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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

The idea of federal support for education is not new. Three years before the Federal Constitution was ratified, the Northwest Ordinance of 1785 was enacted under the Articles of Confederation, specifying that in the new lands of our nation "there shall be reserved the lot Number 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township."¹ The Ordinance was responsible for the establishment of public schools in many states and for many years provided a major portion of their financial support. Throughout the second half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries, public laws for vocational education programs, for aid to "federally impacted" areas, for national defense educational measures, and for many other federal programs provided help in special areas.²

Recently, however, federal legislation in support of education has been dramatically increased, as a result of new demands made upon the schools by the society. When the

²Ibid., p. 1.
circumstances in which youth of this generation are maturing, getting an education or failing in the attempt, seeking employment, and striving to carve out places for themselves in the world about them, are examined, the need for larger scale action is apparent:

Technological advance that has created new relationship between people, education, and work, with technical skills and knowledge, mental alertness, and creative capacities taking priority over capacities to endure hard physical labor.

The specter of unemployment worrying families, frustrating neighborhoods, and haunting political leaders--even at a time when there are more people employed in this country than ever before.

More young people entering the labor force when job opportunities in the unskilled and simpler occupational fields are markedly decreasing.

Science and mathematics becoming increasingly important in almost every facet of the total culture and affecting the lives of people in every family and neighborhood in a vital way.

The security of the nation as a whole dependent upon the expansion of economic enterprise and upon scientific advancement.

Consuming ideological conflicts gripping the world, with much of the public budget, much public policy, much effort in military defense, much of the economic resources of the country, and much of the thoughts of people devoted to meeting this challenge.

Common problems and issues submitted to the people for decision at the ballot box becoming increasingly complex and of greater consequence.

Rapid advance in communication and travel bringing nations all over the world into closer touch with one another and increasing the need for better understanding of the cultures, institutions, mores, languages, and goals of all peoples.
Mass migration of people from the open country and smaller towns and villages to large centers of population and from the centers to cities to the suburbs, with the inevitable consequences of cultural clashes that shake institutions, disturb long-established customs, set values in new perspective, color political action, disrupt systems of school support, and leave indelible marks on the behavior patterns and characters of children.

Different ethnic, racial, and cultural groups of people vigorously struggling for recognition, full rights, fair employment practices, non-discrimination in housing, and higher levels of living.

Pressure tactics, emotional displays and florid propaganda displacing reason and exercise of sober judgment in approaches to the solution of common problems.

Demands for education beyond the high school exceeding the capacities of institutions of higher learning, with rising standards for admission and escalating tuition charges.  

These cultural circumstances are alive with challenges to the schools. The powerful forces that generate cultural change and lead to these circumstances have true meaning only as they affect the lives of individuals in many social groups—family groups, clusters of people, whole communities, and the institutions that serve them. Without innovations, new approaches, and new emphases in the education program, the schools will fall short of achieving the higher purposes they are expected to achieve.  

---


4Ibid., pp. 2-3.
Federal legislation offers many opportunities for improving local programming through federal assistance. Some of the legislation is new (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965) and some has extended what has been law for a period of time (Vocational Act of 1963, incorporating and adding to the earlier Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts). The combination of new and old legislation, together with the prospect of still more comprehensive federal involvement in education, places a new and often confusing responsibility upon the local school system. 5

As of 1965, ten major sources of federal funds were available to public school systems for use in initiating, creating, and facilitating educational change to meet new social challenges. These included the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the National Defense Education Act; the Library Service and Construction Act; School Assistance to Federally Affected Areas; Provisions for Educational Television; the Vocational Education Act; the Manpower Development and Training Act; the Economic Opportunity Act; the Civil Rights Act; and numerous other miscellaneous research and development grants available to public schools in such important areas as control of juvenile delinquency and aid to handicapped children. 6

5 John W. Bott and William Senft, Handbook on Federal Programs, South-Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio, p. 1.
Singling out the Act which presently has the widest impact, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), one can readily see the abundance of monies for implementing programs that were but dreams a decade ago. The effect of this Act echoed across the nation from the large metropolitan school districts to the rural one-room systems.7

Local school districts quickly realized that the specter of federal control was less frightening than the prospect of bountiful aid was tantalizing.

The coffers were opened wide. School officials all over the country could see new sources of revenue which could not groan or growl when tapped. They also luxuriated in an unaccustomed freedom, made possible by federal funds, to initiate new programs, conduct research, and foster experiments, areas long neglected in local level education.8

Briefly viewed, this Act was categorized into five parts, each designed to attack an existing weakness in the elementary and high school systems:

Title I:—Of the $987 million set aside by Congress, $775 million goes back to the local school districts to help them improve schools in areas where there are concentrations of low income ($2,000 a year or less) families.

Title II:—It provides a $100 million to improve and expand school libraries, and to purchase such


educational materials as textbooks, magazines, tape recordings, and phonograph records.

Title III:—It channels another $75 million to create supplementary centers for all of those extra services that makes the difference between an average school and a fine school. These include special facilities for the instruction of science, music and arts, guidance and counseling services, and visits to museums, theaters, and art galleries.

Title IV:—The Act provides $20 million for the construction and operation of education research centers, and for the expansion of studies to improve teaching methods.

Title V:—Finally, it sets aside $17 million for the improvement of state departments of education.9

Importantly, it may be noted that the first three categories are directed to the improvement of education at the local level and the latter two are focused on the development of the educational systems on the state and national levels, respectively. Approximately $1-1/4 billion were allocated to initiate the first three Titles, as compared to $125 million appropriated for Titles IV and V. Needless to say, the major impetus is directed toward the first three categories, improvements in the public school systems.

Even though the bulk of the monies center around the aiding of the public school systems directly, the impact of Titles IV and V cannot be discounted. In 1964, four research and development centers were established by authority of the Cooperative Research Act of 1954. Now there are ten

such centers, each supported under Title IV of the ESEA Act of 1965, which assumes the responsibility for funding at levels between one-half and one million dollars a year. ¹⁰ These ten centers differ from nineteen regional centers also organized by the same Act.¹¹ Their number alone indicates a newly created force with the potential of having great impact on educational structure.

With this new horizon for growth comes innumerable problems—problems of organizing a staff, planning programs, writing proposals, applying for funds, managing programs and personnel to teach the programs, and training and maintaining competencies of the involved personnel (pre-service and inservice training).

The major problems of administering the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 have already been identified by Eikenberry as centering on Titles I, II, and III, these problems being of a more serious nature than those of previous major Acts (National Defense Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1963).¹²

Singling out one Act to represent new "school business" problem areas, Jones has pointed out that ESEA's


¹¹ Ibid., p. 151.

Title III projects required modification of administrative structure in order to plan and implement programs under this Act.¹³

Further help in identifying problem sources is found in the 1967-68 Guide to Federal Aid for Schools, which points out seven areas of key reasons why school staffs are slow to take advantage of federal grant funds:

1. Multiplicity of Programs.—The chief school administrator is usually too busy to be an authority on the federal aid programs. In most cases, he has neither the staff that is well-informed on proposal making nor the budget for obtaining effective consultation. Yet he is expected to win somehow for his school district its fair share of a host of complexed and multifaceted assistance programs—some of which are highly specialized and competitive.

2. Source of Funds.—It is now known in a vague and general way that there are federal and state support sources. Newspapers and journals often carry reports about neighboring districts receiving sums of money. But the picture is complex and confusing. Which of the federal grants opportunities should the administrator start with? Which programs will support local projects that need financial help? Can the school system meet the federal requirement? Many school administrators are understandably perplexed.

3. The Writing:—If the previous two problems are solved and a project and funding agency are identified, who will write the proposal? The business manager? Some over-burdened elementary principal? The superintendent? Writing takes skill, not only in knowing where all the commas go, but in describing procedures clearly, specifying objectives, and outlining a reasonable evaluation technique.

Writing takes time, and time is money which often is not refundable.

4. Submission:—Once a proposal is drafted, it must go through channels—unfortunately, channels that differ for different funding agencies. It must meet a deadline—which often differs for each title of a program (such as ESEA) and even for each part of a title. Everything must be submitted in thirty copies, or ten copies, or five copies. Approval takes time—sometimes as long as nine months. After approval comes, the negotiation of the budget, and then the delay in implementing the contract. These conditions can be frustrating, particularly if they are poorly understood or if the participant has not steeled himself against despair through previous experience.

5. Administration:—During and after the planning there are persistent problems of personnel, facilities, bookkeeping, and other administrative details. When the grant has been approved, and all other problems solved, the project must be administered. Reports must be filed, Separate accounts must be kept. Purchase orders must be processed.

6. Personnel:—When the project has been approved, who should run it? The ideal project director is thought to combine in his person the abilities of a researcher, an administrator, an evangelist, a writer, and an expert in the project field selected. Such persons are hard to find. All the commonly accepted techniques of getting good personnel—thief, enticement, promotion, impressment, legitimate recruitment—require skill and energy.

After a qualified project director is located, other staff members are needed, many of whom must have specific knowledge or experience.

7. Facilities:—The schools are crowded. When a director is hired, where will he be put? Where will the new laboratory equipment or reading classes go? In what facility will the computer or the teaching machines be housed? Many sources of federal funds do not permit money to be spent for building purposes. This is a serious problem and one for which there is often no satisfactory answer.14

---

14Rowland and Wing, op. cit., pp. 2-3.
The point being made is that the newness and complexity of the vast federal funds, their meanings, directions, and scope, have been a traumatic experience for American public schools. The tasks of designing, approving, implementing, and evaluating innovative programs and the task of ably utilizing the available aid, both service and financially, have created a new structure in school business.

In a previous sequence of curriculum practicum courses centered around visiting the central offices of Ohio city and county school systems of varying size, the writer found that no uniform structure for the utilization of federal aid prevailed among the systems, even among those of comparable size. The structure used to develop federally aided programs under these new categories seemed to be unique to each school system's administrative structure. The method of identifying curriculum and instructional needs, involving people in the planning process, designing and writing the program, and implementing the project at that time possessed only the commonality of being different.

Some of the systems worked with considerable difficulty in the securing and administering of projects, while others had great sophistication in their technique. Some had released time for especially appointed personnel to do the chore, while others had a staff of planners and clerical personnel structured specifically to design projects for federal acceptance. "Undoubtedly, more districts will
employ additional administrators to handle federal programs which will, in turn, remove the burden from administrators who need to devote all of their time to the normal on-going tasks of operating the districts.  

The fact that Ohio school districts as a whole are alike in organizational structure and implementational method for federally funded programs only in that they all differ has been affirmed by the director of federal assistance programs in Ohio, R. A. Horn. Horn states that there is probably an ideal (theoretical) structure, but that the available people within the systems do not fit these structures perfectly. Therefore, the true structures must be organized around the strengths of the available people.  

The abundance of federal monies for programs and the apparent complexity, confusion, and competition in regard to their allocation combine to indicate that the situation is a problem area of needed study.

Statement of the Problem

The study described here will investigate the duties, problems, and training needs of the personnel who direct the development of federally assisted programs in selected city school systems in Ohio. For the purpose of the study, the


16Interview with Dr. R. A. Horn, Director of Federal Assistance Programs, Columbus, Ohio, September 18, 1967.
person coordinating the activities necessary for federal assistance will be referred to as the local programs developer.

**Underlying Questions of the Study**

In planning to undertake the study, the writer conferred with school administrators and university faculty, reviewed the notes of a previously cited practicum, and surveyed background material; the following questions concerning this area of study were then formulated:

1. Where does the local program developer fit administratively in line and staff organization?

2. What change, if any, would be necessary in the organizational structure in order to effectively utilize this person?

3. What must this person know in order to perform the assigned duties?

4. What kind of pre-training should he have in order to perform efficiently in this capacity?

5. What kind of in-service training is important in order that this person maintain adequacy in performance?

6. How does he implement his product?

**Objectives of the Study**

In order to accomplish the primary objectives of the study, to identify the duties, problems, and training needs of the personnel assigned the task of coordinating the activities concerning federal assistance for educational programs in selected city systems, a framework of specific study objectives was formulated from the underlying questions.
These objectives are categorized into four study patterns: (1) the organizational structure in which the local program developer functions; (2) background of the local program developer; (3) the operational role (duties) of the local program developer; and (4) the preservice and inservice training needs of the personnel occupying this position. These categories will maintain focus on the realities (what is) and needs (what ought to be) of the position.

The specific study objectives are as follows:

1. To identify the necessary change, if any, in the formal organizational structure for utilizing the federal monies.

2. To identify the line and staff organization of the school system and the placement of the local programs developer in the design.

3. To identify the duties of the local programs developer in particular school systems.

4. To identify the mode of implementing the approved programs in each of the particular school systems.

5. To identify the preservice and inservice educational experiences of the person assigned this position.

6. To identify the educational needs of the position, preservice and inservice.

Significance of the Study

It is the intention of the researcher in his analysis of the data to provide a means to establish insights and guidelines for school personnel confronted with the problems of obtaining funds for federal assistance programs.
It is not the intention of the researcher to develop a set of absolute guidelines for school people in the area of federal assistance. A set of guidelines of this nature—if they could be developed—would in reality be worthless. The uniqueness of each school system makes such an effort impossible.

The results of the study should allow its readers to compare the practices of their districts with districts of comparable size and composition. This comparison, along with their implications, should afford the schoolman a basis to try different approaches to the problems of his system. With this in mind, the study should provide a basis for developing:

1. Guidelines for administratively structuring organizational design in order to utilize a program developer effectively.

2. Guidelines to the functional roles of the personnel involved in the coordinating activities necessary for federal assistance.

3. Guidelines for implementational methods for federally assisted programs.

4. Guidelines to develop training programs, pre-service, inservice, and graduate school work.

5. Guidelines for future study in the area.

Assumptions of the Study

The design of the study will concentrate on moving the objectives through a data source, by structured instruments, making a focus on previously stated outcomes (significance of the study). The following scheme represents a
four-step model of the study, illustrating the structure and the sequence of the project:

1. Basically, the researcher has developed a set of underlying questions from the literature and the people in the field, prior to undertaking the study.

2. The study objectives were formulated from these underlying questions. The objectives are categorized into four study patterns aimed at identifying (a) the organizational structure utilizing the services of the local programs developer; (b) background of the local program developer; (c) duties and problems of local program developer; and (d) the preservice and inservice training needs of local program developers.

