in the consideration of which advancements can be effected.  

Types of Evaluation

The types of educational evaluations are varied, and it is not always easy to classify each. One problem related to classifying types of educational evaluation is that there are some which belong in two or more classifications. 

One of the more obvious classifications appears to be that of a governmental unit, such as a city, county, or state educational system. Each of these classifications may be further defined by the geographical boundaries within which they operate.

13 Ibid., pp. 525-527.
14 Ibid., p. 527.
A second group includes those evaluations which are classified as either comprehensive or limited in scope. A comprehensive evaluation may include the entire educational system in its appraisal. On the other hand, an evaluation which is limited in scope may be the appraisal of business and office education programs, which is only one program area of the entire educational system.

The third category or classification includes the range from continuous to sporadic or irregular. It is quite obvious that the more desirable type of evaluation is the continuous type which is well planned and becomes an integral part of the educational program. This type of evaluation provides the needed information for program planning and redirection. The sporadic or irregular type of evaluation is all too often the result of a pressing need which, when the problem is eliminated, brings evaluation to a close. Its purpose is to solve an immediate problem and it is not concerned with the on-going program.

A fourth type of classification may be described according to whether its purpose is status, diagnostic, or implementative. The purpose of a status appraisal is simply to arrive at a valid description of existing conditions in the educational system. Diagnostic studies go one step further by not only describing existing conditions but attempting to discover the cause or reason for these
conditions. The implementative evaluation builds upon the status and diagnostic appraisals and suggests some action to be taken. Since action and possible change are two of the ingredients usually sought in an evaluation, the implementative appraisal appears to be the most desirable.

After examining the types of evaluation listed above, it can readily be seen that some types may belong in many classifications. For example, an evaluation may be of a state level program of business and office education, continuous in nature, and may have as its purpose to suggest possible action. This evaluation effort includes each of the types discussed above. There are possibly other classifications not discussed in which this and other evaluations could logically fit.

Techniques of Evaluation

Figure 1 illustrates three techniques of evaluation which are commonly used in education today. One is an evaluation of the educational system by studying its product—the student. The follow-up questionnaire technique is used extensively in evaluating education today.

Another technique illustrated is that of appraising the educational establishment as it is measured against predetermined standards which are commonly accepted by the profession. Rating scales or inventory check lists of ways and means are used to make this appraisal, and in
Evaluate the educational establishment or behavioral outcomes in relationship to STATED GOALS

Evaluate the educational establishment against accepted standards.

Evaluate the educational establishment in relationship to its product.

Figure 1. Techniques of Evaluating Educational Programs
most cases they have no direct relationship or reference to the outcome or product of the system.

The third technique illustrated is that of evaluating organizational or behavioral outcomes in terms of the goals which have been established. The latter technique seems to be the most meaningful in evaluating business and office education programs.

After examining some of the techniques of evaluation, we may ask the question, "Who will evaluate?" There are several alternatives in choosing those who are to make an evaluation. We may use members from inside the educational organization, members from outside the educational organization, or a cooperative approach, which involves both. Each alternative has certain merits. Those from inside the educational organization should have a better understanding of the program and problems which exist. However, it is possible that the internal organization may not have certain specialized competencies which are needed to make the appraisal. Also, these individuals may be limited in their viewpoint of the problem, due to the fact that they are working day by day in the surroundings in which the problem exists.

Members of an evaluation team selected solely from outside the organization may not have sufficient insight into the reality of the existing situations. Therefore, it
is possible that these individuals could antagonize the personnel within the educational establishment to the point that the evaluation might not be useful. On the other hand, the fresh viewpoint of someone outside the organization taking a look at the problems that exist may give helpful suggestions on what can be done to alleviate the problems. They may also suggest some action to be taken for future development.

A combination of these two groups might offset the weaknesses of each and develop into a strong evaluative team which would lead to the completion of an effective evaluation. A cooperative approach in this manner and an open and positive attitude of evaluation are two of the best techniques to improve a program.

The process of evaluation must act as a stimulus to improve programs if it is to be an effective process. It must be viewed in a professional light with the attitude that improvement is brought about by identifying both the weak and strong points throughout the total program.

Regardless of the technique selected, or the members of the evaluation team selected, the evaluation approach should be with the emphasis on "an open mind and
a positive attitude." One is then in a better position to select the best alternative for improving the business and office education programs. It is quite obvious, however, that through using the best possible technique and the best possible evaluative team, it will be possible to make greater progress in meeting our goals.

Principles of Evaluation

There are several possible approaches to a discussion of the principles of evaluation. It could be discussed from a national viewpoint in light of the mandatory nationwide evaluation as called for by the Vocational Education Act of 1963. It could also be discussed by limiting ourselves exclusively to state level evaluations. One step further could be taken and the emphasis be placed on principles for appraising local programs.

A closer look at the local program would be concerned with the principle for evaluating students, teachers, or a single department within a particular school. However, it seems logical to place emphasis at this point on those principles or generalizations regarding educational evaluation which would be common to all of these segments of the program. Each aspect is an integral

---

part of the total program of business and office education, which is an integral part of the total education program.

There are many lists of principles of evaluation which appear to be appropriate for use in evaluating educational programs at various levels. Sid Sutherland presented the following generalizations or principles in his discussion on evaluation:

1. **Evaluation, and particularly evaluation of educational programs, should be made in terms of the objectives—the purposes—of these programs.**

2. **Evaluations should include assessments and appraisals of both product and process. Stated in another way and relating this principle to our field, we should measure and weigh both the outcomes of our programs and the manner in which they are conducted and administered.**

3. **Evaluation should be a continuous process, not just a "point-in-time" judgment.**

4. **Evaluation should be made by teams comprised of both professional and lay personnel.**

5. **Evaluation of publicly supported programs should include economic factors and concern itself with input-output relationships.**

6. **Evaluations and appraisals should be made not only on the basis of what has been done, but also on what should have been done.**

7. **The major purposes of evaluation should be to provide quality control and a basis for intelligent change.**
8. An evaluation should concern itself primarily, if not exclusively, with the key indicators of success or failure.16

Another listing of principles, which is slightly different from the above list, was developed by Morphet, Johns, and Rellor and has been labeled "principles of appraisal."17 Even though the two sets of principles are quite similar, it would appear to be of value to include both in viewing the basic principles of such an important area as evaluation. The following list provides a deeper insight into the complexities of the field of evaluation.

1. Effective appraisal is dependent upon clearly defined educational objectives.
2. Appraisal must be valid. This requires that the appraisal be what it purports to be.
3. Bases or standards for the appraisal must be established. An appraisal must be made with consideration of some base or standard.
4. Appraisal must be comprehensive.
5. Appraisal must be continuous.
6. Appraisal must be cooperative.
7. Appraisals must be integrated into a portrait.18

17 Morphet, Johns, and Rellor, op. cit., p. 530.
18 Ibid., pp. 530-534.
The Continuous Process of Evaluation

Evaluation must be a continuous process to fulfill a vital need in a nuclear age. New scientific and technological developments made this an imperative. Changing conditions necessitate the need for continued education that furnishes current information, new skills and competence. This calls for evaluating these changes in terms of new knowledge, ideas, techniques, and experiences that tend to affect various phases of society.

Kropp says that "evaluation is a continuous process which should be carried out in terms of set objectives." Evaluation should be conceived as a continuing cycle of related activities. Figure 2, which is self-explanatory, illustrates a conception of a continuous cycle of these activities. These activities may be carried out periodically on an annual formal basis or may be carried out on a less formal basis and during intermittent times.

By utilizing a continuous cycle of evaluation activities, it is possible to bring about improvements not only in the student product and the operation and administration of the educational establishment, but even more

--

19 M. P. Moffatt, op. cit.

FIGURE 2. THE CONTINUOUS PROCESS OF EVALUATION
importantly, in the program goals which must be continually updated and reformulated.

Barlow agrees that evaluation should be a continuous process as indicated in his statement that "single-shot" evaluations are not effective. He refers to the need for periodic appraisal if over-all evaluation is to be successful.21 Sutherland, in reference to his principle on continuous evaluation, states the following:

Therefore, the evaluations in each state should be planned not just to tell us where we are today, but to provide a benchmark for measuring future progress. One weakness of a point-in-time assessment is clearly evident in the example given earlier of the program for training tomato pickers. While two weeks after the close of this program there were 15 workers on the job, three weeks later there may well have been none or 30. A point-in-time evaluation is just like a snapshot. When it is taken it may find you looking good or bad.22

If changes in programs do not take place as a result of the evaluation process, there would appear to be little benefit from such a process. However, if we evaluate continuously to determine the strengths and weaknesses of programs, needed changes will be identified and priorities may be established to remedy existing needs.


22Sid S. Sutherland, op. cit., p. 16.
This type of evaluation provides the means by which quality itself may constantly be improved.

Relationship of Pupil Progress and the Evaluation of Supervision

In analyzing the progress made by pupils, Spears indicates that there are some basic principles which should be followed: Know what it is you are attempting to measure; select the most promising way of accomplishing the task; and apply the results. It would appear that principles such as those stated above would be equally as important in assessing progress of a supervisory program. Hicks points out that "one of the primary contributions of the supervisor... is that of keeping the focus of significance on the children." It would, therefore, follow that the process of evaluation of a supervisory program should consider the pupils in the classroom as well as fundamental supervisory activities. Hicks also points out that it is impossible to indicate all the ways in which the effectiveness of the supervisory program is related to various elements of the school program. However, he suggests several principles

---


24Hanne J. Hicks, op. cit., p. 415.
very closely related to those of Spears which are helpful in appraising a supervisory program. 25

The close relationship between supervision and pupil progress is confirmed by the writings of Burton and Brueckner. They state:

The effectiveness of supervision may be evaluated by measuring or describing in specific terms the changes and improvements that take place over a period of time in the total educational program, or in any phase or element of it, as an apparent result of the leadership provided by those who are responsible for the improvement of learning and instruction. The areas in which these changes can be identified are the same as those that must be considered in evaluation of the effectiveness of the total educational program, namely, (1) growth and development of the learner toward accepted educational goals and objectives, (2) improvement of the curriculum, (3) improvement of instructional practice as well as in general teacher personal development, (4) improvement in the quality and use of instructional materials and aids to learning, and (5) improvements in school-community relations. 26

"Because the main purpose of school supervision is to improve learning situations for children, the most direct way to appraise supervision is to study its effect on the learners." 27 This statement by Farnseth suggests her feelings regarding the close relationship between pupil progress and supervision, but she also goes on to say,

25 Ibid., pp. 412-416.
26 Burton and Brueckner, op. cit., p. 656.
"This is also the most difficult approach." Even though there has been a close relationship established between pupil progress and supervision, Farnseth sees other methods of evaluating supervisory practices and states:

Common to most good evaluation programs is an attempt to determine the extent to which existing supervisory practices are in accord with accepted principles of educational leadership.

It would appear that there is a great deal of evidence that the improvement of supervisory programs at all levels of education should result in improved learning opportunities and experiences for our students. It would logically follow that the evaluation process, in terms of supervision and administration, is becoming increasingly more significant.

The Implications of Evaluation for State Level Administration and Supervision

"By the authority of the Constitution of the United States, it is the responsibility of the states to conduct educational programs." Although the several states have established varying organizational patterns in terms of

28 Ibid., pp. 298-299.
29 Ibid., p. 318.
their educational agency, the basic foundation is set forth in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively or to the people."\(^{31}\)

The most significant single element affecting the organizational pattern is that while education has been completely accepted in every legal way as a state function, historically education grew up under local control.\(^{32}\) Down through the years many factors have contributed to the expanding role of the state in providing for public education. Thurston and Roe cite the following as being among these factors:

1. The maturation of the state-local relationship.
2. The growing public demand for improved educational opportunities.
3. An increasing acceptance of the ideal of universal free public education for all.
4. An increasing emphasis upon equality of educational opportunities.
5. A continuing trend toward shifting the tax base for school support from almost

\(^{31}\)U.S., Constitution, Bill of Rights, Amendment X.

exclusive dependence on locally collected property tax to substantial portions of state-collected taxes.

6. The developing recognition that the state must assume its share of the responsibility for providing for public education if all children are to be assured an equitable educational opportunity.33

Recognizing that there are changes rapidly coming about as a result of technological advancements, as well as the above cited factors, it seems essential that necessary changes be made in our educational programs at the state level upon sound evaluative data. Byrn suggests that evaluation designed for program planning and decision-making purposes consists of four procedural elements:

1. A statement of educational objectives.

2. An inventory of what was done to achieve the objectives.

3. An appraisal of the situation before the start of the program (determine benchmarks).

4. Subsequent measurement to determine progress and accomplishments.34

The state education agency's responsibility for the state-wide educational program certainly indicates


that any improvement of any of the component parts, such as the division of business and office education, would subsequently contribute to the improvement of the total educational program throughout the state. In order to provide the kind of leadership needed for a dynamic state school system, it appears that effective evaluations are desirable on the part of educational leaders.

Elsbree and McNally suggest the following regarding supervision in the elementary school:

One of the foundation stones of the emerging philosophy and practice of supervision is the belief that current practice should always be questioned, examined, evaluated, and placed upon the searching light of critical analysis, and that such analysis should be applied to supervisory practice itself.35

There is little doubt that such a statement could equally be applied to state supervision as evidenced by the need for improvement of supervisory practice in a statement from Lucio and McNeil: "The common dimension of supervision--found in all positions of leadership--is the ability to perceive desirable objectives, and to help others contribute to this vision and to act in accordance with it."36


The required leadership for educational programs to meet the changing needs of the nation's citizens must have some guidelines to assist them in planning desired changes. Adams and Dickey, in referring to evaluation and in support of it as an integral part of the education process state that

It is a recurring process involving the formulation of objectives, their clearer definition, and continued efforts to interpret the results of appraisals in terms which throw light on the educational program and on the individual problems.37

Burton and Brueckner suggest that the necessity for development methods of evaluating leadership through supervision may grow out of such problems as:

1. The need for justifying the establishment and maintenance of various services having supervisory functions.

2. The need for evaluating the services rendered by members of the supervisory staff.

3. Planning for the continued improvement of supervisory personnel, procedures, and services.38

Kimball Wiles indicated that it is important for the supervision of local programs to lead in the area of evaluation, also. Wiles felt that the supervisor must be the first to be evaluated and that he should practice

37Adams and Dickey, op. cit., p. 102.
38Burton and Brueckner, op. cit., p. 656.
self-evaluation and secure group evaluation of his work. It would follow that, as each individual supervisor's growth progresses, the sum total of the supervisory program improves. This "self-evaluation" technique is further emphasized in a report of the American Association of School Administrators.

Based upon the preceding discussion of evaluation, it would appear safe to state, in general, that "the principle of self-evaluation is acceptable to most groups interested in an improvement program."

McNerney supports this contention when he states that "few thoughtful educators would deny that improving supervisory practices is one of the most important professional educational imperatives."

Burton and Brueckner state that "every person with leadership responsibility should be expected to furnish tangible evidence of the

---


effectiveness of the improvement programs that he proposes and puts into operation.