3. The study consists of the analysis of the data in light of the stated objective—identifying the duties, problems, and training needs of the local program developer. In essence, the study will:

(a) Utilize the objectives focused at the data source with specifically designed instruments

(b) Analyze and interpret the data

(c) Form pertinent conclusions and applications from the findings

The data source is comprised of:

(a) Superintendent of schools

(b) Assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction and/or directors of curriculum and instruction

(c) Supervisory staff of curriculum and instruction as they are involved in federally assisted programs. This includes program coordinators (individual programs) and/or the coordinators in each of the metropolitan area schools—e.g., Title I, II, or III
(d) Principals of schools having federally assisted programs when serving in a supervisory and/or advisory capacity to these programs

(e) local program developers

The data from these personnel groups will be viewed by school systems broken down into three size categories, based on the Average Daily Membership of the individual sample systems (further discussed in Chapter II).

4. The significance of the study, as previously stated, is dependent upon the fulfillment of the primary objective— the identification of the duties, problems, and training needs of the local program developers in selected city school systems in Ohio.

This study is limited to the city school systems in Ohio as represented in the County and City Data Book, 1962.\(^{17}\) Granted, this represents only a portion of Ohio's city school systems, but it does represent a core of districts with substantial statistical data to provide an adequate basis for the study. The time and the finance necessary to undertake a total study of approximately 800 Ohio school systems, city, county, and exempted village would be prohibitive.

It can be expected that not all of the selected city school systems will consent and/or respond to the study. It is possible that a system may consent to the study, but not all of the selected respondents of that district will respond. Too, some of the systems because of size and/or

wealth, may not have a local program developer as such, but minimum involvement in federally assisted programs may only command part-time services from staff with other primary duties.

This study is not concerned with the formalized procedure of writing and submitting programs per se. It is focused on the identification and characteristics of the personnel delegated the responsibility of designing and implementing federally assisted programs.

Because of the newness of the problem—that the dreams of programs are now possible through the abundance of federal monies, there has been no precedent set for design or implementation of the programs, though the programs themselves are recorded and publicized. This is exemplified through ERIC: Document and Reproduction Service. Consequently, the literature pertaining to this particular kind of research in this particular area is at the "grassroots" level; and by nature, the investigation is an exploratory or formulative study.

In the questionnaire approach, which will be used in this study, heavy reliance is placed on the subject's report for information about the stimuli or experiences to

---


which he is exposed and for the knowledge of his behavior. Usually the investigator has not observed the events discussed. The subject's report may or may not be taken at face value; it may be interpreted in the light of other knowledge about him or in terms of some psychological theory, and inferences may be drawn about aspects of his functioning which he has not reported. Regardless of the amount and kind of interpretation, however, the starting point is the subject's self-report. Thus, these approaches can ordinarily obtain only material that the subject is willing and able to report.  

Definitions

The vast increase in federal financial assistance has obviously created a new appendage to administration procedures in many of the public school systems in the United States. With this birth, the jargon of education has also expanded, making it necessary for the researcher to establish a set of defined terms:

Federally assisted programs.—These are educational programs that are financially supported by the federal government, primarily as a result of the ESEA Act of 1965. It is the impetus of this Act that has created the "new" appendage.

20Ibid., p. 236.
Federally funded programs.—This term is used synonymously with federally assisted programs.

Local program developer.—The school staff member assigned the responsibility as the key consultant to federally assisted programs of a particular school district will be referred to as the local program developer. The role will change from system to system, as the study will indicate, but he may be the key information source, the disseminator of information, the research person for federal aid, the designer of programs, the master scheduler of federally assisted programs, and perhaps have other duties as prescribed by his administrative superior. He, too, may be referred to as the federal programming specialist or the federal program developer. For the sake of brevity the initials, LPD may be used in lieu of the formal title.

Implementational method.—Reference is made to the way federally assisted programs are put to use.

Operational role of the local programs developer.—This refers to the delegated duties and job description to this position and the person assigned it. Essentially, it is the framework of operation.

Organizational structure.—This refers to the particular line and staff arrangement that a particular school district uses for administering the total school program.
(The categories of the total program are outlined by B. T. Chandler and Paul V. Petty.)

Personnel groups.---These people formulate the total personnel used as the data source which include, the superintendent of schools, the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction, supervisors and/or coordinators of curriculum and instruction, principals having involvement in federally assisted programs, and local program developers.

Program coordinator.---This refers to the supervisor of a given program after it has been approved for federal assistance and is ready for implementation.

Titled programs.---These are the programs categorized by the nature of their aid as it is funded to the school systems. Primarily, this study is concerned with Titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965, but other acts may be represented as titled programs, and will be appropriately designated.

Summary

Through recent federal legislation, the abundance of monies made available for programs that were but dreams a decade ago has created complexity, confusion, and competition in regard to their allocations. Public school

---

administrative changes have been made in order to utilize these funds.

The newness of these monies and positions presents numerous problems in the selection and training of personnel for planning, designing, and supervising federally assisted programs.

This research study is one in which the writer will investigate the duties, problems, and training needs of the personnel who direct the development of federally assisted programs in selected city school systems in Ohio.
CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Method

The investigator used the descriptive method of research for this study. As pointed out by McGrath, Jelinek, and Wochner, the descriptive technique has frequently been labeled as the "what is" kind of research. Such an approach fits the purpose of this project.

Technique

The instruments for the study, structured questionnaires, were designed after:

1. Consultation with public school people directly involved with federal assistance
2. Consultation with faculty at the Ohio State University's School of Education
3. Review of two previous dissertations, completed in 1967, by Ronald G. Eikenberry and

---


David M. Jones, both at the Ohio State University's School of Education.

In interviewing public school personnel actively involved in planning, coordinating, and/or supervising federally assisted programs, the researcher probed to find what was causing the greatest concern. The concerns commanding broadest interest centered around these questions:

1. What are other schools doing with federal assistance?

2. What are the prime problems concerning federal assistance to public schools?

3. What are the practices of other school systems in providing inservice training for people working directly with planning, coordinating, and/or supervising federally assisted programs?

4. What type of staff members were employed for these new positions?

The faculty consulted, primarily those of the dissertation committee, agreed that the planning and coordinating of federally assisted programs merited investigation in light of the variety of procedures being developed by school districts.

---

One of the committee members had advised both Eikenberry and Jones in their studies of federal aid to public education. He indicated that a study identifying the duties, problems, and training needs of those who plan, coordinate, and supervise federally assisted programs would extend the field thus far explored. The two previous dissertations could serve as resource and insight material in designing this project.

Eikenberry's study examined administrative tasks and problems encountered by Ohio public school administrators in the process of procuring federal funds. His project was used in this study to aid in identifying items which pointed out the problem areas.

Jones' work was reviewed mainly for developing a realization of the complexity of the problems concerning federal aid for Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. His study was not used as a direct aid for questionnaire item selection.

The conferences and interviews with this cross-section of persons, knowledgeable in the area of educational administration, pointed out that the people in various positions relative to federal programs may well view duties, problems, and training needs of local program developers differently.

---

4 Eikenberry, op. cit.

5 Jones, op. cit.
For example, the superintendent, because of the forces unique to his situation, may differ a good deal in what he regards as appropriate as compared with the local programs developer. It was also pointed out by these people that the perception of personnel may differ depending on the size of the school system.

In order to make use of these varying perceptions, it was decided to use the following five categories of school personnel as sources of data focusing on the roles, problems, and training needs of the personnel in charge of federal programs in selected school districts:

1. Superintendent
2. Assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction
3. Supervisors of curriculum and title or project coordinators
4. Principals who are involved in federal programs
5. Local programs developers

It was then decided to view the perceptions of these people by school system size, based on average daily membership. The breakdown by small, medium, and large school systems is described in detail on pages 36 and 37.

Instrumentation

After the identification of the problem areas, the formation of the study objectives, and a consideration of ideas from knowledgeable people about the subject, three
questionnaires were developed:

1. **Superintendent's Report Form**
2. **Federal Program Developer's Report Form**
3. **Duties, Problems, and Training Needs of Federal Program Developers**

The **Superintendent's Report Form**, a brief five-question, single-page fill-in, was structured to:

1. Obtain permission from the superintendent to use his school system for part of the study sample.
2. Identify the organizational structure used to utilize the LPD (a line and staff chart, marking the present organizational position of the LPD, was requested).
3. Identify the names and positions of pertinent personnel involved in the school district's federal programs. The names and positions solicited from the superintendent were as follows:
   (a) Elementary and secondary principals involved in federally assisted programs in a supervisory or advisory capacity.
   (b) Supervisors of curriculum and instruction involved in federally assisted programs. This includes program and/or title coordinators.
   (c) The local programs developer (LPD).

The names of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction, who
completed the data sources to be used were obtained from the Ohio Educational Directory, 1967-68.  

This questionnaire also asked for the Average Daily Membership (ADM) as of October 1, 1967, which later would be used for categorizing the participating districts into size classifications for data analysis.

The form ended by soliciting the superintendent's signature to verify that permission had been granted to use the district as part of the study sample.

The federal program developer's report form, consisting of fourteen questions, both check-off and fill-in, was designed to:

1. Obtain the LPD's perception of his role in the present administrative structure.
2. Identify the school system's involvement in federal programs.
3. Identify the LPD's educational background, formal and experiential.
4. Identify the inservice training practices available to the LPD's.

The primary questionnaire, Duties, Problems, and Training Needs of Federal Program Developers, was a thirty-question check-off form designed to ascertain (1) the
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organizational structure in which the LPD functions, (2) the duties and problems of the LPD, and (3) the LPD's preservice and inservice training needs. Thus, all of the questionnaires were aimed at four distinct categories of concern of the study:

1. Organizational structure for utilizing the LPD.
2. Background and characteristics of the LPD.
3. Duties and problems of the LPD.
4. Preservice and inservice training needs of the LPD.

Young, Good, and Goode and Hatt's work in structural technique, as well as the professional advice from knowledgeable people in the field of education, provided insightful direction in designing these instruments.

Two letters were drafted to accompany respective questionnaires. Utmost care was taken to promote brevity and conciseness.

The first letter, written to be forwarded to the superintendent, explained the purpose of the study and the involvement needed from each participating school district.

---

This letter, along with a packet containing all correspondence and instruments to be used in the project, was the initial contact with the superintendent.

The second letter was drafted to be sent, along with the primary questionnaire, to all of the participants as selected and listed by the superintendent on his report form. It stated that permission had been granted by their superintendent to use the district as part of the study sample. It briefly described the purpose and procedure of the project.

**Instrument Trial**

After completion, the instruments and letters were closely scrutinized by (1) faculty advisors in the College of Education of the Ohio State University, (2) colleagues on staff and/or enrolled in doctoral programs in the College of Education of the Ohio State University, and (3) personnel in two school systems not included in the sample.

After recommended adjustments were made, the letters and instruments were ready to be used. The approved forms are listed in the appendices under the following headings:

A. **Superintendent's Report Form**
B. **Federal Programs Developer's Report Form**
C. **Duties, Problems and Training Needs of the Federal Program Developer**
D. Cover letter to the superintendent
E. Cover letter to selected participants
Sample

The County and City Data Book, 1962, compiled from the 1960 census, presented a block of forty Ohio cities, based on a population of 25,000 or more. These populations and their demographic characteristics furnished the researcher defined limits for the study and hard core data that otherwise would have been difficult to obtain. The statistical data of the represented cities in the census book allowed the researcher to draw inferences about a school district's federal assistance program. The cities listed in the County and City Data Book are found in Table 1.

TABLE 1

THE FORTY OHIO CITIES WITH A POPULATION OF 25,000 OR MORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akron</th>
<th>East Cleveland</th>
<th>Lorain</th>
<th>Sandusky</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>Elyria</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Shaker Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barberton</td>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>Maple</td>
<td>South Euclid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>Findlay</td>
<td>Heights</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Steubenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Heights</td>
<td>Massillon</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heights</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Falls</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>Zanesville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 The County and City Data Book, 1962, will be used in conjunction with the 1967 supplementary issue of the same book, both based on the 1960 census.


12 Ibid., p. 546.
The socio-economic data deemed pertinent by the researcher for making inferences about the participating school system's federally assisted programs are presented in Table 2. The selected factors were: (1) School population (adjusted to Average Daily Membership), (2) Median income of the city, (3) Median years of school completed in the city, and (4) Per cent Negro population of the city.

The initial contact.—The superintendents of these selected city school systems were forwarded a packet containing:

1. A cover letter explaining the project
2. The Superintendent's Report Form
3. The Federal Program Developer's Report Form
4. The primary questionnaire—Duties, Problems, and Training Needs of the Federal Program Developers
5. A return-stamped envelop addressed to the researcher.

The superintendent was to complete Items #2 and #4, returning them in the self-addressed envelope. Item #3 was forwarded for his scrutiny only.

These packets were mailed February 15, 1968. This allowed ample time for the instruments to be distributed, avoiding the autumn and spring rushes on administrative duties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Average Daily Members</th>
<th>Average Median Income of City</th>
<th>Median Years of School</th>
<th>Percent Negro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steubenville</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>$6,162</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>6,245</td>
<td>5,123</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandusky</td>
<td>6,559</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>5,854</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>7,516</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaker Heights</td>
<td>7,976</td>
<td>13,933</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>8,467</td>
<td>11,915</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>8,832</td>
<td>8,939</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findlay</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>6,077</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>10,169</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima City</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Falls</td>
<td>11,902</td>
<td>7,737</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>6,492</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyria</td>
<td>12,956</td>
<td>6,486</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Heights</td>
<td>13,202</td>
<td>8,623</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>14,121</td>
<td>7,146</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>6,265</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>15,645</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>15,850</td>
<td>8,441</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>17,144</td>
<td>5,908</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>18,745</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>24,493</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>27,177</td>
<td>5,749</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>57,466</td>
<td>6,466</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>59,933</td>
<td>6,266</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>93,031</td>
<td>5,701</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>5,982</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>152,000</td>
<td>5,935</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By March 15, twenty-two superintendents out of the sample of 40 had returned their part of the packets. March 15 marked a second mailing to the superintendents that showed no response. By April 15, five more districts sent in the approval forms for the study.

Three of the largest metropolitan area city school systems did not respond either to the first or second mailing. Telephone contact was made with the Local Programs Developers in these systems. Arrangements were made with the LPD's of these three metropolitan districts and necessary permission was granted by their offices to forward the primary questionnaire to those persons identified as pertinent data sources for the study. (Questionnaires were not obtainable from the superintendent and assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction.) This raised the number of the participating school systems to 30 or 75 per cent.

Table 3 represents the participating systems and their Average Daily Membership as of October 1, 1967. (Note: School systems are ranked according to ADM.)

The primary instrument and response.—The first and limited use of the primary instrument (Duties, Problems, and Training Needs of the Federal Program Developer) was experienced with the superintendents. But immediately upon return of the Superintendent's Report Form, the participants as selected by the superintendent were sent the primary instru-
TABLE 3

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steubenville</td>
<td>5,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>6,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandusky</td>
<td>6,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>6,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
<td>6,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaker Heights</td>
<td>7,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>8,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>8,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findlay</td>
<td>8,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>10,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima City</td>
<td>11,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>11,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>12,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyria</td>
<td>12,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Heights</td>
<td>13,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>14,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>15,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>15,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>17,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>18,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>24,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>27,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>57,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>59,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>93,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>106,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>152,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ment, accompanied with the explanatory cover letter and a return-stamped envelope.

Totally, 447 primary instruments were forwarded, 310 were returned, and 295 were retained as valid data forms. (Fifteen were not filled in sufficiently.) This afforded the researcher with a total of 66 per cent valid return with
a number of 295—a substantial base for the research. Table 4 briefly summarizes the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total School Districts Contacted</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School Districts Consented</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Primary Questionnaires Forwarded</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Primary Questionnaires Returned</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid Primary Questionnaires</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 5, a breakdown is made of participants named by their superintendents to whom questionnaires were forwarded. It also accounts for the primary questionnaires completed by the superintendent and assistant superintendent identified through the Ohio Educational Directory, 1967-1968. 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Questionnaires Forwarded</th>
<th>Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supt's.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. Supt's.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super/Coor'ds.</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD's.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A breakdown of the total participants in the study according to school system size is found in Table 6.

### TABLE 6

TOTAL RESPONSES ACCORDING TO SCHOOL DISTRICT SIZE AND PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Districts</th>
<th>Medium Districts</th>
<th>Large Districts</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supt's.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. Supt's.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super/Coor'ds.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD's</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>295</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizing the Sample for Data Analysis

Obviously, all school systems do not have the same organizational characteristics, i.e., Average Daily Membership, administrative organization, and demographical structure. The responding sample of 30 schools ranged from an ADM of 5,022 to 152,000. It was realized that the differences in size of school population would certainly affect the perspectives of the individual responsible for decision making. Consequently, these anticipated perceptual differences instigated a breakdown of the sample into three major size divisions, with consideration given to both (a) size of ADM and (b) size of administrative staff.
Table 7 compares the school districts' ADM with the number of administrative staff, as listed in the Ohio Educational Directory, 1967-1968. A ratio of administrators per 1000 pupils was computed in order to more precisely make this comparison. In developing the ratio, it was found that use of size of the administrative staff to make the size divisions did not provide any alternative to use of simple ADM figures. The administrative number had a range of 3.03 (1.39 to 3.42). The differences within the range seemingly display no trend; the ratio fluctuated throughout the sample.

It was then decided to break the school systems into three divisions based on size according to Average Daily Membership as of October 1, 1967. The following divisions were compiled from Table 7:

Division I--Included ten districts ranging from an ADM of 5,022 to 8,915. These districts are referred to as small school systems.

Division II--Consisted of fifteen school districts, ranging from 9,900 to 27,177 pupils. These are referred to as medium school systems.

Division III--Was represented by five large metropolitan area city school systems, ranging from 57,466 to 152,000 pupils. Obvious, these districts are referred to as large school systems.

---

15 Includes certificated central office personnel and elementary and secondary principals.

16 Ibid., pp. 17-104.
## TABLE 7

THE 30 SCHOOL SYSTEMS SAMPLE WITH RESPECTIVE AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF NUMBER, AND RATIO OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PER 1000 PUPILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small School Systems</th>
<th>ADM</th>
<th>Staff Number</th>
<th>Ratio Staff/1000 Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steubenville</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>6,245</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandusky</td>
<td>6,559</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaker Heights</td>
<td>7,976</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>8,967</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>8,832</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findlay</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium School Systems</th>
<th>ADM</th>
<th>Staff Number</th>
<th>Ratio Staff/1000 Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>10,169</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima City</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>11,902</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyria</td>
<td>12,956</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Heights</td>
<td>13,202</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>14,121</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>15,645</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>15,850</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>17,144</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>18,745</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>24,493</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>27,177</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large School Systems</th>
<th>ADM</th>
<th>Staff Number</th>
<th>Ratio Staff/1000 Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>57,466</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>59,933</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>93,031</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>152,000</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compilation of Data

The Federal Program Developer's Report Form and the primary questionnaire, Duties, Problems, and Training Needs of the Federal Program Developers, upon return were examined for validity and coded for data processing. The data were classified into small, medium, and large school systems, as described above, and by five personnel groups:

1. Superintendents of schools
2. Assistant superintendents in charge of curriculum-instruction
3. Title and curriculum supervisors and/or project coordinators
4. Principals having involvement in federally assisted programs
5. Local program developers (LPD's)

The computer print-out provides the researcher with frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations of the responses by question. The frequency distribution in percentage and the mean are the two arithmetical measurements used for data analysis. Questions that are not scaled, use a frequency distribution in percentage to illustrate the trends and central tendencies. Questions structured to scale use the arithmetic mean to illustrate central tendencies.

The data illustrated by percentages, comparing the responses between personnel groups and school system size, are tested by using the Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table. When differences appear within the item
at the .05 confidence level, further Chi Square Tests are computed to specifically identify the agreement and/or disagreement between the data groups.

Data illustrated by arithmetic mean responses are treated by a one-way analysis of variance to the .05 confidence level. Items showing responses falling within this .05 level are then subjected to Duncan's Multiple Range Test in order to ascertain the specific differences within the sample groups.

Summary

A descriptive study was designed to investigate the Duties, Problems, and Training Needs of Local Program Developers of Federally Assisted Programs, after an in-depth consultation with knowledgeable people in the field of education.

The project design focused on organizing the study to treat four specific categories:

1. Organizational structure utilizing the LPD
2. Background and characteristics of the LPD
3. Duties and problems of the LPD
4. Preservice and inservice training needs of the LPD

These categories are to be investigated by structured questionnaires aimed at gaining problem perspectives from personnel groups of small, medium, and large school systems. These personnel groups are comprised of the following school people:
1. Superintendents of schools
2. Assistant superintendents in charge of curriculum-instruction
3. Title and curriculum supervisors and/or project coordinators
4. Principals having involvement in federally assisted programs
5. Local program developers (LPD's)

The study sample was selected from the County and City Data Book, 1962, in which 75 percent of these school systems participated. The sample ranged in pupil population of 5,022 to 152,000. Totally, 447 primary instruments were forwarded, 310 were returned, and 295 were retained as valid data forms. The data were then processed by computer, analyzing the responses in three school system size divisions based on Average Daily Membership as of October 1, 1967. The data were further broken down by five personnel groups—the focus being on the perceptual differences between these groups and small, medium, and large school systems.

The responses to questions illustrated by percentages were statistically tested by using the Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table. When differences appeared within the item at the .05 confidence level, further Chi Square Tests were computed to specifically identify these differences.

Data illustrated by the arithmetic mean responses were subjected to a one-way analysis of variance to the .05
confidence level. Items indicating responses within this .05 confidence level, were further subjected to Duncan's Multiple Range Test in order to pin-point the agreements and/or disagreements within the sample groups.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The presentation and analysis of data falls into four categories, each treating a segment of the study. These categories are:

Category I. Organizational Structure Utilizing the Local Program Developers

Category II. Background of the Local Program Developers

Category III Duties and Problems of the Local Program Developers

Category IV. Preservice and Inservice Training Needs of the Local Program Developers

The data in each category, obtained from structured questionnaires, are viewed by the previously described breakdown—personnel groups and school system size. The total sample response is used to rank and compare the item responses. Statistically, frequency distributions in percent and by the means of the responses are the two arithmetical measurements used for data analysis. Questions structured for scaling are viewed by using their means; questions not structured for scaling are viewed in terms of number and percent.

Category I draws data from questions 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Federal Program Developer's Report Form, and questions
5, 6, 7, and 8 of the primary questionnaire—Duties, Problems, and Training Needs of the Federal Program Developers.

Category II draws data from questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of the Federal Program Developer's Report Form.

Category III obtains data from questions 11, 12, 13, 14, 25, 26, and 27 of the primary questionnaire.

Category IV draws data from questions 9, 10, 15 (A through F), 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 of the primary questionnaire.

Questions 28, 29, and 30 of the primary questionnaire were voided due to limited response.

**Category I: Organizational Structure Utilizing Local Program Developers**

This category is aimed at ascertaining the impact that the abundance of federal funds allocated for improving public education at the elementary and secondary levels, had on the organizational structures of school systems. This section is investigated in terms of (1) socioeconomic variables and approved programs, (2) the placement of the LPD in the organizational hierarchy, (3) changing the structure in order to utilize new personnel, (4) the adequacy of the organizational arrangement, and (5) the effectiveness of new personnel in a newly created area.
Socioeconomic considerations and ESEA Programs

It was the assumption of the researcher that school systems with low median incomes, low median years of education, and a high percent Negro population (poverty areas), or a combination of these factors, would result in a greater number of federally funded programs. It was also suspected that the number and quality of the programs were not solely dependent upon the socioeconomic needs of the served constituency of the school district, but may be more dependent upon the experience and "know-how" of the administrator(s) involved in this new endeavor.

Table 8, based on questions 3 and 4 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form, presents the data concerning socioeconomic factors and ESEA involvement from 1965 through 1968.

It was difficult to generalize from the table that systems of lesser wealth, lower levels of education, and greater poverty potential had more federally funded programs. In fact, the table illustrates that three systems had median incomes above $7,500 (as of the 1960 census), median years of education clustering around 12, and less than 1 percent Negro population, had 10 or more federally funded programs. It was apparent that wealthy districts, as based on high median incomes and limited poverty potential, had fewer funded programs under Title I of the ESEA. (This Title is aimed at the educationally deprived communities.) These
TABLE 8
SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION ACT (ESEA) PROGRAMS, TITLES I, II, AND III, 1965 THROUGH 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEMS</th>
<th>AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>MEDIAN INCOME</th>
<th>MEDIAN YEARS</th>
<th>PERCENT NEGRO POP</th>
<th>TITLE I 1965-68</th>
<th>TITLE II 1965-68</th>
<th>TITLE III 1965-68</th>
<th>TOTAL PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stuebenville</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>5,123</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandusky</td>
<td>6,559</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>5,854</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>7,516</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaker Heights</td>
<td>7,976</td>
<td>13,933</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>8,167</td>
<td>11,915</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>8,832</td>
<td>8,936</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findlay</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>6,077</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>7,532</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>10,169</td>
<td>5,977</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima City</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>11,902</td>
<td>7,737</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>12,110</td>
<td>6,192</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyria</td>
<td>12,956</td>
<td>6,166</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Heights</td>
<td>13,202</td>
<td>8,623</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>14,121</td>
<td>7,116</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>6,265</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>15,615</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>15,850</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>17,114</td>
<td>5,908</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>18,745</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>21,493</td>
<td>7,819</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>27,177</td>
<td>5,742</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>57,166</td>
<td>6,166</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>59,933</td>
<td>6,266</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>93,031</td>
<td>5,701</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>5,982</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>152,000</td>
<td>5,935</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
systems are exemplified by Shaker Heights, Upper Arlington, Cleveland Heights, and Kettering.

The large city school systems, with their cultural problems of low income, median years of education clustering around 10, and ghetto areas, showed a diversity of programs in number and category. They generally displayed more success in setting up Title III programs which are geared to creating supplementary centers to upgrade the quality of education in the individual systems. As the table indicates, Title III projects show sparseness in participation with the exception of a cluster of large school system responses.

It was concluded in Eikenberry's study that "the largest and wealthier districts have a decided advantage over smaller, less wealthy districts particularly in relation to legislative programs which require matching funds that have requirements related to sufficient numbers of students."¹

All systems of the sample showed participation in ESEA Title II programs. According to the data, the allocations by the federal government fell into a single grant per system per year. Horn pointed out that less emphasis is placed on innovative programs under Title II—that this Title is aimed at library improvement through additional books and materials.² These grants tend to be more

¹Eikenberry, op. cit., p. 208.

²Interview with Dr. R. A. Horn, Director of Federal Assistance Programs, Columbus, Ohio, September 18, 1967.
perfunctory than Titles I and III. Horn also indicated that freedom of time and skill on the part of the local program developer may be related to the effectiveness of the school to have programs funded under Titles I and III.\(^3\)

It is evident that programs generally increase in number as the Average Daily Membership increases. A definite increase in Title I programs can be noted in large school systems.

**Title and Place of the LPD**

Organizational placement is a problem whenever new positions are created. Seemingly, the crucial test is a functional one—to place new personnel in the administrative structure in such a way as to gain maximum efficiency.

The initial contact packet sent to the superintendent of schools requested an organizational chart identifying the location of the local programs developer. It was also requested that a formal title of the position and the administrator to whom the LPD was responsible be identified. The relevant data are presented in Table 9, with the identification of the LPD's formal title and the administrative officer(s) to whom the LPD is responsible.

Small systems have generally delegated the duties of federal programs development to an already established position. In the 10 small systems, four had local programs

\(^3\)Ibid.
### TABLE 9

**FORMAL TITLE OF THE FEDERAL PROGRAMS DEVELOPER AND HIS RESPONSIBLE ADMINISTRATOR AMONG SYSTEMS IN THE STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>ADM</th>
<th>Title of Position (LPD)</th>
<th>To Whom Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small School Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steubenville</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>FPC</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>Dir.-Cur.&amp; Instr.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>6,245</td>
<td>FPD</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandusky</td>
<td>6,559</td>
<td>Adm. Asst.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>Dir.-Fed.Prog.&amp; Adult Educ.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaker Heights</td>
<td>7,976</td>
<td>Adm. Asst.to Supt.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>8,467</td>
<td>Adm. Asst.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>8,832</td>
<td>Asst. Supt.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findlay</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>Coord. of Fed.Prog.</td>
<td>Dir. of Cur. (Adm.Asst.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium School System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>Asst. Supt.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>10,169</td>
<td>Adm. Asst.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima City</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>11,902</td>
<td>Adm. Asst.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>Dir. of Fed. Prog.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyria</td>
<td>12,956</td>
<td>Dor.-Govern.Ass't</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>14,121</td>
<td>Team effort</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>15,850</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>17,144</td>
<td>Dir.Fed.Asst.Prog.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>18,745</td>
<td>Dir.-Instr.&amp; Cur.</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
developers as such, even though the person was not necessarily titled as the LPD. The remaining six systems assigned the task of program development to an established department or position. In 9 of the 10 systems, the coordinator of federal program activities was directly responsible to the superintendent. In the remaining district, the superintendent coordinated all of the federal programming activities.