The process of evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of educational programs is concerned with whether the programs lead to the results desired and whether the results are reached efficiently. Therefore, continuous evaluation should deal with an appraisal of the end results as well as the functioning of each component part.

In an effort to focus attention on the great importance of evaluation of supervisory programs, the following statement is provided and appears to have exceeding merit in regard to appraising state level administrative and supervisory programs:

Realization and growth of . . . school personnel seems dependent in large measure upon their willingness and ability to appraise their own progress. Doing this is made more difficult when they are evaluated by someone else and then expected to perform in accordance with the "foreign" yardstick. Improvements usually come more quickly and lastingly on the basis of evaluations made by those directly concerned with the responsibility of the school program.

---

43 Burton and Brueckner, op. cit., p. 655.
44 Education for a Changing World of Work, op. cit., p. 65.
Growth of the individual is also emphasized by the American Association of School Administrators and evaluation contributes to this growth of those in leadership positions. They state that "if growth is not static, sporadic, or unilinear, then the appraisal of what is happening becomes more important than what has happened. If this is true, then evaluation is an integral part of the whole process of becoming."46

Although the major concern of this research is aimed primarily at the evaluation of programs of leadership in business and office education rather than of individual supervisors, it is expected that many benefits will accrue to the individual supervisors as they more closely analyze their supervisory program, procedures, and activities.

46 The Superintendent as Instructional Leader, op. cit., p. 197.
CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM GOALS

Vocational education has evolved as an integral part of the educational system in our nation. Business and office education has played an important role in the development of vocational programs even though it was not being supported by Federal financial aid. It is the purpose of this chapter to substantiate the need for program goals on the state level and report the findings of a portion of this research concerning the development of a set of program goals for vocational education.

The Need for Program Goals

The need for a set of program goals for vocational education, in which business and office education holds a prominent position, became apparent in the initial stages of this research. Many recognized authorities have filled the literature with statements indicating or implying the need for such goals or objectives as a framework around which evaluation may be built. Not only should there be a set of realistic program goals established, but there should
also be a set of guiding principles used to direct supervisory activities toward the accepted goals.

One of the major functions of supervision is expressed by Wiles in that the function of the supervisor is to contribute to the group's accomplishment of its goals. Wiles states that "the supervisor's work should be evaluated as a part of the judgment concerning the total group effort. . . . The goals . . . are the criteria against which the work of the official leader must ultimately be judged."\(^1\)

In thinking about evaluation, two key ideas need to be kept clear: the concept of a goal, giving direction to the behavior being evaluated, and the concept of some norm, standard, or value being applied to the behavior to determine its adequacy.\(^2\)

Behavior in research has been viewed as interactions of the state supervisory program in business and office education with other educational, governmental, and civic groups. The criterion statement and key indicators are intended to be used as the criteria for determining the adequacy of the concepts referred to by Herrick.

The research of The Ohio Center for the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration suggests that of the

\(^1\) Kimball Wiles, *op. cit.*, pp. 299-300.

nine critical areas of administrative behavior, the most important one is setting the goals. This critical activity is closely related to the fourth administrative behavior which is appraising effectiveness.\(^3\) Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer state that "the people involved in determining goals and the way goals are set are crucial factors in bringing about their achievement."\(^4\)

In discussing evaluation in education, Burton and Brueckner suggest that one of the basic steps which seems appropriate for the evaluation of supervision, as for any other aspect of education, is that "all major goals and values of the educational program must be determined and accepted."\(^5\)

It is obvious that the scope of evaluation will vary according to the purpose of the specific areas of education being evaluated. In general, it can be said that evaluation is concerned with (1) the scope and quality of the goals, purposes and (2) the function of the total educational program and the extent to which they meet

---


\(^4\)Ibid., p. 225.

the needs of the various individuals and are in line with the desires and needs of the community as a whole. 6

Farnseth states that "good school supervision is a resource, consultant, and coordinating service that contributes significantly to the goals of the school." 7 It is again implied here that accepted goals serve as a basis for supervision. Farnseth adheres to the point of view that supervision is most effective in accomplishing its purposes when it contributes significantly to the solution of problems and to the accomplishment of goals considered important by the teachers and supervisors. 8

There appears to be value both in the development of criteria concerning some of the major goals of the supervisory program and in the use of such criteria in the discussion and appraisal of various phases of supervisory activity. Hicks outlines criteria related to the philosophy and goals of the supervisory program which indicates the importance which he places upon the concept of goals as a basis for supervision. 9 Hicks points out the importance of goals in evaluating the supervisory program when he

7 Farnseth, op. cit., p. 29.
8 Ibid.
9 Hanne J. Hicks, op. cit., pp. 418-419.
states that the effectiveness of each part of the educational process is influenced by the degree to which goals have been achieved.  

To further emphasize the need for program goals in the evaluation process, Wilhelms says that "it is important to emphasize that education must concern itself with all the important objectives..."!

Ideally, evaluation of an educational program is carried out "in terms of its philosophy of education, its individually expressed purposes and objectives, ... and the nature of the American democracy of which it is a part."! The Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition, states that "philosophy expresses an ideal--something to strive for, something to reach for. The objectives are more imminent. They are goals that are ... within one's group."!

There appears to be no reason why accepted goals of state supervision could not be utilizes in the process of

\[\text{10} \text{Ibid.}\]


evaluation the same as has been indicated for instructional programs.

In referring to the need for an organizational structure for any type of organization, Morphet, Johns, and Reller present the idea that

An organizational structure is necessary when any group has a common task. An unorganized group is a mob. It can neither determine nor accomplish its goals. Therefore, in order to survive, the group must provide for at least the following procedures for making decisions and taking action:

1. a procedure for selecting a leader or leaders;
2. a procedure for determining the roles to be played by each member of the group;
3. a procedure for determining the goals or purposes of the group;
4. a procedure for achieving the goals of the group.

It would appear from the foregoing statement that the establishment of goals or purposes is a major step in the organization of any type of program. The procedure for determining the goals or purposes would surely precede any plan of action for implementation.

Wiles has summed up the evaluation process rather completely in regard to the important role that program goals play in this process.

Evaluation is the process of making judgments that are to be used as a basis for planning. It consists of establishing goals, collecting evidence concerning growth or lack of growth toward goals, making judgments about the evidence, and revising

---

14 Morphet, Johns, and Reller, op. cit., p. 54.
procedures and goals in light of the judgment. It is a procedure for improving the product, the process, and even the goals themselves.15

In a later edition of Wiles' book, he purports that "the only way to judge the success of the group and the supervisor is by the amount of progress made toward the goals."16

Even though the literature is filled with principles of evaluation, it would be difficult to find a given set of principles that does not include (1) the need for goals, (2) the consideration of both process and product, (3) the concept of continuity, and (4) wide participation by those being evaluated (self-evaluation concept).

The principles presented by Sutherland contain one unique principle which appears to have a great deal of merit in terms of evaluating supervisory programs. That is, identifying "key indicators of success or failure."17 This principle appears to apply equally as well to the development of program goals. The goals of a program should be broad and comprehensive and the specifics of these broad, comprehensive goals should be stated in operating procedures to be followed for the implementation.

17Sid S. Sutherland, op. cit., p. 17.
Program Goals Related to the Rationale for Vocational Education

Vocational-technical education has undergone systematic and dynamic changes over the years since its early beginning in the public schools. However, it has not changed its basic purpose of educating and training our nation's citizens for entrance into and advancement in the world of work. It is one of the most important avenues of conserving and developing both human and natural resources in this country. It is of great significance to point out that vocational-technical education is considered to be "a wise business investment for this Nation, because our national prosperity and happiness are at stake and our position in the markets of the world cannot otherwise be maintained." 18

The systematic and dynamic changes taking place are evidenced in recent legislation such as the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, The Vocational Education Act of 1963, The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps), and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Prior to these Acts, there

had been little change in the Federal legislation regarding vocational education.\textsuperscript{19}

While the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 represented a national endorsement of vocational-technical education, its provisions were rooted in circumstances preceding World War I. Venn and Marchese point out that this had led to some undesirable results such as:

1. Identification of vocational education as a high school function, outside the interest or concern of higher education.

2. Stress on useful and productive activities as a major portion of the programs of instruction.

3. Expectation that graduates would enter employment related to this training, with need for retraining unlikely.

4. Limitation of chances for continuing education beyond the high school for those who elected vocational programs.\textsuperscript{20}

The desire of society to achieve the national goal of education, "the optimum development of all the American people—children, youth, and adults at all levels of


ability and from all socio-economic backgrounds," has been a major factor in the further development of vocational-technical education.

The concern for a dynamic system of vocational-technical education is evidenced by the following statement in 1961 by the late President John F. Kennedy in his message to Congress on American education:

The National Vocational Education Acts, first enacted by the Congress of 1917, and subsequently amended, have provided a program of training for industry, agriculture, and other occupational areas. The basic purpose of our vocational education effort is sound and sufficiently broad to provide a basis for meeting future needs. However, the technological changes which occurred in all occupations call for a review and reevaluation of these acts, with a view toward their modernization.

In seeking guidance in the direction for vocational-technical education to move toward better fulfilling the needs of the country, President Kennedy appointed a Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. The report of this Panel appears to contain a concept recognizing the "primacy of individual." This concept has been advocated strongly by Alberty in his system of values in a democracy.

---


The responsibility of society is also expressed in the providing of a program to meet the Nation's need for trained workers as reported by the Panel. The "program standards" set forth by the Panel should be utilized in the establishment of any program goals at all levels of vocational-technical education. The program standards provided by the Panel are as follows:

1. The vocational education program should be an integral part of the total public education program, rendering service and earning status commensurate with its significance to the community, the State, and the Nation.

2. The vocational education program should offer opportunities to all youth and adults at appropriate levels in all occupational fields, including highly technical work of less than professional grade. It should be sufficiently flexible to meet the needs, not only of youth seeking occupational preparation as a part of their high school education, but also of persons who desire full-time training, employed persons who desire pre-employment training for one field while working in another, and those who desire training for updating and upgrading.

3. Vocational education programs should maintain a high level of quality through well-developed curriculums and courses of study, satisfactory and accessible facilities, up-to-date instructional equipment and materials, competent instructors employing good teaching methods, carefully selected students, and efficient administration and supervision.24

The program standards established by the Panel indicate that there is a need for a set of program goals

---

to be developed and subsequently accepted by vocational educators. The importance of these program goals to state level administrators and supervisors of business and office education is self-evident. However, one important fact, not generally known nor accepted by educators in the other vocational service areas, is that "secondary schools employ more than 60,000 business education teachers compared with some 37,000 high school teachers engaged in all the vocational education programs aided by Federal grants."^25

Prior to the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, business and office education was receiving no Federal financial aid in support of its programs. Levitan reported that at the time of his research, which was prior to 1963, it was estimated that as many high school students were registered in these programs as in all the other vocational service area programs which were benefiting from Federal financial aid. Any program goals developed for vocational-technical education would be doubly important to business and office educators based upon the findings of Levitan. However, they will be equally important to all vocational educators and not unique or peculiar to any individual vocational service area.

[^26]: Ibid.
The Evolvement of Program Goals

This portion of the research was completed while employed at The Center for Research and Leadership Development in Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. A review of literature, related studies, and investigations in connection with the development of program goals for vocational-technical education was conducted.

With the assistance of several project directors, graduate advisers, supervisors, graduate students, and specialists at The Center, six program goals were refined and modified in order to present them to state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of the several vocational service areas at the state level. Prior to release of these suggested program goals, several advisory committees were consulted in an effort to further refine the statements and clarify their meanings.

The final draft was mimeographed and distributed to the selected groups identified above. The six program goals which were presented to this jury are as follows:

1. To provide vocational-technical education and training to youth and adults who will be entering the labor force and to those who seek to upgrade their occupational competencies or learn new skills.
2. To provide comprehensive curricula which relate general and vocational-technical education offerings to the vocational objectives of students.

3. To provide increased accessibility to programs of vocational-technical education to meet the needs of those to be served.

4. To provide quality instructional programs which meet the vocational aspirations of people while being compatible with employment opportunities.

5. To provide for the maximum utilization of administrative, supervisory, teacher education, research, guidance, and other personnel toward the achievement of program objectives.

6. To provide a systematic and continuous evaluation of vocational-technical education in terms of national and state interests, student benefit, and manpower requirements as a means for making decisions concerning alternative investments of human and economic resources and the redirection of program objectives.

The state directors or supervisors of agriculture, business education, distributive education, home economics, and trade and industrial education were asked to respond to the above goals in terms of whether they considered the goals acceptable or unacceptable. Also, state directors
of vocational education were requested to respond in a like manner.

In addition to indicating their acceptance or unacceptance of a particular program goal, each respondent was requested to indicate possible changes which he or she would recommend to be made in the program goal.

There were 290 survey instruments sent to state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of the several service areas. A total of 189 survey instruments were returned and are analyzed in this part of the study. This number represents 65.17 percent of the total population.

Table 1 indicates the responses to program goal number one. Of 189 responses only 3 indicated that program goal number one was unacceptable. However, seven respondents indicated changes which they would recommend for this program goal.

One director of agriculture who indicated that program goal number one was unacceptable also indicated that all the other program goals were unacceptable. He stated "these might be used in a trade and industrial education program, but hardly seem to be directed toward the vocational agriculture program."

The two home economics directors who indicated that program goal number one was unacceptable did so
TABLE 1
JURY RESPONSES TO PROGRAM GOAL NUMBER ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury Group</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Directors of Vocational Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Office</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industrial</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

because, as they indicate, the goal "does not include home-making." Other recommended changes for this program goal included such statements as "include those in the labor force who seek . . .," "in place of youth and adults use citizens," and two respondents indicated that the word "training" should be omitted.

It is evident that there is a problem of semantics involved in writing or discussing program goals, and,
therefore, misunderstandings and misinterpretations of these goals are somewhat evident. The changes recommended by the jury for program goal number one were not major changes but rather were semantic changes.

Three respondents indicated that program goal number two was unacceptable. There were, however, fourteen respondents who felt that changes were needed in this program goal. A total of fourteen changes was recommended.

TABLE 2

JURY RESPONSES TO PROGRAM GOAL NUMBER TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury Group</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Directors of Vocational Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Office</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industrial</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The major questions or concern on the part of the jury regarding program goal number two dealt with the term "general education" which appeared to be quite confusing to the respondents. The word "relate" used in connection with general and vocational-technical education appeared to create concern on the part of the directors or supervisors.

One respondent indicated that the program goal "should tell how the relationship between general and vocational education is to be completed." Still another indicated that "the term 'direct' should be used in place of the word 'relate'." Still another respondent felt that "the term 'comprehensive' should be taken out and 'curricula based on job requirements' should be inserted."

Basically, half of this group who recommended changes—seven in number—questioned the term "general."

Other changes were recommended which were primarily changes in punctuation or in a word. All of the recommended changes for program goal number two combined would not significantly change the meaning of the statement as it was originally constructed and refined.

Table 3 indicates that there were three respondents who indicated that program goal number three was unacceptable.