In 8 of the 15 medium school systems, specific personnel had been assigned the task of coordinating the activities for federal assistance. Four school systems delegated these duties to an already established position. Two systems reported not having such personnel (one of these was obviously justified socioeconomically). One school system used a team effort approach, the team answering directly to the superintendent.
Of the fifteen medium systems eight indicated that the LPD was directly responsible to the superintendent. Four of the LPD's were directly responsible to assistant superintendents, two of which were assistant superintendents of curriculum and instruction. One was responsible to a curriculum coordinator, and as previously mentioned, two systems did not have LPD's as such.

All of the large systems had LPD's (5), although their formal titles were somewhat different. All of them were directly responsible to assistant superintendents, four of which were assistant superintendents of curriculum and instruction. One of the LPD's was responsible to the assistant superintendent of special programs—a newly formed office in that system.

It was found that small and medium systems had specific people coordinating the activities for federal assistance and that these people were responsible to the superintendent of schools. The trend indicated that the larger the system, the farther away the responsibility is from the superintendent.

Changing the Organizational Structure

With the availability of vast sums of federal money for public schools to improve and innovate educational programs, it was assumed that some administrative change would have to be made in order to obtain these available funds and implement programs.
Compiled from question 4 of the primary questionnaire, Table 10 focuses on reporting the changes made in the organizational structure of the school systems in order to utilize the services of the local program developers. The response choices are (1) necessary to change structure and (2) not necessary to change the structure. The responses are listed in number and percent.

Personnel groups viewed change as necessary with percentages ranging from 53.8 to 73.6. Superintendents, assistant superintendents, and principals had responses of 56.0, 53.8 and 57.5 percent, respectively. LPD's and supervisors and/or coordinators showed responses of 72.0 and 73.6 percent. The Chi Square Test of Independence indicated no significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

School systems showed responses of 61.5, 57.9, and 71.1 percents. The test of these statistics illustrated no significance at the .10 confidence level.

Totally, 62.2 percent of the respondents perceived that change in the organizational structure was necessary in order to utilize the services of the local program developers.

Table 11, compiled from question 5 of the primary questionnaire, focuses on identifying the kinds of changes that occurred in the organizational structure for utilizing the services of the LPD.
### Table 10

**NECESSITY TO CHANGE THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE FOR UTILIZING THE SERVICES OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL GROUPS</th>
<th>RESPONSE RANGE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NECESSARY TO CHANGE STRUCTURE</td>
<td>NOT NECESSARY TO CHANGE STRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/Coordinators</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFD's</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 7.544; this is not significant at the .10 confidence level.\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for School System Size = 3.672; this is not significant at the .10 confidence level.\(^b\)

---

*Responses are listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Group Size and by respective School System Size.*

*Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.*
### TABLE 11

**ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A formation of a totally new appendage</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manifested in a special person responsible to the supt.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An addition to an already established position</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Manifested in a special person responsible to the assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Manifested in a special person responsible to the director of pupil personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N=178)</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aResponses listed by area of change, percent, and number.*

As it is pointed out, the changes were primarily clustered into three groups. **Area I, a formation of a totally new appendage**, showed the greatest concentration of responses; 36.3 percent of the responses fell into this group. This cluster tends to verify what was previously characterized by the districts' organizational charts represented in Table 9, portraying the LPD as being a new position forming a new appendage to the administrative structure.

**Area II, manifested in a special person responsible to the superintendent**, received 26.4 percent of the
responses. Referring back to Table 9, these responses would be characterized as coming from small and medium school systems.

Area III, an addition to an already established department, received 24 percent of the responses. Totally, these three areas made 86.7 percent of the responses.

Area IV cannot be completely discounted; 12.2 percent responded that change in their system was manifested in the addition of a special person responsible to the assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction. These were large school systems (see Table 9).

Adequacy of Present Administrative Organization

The rapidity with which federal legislation freed vast sums of money to upgrade the quality of education at the elementary and secondary levels triggered the urgency in which school administrators had to act in order to create departments and appoint personnel. When time is of essence in decision making, sometimes the quality of these decisions suffer. This section focuses on this problem.

Table 12 views the adequacy of the present organizational structure for utilizing the services of local program developers. (The data represent responses only from the LPD's, obtained from question 2 of the Federal Program Developer's Report Form.)

Small school systems felt that the present structures were adequate (5 of 8). In the medium districts 8 of 13
perceived the structure as adequate. All of the large systems (4) agreed on adequacy. Two undecided respondents appeared in the medium systems.

TABLE 12
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO SATISFACTORY USE OF THE SERVICES OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS AS PERCEIVED BY LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy Range</th>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total sample of LPD's, 17 of 25 or 68.0 percent viewed their organizations as having an adequate structure.

Table 13, compiled from question 6 of the primary questionnaire, views the adequacy of the present organizational structure by personnel groups and by school system size.

Personnel groups, with exception to the LPD's, perceived the structures at least adequate at the 80.0 percent level. The responses were either highly adequate or moderately adequate. Assistant superintendents viewed their


**TABLE 13**

ORGANIZATIONAL ADEQUACY FOR UTILIZING THE SERVICES OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GROUPS</th>
<th>ADEQUACY RANGE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/Coordinators</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD's</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 2.565; this is not significant at the .10 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for School System Size = 1.038; this is not significant at the .10 level.

---

*a* Responses listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Groups Size and by respective School System Size.

*b* Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.
systems higher in adequacy than did other personnel groups; 48.0 percent responded to highly adequate. LPD's perception of their present structure showed that 76.0 percent (19 of 25) viewed it at least adequate (high + moderate); only 20.0 percent (5) viewed their systems as being highly adequate. Personnel groups indicated no significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size illustrated that 37.4 percent of the districts felt their structures were highly adequate. Nearly half (47.6 percent) of the districts saw themselves as being moderately adequate. Thus, 85.0 percent of the respondents considered their structures as being at least adequate. The test of the statistics showed no significant perceptual difference at the .10 confidence level.

Totally, 85.0 percent of the respondents viewed their organizational structure for utilizing the services of the LPD's as being at least adequate as opposed to 15.0 percent feeling an inadequacy with the present arrangement.

Table 14 focuses on modes of improving the organizational structures to a level of highly adequate in the utilization of the LPD's services. (Question 7 of the primary questionnaire asked the respondents what they would propose to improve the function of the LPD's organizationally in order to make their services highly adequate.)

Since the data from this question only pertain to those participants who considered their systems less than
highly adequate, the breakdown by personnel groups and school system size produces limited responses. Consequently, the data are viewed by the total response.

TABLE 14

FUNCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT OF THE LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes of Improvement</th>
<th>Number of Responses (N=88)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Create a special department for local program development</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assign the LPD to the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assign the LPD to the superintendent of schools</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assign the LPD to the director of pupil personnel services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses for Functional Improvement are focused on those respondents viewing their systems as less than highly adequate in Table 14.

Four choices were given as suggested modes of improvement, plus an open-ended opportunity for the respondent to express other methods. These choices in order of greatest response are as follows:

1. Create a special department for local program development

2. Assign the LPD to the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction

3. Assign the LPD to the superintendent of schools
4. Assign the LPD to the director of pupil personnel services

Of the 88 responses, 44 (50.0 percent) favored improvement through the creation of a special department for federal program development; 31.9 percent (28) of the respondents indicated that assigning the LPD to the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction would facilitate improvement. These two areas encompassed 81.9 percent (72 of 88) of the responses.

Only 13 of the 88 respondents (14.7 percent) viewed improvement through assigning the LPD to be directly responsible to the superintendent of schools. Three (3.4 percent) chose improvement by assigning the LPD to the director of pupil personnel services.

None of the respondents suggested other means to improve the present organizational structure for utilizing the services of the LPD's. Thus, items 1 and 2 obviously reflect the areas most considered as modes of improvement.

Table 15, compiled from question 3 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form, views organizational improvement as perceived by the local program developers. The LPD's that perceived their organizational structures as not being satisfactory for utilizing their services were asked for proposals to improve the situations. Of the eight LPD's responding, six made comments having as a common theme that the position demands more time than is allotted. The duties and responsibilities involved in federal assistance are very
time consuming. The comments of even the small school systems reflected that federal program development was a full-time position.

**TABLE 15**

**PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

(N = 6) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Size</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Principal and LPD</td>
<td>Relieve director of full-time administrative duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Delegate more of the extraneous duties to clerks in order to free the LPD. (Too many small duties.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>LPD</td>
<td>Give full responsibility of the department to the LPD, including budget, bookkeeping, supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Assign him (ass't sup't) a person specifically for this task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Assign full-time person to job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Administrative Team</td>
<td>Allow more time from regular duties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comment identified by school system size and official title of person making the suggestion. Data obtained from an open-ended question.*

Effectiveness of Newly Appointed LPD's

The question of effectiveness, always a concern of school administrators in the appointment of new personnel, becomes especially important in the LPD positions so different from any thus far practiced in contemporary school
business. Given ample time and training, effectiveness is not necessarily a problem, but in the case of the immediacy and availability of vast categorical funds, time for searching for and requirements in training of LPD's were unavailable to school administrators. This section focuses on ascertaining the effectiveness of those appointments.

Formulated from question 8 of the primary questionnaire, Table 16 views the effectiveness of the LPD as he was appointed to the new position. The table presents the data by personnel groups and by school system size, listing the responses by number and percent.

Personnel groups, with exception to superintendents and their assistants, displayed very little difference in perception, their responses clustering around that of the total sample (74.0 percent effective). Superintendents viewed the LPD's effectiveness higher than did the LPD himself (91.3 to 60.0 percent, respectively). Superintendents and their assistants rated the LPD's higher than did other personnel groups of the sample. Of the 25 LPD's, 9 of them felt that they were ineffective in their new job role; by percentage of response they showed the lowest perception of effectiveness. Although there are noted percentage differences, personnel groups illustrated no significant difference at the .10 percent confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size displayed some disagreement in effectiveness. Small and medium
# EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS
## IN THEIR NEWLY APPOINTED POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GROUPS</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RANGE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/Coordinators</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED's</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST
Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 5.087; this is not significant at the .10 level.\(^{a}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST
Chi Square for School System Size = 1.644; this is significant at the .05 level.\(^{b}\)

---

\(^{a}\)Responses listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Group Size and by respective School System Size.

\(^{b}\)Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.
systems agreed with responses of 75.6 and 68.9 percent, respectively. Large systems viewed the role of the LPD at the 80.0 percent effective level. Chi Square tests illustrated that small and medium systems agree as well as the small and large systems; the disagreement tested between the medium systems and the large systems with responses of 68.9 and 80.0, respectively.

Totally, 74.0 percent of the respondents felt that the LPD was effective; 76.1 percent perceived his function, at least, moderately effective (216 of 285). Only 68 or 23.9 percent felt that the LPD's services were ineffective in his newly appointed position.

Summary of Findings under Category I

This category focuses on determining the impact that the vast federal monies allocated for improving public education at the elementary and secondary levels had on the organizational structures of the school systems. This area is investigated in terms of (1) socioeconomic variables and approved programs, (2) the placement of the Local Program Developer in the organizational hierarchy, (3) changing the structure in order to utilize the new personnel, (4) the adequacy of the organizational arrangement, and (5) the effectiveness of the new personnel in a newly created task.

Socioeconomic considerations and ESEA Programs.--It was not explicity illustrated that federally assisted programs were dependent upon socioeconomic needs of the
districts' constituency. It was apparent that wealthy districts, districts that were more financially able to maintain quality programs, had fewer funded programs—especially Title I programs, aimed at the problems of the culturally deprived. The presence of Title II programs, focused on library improvement, showed no discrimination concerning school system size and socioeconomic variables. In fact, the application for funds under Title II tended to be more perfunctory than do Titles I and III. Title I and III seemingly command more time and skill on the part of the local program developers.

Generally, programs increase in number as the Average Daily Membership increases.

Title and placement of the LPD.—The data illustrated that the smaller the school system, the closer the responsibility of developing programs is to the superintendent of schools. Medium size systems show more sophistication in federal program development than do small systems. Medium systems tend to have specific personnel assigned to the task of coordinating the activities necessary to obtain federal assistance for programs; these personnel are responsible to the superintendents of schools. As the systems increase in size, the LPD's become responsible to assistant superintendents—usually to assistant superintendents of curriculum and instruction.
Large systems definitely have specific personnel handling the duties of federal program development. These people are responsible to assistant superintendents in charge of curriculum and instruction.

Changing the organizational structure.---It was the assumption of the researcher that organizational change was necessary in order to adequately utilize the services of the LPD. It was found that 62.2 percent of the respondents felt that school systems experienced organizational change. Large systems perceived more change than did small and medium systems; 71.1 percent of the respondents from large systems perceived change in the organizational structure.

All changes perceived in small, medium, and large systems clustered heavily into three groups:

1. A formation of a totally new appendage (36.3 percent)

2. Manifested in a special person responsible to the superintendent of schools (26.4 percent)

3. An addition to an already established department (24.0 percent)

These three groups received 86.7 percent of the responses. A fourth group, made up of a special person responsible to the assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction, received 12.3 percent of the responses.

Adequacy of present administrative organization.---Personnel groups viewed the adequacy of the present organization for utilizing the services of the LPD at a level of 80.0 percent (high + moderate) or above, with exception to
the LPD's themselves. They perceived their adequacy level at 76.0 percent (high + moderate). Assistant superintendents viewed their school systems higher than did other personnel groups; 48 percent of them considered the systems as highly adequate. The breakdown by school system size showed little perceptual difference, the responses clustering around 80 percent as being at least adequate.

The 28 respondents (9.7 percent) viewing their systems as inadequate, felt that the following modes of change would improve their structures:

1. Create a special department for this service (50 percent)
2. Assign the LPD directly to the assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction (43 percent)
3. Assign the LPD directly to the superintendent of schools (6.3 percent)

Generally it was felt that a special department had greater merit than did the other suggested methods, although assigning the LPD to the assistant superintendent did command 43.0 percent of the responses (these were from medium school systems). It was also noticed that some of the suggested improvements were already in force with districts that considered themselves adequate.

These data were also treated by the Federal Program Developers Report Form, surveying only the perceptions of the LPD's. LPD's of small, medium, and large school systems felt that the present organizational structure was adequate; 68 percent of the respondents reflected this adequacy. Of
those that did not feel that the structure was adequate (6 of 25), the common theme for improvement focused on allotting more time to perform their duties and responsibilities—that the position of local program developer is a full-time job and should be regarded as such.