The changes which were recommended by the respondents regarding program goal number three were closely
related to the terminology used in Public Law 88-210 regarding persons "who can profit from the program," as one respondent stated it. Another respondent added that "not only the needs of the individuals to be served is important, but also the needs of business and industry for competent personnel must be served." It was the intent of this goal when it was developed to be broad enough to cover the needs of these two groups.

TABLE 3
JURY RESPONSES TO PROGRAM GOAL NUMBER THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury-Group</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Directors of Vocational Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Office</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industrial</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other very minor semantic changes were recommended. An example of a minor recommended change is: "The 'to' following the word education in program goal number three should be changed to 'which'." Many of the changes indicated by the jury were of this nature.

In Table 4 there were four unacceptable responses indicated. Of this number three of the unacceptable responses were so indicated because of the need for the inclusion of some statement relative to the "potential of people" and "the needs and desires of people." The fourth unacceptable response is one which was indicated earlier by the supervisor of agriculture who indicated that none of the program goals was acceptable due to the fact that they were more related to trade and industrial education than agriculture or vocational education in general.

Some of the changes which were indicated for program goal number four were: "aspiration is not a good term to use," "some statement regarding the introduction and orientation of new employment opportunities should be added," and "the words 'present' and 'future' should be inserted before the word 'employment' in goal number four."

Table 5 indicates that three respondents considered program goal number five as unacceptable. Two of these unacceptable responses were based on the premise
TABLE 4
JURY RESPONSES TO PROGRAM GOAL NUMBER FOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury Group</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Directors of Vocational Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Office</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industrial</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>185</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 179</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that "teachers" were not included in the statement, and, therefore, the statement was unacceptable. The other unacceptable response was recorded and this negative response to all the program goals has been explained above.

The smallest number of recommended changes was recorded for program goal number five. There were only five changes recommended for this goal. They included statements such as "this statement is far too broad to
be used as a program goal," "be sure to include business or industrial advisory committees," and "add 'teachers' to this list."

TABLE 5
JURY RESPONSES TO PROGRAM GOAL NUMBER FIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury Group</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Directors of Vocational Education . . .</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture . . .</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Office . . . .</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive . .</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics .</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industrial . .</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 6, jury responses to program goal number six, indicate a sharp increase in the changes which were recommended by the respondents and also indicate that there were five respondents who considered program goal number six to be unacceptable. This is the
largest number of recommended changes and unacceptable responses for any of the goals included in the survey instrument.

**TABLE 6**

**JURY RESPONSES TO PROGRAM GOAL NUMBER SIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury Group</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Directors of Vocational Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Office</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industrial</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would appear that the length of goal number six had a great deal to do with the understanding and subsequent acceptance or recommended changes regarding it. Five respondents indicated that the statement was "too long." Others indicated that the "wording is unclear,"
"this statement is too broad and not clear," and "make goal number six more clear!"

What appeared to be one of the major misunderstandings of this set of program goals was brought to light by the reaction of the respondents to program goal number six. Even though the respondents were told that the program goals were being developed for a state program of vocational-technical education, eight of the respondents indicated that this goal should include the term "local" when referring to state and national interests. This possible misunderstanding may have accounted for the large number of changes which were recommended by the respondents to goal number six.

Other comments by the respondents regarding program goal number six included "sounds dictatorial," "reverse state and national goals," and "insert a period after the word 'goals' and leave out the rest."

Table 7, a summary of all jury responses, indicates that the general acceptance of the program goals is quite high. Of 1,134 possible responses on the part of state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of agriculture, business and office education, distributive education, home economics, and trade and industrial education, 1,113--98.15 percent--indicated acceptance. Recommended changes for all program goals represented only 5.91 percent.
TABLE 7
SUMMARY OF JURY RESPONSES TO PROGRAM GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>98.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>98.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>98.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>97.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>98.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>97.35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>98.15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is significant that program goal number six was unacceptable to 2.65 percent of the respondents and that 11.64 percent recommended changes for this goal. Also, the reader should note that, even though 98.41 percent of the respondents accepted program goal number two, 7.40 percent recommended or suggested possible changes.
Chapter IV was designed to report the development of an evaluative instrument to be used by state personnel in evaluating the business and office education service at the state level. This chapter also presents an analysis of the ratings of the criterion statements and key indicators for evaluating state level programs of business and office education as recorded by state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of business and office education.

The Evaluative Instrument

Before analyzing the ratings as recorded by the respondents, it would be well for the reader to examine the evaluative instrument which was developed in this study. It should be noted that the evaluative instrument included in this chapter is the complete instrument that was presented to the respondents with the exception of one minor difference, that difference being that the evaluative instrument which was presented to the respondents for their reaction and ratings was presented in small type.
which took up twelve typewritten sheets for the total instrument. The draft as presented in this chapter, in order to comply with the rules and regulations regarding dissertations, takes up considerably more space.

The general instructions regarding the process whereby the respondents were to mark their ratings on the survey instrument are included in the general directions which was the first page of the instrument.

The evaluative instrument was developed and constructed on the basis of an extensive review of literature in the field of evaluation, personal interviews with recognized authorities in the field of evaluation, and on personal experience in the field.

In the Bibliography, a section has been included entitled Other References; in this section of the Bibliography there are many of the articles reviewed that served as a basis for this evaluative instrument, but which were not specifically cited in the study.

In reviewing the references cited in the Bibliography and in reviewing evaluative instruments developed by a number of persons in the field of vocational education and general education, it was noted that, in general, they recommended or included a number of common characteristics. Some of these major common characteristics are as follows:

1. The evaluative instrument is generally divided into appropriate sub-sections or divisions.
2. Each sub-section or division is generally introduced by a principle or statement of philosophy.

3. The evaluator is generally given an opportunity to place qualitative, quantitative, or both types of value on the activities described.

4. Each sub-section or division usually contains statements which describe activities or questions, which when answered, describe activities.

5. The evaluator is provided an opportunity to observe activities which are not included in the evaluative instrument.

6. A suggested procedure for using the evaluative instrument is included.

7. Evaluative instruments are usually designed to measure progress toward the accomplishment of goals and objectives of the specific program to be evaluated.

The evaluative instrument constructed and developed in this study incorporates each of these common features.

As discussed in Chapter III, the goals for vocational education which were developed and analyzed as a part of this research served as guidelines in the development of the evaluative instrument for this study. It was quite apparent that very few states had written materials which described their goals or objectives. Therefore, these program goals were developed in such a way as to be
broad enough to fit any state level program in any state. Likewise, the evaluative instrument developed for this study, in line with these accepted program goals, was constructed in such a manner as to be workable under varying circumstances for varying state needs or conditions.
EVALUATING THE BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SERVICE

AT THE STATE LEVEL
GENERAL DIRECTIONS

The purpose of developing an instrument to evaluate the business and office education service at the state level is to provide state staffs an opportunity to examine their programs and determine possible ways and means of improving them. This instrument is being designed as a self-evaluation mechanism.

As you read and react to each CRITERION STATEMENT and KEY INDICATOR, simply place a check (✓) mark in the parenthesis in front of the word which best describes how you would rate the statement for use in evaluating a state level program of supervision in business and office education.

In reading and reacting to the SUPPORTING EVIDENCE, simply draw a line through any item that you think is inappropriate and add other appropriate items in the space provided at the end of each of these sections. Your comments or suggestions—written on the instrument or attached—will be appreciated.
CRITERION STATEMENTS, KEY INDICATORS, AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCES

If you have comments or suggestions, please write freely on this instrument.

YOUR RESPONSES

How do you rate these statements for use in evaluating a state level program of supervision?

PLEASE CHECK (✓) ONE

CRITERION STATEMENT

I. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

should provide the leadership in the development of the educational services provided by the business and office education service in the state.

KEY INDICATORS

A. USES a written statement of philosophy and goals as a basis for the promotion and development of the state program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Written statement of philosophy
2. Copy of immediate and long-range goals
3. Other pertinent data: ____________________________
B. IMPROVES classroom and laboratory instruction by suggesting and providing enriched learning opportunities for the state's teaching force.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Number and topic of state-wide workshops or in-service programs
2. Number of participants in state-wide workshops and in-service programs
3. Number and topic of local or regional workshops or in-service programs
4. Roster of participants in local or regional workshops and in-service programs
5. Number and topic of individual and small group conferences, including seminars, conducted
6. Roster of persons participating in individual or small group conferences
7. Copy of agenda for state-wide, regional, local, and small group conferences, workshops, and in-service programs
8. Inventory of consultants used for all workshops or in-service programs
9. Other pertinent data:

C. CONDUCTS curriculum development activities with representative groups of educators, using the advice and counsel of people from business and industry.
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Roster of participating groups in curriculum development
2. List of local school districts or regions of the state represented in curriculum development
3. Report of curriculum councils developed on the local school district level
4. Report of the relationship of the state advisory committee to the business and office education service in curriculum development
5. Copy of curriculum guides for business and office education
6. Procedures for changes in curriculum design and curriculum guides
7. Changes in curriculum design and guides put into effect since the last evaluation
8. Additional changes in curriculum design and guides that have been identified but not yet put into effect
9. Other pertinent data: ______________________

D. PREPARES or OBTAINS appropriate instructional materials and distributes the material to the state's teaching force.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. File of instructional materials prepared by business and office education service -continued-
2. File of instructional materials obtained from outside sources
3. Roster of outside sources for obtaining suitable instructional materials
4. List of instructional materials which have been identified as needed but are not available
5. Procedures for dissemination of instructional materials
6. Roster of personnel across the state who have the abilities and interests in developing instructional materials
7. List of persons used in preparing instructional materials
8. Other pertinent data: ____________________

E. DEVELOPS and PROMOTES youth organization activities that provide leadership outlets for students.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Number of schools with youth organizations
2. List of schools that should initiate youth organizations
3. Diagram showing relationship of local youth organizations to state and national youth organizations
4. Roster of sponsors of local and state youth organizations
5. Roster of state officers of the state youth organizations

--continued--
6. Report of the activities of the state youth organizations
7. List of youth and sponsors representing the state in national youth organization conventions
8. Report of youth organization activities in community and civic affairs
9. Written statement indicating the relationship of youth organization activities and instructional program
10. Other pertinent data: __________________

F. PROVIDES assistance in planning for appropriate equipment, layout, and facilities

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
1. List of recommendations for equipment to be used in the various subject-matter areas
2. File of specification sheets on office machines and furniture
3. Guidelines for selecting proper equipment and furniture
4. Report of amortization schedules used by local schools
5. Priority schedule for equipping local programs
6. Copy of layout diagrams recommended for each type of classroom or laboratory
7. Guidelines for classroom and laboratory size, electrical requirements, lighting, and other physical requirements -continued-
8. Diagram showing facility planning in terms of overall location relationships of classrooms and laboratories

9. Other pertinent data: ___________________

G. ENCOURAGES and ASSISTS in the evaluation of local programs in interpreting and utilizing evaluation results to improve instructional programs.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. File of evaluation reports concerning local programs qualifying for accreditation
2. Number of formal evaluations of local programs that state office personnel assisted in conducting
3. List of business and office education service personnel assisting in local program evaluation
4. Roster of schools conducting informal evaluation of their programs with the assistance of the business and office education service
5. Report of changes in local programs as a result of an analysis of evaluation results
6. Number and type of consultative services provided to local school districts regarding interpreting and utilizing evaluation results -continued-
7. Other pertinent data: ___________________ 

H. INITIATES, PROMOTES, and UTILIZES research in identifying program needs and possible needs for redirection of supervisory activities.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of researchable topics that have been identified and priorities established
2. Report of research projects completed or under way
3. Roster of researchers conducting research by topic
4. Number and type of demonstration, experimental, and pilot programs initiated on the basis of research findings
5. Amount of financial aid provided for research projects
6. Report of efforts to coordinate research activities of graduate students with other research activities in the state
7. Number and types of changes in instructional programs brought about as a result of research activities
8. Changes in supervisory activities based upon research findings
9. Other pertinent data: ___________________
I. COOPERATES with teacher-education institutions in developing effective programs for pre-service and in-service teacher education.

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

1. Copy of report showing how the business and office education service and teacher education programs complement one another
2. Number and type of joint activities sponsored by the business and office education service and teacher education institutions
3. Roster of personnel from both the business and office education service and teacher-education institutions participating in joint teacher education activities
4. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

**CRITERION STATEMENT**

II. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN COORDINATING THE EFFORTS OF THE BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SERVICE WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE AGENCIES TO IMPROVE THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE STATE.
KEY INDICATORS

A. IDENTIFIES governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations that are concerned and involved with business and office education programs in the state.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. File of governmental agencies conducting business and office education programs
2. List of private agencies conducting business and office education programs
3. Roster of governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations interested in and supporting the business and office education program other than by conducting such programs
4. Other pertinent data: ________________________________

B. INITIATES conferences with representatives of governmental and private agencies, groups, and organizations in an effort to coordinate educational efforts and to improve programs throughout the state.

A. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
   ( ) Average ( ) Fair
   ( ) Poor

B. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
   ( ) Average ( ) Fair
   ( ) Poor
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (B.)

1. List of representatives and agencies, groups, or organizations in attendance at such meetings.
2. Agendas of such meetings.
3. Catalog of activities jointly sponsored or conducted by the business and office education service and governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations.
4. Other pertinent data: ______________________

C. UTILIZES the consultative services and expertise of representatives of governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations, as well as providing such services in return.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Roster of those representatives of governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations who supplied consultative services to the business and office education service.
2. Number and type of consultative services supplied to governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations by the business and office education service.
3. Other pertinent data: ______________________
CRITERION STATEMENT

III. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN PROMOTING LOCAL INITIATIVE, CONTROL, AND RESPONSIBILITY WHILE COORDINATING THESE ELEMENTS INTO A UNIFIED STATE PROGRAM.

KEY INDICATORS

A. PROVIDES a consulting service, rather than a dictatorial relationship, to local school districts.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. File of state regulations which indicate maximum freedom and responsibility to local school districts, yet are consistent with the state's obligation for effective education
2. List of appearances before local governing school boards on behalf of local school personnel
3. Inventory of consultative efforts in assisting local school personnel in developing short- and long-range program goals with possible ways and means of implementation
   -continued-
4. Copy of reimbursement policies which indicate local school initiative
5. Directory of local supervisory personnel in business and office education responsible for local program promotion, development, and control who assist in coordinating their programs into a unified state program
6. Other pertinent data: __________________

B. UTILIZES the efforts of local school personnel in developing a unified state program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Report of local educational innovations or specialized techniques which were relayed by the business and office education service to other areas of the state in order to improve other programs
2. List of local experimental, pilot, or demonstration programs, which were relayed by the business and office education service to other areas of the state in order to improve other programs
3. Roster of local school personnel used as consultants to the business and office education service in developing various aspects of the state program
4. Report of visits of local school personnel to other school districts to observe program operations which were initiated by the business and office education service

B. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
     ( ) Average ( ) Fair
     ( ) Poor

-continued-
5. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

CRITERION STATEMENT

IV. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN DEVELOPING A
SOUND HUMAN RELATIONS PROGRAM WHICH CONTRIBUTES
TO THE STIMULATION OF INDIVIDUAL CREATIVITY AND
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH.

KEY INDICATORS

A. INVOLVES those persons in program develop­
ment who are affected by the state program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of categories of those persons
   affected by the program
2. Roster of representatives of the
categories of persons affected by the
program who were involved in its
development
3. Report of persons recognized for their
contribution to the state program and
how they were recognized
4. Other pertinent data:________________________

B. UTILIZES an effective communication system

involving all persons affected by or concerned

IV. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
     ( ) Average ( ) Fair
     ( ) Poor

B. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
     ( ) Average ( ) Fair
     ( ) Poor
with the business and office education program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Diagram showing official channels of communications among educational agencies as well as other governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations
2. Copy of policies and procedures regarding communications within educational agencies
3. Copy of policies and procedures regarding communications outside educational agencies
4. Diagram showing possible channels of informal communications
5. List of categories of those persons receiving copies of policies and procedures regarding communications
6. Other pertinent data:__________________

CRITERION STATEMENT

V. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

SHOULD ENSURE THAT BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE PROMOTED, DEVELOPED, AND OPERATED WITHIN THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND PROVISIONS OF THE STATE PLAN FOR BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION.
KEY INDICATORS

A. ASSISTS in preparing and securing legislation that is essential for adequate programs by working through the state director of vocational education.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of proposed legislation
2. File of legislation which has been passed
3. Number and names of legislators who were contacted regarding the pending or passed legislation
4. Number and name of committee members who worked on pending or passed legislation
5. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

B. PROVIDES a state plan constructed to be flexible so as to include minimum standards for efficient and effective program operation.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of State Plan for business and office education
2. Listing of needed changes in the State Plan to ensure flexibility
   -continued-
3. File of materials used in explaining the State Plan's minimum standards and inherent flexibilities to local school administrators

4. Other pertinent data:________________________

C. MAINTAINS a system of records which provides evidence of the state's compliance with the legal provisions of state and Federal legislation and regulations.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of information requests sent to local school districts regarding compliance to State Plan
2. Reports of on-site visits to local school districts regarding compliance to State Plan
3. Guidelines used in determining the eligibility of local school districts for reimbursements
4. Other pertinent data:________________________

CRITERION STATEMENT

VI. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

SHOULD DEVELOP A PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM WHICH INTERPRETS THE PURPOSES, PROCEDURES, AND

C. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
   ( ) Average ( ) Fair
   ( ) Poor
ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION TO THE PUBLIC.

KEY INDICATORS

A. UTILIZES an active advisory committee comprised of leaders from education, business, and industry in planning and promoting the state-wide program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Roster of advisory committee members and the area and organization they represent
2. Agenda of advisory committee meetings
3. Proceedings and outcomes of advisory committee meetings
4. Other pertinent data: ___________________

E. ATTEMPTS to ascertain and continually improve the public image of business and office education.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Collection of printed articles published throughout the state concerning business and office education programs
2. Correspondence or specific sections of -continued-
speeches related to the public image of business and office education
3. File of all printed brochures or other material interpreting the present and future of business and office education to the general public, school administrators, teachers, and students
4. Copies of all releases to news media related to business and office education
5. Other pertinent data:

C. UTILIZES the talents and efforts of persons specifically trained in public relations techniques, as well as local school personnel and citizens, to develop a coordinated public relations program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
1. Copy of a diagram or list showing personnel and procedures followed in public relations activities
2. Copy of diagram or list indicating possible news media throughout the state which can be and is being utilized for public relations activities.
3. Other pertinent data:

D. PROVIDES the leadership in interpreting the business and office education

D. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
( ) Average ( ) Fair
( ) Poor
program to the citizens of the state.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Listing of:
   a. appearances before educational groups
   b. appearances before civic groups
   c. appearances before professional groups
   d. articles written and published
   e. radio and TV appearances
   f. films prepared
2. File of displays shown to the general public
3. Other pertinent data: __________________________

CRITERION STATEMENT

VII. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

SHOULD PROVIDE FOR A CONTINUOUS, SYSTEMATIC
EVALUATION OF THE STATE PROGRAM AS WELL AS SELF-
GENERATED PERSONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE
STATE STAFF.

KEY INDICATORS

A. SETS aside a definite period of time for
   the evaluation process with sufficient
resources allocated in order to readily complete the task.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Time schedule for evaluation, including data collection
2. Statement of the time requirements of personnel needed to complete the evaluation
3. Information related to any informal evaluation of supervisory effort
4. Report of actual time involved in conducting the evaluation
5. Other pertinent data: ___________________

B. UTILIZES available techniques and criteria in the evaluation process of the supervisory effort.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of instruments used
2. Copy of procedures followed
3. Roster of persons used to conduct the evaluation
4. List of additional instruments which would have aided in the evaluation, but were not available
5. Distribution list of evaluation results
6. Other pertinent data: ___________________
C. MAINTAINS adequate records pertaining to the status of business and office education and employment opportunities in the state that are used as a basis for program evaluation.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Report of expenditures of funds for business and office education
2. Report of number and type of schools offering business and office education
3. Report of numbers of state personnel, local supervisors, and teacher educators in business and office education
4. Report of number of teachers and enrollments in business and office education
5. Report of follow-up studies of graduates
6. Demographic data concerning the citizens of the state; e.g., educational attainment, family income, sex, etc.
7. Distribution of employment opportunities in business and office occupations by labor market areas
8. Trends and projections of employment opportunities in the business and office occupations by labor market areas
9. Census Bureau statistics—population distribution
10. Other pertinent data:

D. USES each evaluative period to serve as a "benchmark" for the next evaluation.

C. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
   ( ) Average ( ) Fair
   ( ) Poor

D. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
   ( ) Average ( ) Fair
   ( ) Poor
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (D)

1. Copy of projected program of activities' based upon the evaluation results of the previous evaluation period
2. Reports, statistical and descriptive, which indicate that needed changes which were projected in the program of activities were accomplished
3. Projected program activities which were not accomplished
4. Reasons why projected program activities were not accomplished
5. Other pertinent data:

E. ENGAGES in a personal improvement program in order to grow professionally and to be better qualified to serve in leadership roles.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of personnel qualifications and certification requirements of business and office education personnel in the State Plan
2. Number and type of in-service training programs for state office personnel and names of those attending
3. List of informal training sessions for state office personnel and roster of those participating
4. State office personnel taking sabatical leave for professional development -continued-
5. State office personnel taking vacation leave for professional development
6. Other pertinent data:

CRITERION STATEMENT

VIII. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

Should make a contribution to the improvement of the educational profession through active participation in professional associations.

KEY INDICATORS

A. SUPPORTS and PARTICIPATES in local, state, and national professional education associations.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of professional education associations in which business and office education service personnel are members
2. Report of professional education association meetings attended by business and office education service personnel
3. Roster of business and office education service personnel holding offices -continued-
4. Catalog of activities within professional education associations in which business and office education service personnel participate

5. List of responsibilities and activities pertaining to professional education association programs in which business and office education service personnel are engaged

6. File of other professional education associations in which business and office education service personnel were not members but took part in their programs or activities

7. Inventory of contributions of business and office education service personnel to professional education association journals

8. Other pertinent data: __________________

B. SUPPORTS and PARTICIPATES in those professional associations, other than educational, and civic organizations that are contributing to the advancement and improvement of education.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of those professional associations -continued-
and civic organizations that have been identified as making a contribution to education

2. Contributions made by professional associations and civic organizations by type of contribution made

3. Roster of membership in professional associations and civic organizations by business and office service personnel

4. Activities of these professional associations and civic organizations in which business and office education service personnel took part

5. Leadership activities or other responsibilities which business and office education service personnel carry out

6. Other pertinent data:

CRITERION STATEMENT

IX. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

SHOULD DEVELOP ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WHICH ARE FLEXIBLE AND FUNCTIONAL TO PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE PROGRAM OF LEADERSHIP.

KEY INDICATORS

A. PROVIDES maximum utilization of personnel in providing a consultative service to the

IX. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
( ) Average ( ) Fair
( ) Poor

A. ( ) Excellent ( ) Good
( ) Average ( ) Fair
( ) Poor
state's program of business and office education.

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

1. Copy of organizational chart showing relationships of the business and office education service to other vocational service areas and to other state and local education personnel
2. Copy of job descriptions indicating relationships of authority and responsibility within, and without, the business and office education service
3. Number of personnel authorized by the state board of education for the business and office education service
4. Number of vacancies existing in authorized positions and an indication of how the duties of the vacant position are being fulfilled
5. Numbers indicating ratio of supervisors to subordinates
6. Records which indicate that positions and job responsibilities have been altered or abolished which has led to greater efficiency and effectiveness
7. Other pertinent data: __________________

B. IDENTIFIES needed changes in its program and plans for these changes in conformity with

---

( ) Excellent ( ) Good
( ) Average ( ) Fair
( ) Poor
current and projected economic and educational trends.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Inventory of needed changes that have been identified, including new occupational needs, as indicated by results of evaluation efforts.
3. Report of current and projected educational needs in business and office education programs by regions of the state.
5. List of priorities for program development in business and office education by regions of the state and by groups of persons to be served.
6. Report showing criteria by which priorities were established for business and office education programs.
7. Time schedule and list of business and office education personnel involved in program planning.
8. Copy of completed "program of work" indicating specific ways and means for -continued-
implementation, including staff responsibilities and a flexible schedule or calendar of activities

9. Report showing how the program plan complements the efforts of other educational, governmental, and private agencies, groups, and organizations

10. Other pertinent data:

C. DEVELOPS a realistic budget and is knowledgeable concerning its overall provisions and relationships to local school districts, as well as the state office.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Diagram of accounting procedures indicating input and output methods for up-to-date information retrieval
2. File of needs and requests of funds for state office operation
3. Copy of policies and procedures for local school districts to follow in requesting funds for reimbursement
4. File of needs and requests for funds submitted by local school districts for approval
5. List of priorities established for expenditure of funds
6. Criteria by which priorities were established for the expenditure of funds
7. Copy of previous fiscal period budget -continued-
8. Report of actual expenditures during previous fiscal period
9. Copy of proposed budget
10. Other pertinent data:

D. UTILIZES an effective system for reporting data from local school districts through the business and office education service to the state director of vocational education, state department of education, and the U.S. Office of Education.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of procedures involved in reporting data from local school districts to business and office education service
2. Copy of procedures for handling data received from local school districts and organizing data for further reporting
3. Copy of procedures for reporting data to state director of vocational education and U.S. Office of Education
4. Copy of report forms indicating types of data collected and subsequently reported by the business and office education service
5. List of types of data which are needed by business and office education service -continued-
for decision-making purposes but are not presently available

6. Other pertinent data:

**CRITERION STATEMENT**

**X. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION**

SHOULD COOPERATE WITH AND ASSIST OTHER SERVICE AREAS WITHIN THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN DEVELOPING AND PROMOTING A SOUND EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR ALL THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE.

**KEY INDICATORS**

**A. PARTICIPATES in staff meetings of the entire state department of education, vocational and non-vocational, and promotes mutual understandings of each service area's unique contributions and problems.**

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

1. Number and type of presentations made to entire state department staff
2. Number and name of general committees
   -continued-
served on by business and office education service personnel

3. Number of state department of education staff meetings attended and number of business and office education service personnel attending

4. Roster of persons in non-vocational areas of the state department of education used as consultants to the business and office education service and how they were used

5. List of business and office education service personnel used as consultants to non-vocational areas of the state department of education and how they were used

6. Other pertinent data: __________________

B. UTILIZES the complementary services provided by the state department of education, as well as making a contribution to these services.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Number of times and type of:
   a. data provided by the Bureau of Statistical Services
   b. assistance provided by Publications and Public Information Division
   c. assistance provided by Budgetary and Financial Division
   -continued-
d. assistance provided by Credentials and Certification Division

e. consultative services provided by these complementary services by the business and office education service

2. Other pertinent data:

C. AIDS in the development of a comprehensive vocational program, and cooperatively works with other vocational service areas in program development.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Number of cooperative efforts involving two or more vocational service areas

2. Types of cooperative efforts undertaken by two or more vocational service areas and names of service areas involved

3. Roster of those persons from each service area involved in the cooperative efforts

4. Other pertinent data: _____________________________

| C. | ( ) Excellent | ( ) Good |
|    | ( ) Average | ( ) Fair |
|    | ( ) Poor    |          |
Analysis of Data

At the time the evaluative instrument was mailed to the state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of business and office education, they were requested to make any comments or suggestions which would be helpful in refining the evaluative instrument for future use. These comments or suggestions are reported in this section.

The data are discussed in reference to the ratings by state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of business and office education. The instrument developed for assessing the criterion statements and key indicators was designed to record the responses from these two groups of leaders in the field of education and utilized the following scale:

- ( ) Excellent
- ( ) Good
- ( ) Average
- ( ) Fair
- ( ) Poor

For purposes of statistical analysis, the following number values were assigned to the terms: Poor = 1, Fair = 2, Average = 3, Good = 4, Excellent = 5.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test was used to see whether the state directors of vocational education and the state directors or supervisors of business and office education evaluated the ten criterion statements and their key indicators in the same way. As pointed out
by Siegel "this test is sensitive to any kind of difference in the distributions from which the two samples were drawn—differences in location (central tendency), in dispersion, . . . etc."\(^1\)

This test is thus concerned with the agreement between two sets of sample values. It is based upon the fact that, if the two samples have been drawn from the same population distribution, then the cumulative distributions of later samples may be expected to be fairly close to each other, inasmuch as they should show only random deviations from the population distribution. If one finds that the two-sample cumulative distributions are "too far apart" at any point, it is inferred that the two samples came from different populations.

As pointed out by Siegel, when compared with the "t" test, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test has high power efficiency (above 96 percent) for small samples. It would appear that as sample size increases the power efficiency would tend to decrease slightly. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test seems to be more powerful than either the chi-square test or the median test.\(^2\)

---


\(^2\) Ibid.
This is the procedure used in this study for testing whether or not the two distributions of the responses of state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of business and office education were significantly different from each other. The value of chi-square shown in the last column of Tables 8 through 17 was obtained by using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test and has, therefore, only two degrees of freedom.

In each of the tables that follow, the statistically significant values of chi-square have been marked with an asterisk. The values marked with an asterisk indicate that on these items there was a statistically significant difference at the .05 or .001 level between the pattern of responses of state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of business and office education.

The manner in which the two groups of respondents reacted to the criterion statements and key indicators served as the basis for determining whether or not items should be kept as they were, eliminated, or revised. If a total of 51 percent of the combined number of respondents rated the criterion statements or key indicators as good and excellent, these items were retained for use in the revised instrument. If 50 percent, or less, of the total respondents rated the criterion statements or key indicators as average, fair,
or poor, these statements were eliminated from the evaluative instrument.

Revisions to the evaluative instrument were made if as many as 5 percent of the total respondents recommended the same revision. The revised evaluative instrument was formulated on the basis of these guidelines and is presented in Appendix A.