**Effectiveness of newly appointed LPD's.**—Of all of the personnel responding, 73.4 percent felt that the LPD's were effective in their new role shortly after appointment. Too, it was felt that 15.8 percent were moderately effective; thus, 89.2 percent viewed the LPD's at least moderately effective in their new role shortly after appointment.

Superintendents viewed job effectiveness higher than did the LPD's (91.3 to 60.0 percent, respectively). Very little difference was shown by school system breakdown, although medium systems did perceive the effectiveness of the LPD slightly lower than did small and large systems. The responses clustered around that of the above mentioned sample responses.
Category II: The Background of the Local Program Developers

This section is concerned with ascertaining the educational background, formal and experiential, of the Local Program Developers.

Viewing the data of this category in terms of three divisions based on school district size does not lend to the development of validity and inference. The divisional breakdown was 8, 12, and 5 for districts small, medium, and large, respectively. Too, the no-data factor must be taken into account. Consequently, the group of 25 is better viewed as a total, rather than by division.

System Appointments

It was assumed by the researcher that the appointments of the LPD came from within the school system, since the familiarity with the districts' problems and membership composition would undoubtedly be an asset to those people involved in planning programs.

Table 17, compiled from question 6 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form, focuses on ascertaining the extent to which Local Program Developers were appointed from within the school system.

It was found that 92 percent (23 of 25) were appointed from within their school system. Only 8 percent (2) were personnel appointed from other systems.
Table 17, based on question 7 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form, identifies the service from which the LPD was appointed. It was found that 60.9 percent (14 of 23) of the LPD's were from principalships and assistant principalships. It was also found that 21.8 percent (5) of the LPD's were appointed from curriculum supervision. Thus, 82.7 percent (19 of 23) were appointed from the services of school principalships and curriculum supervision. The remaining positions represent jobs of seemingly less administrative responsibility and experience.

The number of years of service the LPD had accumulated within his school system before being appointed to the position of local program developer (question 8 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form) is reported in Table 19.

The personnel appointed to the position were found to have had considerable experience within the system. Of the sample, 87.5 percent (21 of 24) had ten or more years service, and 91.7 percent (22) had seven or more years
TABLE 18
SERVICES FROM WHICH THE LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS
WERE APPOINTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary principals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting teachers and/or attendance officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator of programs (other)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance counselors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 19
NUMBER OF YEARS OF SERVICE LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS
HAD WITH SYSTEM BEFORE APPOINTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10-More</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

service with the system. Only 8.3 percent had less than 6 years longevity.
Formal Training and Experience of the Local Program Developers

This section deals with the formal educational training and professional experiences of the LPD's.

Table 20, derived from question 9 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form reports the educational level achieved by the LPD. It was found that 96 percent (24 of 25) had at least a master's degree; 68 percent had a master's degree plus additional graduate work. Two the LPD's had obtained doctoral degrees. It may be pointed out that the lone bachelor's plus was from a high medium size district and that the person had had three or less years' service within that district, two of which were in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor's plus</th>
<th>Bachelor's plus</th>
<th>Master's plus</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21, ascertained from question 10 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form reports the years of primary professional responsibility in selected areas. Classroom teaching ranked high among the responses, with 76 percent (19 of 25) having five years or more (Mn = 6.96). High
### TABLE 21

**LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS' YEARS OF SERVICE IN PROFESSIONAL AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL AREAS</th>
<th>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secondary Principal</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elementary Principal</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistant Principal</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisor</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Visiting Teacher and/or Attendance Officer</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The responses are listed by percent and the items are ranked according to the sample mean.*
percentages also occurred in the area of the principalship—elementary, secondary, and their assistants—the mean adequately portraying the trend. The means of the principalship exceeded 5.5 years of service, ranging from 5.55 to 6.63. Guidance counselors and visiting teachers and/or attendance officers appear to be areas of little significance in reference to training and recruiting local programs developers.

**Inservice Training Programs**

The availability of inservice training programs and the availability of time to utilize these programs are two specific and interdependent areas of concern.

Table 22 illustrates the flexibility of the work schedule to allow the LPD's to use available inservice training programs (compiled from question 11, Federal Program Developers Report Form).

It was found that 72 percent (18 of 25) of the persons responding indicated that time was available to them. Only 24 percent (6) responded that time was not available to them. One person responded, did not know.
Table 22 presents the inservice training programs available to LPD's (question 12 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form).

Workshops provided by the state office of education, visitations to other school systems in the state, and the utilization of university and/or college personnel brought in to provide information and give consultation, each received an 80 percent or greater concentration of responses. University and/or college planned seminars serviced 68 percent of the personnel involved in coordinating the activities for federal assistance. Nearly half (48 percent) visited school systems in other states. Only 12 percent indicated the availability of national conferences on curriculum development (ASCD).
### TABLE 23

**AVAILABILITY OF INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS (N = 25)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Programs</th>
<th>Response Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops-State Office of Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation to other schools in state</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and/or college personnel brought in to provide information and consultation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars provided by local college and/or universities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitations to other school systems in other states</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National conferences on curriculum development (ASCD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24, compiled from question 13 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form, ranks the inservice training programs listed in Table 23 in order of importance as perceived by the LPD's. The LPD's were asked to identify three types of programs from this list which they felt benefited them most. (Possible total responses are 75, or 3 x 25.)

Some change in order of ranking did occur in Tables 23 and 24, although four types of programs were identified as areas of priority through their use.
TABLE 24

INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS IN ORDER OF GREATEST BENEFIT
AS PERCEIVED BY LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS
(Possible N = 3 x 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Types of Programs</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visitations to other systems in state</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workshops by state office</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seminars by colleges and/or universities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University personnel brought in to provide information service</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Visitations to systems in other states</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>National curriculum conferences (ASCD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visitations to other schools were thought to be the greatest benefit, with 22 of 70 responses (31.4 percent). Workshops ranked second in importance, with 17 responses (24.3 percent), which reverses the order of the first two items. Seminars held by colleges and/or universities also showed a change in order, ranking slightly higher in importance than university personnel brought in to provide information service, having responses of 17.1 and 12.9.
percent, respectively. These four areas make up 86 percent of the responses.

Visitations to systems in other states, national curriculum conferences (ASCD), and others, fell into the same order as illustrated in Table 23, receiving together only 14 percent of the responses.

Table 25 is directed toward ascertaining how the LPD's perceive improvement in the inservice training function as it pertains to their position. This table is derived from question 14 of the Federal Program Developers Report Form, a question designed to allow open-ended opinions to be expressed.

Only 16 of the 25 LPD's responded to the question. These responses generally fell into seven categories.

Of these 16 responses, 50 percent (8) specifically indicated that LPD's felt the need for involvement in their own inservice training programs. The personnel responding to Item 1 wanted to include outside help, e.g., people from colleges and/or universities, but importantly, they wanted, themselves, to be involved in the programs. The personnel represented in Item 2 definitely indicated that their inservice training programs be designed for and by LPD's.

Two of the LPD's indicated that present programs are adequate but not frequent enough.

Two LPD's said that proper follow-up was lacking from the already existing programs and that important
TABLE 25

IMPROVEMENT OF INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS AS PERCEIVED BY LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of Responses (N = 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop inservice training programs based on coordinating the efforts of knowledgeable college and/or university personnel and the LFD's from the geographical area. The purpose would be to focus on the immediate needs of the LFD's.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop inservice training programs made up of LFD's by LFD's.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The present programs are adequate but more of them are needed.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Need printed guidelines stemming from already active inservice training programs.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Time allotments must be set aside in order to attend programs.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Need more direct and informative assistance from the curriculum supervisors.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Make inservice training a full-time job for one person in that particular school system.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS 16
guidelines should be structured from these programs.

Two indicated that their times schedules were not flexible enough to utilize the existing programs.

One response focused on more direct help from curriculum supervisors and hinted that the supervisors may not be adequately informed.

The remaining response focused on the need for a specialist within the district (large system) to handle the inservice training function.

Summary of Findings of Category II

This category focuses on ascertaining the educational background, formal and experiential, of the Local Program Developers. The data in this section were obtained from the 25 LPD's of the sample. Because of the small number, the data are treated as a conglomerate rather than by a breakdown into size groups.

System appointments.—It was found that 92.0 percent (23 of 25) of the LPD's were appointed from within the school systems. Of these appointments, 60.9 percent (14) were from the principalship (includes assistant principals) and 21.8 percent (5) were from the curriculum-instruction supervisory staff. Thus, 82.7 percent (19) were personnel selected from the principalship and curriculum supervisory positions.

Only two people were appointed directly from the classroom. The positions of visiting teacher and/or
attendance officer, evaluators of programs, and guidance counselors, together, showed appointments of two people. Two people were appointed from other systems.

Appointees to the position of LPD have been veterans within the systems: 87.5 percent (21) had 10 or more years of years of service, and 91.7 percent (22) had 7 or more years of service within the particular school system.

Formal training and experience of the LPD's.—It was found that 96.0 percent (24 of 25) of the personnel appointed to this position had, at least, a master's degree; 68 percent (17) had additional graduate work beyond the master's degree. Two of the LPD's had doctoral degrees. It may be pointed out that appointees were primarily from the principalship and supervisory positions, the requirements for which usually demand at least a master's degree.

Classroom teaching was identified as the primary professional experience of the LPD, showing a concentration of responses of 76.0 percent (19 of 25) having 5 years or more. The mean response of the entire sample of LPD's was 6.96 years of experience in the classroom. High percentages also occurred in the principalship (assistants inclusive), their means exceeding 5.50 years of service. Guidance counselors, visiting teachers and/or attendance officers appear to be areas of little importance in reference to training and recruiting local program developers.

Inservice training programs.—It was found that 72.0 percent (18 of 25) had work schedules flexible enough to use
available inservice training programs and that 24.0 percent (6) did not have this flexibility.

The inservice training programs that were most available to LPD's are listed in the order of greatest response:

1. Workshops provided by the state office of education
2. Visitations to other school systems in the state
3. University and/or college personnel brought in to provide information and consultation services
4. Seminars provided by colleges and/or universities
5. Visitations to school systems in other states.

Only 12 percent (3) of the LPD's listed the availability of national curriculum conferences (ASCD); later data showed that the LPD's felt that the national conferences were of little value. When asked which of these above program benefited them most, local program developers slightly reversed the order, but maintained the same four areas of training. These training areas, ranked in order of greatest benefit are:

1. Visitations to other school systems in the state
2. Workshops provided by the state office of education
3. Seminars provided by colleges and/or universities
4. University and/or college personnel brought in to provide information and consultation services

Visitations to school systems in other states and national curriculum conferences (ASCD) were ranked low as being
beneficial inservice training programs; together they received 12.9 percent (9) of the responses (N=325).

Of the 15 LPD's responding to how to improve inservice training programs, 50 percent expressed a need to be involved in the planning and designing of these programs. Two of them felt that the present programs are adequate but more of them are needed. Two LPD's felt that some specific guidelines should result from the present programs to enhance the development of future inservice training.

**Category III: Duties and Problems of Local Program Developers**

The purpose here is to ascertain the professional duties and problem areas of local program developers. The data are viewed under three major headings in the following order: (1) duties of the local program developers, (2) the effectiveness of program implementation, and (3) problem areas of local program developers.

**Duties of Local Program Developers**

Administrative positions in school business differs from system to system. The educational philosophies of the chief administrators affect the functional framework of the professional personnel within that system. Positions, titles, and job descriptions may have little in common—in fact, formal job descriptions and the actual duties of the position may be in conflict. Consequently, it is highly probable that the expectations of a position as viewed by
other personnel may be in complete disagreement with the realities of the job.

The data in this section focus on identifying the ideally structured role of the LPD as opposed to his present functional role. In essence, the data are viewed in light of the theoretical versus the practiced.

Table 26, derived from question 11 of the primary questionnaire, presents data directed toward the identification of the possible (theoretical) duties of LPD's. The possible duty areas are ranked in order of greatest importance and treated in that order. The responses are listed according to their means based on a three-point scale: (1) an important function, (2) a lesser function, and (3) not a function.

Liaison between state and federal offices.—Personnel groups showed a very close distribution of responses, with means ranging from 1.15 to 1.29. All of the groups scaled this item as an important function, displaying no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

School systems also illustrated a like response with means of 1.21, 1.24, and 1.31, respectively. The one-way analysis of variance indicated no significant difference at the .05 level.

Totally, the item scaled as an important function of the LPD by both personnel groups and school systems. The
### Table 26

**Possible Duty Areas of the Local Program Developers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Duty Areas</th>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>Asst' Sup'ts</td>
<td>Super/ Coor'd</td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Liaison Between State-Federal Off</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coord-Federal Prg</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A Proposal Writer</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A Program Designer</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A Budgetary Planner</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collector &amp; Disseminator of Information</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Identifier of Needs</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An Innovator</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluator of Programs</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advisor to Curr Plan</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Supervisor of Programs</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means illustrate the responses based on a three point scale: (1) An Important Function (2) A Lesser Function (3) Not a Function.

bMeans showing significance within the .05 confidence level are denoted by asterisks. Statistics tested by a one-way analysis of variance.
sample mean response of 1.25 exemplified the opinions of the respondents.

Coordinator of all federally assisted programs.—The means of the personnel groups ranged from 1.24 to 1.58, placing the item in the range of an important function of the LPD. It may be noted that assistant superintendents viewed the item with less importance (Mn=1.58), although the one-way analysis of variance indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size showed mean responses of 1.26, 1.36, and 1.47, respectively. This close concentration of responses showed no significant difference at the .05 level, all falling within the range of an important function.

Totally, the item scaled as an important function of the LPD with a sample mean of 1.37. Assistant superintendents viewed the item with less importance (Mn=1.58) although significance was not shown at the .05 confidence level.

A proposal writer.—Personnel groups classified this item as an important function of the LPD, with means ranging from 1.26 to 1.45. No significance was found at the .05 level.

School systems illustrated a perceptual difference in their responses. The one-way analysis of variance indicated a significance at the .05 confidence level. Small,
medium, and large systems had mean responses of 1.26, 1.32, and 1.62, respectively. Obviously large systems viewed this item as having less importance, placing proposal writing in the range of a lesser function. Duncan's Multiple Range Test pointed out agreement in small and medium systems.

Totally, proposal writing is perceived as an important function of the LDP, showing a sample mean of 1.38. Large schools perceived this item as having somewhat less importance (Mn=1.62).

A program designer.—Personnel groups viewed this area as an important function of the LPD, with means ranging from 1.25 to 1.54. Supervisors and/or coordinators perceived the item as having somewhat less importance than did the other personnel groups (Mn=1.54), although the one-way analysis of variance indicated no significance at the .05 confidence level.