Table 8 indicates the ratings by the state directors of vocational education and the state directors or supervisors of business and office education for Criterion Statement I and its nine key indicators.

CRITERION STATEMENT I:

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SERVICE IN THE STATE.

The response patterns of both groups are shown by percent in Table 8. There were no statistically significant differences between the responses of the two groups.

The greatest difference between the ratings of both groups is indicated in Table 8 as Key Indicator A. As can be seen from this table, 78 percent of the state directors of vocational education rated this key indicator as excellent. The state directors or supervisors of business
TABLE 8
EVALUATION OF CRITERION STATEMENT I AND ITS NINE KEY INDICATORS BY STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND STATE DIRECTORS OR SUPERVISORS OF BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Criterion Statement I</th>
<th>Key Indicator A</th>
<th>Key Indicator B</th>
<th>Key Indicator C</th>
<th>Key Indicator D</th>
<th>Key Indicator E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings expressed in percentage</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator F</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator G</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator H</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator I</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and office education rated this particular key indicator as 54 percent excellent.

Key Indicator A, which is "USES a written statement of philosophy and goals as a basis for the promotion and development of the state program," appears to receive a top priority with state directors of vocational education. On the other hand, state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated this item relatively low in comparison with those ratings recorded by the state directors of vocational education. However, there was no statistically significant difference at the .05 level on this or any of the other items shown in Table 8.

One possible explanation for the difference in the ratings of these two groups, in relationship to Key Indicator A under Criterion Statement I, is that at the time of this study there was a great deal of interest and concern shown by state directors of vocational education relative to the mandate of Public Law 88-210 concerning evaluation. It would appear that state directors of vocational education, having full responsibility for the total field of vocational education, were more aware of the problems which related to evaluation and particularly the need for definite goals and philosophy upon which their evaluation would be based.
This is not to say, however, that state directors or supervisors of business and office education are not concerned about the need for a written statement of philosophy or goals. It merely indicates that there is a wider difference of opinion on this particular key indicator under Criterion Statement I than there is for any of the other key indicators under this criterion statement. It is important to note that at the .05 level of confidence there was no statistically significant difference in the responses of the two groups.

The responses of these two groups on Criterion Statement II is reported in Table 9. Again, each group of respondents was requested to record their responses in the same manner using the scale provided.

CRITERION STATEMENT II:

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION
SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN COORDINATING
THE EFFORTS OF THE BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SERVICE WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE AGENCIES TO IMPROVE THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE STATE.

As indicated in Table 9, the state directors of vocational education and the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated Criterion Statement II quite differently. The state directors of vocational
**TABLE 9**

**EVALUATION OF CRITERION STATEMENT II AND ITS THREE KEY INDICATORS BY STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND STATE DIRECTORS OR SUPERVISORS OF BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Ratings expressed in percentage</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement II</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level
education rated this statement 68 percent excellent, whereas state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated this criterion statement as 43 percent excellent.

Also, Table 9 reveals that, after statistical analysis of these two ratings by these two groups, a statistically significant difference at the .05 level of confidence was found. The state directors of vocational education again rated this criterion statement much higher than the state directors or supervisors of business and office education.

This may be due to the fact that state directors of vocational education work much closer with other governmental and private agencies in conducting the total vocational education program planning and development activities. However, this does not preclude the fact that state directors or supervisors of the several vocational service areas, including business and office education, should be working with the appropriate personnel in other governmental and private agencies in order to promote the total education program.

One director or supervisor of business and office education indicated that "this is a function of the state director of vocational education." This may explain the low ratings recorded by the respondents who work directly under the director of vocational education.
Many times a certain condition exists due to the fact that specific guidelines have not been developed for the subordinates of the directors of vocational education. Consequently, many of these state directors or supervisors of business and office education, as well as their counterparts in the other vocational service areas, do not feel free to take the initiative in developing some type of working relationship with personnel in other governmental and private agencies. They feel that it is the responsibility of the state director of vocational education to initially establish this working relationship. In turn, they are quite willing to work with these personnel.

Based upon personal experience and on a direct personal relationship with the majority of the state directors or supervisors of business and office education, the possibility described above appears to have a good deal of merit.

Each of the key indicators under Criterion Statement II were rated fairly equal by both groups. In each case, however, the state directors of vocational education rated the key indicators higher than the state directors or supervisors of business and office education. There was no statistically significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the response patterns of the two groups concerning the key indicators under Criterion Statement II.
The ratings of the two groups regarding Criterion Statement III and its two key indicators are shown in Table 10.

CRITERION STATEMENT III:

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN PROMOTING LOCAL INITIATIVE, CONTROL, AND RESPONSIBILITY WHILE COORDINATING THESE ELEMENTS INTO A UNIFIED STATE PROGRAM.

The two groups generally agreed that this criterion statement and its key indicators were excellent items to include when evaluating the business and office education service at the state level. There were no statistically significant differences revealed by an analysis of the data for this criterion statement and its two indicators.

Key Indicator A under Criterion Statement III is "PROVIDES a consulting service, rather than a dictatorial relationship, to local school districts." This key indicator was rated high by the state directors of vocational education. That group of respondents rated this statement as 90 percent excellent. On the other hand, the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated this statement as 65 percent excellent.
TABLE 10
EVALUATION OF CRITERION STATEMENT III AND ITS TWO KEY INDICATORS BY STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND STATE DIRECTORS OR SUPERVISORS OF BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Ratings expressed in percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Statement III</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator A</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator B</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One comment by a state director of business and office education was "should we present such a negative viewpoint in an evaluative instrument? I would suggest that you simply say 'provides a consulting service to local school districts' and leave out the negative language, 'rather than a dictatorial relationship'." Another state director of business and office education simply drew a line through the same part of the key indicator that had been pointed out as "negative" by the state director of business and office education mentioned above.

This may, in a large part, explain why the state directors or supervisors of business and office education did not rate Key Indicator A under Criterion Statement III any higher than they did. However, there was no statistically significant difference between the ratings of these two groups for Criterion Statement III and its two key indicators.

Table 11 contains the analysis of Criterion Statement IV and its two key indicators as recorded by the respondents.

CRITERION STATEMENT IV:

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN DEVELOPING A SOUND HUMAN RELATIONS PROGRAM WHICH CONTRIBUTES TO THE STIMULATION OF INDIVIDUAL CREATIVITY AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH.
### TABLE 11

EVALUATION OF CRITERION STATEMENT IV AND ITS TWO KEY INDICATORS BY STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND STATE DIRECTORS OR SUPERVISORS OF BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion Statement IV</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.240**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator A</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .001 level**
Statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference at the .001 level of confidence for Criterion Statement IV. The state directors of vocational education rated this criterion statement as 81 percent excellent and 19 percent good. The state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated this statement as 35 percent excellent and 51 percent good.

With a chi-square value of 15.240, it would appear that this particular criterion statement would have to be analyzed carefully in order to determine whether or not to retain this statement in the final revised copy of the evaluative instrument. However, by examining Table 11, one can see that the criterion statement itself is not actually rated low. Due to the fact that the state directors of vocational education rated this criterion statement as 100 percent excellent or good, and the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated the criterion statement as 86 percent excellent or good, it is safe to assume that the criterion statement is considered to be of merit.

There appeared to be some confusion on the part of some respondents regarding Criterion Statement IV and Criterion Statement VI. Criterion Statement IV relates to human relations, whereas Criterion Statement VI relates to public relations.
Several of the state directors or supervisors of business and office education indicated that they felt these two should be combined. However, it was not intended that these two be closely correlated. Criterion Statement IV has to do with the relationship of the personnel in the business and office education service at the state level with those persons on the local level who ultimately must implement programs which have been planned and developed.

Criterion Statement VI relates to a public relations program which involves the matter of the personnel in the business and office education service at the state level and how they relate and communicate with persons outside the "education family." This is one possibility for the relatively low rating in the category of excellent for Criterion Statement IV by state directors or supervisors of business and office education.

Criterion Statement V and its three key indicators, as rated by these two groups of respondents, are recorded in Table 12.

CRITERION STATEMENT V:

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD ENSURE THAT BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE PROMOTED, DEVELOPED, AND OPERATED WITHIN THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND PROVISIONS OF THE STATE PLAN FOR BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Ratings expressed in percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement V</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no statistically significant differences between the ratings of these two groups of respondents regarding Criterion Statement V or any of its three key indicators. The response patterns of the two groups were relatively close, percentagewise, in each case with the exception of Key Indicator B.

Key Indicator B under Criterion Statement V is "PROVIDE a state plan constructed to be flexible so as to include minimum standards for efficient and effective program operation." This statement was included in the evaluative instrument to indicate that the business and office education service at the state level was not taking all of the responsibility out of the hands of local school personnel in regard to establishing standards for program operation.

This key indicator was written in such a way as to indicate that there are minimum standards which the business and office education service should establish for efficient and effective program operation. However, it would logically follow that local school administrators and personnel could provide or require even higher standards in order to better serve the students' needs in preparing for employment.

Several of the state directors or supervisors of business and office education wrote on the survey instrument
which was mailed to them indicating that they felt this statement should be much stronger than what was presently written, and they, therefore, would not rate this key indicator as high as they would if it had contained stronger language.

The ratings of Criterion Statement V and its three key indicators, as shown in Table 12, are relatively high in each case. One should note that over 50 percent of all the respondents in each of the two groups rated the criterion statement and key indicators as excellent with the exception of Key Indicator A. The state directors of vocational education only rated this key indicator as 49 percent excellent; however, 26 percent rated the same key indicator as good.

Table 13 contains the responses of the two groups regarding Criterion Statement VI and its four key indicators.

CRITERION STATEMENT VI:

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD DEVELOP A PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM WHICH INTERPRETS THE PURPOSES, PROCEDURES, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION TO THE PUBLIC.

The ratings of Criterion Statement VI by both groups of respondents were practically identical. The state
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Ratings expressed in percentage</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion Statement VI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicator D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level
directors of vocational education rated the criterion statement as 49 percent excellent, 45 percent good, 6 percent average, and no ratings of fair or poor. On the other hand, the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated the statement as 47 percent excellent, 47 percent good, 4 percent average, zero percent fair, and 2 percent poor.

Of all the criterion statements contained in the evaluative instrument, the two groups of respondents appeared to be in most agreement on Criterion Statement VI. Statistical analysis revealed a chi-square value of .028.

Table 13 also reveals that the two groups of respondents were not in close agreement on their ratings of Key Indicator D under Criterion Statement VI. With the state directors of vocational education rating this key indicator as 84 percent excellent and 16 percent good, and the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rating this statement as 53 percent excellent and 40 percent good, there was a statistically significant difference in the pattern of their responses significant at the .05 level of confidence. This is indicated by the chi-square value of 6.923.

Key Indicator D is "PROVIDES the leadership in interpreting the business and office education program to the citizens of the state." The state directors of
vocational education appear to feel that appearances before education groups, civic groups, radio and TV appearances, and displays shown to the general public are important factors in the general operation of the business and office education service at the state level. This is evidenced in the rating of excellent by 84 percent of the respondents in this category.

On the other hand, it would appear that, due to the fact that the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated this key indicator as 53 percent excellent, they were not in close agreement with their immediate superiors.

This could be interpreted as a lack of interest on the part of state directors or supervisors of business and office education regarding making personal appearances and promoting business and office education. However, if one goes a step further in looking at Table 13, it will be noted that 40 percent of the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated this key indicator as good. The two categories of excellent and good, when combined, make up 93 percent of the state directors or supervisors of business and office education.

This would be in no way an indication of a lack of interest on the part of these individuals regarding the important program of public relations. It simply indicates
that there is a difference of value placed upon this activity by the two groups.

The percents of each group of respondents regarding their ratings of Criterion Statement VII and its five key indicators is presented in Table 14.

**CRITERION STATEMENT VII:**

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE FOR A CONTINUOUS, SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION OF THE STATE PROGRAM AS WELL AS SELF-GENERATED PERSONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE STATE STAFF.

As indicated by the chi-square value for Criterion Statement VII and each of its key indicators, there were no statistically significant differences between the response patterns of the two groups. The widest variation in the pattern of responses is recorded for the criterion statement itself.

The state directors of vocational education rated this criterion statement as 64 percent excellent, whereas the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated this criterion statement as 61 percent excellent. Even though the widest variation in the responses of the two groups to each of the items in Table 14 occurs at this point, it can be seen that both groups rate the criterion statement relatively high and there were
### Table 14

**EVALUATION OF CRITERION STATEMENT VII AND ITS FIVE KEY INDICATORS BY STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND STATE DIRECTORS OR SUPERVISORS OF BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Ratings expressed in percentage</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Statement VII</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator A</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator B</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator C</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator D</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator E</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
no statistically significant differences between the two patterns of responses.

The responses of the two groups regarding Criterion Statement VIII and its two key indicators are exhibited in Table 15.

CRITERION STATEMENT VIII:

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION
SHOULD MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROFESSION THROUGH
ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS.

At this point, it is important to point out that Criterion Statement VIII is the only criterion statement that was rated higher by the state directors or supervisors of business and office education than it was by state directors of vocational education. Also, one should note that the same is true for Key Indicators A and B.

Overall, Criterion Statement VIII and its two key indicators were rated more alike by the two groups than any of the other sections of the evaluative instrument. This is indicated by the percentage of ratings in each of the categories.

As indicated in Table 15, there were no statistically significant differences between the response patterns of the two groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Ratings expressed in percentage</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Statement VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Indicator B, which is "SUPPORTS and PARTICIPATES in those professional associations, other than educational and civic organizations, that are contributing to the advancement and improvement of education," was rated lower than either the criterion statement or Key Indicator A. The state directors of vocational education rated this key indicator as 35 percent excellent and 42 percent good, while the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated this key indicator as 52 percent excellent and 37 percent good. This is one of the few cases where state directors of vocational education rated either the criterion statement or one of the key indicators lower than the state directors or supervisors of business and office education.

Table 16 presents the response patterns of both groups regarding their ratings of Criterion Statement IX and its four key indicators.

CRITERION STATEMENT IX:

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD DEVELOP ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WHICH ARE FLEXIBLE AND FUNCTIONAL TO PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE PROGRAM OF LEADERSHIP.

On Criterion Statement IX and each of its four key indicators, the state directors or supervisors of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Statement IX</th>
<th>Dir. (N=31)</th>
<th>Sup. (N=43)</th>
<th>Ratings expressed in percentage</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
business and office education rated the criterion statement and key indicators lower than the state directors of vocational education. There was a difference between the responses of the two groups as indicated by the chi-square value of each in Table 16. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the response patterns of the two groups.

One possible reason for the ratings on the part of the state directors or supervisors of business and office education being lower than that of state directors of vocational education is that they may have felt that administrative policies and procedures should be determined by the state director of vocational education. This was evidenced by the fact that several comments implying this were included on the survey instrument which was returned by the respondents of the subordinate group.

One particular comment stated that "this is a function of the state director of vocational education. The policies and procedures followed by our business and office education service are established by our immediate superior."