School systems considered by size had a close concentration of responses, with means of 1.47, 1.44, and 1.37, obviously showing no significance at the .05 level.

Totally, the item scaled as an important function, the sample mean being 1.43.

A budgetary planner.—Personnel groups perceived the item as an important function of LPD's, having a range of means from 1.23 to 1.53; no significance was shown at the .05 confidence level.
Viewing the responses by school system size showed a perceptual difference in the districts. The means for the small, medium, and large systems were 1.45, 1.37, and 1.62, respectively. Small and medium systems showed agreement, but large systems did not agree, as was revealed by Duncan's Multiple Range Test. There was a significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Totally, budgetary planning, with exception to large school systems, was looked upon as an important function of the LPD. The total sample mean was 1.46.

Collector and disseminator of information.--Viewing this item by personnel groups showed a close range of means from 1.44 to 1.65, with no significance shown at the .05 level. As the means indicate, the responses show marginal implications of the item being viewed as an important function of the LPD.

School systems, having means of 1.53, 1.54, and 1.74, showed a significant difference at the .05 confidence level. Small and medium systems agreed in perception, but large systems considered the item safely in the range of a lesser function.

Totally, the item scales as being marginally an important function of the LPD, but large school systems clearly perceive this area as a lesser function. The total sample mean was 1.59.
Identifier of needs.—Personnel groups illustrated a perceptual difference in this item. The means ranged from 1.37 to 1.80. Assistant superintendents and LPD's scaled this area as an important function, with means of 1.38 and 1.37, whereas superintendents viewed the item in the mid-range of a lesser function (Mn=1.80). The multiple range test pointed out that the responses of the superintendents show a significant difference from other personnel groups at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size revealed a relatively close concentration of responses, with means of 1.60, 1.64, and 1.51. The one-way analysis of variance indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Totally, the item was scaled as a lesser function of the LPD, with exception to assistant superintendents and LPD's; they viewed the item as an important function. The sample mean was 1.60.

An innovator.—Personnel groups perceived this item as a lesser function duty area of the LPD's. The means ranged from 1.46 to 1.72, the LPD's giving it the greatest importance (Mn=1.46). The test of the means indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

School systems by size had means of 1.52, 1.75, and 1.47. The test of the means showed that medium systems (Mn=1.75) differed significantly (.05 level), with small
and large systems (Mns=1.52 and 1.47). The item scales as a lesser function of the LPD although large systems do marginally fall within the range of an important function (Mn=1.47).

Totally, the item scaled as a lesser function of the LPD, having a sample mean of 1.61.

Evaluators of programs and advisors to curriculum planners. These two duty areas were perceived so nearly alike that individual treatment was not needed. Personnel groups and school systems by size both rate these items as a lesser function of LPD's, with sample means of 1.75 and 1.78, respectively. No significant difference was found at the .05 confidence level in either item.

Totally, they scaled as lesser functions of the LPD's.

Supervisors of programs. This item scaled within the mid-range of lesser function of the LPD. Throughout the sample groups, by personnel and by size of school systems, the means ranged from 1.96 to 2.11—the concentration of responses indicating no significance at the .05 confidence level.

This item was rated as a lesser function of the LPD's, with a sample mean of 2.03.

In summary, Table 26 indicates that items I through 5 can be definitely considered as being perceived to be important functions of the LPD's. All of these items have
total sample means of less than 1.50. Items 6 through 8 displayed a concentration of marginal mean responses that must be given definite consideration as important functions, their sample means being 1.59, 1.60, and 1.61, respectively. Where disagreement is found at a significant level (.05) within these five possible duty areas, the occurrences was found in large schools; they perceived proposal writing and budgetary planning in the range of a lesser function (Mns=1.62).

Item 6, collecting and disseminating information, displayed a significant difference at the .05 confidence level in regards to the larger systems. They perceived this item as a lesser importance (Mn=1.74) than did small and medium systems (Mns=1.53 and 1.54).

Item 8, the innovator, also showed a significant difference within the school system breakdown. Small and large systems, having means of 1.52 and 1.47, placed this item in the marginal range of an important function, whereas medium systems safely scaled the innovator as a lesser function of the LPD (Mn=1.75).

The remaining items, 9 through 11, clearly scaled as lesser functions of the LPD's with sample mean responses ranging from 1.75 to 2.03.

Table 27 summarizes Table 26. As the data were treated in Table 26, it was found that none of the items were scaled as unimportant by any part of the sample. It
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duty Areas</th>
<th>An Important Function</th>
<th>A Lesser Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A Liaison Between the School-State-Federal Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A Coordinator of All Federal Aid Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A Proposal Writer</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A Program Designer</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A Budgetary Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A Collector and Disseminator of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. An Identifier of Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An Innovator</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. An Evaluator of Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. An Advisor to Curriculum Planners</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A Supervisor of Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was also found that the sample means of the first eight items ranged from 1.25 to 1.61. The collector and disseminator of information, the identifier of needs, and the innovator had sample means of 1.59, 1.60, and 1.61. These means fell so closely to the range of an important function that consideration must be given to their ranking. It is very doubtful that a significance at the .05 confidence level exists between items 4 through 8 (Mns 1.43, 1.46, 1.59, 1.60, 1.61). Simple inspection of the distribution of means within items substantiates this inference.

As pointed out in Table 27, the researcher finds items 1 through 8 perceived to be important hypothetical functions of local program developers, and items 9 through 11 to be lesser functions of the LPD's.

Table 28, compiled from question 12 of the primary questionnaire, focuses on presenting data aimed at identifying the actual duties (practice) of the local program developers. The same items are presented here as were presented in Tables 26 and 27. The data are listed by number and percent. The items are ranked according to the greatest number of response and descriptively treated in that order.

Items 1 and 2, collector and disseminator of information, and liaison between school, state, and federal offices show results so nearly alike that individual treatment of the items is not necessary.
## Table 28

### Practiced Duties of the Local Program Developers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Duty Areas</th>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Super</td>
<td>Prin-</td>
<td>LPD's</td>
<td>Conf-</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Collector-Dissemin-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ator of Information</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Liaison-School-State-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Offices</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Budget Planner</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proposal Writer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coord Fed Programs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program Designer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Identifier of Needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Program Evaluator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Innovator</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Curriculum Advisor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Program Supervisor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items are ranked according to greatest number of responses of the total sample and listed in terms of number and percent by respective Personnel Group size and by respective School System size.

bStatistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table. Asterisks denote significance within the .05 level.
Personnel groups and school systems perceived these items as being the duties of greatest importance. Both items had sample responses of better than 92.0 (92.7 and 92.6). The Chi Square Test of Independence indicated no significant difference at the .10 confidence level in either item. By simple inspection, there appears to be no difference between the items.

 Totally, collecting and disseminating information and being the liaison between school, state, and federal offices seem to be the two most important functional duties of the LPD's.

 Budgetary planner.—Personnel groups showed percentages of responses ranging from 81.4 to 95.8 percent. Superintendents viewed the item with greatest importance (95.8 percent or 23 of 24), although the Chi Square Test of Independence showed no significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

 Viewing the item by school system size showed percentages of 85.9, 88.8, and 75.7. The Chi Square Test indicated a significant difference at the .05 level between large systems and small and medium systems. Large systems did not view the item as importantly as did the small and medium systems.

 Totally, the item was perceived as an important duty, with 84.6 percent (242 of 286) of the respondents selecting budgetary planning as a true function of the LPD.
Proposal writer.—Personnel groups perceived this item as an important duty of the LPD with nearly 80.0 percent (79.4) of the respondents showing concern. Percentages for personnel groups ranged from 78.2 to 84.0, illustrating a very close concentration of responses. The Chi Square Test of Independence indicated no significance at the .10 confidence level.

School systems showed percentages of 85.9, 83.6, and 64.9. The Chi Square Test indicated that small and medium systems agreed on perception (85.9 and 83.6 percent), but large systems (64.9 percent) were different at the .25 confidence level.

The total sample showed a response of 79.4 percent as perceiving proposal writing as a practiced function of the LPD.

Coordinates of all federally assisted programs.—Personnel groups responded to this item with similar attitudes, displaying a range of percentages from 68.0 to 83.3. The Chi Square Test indicated no significant difference at the .10 percent level of confidence.

School systems showed a cluster of percentages of 80.8, 79.1, and 70.3, with no significances shown at the .10 level.

Totally, 77.3 percent (221 of 286) of the respondents perceived this item as a practiced duty of the LPD.
Program designer.—Personnel groups showed a division in opinions on this item. Superintendents, supervisors/coordinators, and principals perceived this item nearly alike, with percentages of 66.7, 67.1, and 63.4. Assistant superintendents and LPD's viewed this item as of greater importance, showing responses of 92.0 and 80.0 percent—the significance being at the .25 confidence level.

Viewing the item by school system size indicated very little difference with the responses concentrated in a range from 67.2 to 70.3 percent, obviously no significance tested at the .10 confidence level.

Totally, 68.5 percent (196 of 286) of the respondents viewed this item as a practiced duty area of LPD's. Personnel groups illustrated a significant difference at the .25 confidence level with assistant superintendents and LPD's regarding program designing as of greater importance.

A definite break in the response pattern is evident at this point. The remaining items (7 through 11), identifier of needs, program evaluator, innovator, curriculum advisor, and program supervisor, all fell within a 10.0 percent response range and also showed a 10.0 percent differential from item 6.

In items 7 through 11, the total response percentages ranged from 59.1 to 48.3 with numbers ranging from 169 to 138. There were no significant differences at the .10 confidence level in any of the items, either by personnel groups or by school system size.
Program supervisor was viewed lowest in the duty area rankings, with responses slightly under 50.0 percent (48.3 or 138 of 286). It is the only item that ranked under 50.0 percent.

Totally all of these items can be viewed with positive concern as practiced duty areas of LPD's but emphasis should be placed on items 1 through 6. These items range from 92.7 to 68.5 percent—the latter showing nearly 7 out of 10 responses indicating the area as a practiced duty of the LPD.

Table 29, from question 13 of the primary questionnaire, is used as summary or verification instrument for Table 28. Question 13 asked the respondents to select three items (listed in Table 28) which they felt commanded the greatest amount of time and effort (possible N=3x287).

In Table 29, a slight change in ordering occurred when compared to Table 28. The same duty areas still maintain the first six rankings in both charts although order changed. These six items—(1) proposal writer, (2) coordinator of all federally assisted programs, (3) budget planner, (4) liaison between school, state, and federal offices, (5) program designer, and (6) collector and disseminator of information—commanded 80.3 percent (642 of 797) of the responses where the rest—(7) program supervisors, (8) identifier of needs, (9) evaluator of program, (1) innovator, and (11) curriculum advisor—received altogether only 19.7 percent (155 of 797) of the responses.
TABLE 29

PRACTICED DUTIES OF THE LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS COMMANDING THE GREATEST AMOUNT OF TIME AND EFFORTa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUTY AREAS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Number (N=287)b</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposal Writer</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coordinator of all Federally Assisted Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Budget Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Liaison between School, State, and Federal Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Program Designer</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collector and Disseminator of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Program Supervisor (all federal assistance programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Identifier of Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluator of Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Innovator</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curriculum Advisor to Curriculum Planners</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>797</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aItems are selected from duty areas of Table 28. The respondents were asked to identify three areas commanding the greatest amount of time and effort. The responses are ranked in order of importance as perceived by the total sample.

bThe possible total number of responses = 3 x 287.
Looking at both Tables 28 and 26, it is found that items 1 through 6 illustrate the present day areas of the LPD's and also that these items commanded the greatest amount of time and effort on the part of local program developers.

Personnel groups (Table 28) only showed a significant difference in one item (program designer). Assistant superintendents and LPD's perceived this area as having greater importance than did the other personnel groups.

School system size showed significant differences within two items, budget planner and proposal writer. Small and medium systems, in both cases, perceived the areas of greater importance than did large systems.

Items 7 through 11 showed a definite break in the response patter, indicating a somewhat less concern for their value. But all of the items can be viewed with position concern as practiced duties of the LPD. With exception to program supervisor, they all received at least 50.0 percent response as being a practiced duty. As pointed out in Table 29, the first six items received 80.3 percent (642 of 797) of the responses as commanding the greatest amount of time and effort on the part of local program developers.

Table 30, compiled from question 26 of the primary questionnaire, focuses on the actual duties of the local program developers after the projects have been approved for federal assistance. The eight items used herein as identifiers are ranked in order of greatest response and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUAL DUTIES</th>
<th>PERSONNEL GROUPS</th>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>Asst Sup'ts</td>
<td>Super/ Prin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluate Programs as Part of Team</td>
<td>22 88.0</td>
<td>23 96.5</td>
<td>56 77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chart Phases of Program</td>
<td>19 76.0</td>
<td>16 69.2</td>
<td>47 65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervise Program as Part of Team</td>
<td>19 76.0</td>
<td>21 80.8</td>
<td>47 65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aid in Choosing Program Coordinator</td>
<td>15 60.0</td>
<td>11 42.3</td>
<td>41 56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Independently Supervise Program</td>
<td>5 20.0</td>
<td>4 15.4</td>
<td>14 19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Independently Evaluate Program</td>
<td>4 16.0</td>
<td>2 7.7</td>
<td>11 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Choose Coordinator for Program</td>
<td>4 16.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>12 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No Longer Involved</td>
<td>3 12.0</td>
<td>3 11.5</td>
<td>11 15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items are ranked according to greatest response of the total sample and listed in terms of number and percent by respective Personnel Group size and by respective School System size.

bStatistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table. Asterisks denote significance at the .05 level.
statistically treated in that order. (The responses are listed by number and percent.)

Evaluate programs as part of a team.--Personnel groups showed percentages ranging from 72.0 to 88.5. Superintendents and their assistants responded highest to the item, with 88.0 and 88.5 percents, respectively; the Chi Square Test showed no significance at the .10 confidence levels.

Viewing the item by school system size showed percentages of 65.4, 82.1, and 78.9. The test of the statistics indicated a difference at the .05 level between small systems (65.4) and medium and large systems (82.1 and 78.9).

Totally, 76.9 percent (226 of 294) of the respondents perceive evaluating programs as part of a team as a practiced duty of the LPD after programs have been approved for federal assistance. Small systems perceive this function lesser in practice than medium and large systems.

Items 2 and 3, chart phases of program and supervise program as part of a team, show responses so similar that individual treatment of the items would be of no additional value. This can be verified simply by scanning the sample responses of 71.1 and 69.7 percent--with no significance shown at the .10 confidence levels.