As Criterion Statement IX was written for inclusion in this evaluative instrument, it was written in such a manner so as to imply that the administrative policies and procedures referred to in the statement were those regarding
the operation of the business and office education service and not general administrative policies and procedures followed by the entire vocational division. Quite naturally these policies and procedures would be established by the state director of vocational education as he works with the state board of education.

Even though there are specific procedures and practices to be followed as set forth by the state board of education, many administrative policies and procedures are left to a particular service area to be established. It was the intent of Criterion Statement IX to imply that these administrative policies and procedures should be flexible and should function so as to provide for an efficient and effective program of leadership.

Table 17 shows the results, by percent, of each group according to the way which they rated Criterion Statement X and its three key indicators.

CRITERION STATEMENT X:

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD COOPERATE WITH AND ASSIST OTHER SERVICE AREAS WITHIN THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN DEVELOPING AND PROMOTING A SOUND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ALL THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE.
TABLE 17

EVALUATION OF CRITERION STATEMENT X AND ITS THREE KEY INDICATORS BY STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND STATE DIRECTORS OR SUPERVISORS OF BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Ratings expressed in percentage</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator A</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator B</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Indicator C</td>
<td>Dir. (N=31)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. (N=43)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated by the chi-square value for Criterion Statement X and each of its three key indicators, there were no statistically significant differences between the responses of each of the two groups.

Key Indicator A had the widest difference of response patterns by the two groups and had a chi-square value of 4.503. This key indicator, which is "PARTICIPATES in staff meetings of the entire state department of education, vocational and non-vocational, and promotes mutual understandings of each service area's unique contributions and problems," was rated extremely high by the state directors of vocational education. They gave this key indicator a rating of 94 percent excellent and 6 percent good.

On the other hand, the state directors or supervisors of business and office education rated this key indicator as 69 percent excellent and 16 percent good. Even though there is quite a contrast between the ratings of these two groups, it should be pointed out that both rated this key indicator very high.

Key Indicator B under Criterion Statement X received the lowest rating of any of the items in Table 17. Key Indicator B states, "UTILIZES the complementary services provided by the state department of education, as well as making a contribution to the services." Both groups,
according to their responses, rated this key indicator approximately in the same manner.

The revised evaluative instrument which incorporates many of the comments or suggestions made by the respondents is in Appendix A. It should be noted that most of these suggestions were editorial changes rather than changes in the meaning or intent of the criterion statements or key indicators.

Even though the respondents were not asked to rate the supporting evidences, many suggestions were made to add certain items or delete certain items which helped improve the structure and content of the revised evaluative instrument. Many of these recommended changes were made in the revised instrument which is presented in Appendix A.

The guidelines for determining whether or not to retain the criterion statements or key indicators as they were presented, their elimination, or their revision, as described previously in this chapter, were used as the basis for revising the supporting evidences under each of the key indicators.
CHAPTER V

SUGGESTED PROCEDURES FOR USING
THE EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENT

Chapter V was designed to report the suggested procedures developed for using the evaluative instrument. These procedures developed were based on "desirable" procedures used in evaluation in general as they were reported and elaborated on in the literature.

Procedures for evaluating a state-wide program of distributive education were suggested by Logan in his study. They are:

1. Arrange data for the evaluation conference
2. Appoint the evaluation committee
3. Prepare information for the committee
4. Send the information to the committee
5. Hold the evaluation
6. Follow up the evaluation.¹

The National Study of Secondary School Evaluation appears to be in full agreement with the general steps of

evaluation as set forth by Logan. However, one important aspect is especially emphasized by this group and that is "the first step in the evaluation is to secure the materials for the use of the staff." This statement evidently means evaluative instruments. This aspect, of course, has been the major objective of this study—to develop an effective evaluative instrument to assess state supervisory programs in business and office education.

One important consideration regarding evaluative procedures, regardless of the level or type of evaluation, should not be overlooked—that is, the attitude of those involved in the evaluation. Elsbree and McNally bring this point clearly into view when they suggest that "it is unrealistic to propose any one method of self-evaluation for teachers." It would appear to be an even greater mistake to make such a proposal for the evaluation of state supervisory programs due to varying organizational patterns, time schedules, priorities, etc. Consequently, only a possible way of using the evaluation instrument has been suggested. Elsbree and McNally continue by saying that "the chief objective is to help teachers develop an attitude

---

2 E evaluative criteria, op. cit., p. 7.
3 Elsbree and McNally, op. cit., p. 186.
of self-evaluation, for without the teacher's own disposition to evaluate himself, no self-evaluation is possible."4

Other steps pertaining to the mechanics of using an evaluative instrument have been suggested by Dull, but the alternatives proposed by him in the use of evaluative criteria fall generally in one or more of those previously discussed.5

The basic procedures for conducting an evaluation are influenced by a number of factors which continually fluctuate. In referring to the evaluation of in-service programs in education, Henry purports that "the nature of the evaluation process is determined in part by the nature of the changes desired."6 Even though we may know the desired changes, Henry further states that "it is helpful... to examine briefly the necessary aspects of the

4Ibid.


evaluation process and see how they apply to the problems of evaluation of change in programs.\footnote{7}

In attempting to structure suggested procedures for using the evaluative instrument, the above mentioned factors were considered.

\textbf{Why Evaluate--A Review}

Chapter II has covered this topic quite extensively. However, it is of enough importance to point out its relationship to the development of suggested procedures that it should be briefly reviewed and further documented from the literature.

The role of evaluation in the educational change process has been discussed earlier, but change itself is a difficult task at times. The need for planned systematic change of educational values is pointed out by Conant, who has attempted to show, through a critical analysis of our public schools, that our old methods of determining educational policy needs drastic revision to meet the impact of the educational revolutions.\footnote{8}

Methodology for accomplishing planned change is varied. However, extensive studies of the change process

\footnote{7}Ibid.

have been conducted in the field of rural sociology. Rogers, whose work was concerned with the diffusion of innovation, discusses five stages of the adoption process, of which evaluation is one. The significance of Roger's study, especially for a researcher developing an evaluative instrument, is that any learning or adoption process involves evaluation.

Brickell has presented a plan for educational change which involves three distinctly different phases of instructional innovation, namely: design, evaluation, and dissemination. It would appear that evaluation provides the linkage between the designing and dissemination of an innovation such as a comprehensive state program of supervision. Stufflebeam's placement of evaluation as an event immediately after each activity in his concept of the change process supports Brickell's idea of a linkage and the role of evaluation in such a system.

---


10Ibid.


Changes in educational programs must either take place as a result of evaluation or there would be no reason to conduct an evaluation and thus no benefits accrued. However, sufficient evidence exists and has been cited to support the evaluation activity as a process of determining strengths, weaknesses, and needed changes in all types of educational functions. The improvement of instruction and all its component parts is brought about through effective evaluation. Equally important is the task of planning for indicated changes which are needed. Adams and Dickey have said:

If supervision is actually to improve instruction, it must result in the revision of existing educational points of view and practices... When objectives are determined and evidence of progress toward achieving them is collected, analyzed, and interpreted, then judgments may be formulated to use as bases for planning.¹³

Effective decisions can be made and priorities can be identified and established for a state level supervisory program on the basis of an evaluative instrument which is functional, realistic, and effective.

Who Should Evaluate

In the initial stages of this research, it was determined that the evaluative instrument to be developed would be designed to be used as a self-evaluative mechanism.

¹³Adams and Dickey, op. cit., pp. 248-249.
This is to imply that in the case of a state staff evaluating its program, "self" refers to those directly responsible for the supervisory program at the state level in business and office education.

A self-evaluation conducted by a state supervisory staff would be like a group discussion. The values accrued to each individual participant should also accrue to the state supervisory program due to the fact that the program is made up of its parts. It has been said that "as teachers become clearer about their objectives, they are likely to become serious about them and to attempt to implement such objectives in their teaching." Likewise, it would appear that there would also be value of involvement in evaluative activities on the part of the state supervisory staff.

Supervisory personnel who have the opportunity to look critically at their program will get more involved in it. As they study the program goals during the evaluative process, they will be more likely to become more serious about them and attempt to implement them more effectively and efficiently.

Involvement in the group process of self-evaluation can also be a means of in-service education. Burton and

---

Brueckner have well stated the benefits of involvement or group action in their discussion of supervisory practices when they say

Group process is not merely another "trick" in administration or supervision. It is the basic method of democracy. Participation and interaction do far more than develop good solutions to problems: they affect profoundly the individuals themselves. Each person in contributing affects not only the problem and its setting, not only other persons; each affects himself as no other experience can.  

Labeling an evaluation "self-evaluation" does not imply that other persons or groups should not be involved in the evaluative process. To do so would eliminate some very valuable viewpoints and perspectives different from those of the supervisory staff. Other individuals or groups that might be included in the evaluation process and make a valuable contribution may include:

1. The business and office education teachers charged with the responsibility of carrying out the programs on the local level.

2. The state director of vocational education who is responsible for the total vocational-technical education program in the state.

3. State directors or supervisors of other service areas at the state level, including general education.

15 Burton and Brueckner, op. cit., p. 177.
4. The business and office education teacher educators who are responsible for pre-service and in-service preparation of teachers.

5. The state advisory committee for business and office education which is made up of men and women from business, industry, education, and government.

6. The chief state school officer.

The role of persons serving in a resource capacity in terms of the evaluation is that of raising pertinent questions and stimulating thinking on the part of the supervisory staff. Their involvement also promotes a better understanding of the program and needed changes. Gwynn supports this view by stating that "evaluation can be done accurately only by those affected by supervision, namely, the teachers, the administrative staff, other school personnel concerned, and the supervisor himself." ¹⁶

What Shall Be Evaluated

The evaluative instrument developed for this study was designed to assist in the evaluation of a supervisory program and its component parts. The criterion statements included in the instrument were worded to state "supervision," implying a supervisory program, rather than "supervisors" which would imply individuals. As has been

previously stated, benefits will accrue to individuals but this will be a by-product of the evaluating instrument developed for this study. The major concern should be evaluating purposes and not people.

Gwynn supports this principle when he writes "evaluation takes place in terms of purposes, not people." This concept is also set forth by Hicks as he states "the effectiveness of each part of the educational process . . . is influenced by the degree to which the various elements are coordinated in the movement toward the achievement of the school's goals." Each criterion statement and key indicator included in the evaluative instrument was developed with the following thought in mind: "When one studies how to evaluate supervision fairly and effectively, he should keep constantly in mind that it is the program that is being evaluated, not the supervisor." Other instruments have been designed to evaluate supervisors, but this study was concerned only with the evaluation of the total supervisory program at the state level.

17 Ibid.
18 Hanne J. Hicks, op. cit., p. 411.
Where Should the Evaluation Be Conducted

Certain phases of an evaluation of a supervisory program should be conducted at the location of operation. Data collection, for example, is one activity that should be performed in the general offices of the supervisory staff where all pertinent records are maintained regarding the program. Many of these activities may be performed by clerical and secretarial assistance.

On the other hand, evaluation conferences for the purpose of procedure planning, summarizing of data, analyzing results, and planning subsequent changes should be conducted in an area which will be free from interruption. Such a conference may be held in some location other than the division offices in order to prevent routine telephone calls, visitors, etc., from interrupting unity of thought.

Comfortable facilities with an informal setting and sufficient room for writing and displaying relevant data should be selected for the conference. Free discussion on all matters by all participants is essential for an effective evaluation to take place, and this cannot normally be achieved if the participants are crowded around the state director's desk.
When to Evaluate

Throughout the literature there is constant reference to the "continuous" process of evaluation. This continuous process of evaluation is discussed in Chapter II, but reemphasis at this point seems desirable to bring focus upon this important concept.

If a supervisor is actually to improve instruction to a significant degree and if this improvement is to be of lasting value, then continuous studies should be made of the needs of a good program of supervision and the extent to which these needs are being met.\(^\text{20}\)

Stoops and Rafferty state that "only as evaluation is constantly applied can the superintendent have assurance that developing programs are moving in proper directions."\(^\text{21}\)

A cooperative and continuous plan of evaluation will promote the growth and development of supervisors and those who work with them, and will contribute to the improvement of the whole program of instruction.\(^\text{22}\)

The above statements should not be interpreted as meaning that the whole process of evaluation is to be carried out each day. The intent is that evaluation is to be conceived as a continuous cycle of related events which

\(^{\text{20}}\text{Adams and Dickey, op. cit., p. 271.}\)


\(^{\text{22}}\text{Adams and Dickey, op. cit., p. 271.}\)
are carried out periodically. The specific time for specific evaluative activities to be carried out will vary according to currently existing conditions and circumstances.

It would appear that the most logical time for the formal process of analyzing evaluative data, which had been collected during the year, would be close to the end of the fiscal year. It is at this time that annual reports are due and the new year's program of activities is projected. In most states the fiscal year ends on June 30. As a result of the formal evaluation, adjustments could be made and new programs finalized before school opens in the fall. Other projections and plans could be made for as many as five years on the basis of these evaluations.

Suggested Procedure for Using the Evaluative Instrument

With the assistance of five state directors of business and office education, a suggested set of procedures was developed for conducting the formal evaluation. A set of suggested procedures was drafted and mailed to each of the cooperating state directors.

Rather than have state directors simply write their comments on their copy of the suggested procedures and return it, they were asked to bring their comments to
the conference table. Each state director agreed to do this at a meeting in Washington, D.C., which all were attending. The purpose of getting their reactions to the suggested procedures in this manner was to stimulate interaction and to assure that the suggested procedures were workable under varying state circumstances.

The suggested procedures for using the evaluative instrument were developed in accordance with accepted evaluative procedures used in education in general as documented by writings previously cited. Several excellent suggestions evolved from the meeting of state directors and were incorporated into the suggested set of procedures that follows.

General Information

The procedures presented for using this evaluative instrument are based on the belief that evaluation is a preliminary step to making desirable changes in educational programs. These procedures were developed as a "suggested" method to assist in annual reporting and preparing a projected program of activities for the business and office education service.

This instrument has been developed for the primary purpose of being used by state personnel in business and office education to identify strengths, weaknesses, and needed changes in state level supervisory programs. It is
intended that this instrument serve as a tool for use in developing an improved supervisory program.

Who Should Participate

The entire state staff in business and office education should be involved in this important part of the state supervisory program. In addition to these individuals, it is recommended that representatives of business and office education teacher education personnel, the state business and office education professional association, the state director of vocational education, and a representative of the state advisory committee for business and office education be involved. A representative of local school administrators can be of valuable assistance in the evaluation process also.

When to Evaluate

It is recommended that two or three consecutive days be scheduled annually for the purpose of evaluating the state supervisory program and making plans and projections for future activities. It would appear that the most logical time to conduct the formal evaluation conference would be close to the end of the fiscal year in order to tie the evaluation activities to annual reporting and projected program of activities.
Location of Evaluative Conference

A desirable atmosphere, free from routine inter­ruptions, should be selected for the conducting of the formal evaluation. It is desirable that the conference be held in a building other than the one which houses the state staff.