Inspection of the responses of personnel groups to item 3, supervising programs, indicates that assistant
superintendents and LPD's considered this area somewhat more functional, with responses 80.8 and 80.0 percent.

Totally, 7 out of 10 respondents (59.7 percent) regarded these items as functional duties of the LPD's after programs had been approved and funded.

Aid in choosing a program coordinator.—By inspection, differences can be observed in the responses of personnel groups. The percentages range from 42.3 to 72.0. Assistant superintendents viewed the item as of least importance (42.3 percent or 11 of 26) although the Chi Square Test of Independence showed no significant difference at the .10 level.

School systems showed a closer concentration of responses than did the personnel groups with percentages ranging from 53.8 to 63.2. No significance was found at the .10 level of confidence.

Totally, 56.5 percent (166 of 294) of the respondents perceived this item as a practiced duty of the LPD after the programs had been accepted for federal funding.

After these first four items, a distinctive break in the responses is noted. The sample responses for these items ranged from 76.9 to 56.5 percent. The next item following this division (item 5) had a sample response of 24.1 percent, thus giving verification to the decisiveness in the perceptual concentration.
Items 5 through 8 received limited attention, with response percentages of 24.1, 20.7, 19.4, and 17.3, the range being 7.8. These items, independently supervise programs, independently evaluate programs, choose a coordinator for programs, and no longer involved, were definitely indicated as limited areas of concern and do not merit individual descriptive treatment with the exception of the last duty areas, no longer involved. This item being ranked last indicates that the LPD's remain involved in their programs. No significant difference within the .10 confidence level appeared in these items.

In reviewing Table 30, it was found that items 1 through 4 (evaluate programs as part of a team, chart phases of programs, supervise programs as part of a team, and aid in choosing a program coordinator) were the areas identified as common duties of the LPD's after programs had been approved for assistance. The percentage responses of the sample ranged from 76.9 to 56.5. Items 5 through 8, showing negative importance as LPD duties after program approval, had sample percentages ranging from 24.1 to 17.3, and were deemed to have very little value as duty factors.

Table 31 treats data aimed at ascertaining what the duties of the local programs developers should be after programs have been approved for federal funds. The same items listed in Table 30 are used as identifiers for the ideal role of the LPD's after the approval of programs.
### TABLE 31
WHAT THE ROLE OF THE LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS SHOULD BE AFTER PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN APPROVED FOR ASSISTANCE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEAL ROLE</th>
<th>PERSONNEL GROUPS</th>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEMS SIZE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=25)</td>
<td>(N=72)</td>
<td>(N=76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluate Programs as Part of Team</td>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>Ass't</td>
<td>Super/Coord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervise Programs as Part of Team</td>
<td>23 92.0</td>
<td>25 96.2</td>
<td>66 91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chart Phases of Program</td>
<td>21 81.0</td>
<td>16 69.2</td>
<td>51 70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aid in Choosing Program Coordinator</td>
<td>16 64.0</td>
<td>17 65.6</td>
<td>48 66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Choose Coordinator for Program</td>
<td>6 26.0</td>
<td>2 7.7</td>
<td>10 13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Independently Supervise Program</td>
<td>2 8.0</td>
<td>4 15.8</td>
<td>3 12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Independently Evaluate Program</td>
<td>2 8.0</td>
<td>3 11.5</td>
<td>2 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No Longer Involved</td>
<td>1 4.0</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
<td>2 2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items are ranked according to greatest number of responses of the total sample and listed in terms of number and percent by respective Personnel Group size and by respective School System size.

**Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table. Data tested by Personnel Groups and by School System Size showed no significant difference at the .10 percent confidence level.
Evaluate programs as part of a team.—Personnel groups and school systems alike show a concentration of responses, with percentages ranging from 85.5 to 96.2. The Chi Square Test of Independence found no significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

Totally, this item was perceived by 88.8 percent (261 of 294) of the respondents as an ideal role of the LPDs after programs have been approved for financial assistance.

Supervises programs as part of a team.—This item also showed little difference in the respondents. In the personnel groups, superintendents and their assistants had responses of 92.0 and 96.2 percents—somewhat higher than their colleagues with percentages of 79.2, 79.3, and 76.0; no significance was found at the .10 confidence level.

School systems showed a cluster of percentages with responses of 80.8, 84.2, and 77.6. Too, no significance at the .10 level was found within their groups.

Totally, supervising programs as part of a team is perceived as an ideal role of LPD's after the programs have been approved for funding. Of the 294 respondents, 239 or 81.6 percent viewed the area as such.

Chart the phases of programs.—Responses of the personnel groups indicated that superintendents and LPD's perceived this item to have greater importance as an ideal duty role with response percentages of 84.0 percent than the
other personnel groups, which had responses of 69.2, 70.8, and 78.8 percents. Although there seemed to be some difference, no significance was found at the .10 confidence level when the item was subjected to the Chi Square Test of Independence.

Schools systems had a concentrated response range from 73.1 to 79.3 percent. The test of the statistics showed no significance at the .10 confidence level.

Totally, 226 of 294 respondents, or 76.9 percent, perceived this item as an ideal duty role of the LPD's after the programs have been approved for financial aid.

Aid in choosing program coordinator.—Personnel groups showed a close range of percentages from 59.6 to 66.7, indicated this area as an ideal role of the LPD after programs have been approved; no significance was found when differences were tested at the .10 confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size also showed a concentrated range of responses, with percentages of 59.0, 62.9, and 65.8. Testing these statistics showed no significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

Totally, 184 of 294 respondents or 62.6 percent felt that aiding in choosing a coordinator for federally approved programs should be a duty of the local program developers.

The first four items described in Table 31 definitely represent the vast majority of the responses. The total sample responses for these items range from 88.8 to 62.6
percent. Later items mark a distinct division in the data. Items 5 through 8 provide responses ranging from 20.1 to 5.1 percent. Nearly a 40.0 percent difference is displayed between items 4 and 5.

An overview of Table 31 points out that items 1 through 4 (evaluate programs as a part of a team, supervise programs as part of a team, chart phases of programs, and aid in choosing a coordinator) are ideally considered to be the functions of the LPD after the programs have been federally approved for funding; at least 62.2 percent of the sample shared this opinion.

It may also be noted that the testing of the statistics within the items indicated no significant difference at the .10 confidence level throughout the table.

In comparing Tables 30 and 31—the actual duties as related to the ideal role of the local program developers after their projects have been approved for federal assistance—a definite coalescence of the practiced and the theoretical can be seen.

The same four items in each table command the greatest number of responses. Agreement is seen in item number 1 but a reversal of order appears in items 2 and 3. Item 4 remains the same in both tables.

Items 5 through 8 show limited value in either table, with these areas commanding less than 25.0 percent of the responses.
The Effectiveness of Program Implementation

As was indicated in the comparisons of Tables 30 and 31, the duties of the FPD's after the programs had been approved for assistance showed close agreement in the operational and theoretical functions of the position. It then appears logical that the effectiveness of the FPD's in implementing approved programs would be extremely high. But considerations must be given to the fact that the newness (1965) of the vast sums of available monies may make it difficult to assess the effectiveness of implementation at this time.

Table 32, derived from question 27, presents data aimed at ascertaining the effectiveness of implementing federally approved programs. The three responses proposes are (1) effective, (2) not effective, and (3) too early to evaluate. The responses are listed by number and percentage; the data are viewed by personnel groups and by school system size.

Personnel groups showed percentages ranging from 62.3 to 84.6 on effectiveness of implementation. Assistant superintendents and LPD's viewed effectiveness higher than did the other personnel group, with responses of 84.6 and 76.0 percent.

The general response too early to evaluate showed a response range from 32.0 to 8.0 percent, with superintendent and principals rating this area with greatest importance (32.0 and 25.3 percent).
## TABLE 32

**PRESENT EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTING FEDERALLY APPROVED PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>Range of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Not Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/Coordinators</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED's</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 12.581; this is not significant at the .10 percent confidence level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for School System Size = 4.889; this is not significant at the .10 percent confidence level.

---

*a Responses listed in terms of number and percent by respective Personnel Group Size and by respective School System Size.

*b Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.
Looking at the not effective range of responses shows relatively limited concern on the part of the personnel groups. The percentages range from 3.8 to 16.0 responding on ineffective implementation.

School systems showed a concentration of positive opinions with percentages of 62.8, 67.9, and 75.0. They responded to too early to evaluate with percentages of 28.2, 20.0, and 14.5—the large systems showing the smallest percentage of response. Large systems also showed the greatest response for effectiveness (75.0 percent).

The not effective range for school systems was clustered into a narrow concentration of responses ranging from 9.0 to 12.1 percent.

The Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table indicated no significant difference at the .10 confidence level, either by personnel groups or by school system size.

Totally, 68.4 percent (201 of 294) felt their present implementation of federal programs, upon approval, was effective; 20.7 percent (61 of 294) felt it was too early to evaluate the effectiveness of implementation.

Problem Areas of Local Program Developers

Certainly all task areas have their administrative perplexities, which constantly present conflict and congestion to effective operations. Undoubtedly these conflict areas have some effect upon the efficiency of administrative
positions. Some of the common jargon used in describing the problem phenomena are "red tape," "busy-work," "poor communication," "lack of cooperation," and "too many other duties."

Table 33, compiled from question 14 of the primary questionnaire, presents data aimed at ascertaining the problem areas of LPD's. There are 18 suggested problem areas focused on the operational functions of local program developers. These 18 areas were selected as concern factors from interviews with knowledgeable public school personnel and from recent research. The items are ranked in order of importance as indicated by the total sample means. The data are viewed by personnel groups and by school system size, the responses listed by their means. The items are scaled according to (1) a serious problem, (2) a moderate problem, (3) a slight problem, and (4) unimportant as a problem.

*Time consuming paper work.* Personnel groups showed mean responses ranging from 1.64 to 2.00. Inspection shows that superintendents and LPD's perceive this item as having somewhat greater importance than do the other groups (Mns=1.64 and 1.70), although the test of the means showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size reveals a very close concentration, with means of 1.90, 1.90, and 1.83. No significance was shown at the .05 confidence level.

---

1Eikenberry, op. cit., pp. 76-90.
### Table 33
**Problem Areas of Local Program Developers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Areas</th>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup'ts Ass't Sup'ts Super/ Coord Principals LPH's</td>
<td>Small Systems Medium Systems Large Systems</td>
<td>Total Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Time Consuming Paper Work</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adequate Facilities for Programs</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scheduling Activities</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time Factor Relative to Other Activities</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Planning &amp; Designing Programs</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Budgets Projects</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Writing Proposals</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluating Existing Programs</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gathering Supporting Data</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Availability of Professional Staff</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Communication with School Staff</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * indicates statistical significance at the 0.05 level.
**TABLE 33—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEM AREAS</th>
<th>PERSONNEL GROUPS</th>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asst Sup'ts</td>
<td>Super/Coord</td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mn(N=25)</td>
<td>Mn(N=26)</td>
<td>Mn(N=72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Communication with Lay Citizen Groups</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Implementing Approved Programs</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Advisors to Supervisors of Curr/Inst</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Communication-State Federal Offices</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Availability of State &amp; USOE Guidelines</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means illustrate the responses based on a four point scale: (1) A Serious Problem, (2) A Moderate Problem, (3) A Slight Problem, (4) Unimportant as a Problem. Items are ranked by the response of the total sample.

*Means showing significance within the .05 confidence level are denoted by asterisks; statistics tested by a one-way analysis of variance.
Totally, the item is considered a moderate problem area for LPD's, with a sample mean of 1.88.

**Adequate facilities for programs.** Personnel groups had means ranging from 1.64 to 2.35, showing a concentration of responses in the middle (2.12, 2.06, and 2.00) and at each end (1.64 and 2.35). The one-way analysis of variance indicated a significant difference (.05 level) only between the extremes, the difference appearing between the superintendents and supervisors/coordinators.

Viewing the response distribution by school systems showed that large systems (Mn=1.88) perceived adequate facilities more of a problem area than did small and medium systems (Mns=2.36 and 2.24). The analysis of variance indicated no difference at the .05 confidence level.

Totally, adequate facilities was perceived as a moderate problem area for LPD's, with a sample mean of 2.15.

Items 3, 4, and 5, having no significance shown at the .05 confidence level by personnel group or by school system size and having sample means of 2.22, 2.22, and 2.28, warrant descriptive treatment as a group rather than by individual item. In fact, it is doubtful that significance exists at the .05 level when comparing item against item.

These three items—scheduling activities, time factor relative to other activities, and planning and designing programs— all fall safely within the range of being viewed as moderately important problems of the LPD's. The sample
means of 2.22, 2.22, and 2.28 indicate this placement on the four-point scale.

**Budgeting projects.** Personnel groups had a mean distribution ranging from 2.08 to 2.71. Supervisors/coordiators and LPD's had means of 2.65 and 2.71, which showed a significant difference at the .05 level with superintendents, assistant superintendents, and principals with their respective means of 2.08, 2.27, and 2.33. It is evident that supervisor/coordinator and LPD's perceive budgeting projects a slight problem area, whereas the other groups view the area as a moderate problem.

Viewing the responses by school system size shows little perceptual difference, with means of 2.46 and 2.42, and 2.32. No significance was indicated at the .05 confidence level; thus, school systems agree in viewing this item as a moderately important problem of LPD's.

Totally, supervisors/coordiators and LPD's view budgeting programs as a slight problem area whereas superintendents, assistant superintendents, and principals scale the item as a moderate problem. The sample mean of 2.40 reflects the responses by school system size.

**Writing proposals.** Personnel groups displayed mean responses ranging from 2.19 to 2.62. Supervisors/coordiators definitely scaled the item as a slight problem, and it appeared that principals (Mn=2.48) and LPD's (Mn=2.50) might have shared this opinion. Superintendents and their
assistants placed writing proposals in the moderate problem, range with means of 2.20 and 2.19. It is only by inspection that these inferences can be formed; the one-way analysis of variance indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

School systems showed a more defined distribution of responses, with means of 2.45, 2.37, and 2.64; no significance was shown at the .05 level. It is apparent, however, that small and medium systems view writing proposals as a moderate problem, and large systems tend to consider the item as a slight problem area for LPD's.

Totally, writing proposals is scaled as a moderate problem area with a sample mean of 2.46, although supervisors/coordinators and large school systems rated the item as a slight problem.

**Evaluating existing programs.**—A wide dispersement was seen in the personnel group response to this item. Means ranged from 1.92 to 2.60. Superintendents (Mn=1.92) viewed this item as of much greater importance than supervisors/coordinators and principals—both having means of 2.60. Duncan's Multiple Range Test indicated a significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

The school system breakdown showed a smaller range of responses, with means of 2.53, 2.57, and 2.33. Although no significance was found at the .05 level, it appears that
large systems tend to place the item in the range of a moderate problem.