The conference room should be arranged in such a way as to be conducive to group discussion and have adequate writing and display space available.

Conducting the Evaluation

1. Prior to the formal evaluation conference, each state staff member should be thoroughly familiar with the instrument. Several days in advance of this conference, the state director or supervisor of business and office education should assign each staff member the responsibility of summarizing the "supporting evidence" which has been gathered during the current evaluative period.

2. The total state staff should meet together prior to the formal evaluation conference to ensure that all aspects of the evaluative instrument have been covered and that possible gaps in supporting evidence may be closed. At this time the staff will be able to review the total evaluation and be prepared to make necessary revisions in data needed and procedures for its collection in the future.
3. When the formal evaluation group is called into session, a conference tape recorder or a stenographer should record the proceedings. At a later date, a transcribed summary of the conference may be used as a summary tool and as a check to assure that recommendations of the group have been considered in the planning process.

4. The evaluative instrument is not to be used as a "scoring" mechanism. It, therefore, does not have a scale to use for rating. Its purpose is to stimulate thought for developing a realistic program of action to strengthen possible weaknesses and adopt new, proven innovations.

5. Detailed plans, based on the outcomes of the evaluative conference, should be formulated as soon as possible after the conference is completed. The evaluative conference group can give valuable assistance in establishing priorities, but the details of carrying out the improved program should be determined at another time.

6. In order to assure that evaluations in the future are effective and efficient, it is suggested that the state staff critically analyze this instrument and make desirable changes in it, as well as in these suggested procedures.

7. To assure that evaluation becomes a continuous process, it is recommended that each state staff member
be assigned specific responsibilities for the accomplishment of specific activities related to the evaluation process. Staff members should continuously gather "supporting evidence" which may also be utilized in gaining support of the state board of education, the state legislature, and the state's citizens.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter reviews the purpose, specific objectives, the need for the study, and the method of investigation. It also presents a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Purpose of the Study

The ultimate purpose of this study was to develop an evaluative instrument and suggested procedures which could be used by state directors or supervisors to assess and evaluate the services of the business and office education division of the state departments of education.

Specific Objectives

The following specific objectives were identified in order to provide further direction and to facilitate the study:

1. Develop and validate a set of goals for the division of business and office education in the state department of education which were acceptable by those persons in the other divisions of vocational-technical education at the state level.
2. Structure data gathering instruments, both quantitative and qualitative, which were key indicators of success in accomplishing the accepted goals of the business and office education division and which would signal the possible need for program redirection.

3. Formulate a suggested set of procedures for state personnel of the business and office education division to use in carrying out an evaluation using the instrument developed in this study.

Need for the Study

The need for this study was determined by an analysis of the following conditions:

1. The rapidity of change in business and industry, as well as in the field of education, has pointed up the need to provide a mechanism for continuous evaluation of educational programs at the state level with the results to be used for needed redirection and improvement in the state program of business and office education.

2. The value of evaluation as a means of improving educational programs is well documented in the literature.

3. Writers in the field of educational administration and supervision have pointed up the lack of evaluative criteria and instrumentation for use in evaluating administrative or supervisory programs.
4. Valid instrumentation and procedures for evaluating state level administrative or supervisory programs in business and office education did not exist.

5. State directors or supervisors of business and office education have acknowledged a need for greater emphasis on evaluation of their state level programs.

6. An analysis, by vocational service area, of the acceptance or unacceptance of program goals for vocational education was needed to determine perceptions held by state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of the vocational service areas.

7. The significance of evaluation in the educational change process appeared to have been disregarded in planning and conducting state programs of business and office education.

**Method of Investigation**

The following is a review of the procedures that were employed in the conducting of this study.

A prospectus of the study was presented to the professor of a research methods course and to fellow graduate students enrolled in that course. Several suggestions from the professor and class members were incorporated into a final prospectus which was presented to a graduate advisory committee. Following the approval
of the prospectus by the graduate committee, a review of the literature was completed with special emphasis being given to the evaluation of vocational education programs at the state level, as well as evaluation of general educational administrative or supervisory programs.

As a result of this review of literature, a set of program goals for vocational education was formulated and submitted to all directors or supervisors of business and office education at the state level. At the same time, these goals were submitted to state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of all the other vocational service areas in an effort to ascertain whether or not the goals perceived by business and office education leaders were perceived in the same manner by their immediate superiors and by their counterparts in the state department of education.

Following this phase of the study a tentative evaluative instrument, including both quantitative and qualitative data, was developed and submitted to all state directors of vocational education and all state directors or supervisors of business and office education.

This instrument contained suggested criterion statements and key indicators which were designed to indicate success or achievement of a state administrative and-supervisory program in business and office education.
or the lack of achievement which would possibly signal the need for program redirection.

Suggested changes, additions, or deletions were requested of the respondents as they reviewed the evaluative instrument in relationship to the accepted program goals.

Suggested procedures for using the evaluative instrument were developed in accordance with accepted evaluative procedures used in education in general. These procedures were submitted to a jury of state directors or supervisors of business and office education for the purpose of determining whether or not the procedures were workable under varying circumstances.

**Major Findings**

The major findings derived from the data collected and analyzed in this study follow. These findings are grouped according to the major steps which were outlined for the completion of this study.

1. The six program goals for vocational education developed in this study were acceptable not only by state directors or supervisors of business and office education but also by state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of other vocational service areas. This is evidenced by the fact that 98.15 percent
of the responses received from this group indicated that they accepted the program goals as presented in this research study.

2. The ten criterion statements and thirty-seven key indicators identify the major activities which are important to effective implementation of the program goals of state level programs of business and office education.

3. In only three instances were there statistically significant differences between the response patterns of state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of business and office education. These differences are reported as follows:

   a) Criterion Statement II with a statistically significant difference indicated at the .05 level as reported in Table 9.
   b) Criterion Statement IV with a statistically significant difference at the .001 level as reported in Table 11.
   c) Key Indicator D of Criterion Statement VI with a statistically significant difference at the .05 level as reported in Table 13.

4. Overall ratings of the criterion statements and key indicators were higher on the part of state directors
of vocational education in every instance except Key Indicator A under Criterion Statement V.

5. In the opinion of the two groups of respondents, as indicated by an analysis of the data, the evaluative instrument developed in this study provides an effective guide for evaluating a state level program of business and office education.

6. The state personnel in business and office education who reviewed the suggested procedures for using the evaluative instrument agreed that these suggested procedures were satisfactory and would be workable under varying circumstances and conditions.

7. Several state directors or supervisors of business and office education indicated that they would be making changes in their state level program as a result of having been involved in this research.

Conclusions

The following conclusions, based on an interpretation of the data presented in this study, were drawn:

1. The ten criterion statements and thirty-seven key indicators for evaluating a state level program of business and office education, with revisions, are usable and valid for evaluating state level programs of business and office education.
2. State directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of agriculture, business and office education, distributive education, home economics, and trade and industrial education are in close agreement on the program goals for vocational education as outlined in this study.

3. The program goals for vocational education as evidenced by the perceptions of state directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of the vocational service areas are basically the same as those perceived by state directors or supervisors of business and office education.

4. State directors of vocational education and state directors or supervisors of business and office education are in general agreement regarding their ratings of the ten criterion statements and thirty-seven key indicators of the evaluative instrument developed for this study.

5. The use of the evaluative instrument and suggested procedures developed in this study for bringing about needed change in state supervisory programs of business and office education would be effective.

6. The evaluative instrument identifies the major activities of an effective state supervisory program of business and office education.
7. Even though the instrumentation and procedures developed in this study were designed primarily for business and office education, there is evidence that this instrument and suggested set of procedures could be used effectively for evaluating state level programs in any of the other vocational service areas.

**Recommendations**

In formulating the following recommendations for implementing the findings of this study, it was realized that they are judgments which were not restricted to the data and facts developed in the conducting of this study.

1. The revised evaluative instrument and suggested procedures should be distributed to state directors or supervisors of business and office education and to other state leaders in vocational education.

2. The revised evaluative instrument and suggested procedures developed through this study should be used as an in-service training aid for state personnel in business and office education.

3. Teacher educators of business and office education should use this type of an instrument for class discussion in administration and supervision courses.

4. The development and updating of state level programs of business and office education should be
conducted as a part of the evaluative process developed through this study.

5. Regional or national seminars on the evaluation of state level administrative or supervisory programs of business and office education should be conducted in order to give further consideration to the process of evaluating state administrative and supervisory programs and the findings of this study.

6. Those persons who are involved in the evaluative process should also be involved in the development and updating of the state administrative or supervisory program of business and office education.

7. The revised evaluative instrument and suggested procedures should be utilized in pilot states for evaluation of state level programs of business and office education and further refined for future use.

8. Consideration on the part of all vocational service areas should be given regarding the possible utilization of this revised evaluative instrument and suggested procedures in evaluating other state level administrative or supervisory programs.
Recommendations for Further Study

In conducting this study, several needs for additional research in the areas related to this study were identified. These areas were as follows:

1. To study those criterion statements and key indicators in the evaluative instrument which were rated differently by the respondents, as indicated by the percentage responses, in order to determine possible reasons for the significant difference.

2. To develop and test an evaluative instrument for assessing behaviors unique to vocational administrators or supervisors.

3. To determine additional criterion statements and key indicators which may be used in evaluating a state level program of business and office education.

4. To further refine the criterion statements and key indicators in the revised evaluative instrument for use in evaluating a state level program of business and office education.

5. To develop guidelines for state personnel for using the revised evaluative instrument for program planning purposes in business and office education.

6. To determine the possible effect of the use of the revised evaluative instrument on the improvement of
state level administrative or supervisory programs in
business and office education.

7. To develop a more comprehensive evaluative
instrument for evaluating state level administrative or
supervisory programs of the other vocational service areas.

8. To field test the revised evaluative instrument
and suggested procedures in each of the nine regions
established by the United States Office of Education in
order to prove or disprove their value under varying
circumstances and conditions.

9. To determine the effect of self-evaluation
on the improvement of state level administrative or super­
visory programs in business and office education.

10. To repeat this study in three years to determine
needed changes in the revised evaluative instrument and
suggested procedures based upon practical application.

11. To determine the feasibility of a study on
the economic dimensions of state level administrative and
supervisory programs of business and office education.
The following evaluative instrument was developed to assist state personnel in the business and office education service in establishing specific operational goals, determining progress toward these goals, and in establishing priorities in planning a projected program of activities.

The intent of this evaluative instrument is to provoke thought regarding possible ways and means of improving state supervisory programs. It is intended that this evaluative instrument should serve as a guideline for the improvement of state administrative or supervisory programs of business and office education.

Ratings or evaluations should be made after careful consideration of the supporting evidence. The first step in making such an analysis is to determine what evidence applies and is available. On the evaluative instrument under the sub-heading SUPPORTING EVIDENCE, circle "A" for Available, "M" for Missing, and "NA" for Not Applicable for each item listed.
Based on an analysis of the supporting evidence, rate the state program in regard to each KEY INDICATOR by circling "5" for Excellent, "4" for Good, "3" for Average, "2" for Fair, and "1" for Poor. Using the same scale, rate the program in regard to each CRITERION STATEMENT based on an overall analysis of all the key indicators under the criterion statement.
EVALUATING THE BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SERVICE AT THE STATE LEVEL

CRITERION STATEMENT

I. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SERVICE IN THE STATE.

KEY INDICATORS

A. USES a written statement of philosophy and goals as a basis for the promotion and development of the state program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Written statement of philosophy
2. Copy of immediate and long-range goals
3. Other pertinent data: _______________________________
B. IMPROVES classroom and laboratory instruction by suggesting and providing enriched learning opportunities for the state's teaching force.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Number and topic of state-wide workshops or in-service programs
2. Number of participants in state-wide workshops and in-service programs
3. Number and topic of local or regional workshops or in-service programs
4. Number and topic of individual and small group conferences, including seminars conducted
5. Copy of agenda for state-wide, regional, local, and small group conferences, workshops, and in-service programs
6. Inventory of consultants used for all workshops or in-service programs
7. Other pertinent data:

C. CONDUCTS curriculum development activities with representative groups of educators, using the advice and counsel of people from business and industry.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Report of curriculum councils developed on the local school district level
2. Statement of the relationship of the state advisory committee to the business and office education service in curriculum development
3. Copy of curriculum guides for business and office education
4. Procedures for changes in curriculum design and curriculum guides
5. Changes in curriculum design and guides put into effect since the last evaluation
6. Additional changes in curriculum design and guides that have been identified but not yet put into effect

7. Report of business and office education curriculum guides reviewed by business and office educators

8. Other pertinent data:__________________________

D. PREPARES or OBTAINS appropriate instructional materials and distributes the material to the state's teaching force.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. File of instructional materials prepared by business and office education service

2. File of instructional materials obtained from outside sources

3. Roster of outside sources for obtaining suitable instructional materials
4. List of instructional materials which have been identified as needed but are not available

5. Procedures for dissemination of instructional materials

6. Roster of personnel across the state who have the abilities and interests in developing instructional materials

7. List of persons used in preparing instructional materials

8. Other pertinent data:

E. DEVELOPS and PROMOTES youth organization activities that provide leadership outlets for students.

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

1. Number of schools with youth organizations

2. List of schools that should initiate youth organizations

3. Diagram showing relationship of local youth
organizations to state and national youth organizations

4. Roster of sponsors of local and state youth organizations

5. Roster of state officers of the state youth organizations

6. Report of the activities of the state youth organizations

7. List of youth and sponsors representing the state in national youth organization conventions

8. Report of youth organization activities in community and civic affairs

9. Written statement indicating the relationship of youth organization activities and the instructional program

10. Copy of materials providing information about youth organizations
11. Other pertinent data:

F. PROVIDES assistance in planning for appropriate equipment, layout, and facilities.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of recommendations for equipment to be used in the various subject-matter areas
2. Guidelines for selecting proper equipment and furniture
3. Copy of layout diagrams recommended for each type of classroom or laboratory
4. Guidelines for classroom and laboratory size, electrical requirements, lighting, and other physical requirements
5. Diagram showing facility planning in terms of overall location relationships of classrooms and laboratories
6. File of equipment used which has proved

11. A M NA

F. 5 4 3 2 1

6. A M NA
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unsatisfactory under classroom conditions

7. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

G. ENCOURAGES and PARTICIPATES in the evaluation of local programs and ASSISTS in interpreting evaluation results to improve instructional programs.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. File of evaluation reports concerning local programs qualifying for accreditation

2. Number of formal evaluations of local programs that state office personnel assisted in conducting

3. List of business and office education service personnel assisting in local program evaluation

4. Roster of schools conducting informal evaluation of their programs with the assistance of the business and office education service

5. Report of changes in local programs as a result of an analysis of evaluation results
6. Number and type of consultative services provided to local school districts regarding interpreting and utilizing evaluation results

7. Other pertinent data:

R. INITIATES, PROMOTES, and UTILIZES research in identifying program needs and possible needs for redirection of supervisory activities.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of researchable topics that have been identified and priorities established

2. Report of research projects completed or under way

3. Roster of researchers conducting research by topic

4. Number and type of demonstration, experimental, and pilot programs initiated on the basis of research findings

5. Amount of financial aid provided for research projects

6. A M NA

7. A M NA
6. Report of efforts to coordinate research activities of graduate students with other research activities in the state

7. Number and types of changes in instructional programs brought about as a result of research activities

8. Changes in supervisory activities based upon research findings

9. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

I. COOPERATES with teacher-education institutions in developing effective programs for pre-service and in-service teacher education.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Statement indicating how the business and office education service and teacher education programs complement one another

2. Number, type, and outcome of joint activities
sponsored by the business and office education service and teacher education institutions

3. Roster of personnel from both the business and office education service and teacher education institutions participating in joint teacher education activities

4. Statement of working relationships between teacher educators and business and office education service

5. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

CRITERION STATEMENT

II. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN COORDINATING THE EFFORTS OF THE BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SERVICE WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE AGENCIES TO IMPROVE THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE STATE.
KEY INDICATORS

A. IDENTIFIES governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations that are concerned and involved with business and office education programs in the state.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. File of governmental agencies conducting business and office education programs
2. List of private agencies conducting business and office education programs
3. Roster of governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations interested in and supporting the business and office education program other than by conducting such programs
4. Description of services provided by other agencies
5. Other pertinent data: ______________________

B. INITIATES conferences with representatives of governmental and private agencies, groups, and organizations
in an effort to coordinate educational efforts and to improve programs throughout the state.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of representatives and agencies, groups, or organizations in attendance at such meetings

2. Agenda of such meetings

3. Catalog of activities jointly sponsored or conducted by the business and office education service and governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations

4. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

C. UTILIZES the consultative services of representatives of governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations, as well as providing such services in return.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Roster of those representatives of governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations
who supplied consultative services to the business and office education service

2. Number and type of consultative services supplied to governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations by the business and office education service

3. Other pertinent data:

CRITERION STATEMENT

III. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN PROMOTING LOCAL INITIATIVE, CONTROL, AND RESPONSIBILITY WHILE COORDINATING THESE ELEMENTS INTO A UNIFIED STATE PROGRAM.

KEY INDICATORS

A. PROVIDES a consulting service to local school districts.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. File of state regulations which indicate

2. A M NA

3. A M NA

3. A M NA

CRITERION STATEMENT

III. 5 4 3 2 1

A. 5 4 3 2 1

1. A M NA
maximum freedom and responsibility to local school districts, yet are consistent with the state's obligation for effective education.

2. Inventory of consultative efforts in assisting local school personnel in developing short- and long-range program goals with possible ways and means of implementation.

3. Directory of local supervisory personnel in business and office education responsible for local program promotion, development, and control who assist in coordinating their programs into a unified state program.

4. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

B. UTILIZES the efforts of local school personnel in developing a unified state program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Report of local educational innovations or
specialized techniques which were relayed by the business and office education service to other areas of the state in order to improve other programs.

2. List of local experimental, pilot, or demonstration programs, which were relayed by the business and office education service to other areas of the state in order to improve other programs.

3. Roster of local school personnel used as consultants to the business and office education service in developing various aspects of the state program.

4. Report of visits of local school personnel to other school districts to observe program operations which were initiated by the business and office education service.

5. Other pertinent data: ____________________
CRITERION STATEMENT

IV. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP IN DEVELOPING A SOUND HUMAN RELATIONS PROGRAM WHICH CONTRIBUTES TO THE STIMULATION OF INDIVIDUAL CREATIVITY AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH.

KEY INDICATORS

A. INVOLVES those persons in program development who are affected by the state program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of categories of those persons affected by the program
2. Report of persons recognized for their contribution to the state program and how they were recognized
3. Other pertinent data:

B. UTILIZES an effective communication system involving all persons affected by or concerned with the
business and office education program.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Diagram showing official channels of communications among educational agencies as well as other governmental and private agencies, groups, or organizations

2. Copy of policies and procedures regarding communications within educational agencies

3. Copy of policies and procedures regarding communications outside educational agencies

4. Diagram showing possible channels of informal communications

5. List of categories of those persons receiving copies of policies and procedures regarding communications

6. Other pertinent data: ____________________________
CRITERION STATEMENT

V. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD ENSURE THAT BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE PROMOTED, DEVELOPED, AND OPERATED WITHIN THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND PROVISIONS OF THE STATE PLAN FOR BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION.

KEY INDICATORS

A. ASSISTS in preparing and securing legislation that is essential for adequate programs by working through the state director of vocational education.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of proposed legislation
2. File of legislation which has been passed
3. Number and names of legislators who were contacted regarding the pending or passed legislation
4. Number and name of committee members who worked on pending or passed legislation
5. List of teachers who will assist in contacting legislators regarding pending legislation
6. Other pertinent data: __________________________

B. PROVIDES a state plan constructed to be flexible so as to include minimum standards for efficient and effective program operation.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
1. Copy of State Plan for business and office education
2. Listing of needed changes in the State Plan to ensure flexibility
3. File of materials used in explaining the State Plan's minimum standards and inherent flexibility to local school administrators
4. Other pertinent data: __________________________

C. MAINTAINS a system of records which provides evidence of the state's compliance with the legal provisions

5. A M NA
6. A M NA
B. 54321
C. 54321
of state and Federal legislation and regulations.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of information requests sent to local school districts regarding compliance to State Plan
2. Reports of on-site visits to local school districts regarding compliance to State Plan
3. Guidelines used in determining the eligibility of local school districts for reimbursements
4. Other pertinent data: ________________________

CRITERION STATEMENT

VI. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD DEVELOP A PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM WHICH INTERPRETS THE PURPOSES, PROCEDURES, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION TO THE PUBLIC.

KEY INDICATORS

A. UTILIZES an active advisory committee comprised
of leaders from education, business, and industry in planning and promoting the state-wide program.

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

1. Roster of advisory committee members and the area and organization they represent
2. Agenda of advisory committee meetings
3. Proceedings and outcomes of advisory committee meetings
4. Other pertinent data:

**B. ATTEMPTS to ascertain and continually improve the public image of business and office education.**

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

1. Collection of printed articles published throughout the state concerning business and office education programs
2. Correspondence or specific sections of speeches
related to the public image of business and office education

3. File of all printed brochures or other material interpreting the present and future of business and office education to the general public, school administrators, teachers, and students

4. Copies of all releases to news media related to business and office education

5. File of articles related to student success in business and industry after completing business and office education program

6. Other pertinent data:__________________________

C. UTILIZES the talents and efforts of persons specifically trained in public relations techniques, as well as local school personnel and citizens, to develop a coordinated public relations program.
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of diagram or list showing personnel and procedures followed in public relations activities

2. Copy of diagram or list indicating possible news media throughout the state which can be and is being utilized for public relations activities

3. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

D. PROVIDES the leadership in interpreting the business and office education program to the citizens of the state.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Listing of:
   a. appearances before educational groups
   b. appearances before civic groups
   c. appearances before professional groups
   d. articles written and published
   e. radio and TV appearances
   f. films prepared

2. File of displays shown to the general public

3. Other pertinent data: ____________________________
CRITERION STATEMENT

VII. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE FOR A CONTINUOUS, SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION OF THE STATE PROGRAM AS WELL AS SELF-GENERATED PERSONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE STATE STAFF.

KEY INDICATORS

A. SETS aside a definite period of time for the evaluation process with sufficient resources allocated in order to readily complete the task.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Time schedule for evaluation, including data collection
2. Statement of the time requirements of personnel needed to complete the evaluation
3. Information related to any informal evaluation of supervisory effort
4. Report of actual time involved in conducting the evaluation
5. Other pertinent data:______________________________
B. UTILIZES available techniques and criteria in the evaluation process of the supervisory effort.
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
1. Copy of instruments used
2. Copy of procedures followed
3. Roster of persons used to conduct the evaluation
4. List of additional instruments which would have aided in the evaluation, but were not available
5. Distribution list of evaluation results
6. Other pertinent data:______________________________
C. MAINTAINS adequate records pertaining to the status of business and office education and employment opportunities in the state that are used as a basis for program evaluation.
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Report of expenditures of funds for business and office education
2. Report of number and type of schools offering business and office education
3. Report of numbers of state personnel, local supervisors, and teacher educators in business and office education
4. Report of number of teachers and enrollments in business and office education
5. Report of follow-up studies of graduates
6. Demographic data concerning the citizens of the state; e.g., educational attainment, family income, sex, etc.
7. Distribution of employment opportunities in business and office occupations by labor market areas
8. Trends and projections of employment opportunities
in the business and office occupations by labor market areas

9. Census Bureau statistics—population distribution

10. Other pertinent data:

D. USES each evaluative period to serve as a "benchmark" for the next evaluation.

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

1. Copy of projected program of activities based upon the evaluation results of the previous evaluation period

2. Reports, statistical and descriptive, which indicate that needed changes which were projected in the program of activities were accomplished

3. Projected program activities which were not accomplished

4. Reasons why projected program activities were not accomplished
E. ENGAGES in a personal improvement program in order to grow professionally and to be better qualified to serve in leadership roles.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of personnel qualifications and certification requirements of business and office education personnel in the State Plan

2. Number and type of in-service training programs for state office personnel and names of those attending

3. List of informal training sessions for state office personnel and roster of those participating

4. State office personnel taking sabatical leave for professional development
5. State office personnel taking vacation leave for professional development
6. Other pertinent data:

CRITERION STATEMENT

VIII. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROFESSION THROUGH ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS.

KEY INDICATORS

A. SUPPORTS and PARTICIPATES in local, state, and national professional education associations.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of professional education associations in which business and office education service personnel are members
2. Report of professional education association meetings attended by business and office education service personnel
3. Roster of business and office education service personnel holding offices in professional education associations and the offices held.

4. Catalog of activities within professional education associations which business and office education service personnel participate.

5. List of responsibilities and activities pertaining to professional education association program in which business and office education service personnel were engaged.

6. File of other professional education associations in which business and education service personnel were not members but took part in their program or activities.

7. Inventory of contributions of business and office education service personnel to professional education association journals.
8. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

B. SUPPORTS and PARTICIPATES in those professional associations, other than educational, and civic organizations that are contributing to the advancement and improvement of education.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. List of those professional associations and civic organizations that have been identified as making a contribution to education

2. Contributions made by professional associations and civic organizations by type of contribution made

3. Activities of these professional associations and civic organizations in which business and office education service personnel took part

4. Leadership activities or other responsibilities which business and office education service personnel carry out
5. Other pertinent data: ________________________________

CRITERION STATEMENT

IX. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD
DEVELOP ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WHICH ARE
FLEXIBLE AND FUNCTIONAL TO PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND
EFFECTIVE PROGRAM OF LEADERSHIP.

KEY INDICATORS

A. PROVIDES maximum utilization of personnel in providing
   a consultative service to the state's program of
   business and office education.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of organization chart showing relationships
   of the business and office education service to
   other vocational service areas and to other state
   and local education personnel

2. Copy of job descriptions indicating relationships
   of authority and responsibility within, and
outside, the business and office education service

3. Number of personnel authorized by the state board of education for the business and office education service

4. Number of vacancies existing in authorized positions and an indication of how the duties of vacant position are being fulfilled

5. Other pertinent data:__________________________

B. IDENTIFIES needed changes in its program and plans for these changes in conformity with current and projected economic and educational trends.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Inventory of needed changes that have been identified, including new occupational needs, as indicated by results of evaluation efforts

2. Report of current and projected economic trends
affecting business and office education programs by regions of the state

3. Report of current and projected educational needs in business and office education programs by regions of the state

4. Report of current and projected education trends affecting business and office education programs by regions of the state

5. List of priorities for program development in business and office education by regions of the state and by groups of persons to be served

6. Report showing criteria by which priorities were established for business and office education program

7. Time schedule and list of business and office education personnel involved in program planning

8. Copy of completed "program of work" indicating
specific ways and means for implementation, including staff responsibilities and a flexible schedule or calendar of activities.

9. Report showing how the program plan complements the efforts of other educational, governmental, and private agencies, groups, and organizations.

10. Other pertinent data: ___________________________

C. DEVELOPS a realistic budget and is knowledgeable concerning its overall provisions and relationships to local school districts, as well as the state office.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Diagram of accounting procedures indicating input and output methods for up-to-date information retrieval.

2. File of needs and requests of funds for state office operation.

3. Copy of policies and procedures for local school.
districts to follow in requesting funds for re-
imbursement

4. File of needs and requests for funds submitted by
   local school districts for approval

5. List of priorities established for expenditure of
   funds

6. Criteria by which priorities were established for
   the expenditure of funds

7. Copy of previous fiscal period budget

8. Report of actual expenditures during previous
   fiscal period

9. Copy of proposed budget

10. Other pertinent data:

D. UTILIZES an effective system for reporting data from
    local school districts through the business and office
    education service to the state director of vocational
    education, state department of education, and the U.S.
    Office of Education.
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Copy of procedures involved in reporting data from local school districts to business and office education service
2. Copy of procedures for handling data received from local school districts and organizing data for further reporting
3. Copy of procedures for reporting data to state director of vocational education and U.S. Office of Education
4. Copy of report forms indicating types of data collected and subsequently reported by the business and office education service
5. List of types of data which are needed by business and office education service for decision-making purposes but are not presently available
6. Other pertinent data: ____________________________
CRITERION STATEMENT

X. SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND OFFICE EDUCATION SHOULD
    COOPERATE WITH AND ASSIST OTHER SERVICE AREAS WITHIN THE
    STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN DEVELOPING AND PROMOTING
    A SOUND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ALL THE CITIZENS OF THE
    STATE.

KEY INDICATORS

A. PARTICIPATES in staff meetings of the entire state
    department of education, vocational and non-vocational,
    and promotes mutual understanding of each service area's
    unique contributions and problems.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Number and type of presentations made to entire
   state department staff
   1. A M NA

2. Number and name of general committees served
   on by business and office education service
   personnel
   2. A M NA
3. Number of state department of education staff meetings attended and number of business and office education service personnel attending

4. Roster of persons in non-vocational areas of the state department of education used as consultants to the business and office education service and how they were used

5. List of business and office education service personnel used as consultants to non-vocational areas of the state department of education and how they were used

6. List of services provided for the state department of education by the business and office education service

7. Other pertinent data: ____________________________

B. UTILIZES the complementary services provided by the state department of education, as well as making a contribution to these services.
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Number of times and type of:
   a. data provided by the Bureau of Statistical Services
   b. assistance provided by Publications and Public Information Division
   c. assistance provided by Budgetary and Financial Division
   d. assistance provided by Credentials and Certification Division
   e. consultative services provided by these complementary services to the business and office education service

2. Other pertinent data:

C. AIDS in the development of a comprehensive vocational program, and cooperatively works with other vocational service areas in program development.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Number of cooperative efforts involving two or more vocational service areas

2. Types of cooperative efforts undertaken by two or more vocational service areas, names of
3. Roster of those persons from each service area involved in the cooperative efforts
4. Other pertinent data: _________________________
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