Totally, the item has a sample mean of 2.51 placing it in a marginal range as being a moderate problem. Superintendents and their assistants viewed the item as a moderate problem area. Large school systems also placed evaluating existing programs as a moderate problem for LPD's.

Gathering supporting data for programs.—Personnel groups had means ranging from 2.08 to 2.65. Superintendents and their assistants showed mean responses of 2.08 and 2.42, scaling the item within the moderate problem range. The other personnel groups indicated this area as a slight problem (Mns=2.65, 2.53, and 2.50). No significance was shown at the .05 confidence level.

Schools systems had a close distribution of responses with means of 2.48, 2.53, and 2.49, illustrating marginal placement as a moderate problem area.

Totally, the item has a sample mean of 2.51, displaying a very marginal placement as a moderate problem area of the LPD's. Superintendents and their assistants showed more concern for the area, with mean responses of 2.08 and 2.42. The test of the means indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level in either breakdown.

All of the items from this point on fall within the range of being a slight problem area for LPD's. A break is evident between items 9 and 10, which display sample means
of 2.51 and 2.73, respectively. The mean of 2.51 places an item in a marginal range of a moderate problem, whereas the mean of 2.73 and greater clearly indicate the rating of slight importance.

It is of questionable value to treat each remaining item in its entirety; therefore, only the items displaying any group response within the moderate problem range will be cited.

Availability of professional staff.—Superintendents viewed this item as a moderate problem of LPD's, with a mean of 2.24. All other groups perceived this item comfortably in the slight problem range. Significance was found at the .05 confidence level by using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Communication with school staff.—Large school systems viewed this item in the range of a moderate problem, with a mean of 2.43, significant at the .05 confidence level. Communication with lay citizen groups.—Large school systems scaled this item as a moderate problem, with a mean of 2.42. This is significant at the .05 confidence level.

The remaining items (13 through 18) afford limited value for descriptive treatment; they all scale as a slight problem for LPD's, both by group breakdown and by total sample. These items are as follows: implementing approved programs, advisors to supervisors of curriculum and instruction, communication with state and federal offices, knowledge
of social and community structures, availability of state and U.S.O.E. guidelines, and consultation service from state level.

In overviewing Table 33, it was found that none of the items were scaled as a serious problem of the LPD's. It was also evident that none of the items were scaled as unimportant as a problem. The first nine items scaled as moderate problems. Items 10 through 18 clearly scaled as slight problems. Superintendents scaled item 10 as a moderate problem. Large school systems viewed items 11 and 12 as moderate problems.

The slight problem areas were deemed to have limited value and consequently were not descriptively treated here.

Summary of Findings of Category III

The aim of this category was to identify the professional duties and problem areas of the local program developers. The data were viewed in terms of (1) duties of the LPD's, (2) the effectiveness of program implementation, and (3) problem areas of the LPD's.

Duties of local program developers.--The data in this section focused on ascertaining the ideal role of the LPD as opposed to his present functional role. Table 26 presented data directed toward the identification of the possible (theoretical) duties of LPD's. Of the 11 suggested duties, 8 were considered (using a three-point scale) as important functions of the LPD's. The items are their sample means
ranked in order of importance are listed as follows:

1. Liaison between school, state, federal offices (1.25)
2. Coordinator of federal programs (1.37)
3. A proposal writer (1.38)
4. A program designer (1.43)
5. A budgetary planner (1.46)
6. Collector and disseminator of information (1.59)
7. Identifier of needs (1.60)
8. An innovator (1.61)

It was pointed out that five of these items scaled clearly in the range of important, whereas items 6 through 8 fell into the extreme lower limits of a lesser function. The researcher, because of the proximity of the means to being classified as an important function, considered these as ideally important functions of the LPD's.

Significant differences at the .05 confidence level were shown in items 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Items 3, 5, and 6 indicated significant difference in the responses of large school systems—all showing these areas as lesser functions of the LPD's than did small and medium systems. Item 7 illustrated that superintendents scaled identifier of needs as a lesser function than did other personnel groups. In item 8, medium school systems significantly felt that an innovator was a lesser function of the LPD's than did small and large systems.
Briefly, the first eight items in Table 26 were viewed as ideally important functions of the local program developers; this is further pointed out in Table 27.

Table 28 presented data aimed at identifying the functional (practiced) duties of the LPD's. These 11 items were selected from the duty areas of Tables 26 and 27. The items in order of greatest sample percentage response are listed as follows:

1. Collector and disseminator of information (92.7)
2. Liaison between school, state, and federal offices (92.7)
3. Budget planner (84.6)
4. Proposal writer (79.4)
5. Coordinator of federally assisted programs (77.3)
6. Program designer (68.5)
7. Identifier of needs (69.1)
8. Program evaluator (58.4)
9. Innovator (54.2)
10. Curriculum advisor (51.4)
11. Program supervisor (48.3)

With these recorded responses, all of the items could be viewed with positive concern as practiced duty areas of the LPD's, but special emphasis should be placed on items 1 through 6 where responses ranged from 92.7 to 68.5 percent.

Significant differences at the .05 confidence level were shown in items 3, 4, and 6. Items 3 and 4, budget planning and proposal writing, were viewed as of lesser
importance by large school systems. Item 6, program designer, was perceived with greater importance by assistant superintendents and LPD's.

It was also noted that items 1 through 7 in Tables 26 and 28 (the ideal vs. the practiced role of the LPD's) showed agreement although some reordering was evident.

Table 29 firmed up that items 1 through 6 were considered the most important practiced duties of local program developers, commanding 80.3 percent (642 of 797) of the responses.

Table 30 presented data aimed at identifying the duties of LPD's after the programs had been approved for federal assistance. It was found that items 1 through 4 were the areas identified as common duties of the LPD's:

1. Evaluate programs as part of a team
2. Chart phases of programs
3. Supervise programs as part of a team
4. Aid in choosing a program coordinator

The total sample responses ranged from 79.6 to 56.4 percent for the four items. Items 5 through 8 received less than 25.0 percent of the responses.

The only significant perceptual difference (at the .05 confidence level) was found in item 1, evaluate programs as part of a team; small school systems viewed this area with less importance (65.4 percent) than did medium and large systems (82.1 and 78.9 percent).
It may be pointed out no longer involved (item 8) was ranked last, indicating the opinion that LPD's should remain involved in programs after their approval for federal assistance.

Table 31 treated data aimed at ascertaining what the duties of the local program developers should be after programs have been approved for federal assistance. The same items listed in Table 30 were used as identifiers to determine the ideal role of the LPD's.

It was found that items 1 through are considered to be the ideal functions of the LPD after program approval:

1. Evaluate programs as part of a team
2. Supervise programs or part of a team
3. Chart phases of programs
4. Aid in choosing a program coordinator

At least 62.2 percent of the sample shared this opinion. There were no significant differences at the .10 confidence level in the perception of the sample groups.

Comparison of Tables 30 and 31 revealed that the actual duties as related to the ideal duties showed a definite agreement on items 1 through 4, although a reversal of ordering did appear between items 2 and 3. In both tables, items 5 through 8 showed limited value, commanding less than 25.0 percent of the response.

The effectiveness of program implementation.—Consideration must be given to the fact that the newness of the
vast sums of federal monies for public schools makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of program implementation.

Table 33 viewed the effectiveness of program implementations, using three evaluative responses: (1) effective, (2) not effective, (3) too early to evaluate. It was found that 68.4 percent (61 of 294) of the respondents felt that the present implementation of federal programs, upon approval of financial assistance, was effective; 20.7 percent (61 of 294) felt it was too early to evaluate. Testing the statistics indicated that personnel groups and school systems showed no significant difference at the .10 confidence level of their perception of the data.

Problem areas of the LPD's.—Table 33 presented a list of 18 suggested problem areas focused on the operational functions of the LPD's. These 18 areas were selected as concern factors from interviews with knowledgeable public school personnel and from recent research. These areas were scaled according to (1) a serious problem, (2) a moderate problem, (3) a slight problem, and (4) unimportant as a problem. The responses were listed by their means.

It was found that none of the items scaled as a serious problem. It was also found that none of the items scaled as an unimportant problem.

The first nine items scaled as moderate problem areas. These items and their sample means are as follows:
1. Time consuming paper work (1.64)
2. Adequate facilities for programs (2.15)
3. Scheduling activities (2.22)
4. Time factors relative to other activities (2.22)
5. Planning and designing programs (2.28)
6. Budget projects (2.40)
7. Writing proposals (2.46)
8. Evaluating existing programs (2.51)
9. Gathering supporting data (2.51)

Significant differences in these items at the .05 confidence level were only observed in the personnel group responses. In item 2, superintendents perceived adequate facilities for programs a greater problem than did other personnel groups. In item 6, it was found that superintendents, assistant superintendents, and principals viewed budgeting projects a greater problem than did supervisors/ coordinators and LPD's. In item 8, it was pointed out that superintendents perceived evaluating existing programs a greater problem than did the other personnel groups.

All other suggested problem areas were scaled as slight problems, although some individual sample groups identified some of these areas a moderate problem. These can be summarized as follows:

Availability of profession staff (item 10) was viewed by superintendents as a moderate problem, with a mean response of 2.24.
Communication with school staff (item 11) was viewed by large school systems as a moderate problem, with a mean of 2.43.

Communication with lay citizens groups (item 12) also was viewed by large school systems as a moderate problem with a mean of 2.42.

Items 13 through 18 were all scaled as slight problems, and deemed as limited in value, were consequently not descriptively treated in the text.

Category IV: Preservice and Inservice Training Needs of Local Program Developers

The purpose of this section is to determine the preservice and inservice training needs of local program developers. Five areas are explored in this category; they are descriptively treated in the following order: (1) important preparational experiences for LPD's, (2) considerations for preservice and inservice training programs, (3) training programs for graduate credit, (4) university involvement in training programs, and (5) the future impact of federal funds for public schools.

Important Preparational Experiences for LPD's

The recruitment of personnel for central office staff positions presents an area of concern both for those people involved in the selection of such personnel and for those appointed to the positions. Experience factors tend to form the major criteria in the selection of qualified
personnel. This section deals with the professional experiences deemed important as preparation for the position of local program developer.

Table 3, derived from question 9 of the primary questionnaire, presents data aimed at ascertaining the preparational experience areas considered to be necessary for the position of LPD. By using a three-point scale, the ten items in this table are viewed by degrees of importance ranging from definitely important to unimportant. These 10 job experience areas are ranked in order of importance as perceived by the respondents of the total sample; the responses to the items are listed by their means and are treated descriptively in order of importance.

**Classroom teacher.** Personnel groups perceived this item as definitely important, with means ranging from 1.20 to 1.47. LPD's viewed the item as of greater importance than did the other groups (Mn=1.20), although a one-way analysis of the means showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size indicated that all three perceived classroom teaching as an important job experience for this position. The means for the systems were 1.40, 1.40, and 1.29, respectively, all clustering around the mean response of the total sample (1.39). Testing the means showed no perceptual difference at the .05 confidence level.
### Table 3b

**Educational Experiences Deemed Important as Preparation for the Position of Local Program Developer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Experiences</th>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>School Systems Size</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>Ase't</td>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>Coor'd</td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Classroom Teacher</strong></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Super-Curr/Instruc</strong></td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Elementary Principal</strong></td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Secondary Principal</strong></td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Asst Sup't C O Staff</strong></td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Assistant Principal</strong></td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Guidance Counselor</strong></td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Cadet Principal</strong></td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Sec Worker/Sch Nurse</strong></td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Visit Teacher/Att Off</strong></td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job experiences are viewed by personnel groups and by school system size. The responses are listed by their mean and have a three point scale: (1) Definitely Important; (2) Moderately Important; (3) Unimportant for the Position.

*Means showing significance within the .05 level are denoted by asterisks. Statistics are tested by a one-way analysis of variance.
Classroom teaching was the only experience that clearly fell within the range of definitely important.

Supervisors of curriculum and instruction.--Personnel groups very closely perceived this experience the same, with means ranging from 1.72 to 1.92. These means near the midpoint of being moderately important. The one-way analysis of variance test of the means indicated that personnel groups showed no significant difference in perception at the .05 confidence level.

An analysis of the responses by school system size illustrated a perceptual difference. The means by size breakdown were 1.62, 1.74 and 1.94. The responses by all systems fell within the range of moderately important, although small systems gave greater importance to this experience area. The test of the means fell within the .05 confidence level. (The means were further tested for agreement and disagreement by the use of Duncan's Multiple Range Test.)

Elementary principal.--Personnel groups placed this item in the range of moderately important, with means varying from 1.69 to 1.96. Testing the variance of the means showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the item by school system size with means of 1.83, 1.78, and 1.98, placed the item in a range of moderately important, and also illustrated a clustering of responses around the total sample mean (1.88). The analysis
of variance showed no significant difference within these means at the .05 confidence level.

Totally, this item is viewed as moderately important with a total sample mean of 1.88.

Secondary principal.—Personnel groups placed this item in the range of moderately important, with means varying from 1.77 to 2.16. Assistant superintendents scaled this experience area as having greater importance than did the other groups (Mn=1.77), although, the comparison of means did not indicate a significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

School systems by size showed a cluster of responses around 1.96, with a range of means from 1.89 to 2.00. Here, too, the one-way analysis of variance showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Totally, this item is perceived as moderately important as an experience area with a total sample mean of 1.96.

Assistant superintendents—central office staff.—Personnel groups viewed this experience area as being moderately important, with means ranging from 1.88 to 2.38. Assistant superintendents perceived this item as having greater importance (1.88), the only group falling to the left of the mid-point of being moderately important. The one-way analysis of variance showed no significant difference between these groups at the .05 confidence level.
A breakdown by school system size displayed a difference in response. The means for small, medium, and large systems were 1.94, 2.18, 2.43, all falling within the range of moderately important. The analysis of variance showed a significant difference at the .05 confidence level. Duncan's Multiple Range Test illustrated disagreement between small and large systems with means of 1.94 and 2.43, respectively. Large systems viewed this item on the marginal limits of being unimportant.

Totally, the item falls within the range of moderately important, with a total sample mean of 2.19. Personnel groups viewed the item the same whereas the school system breakdown perceived it in significantly different ways.

Assistant principal.—Personnel groups showed a cluster of responses around that of the sample mean (2.26), with group means ranging from 2.17 to 2.40, placing the item in the range of moderately important. Principals and assistant superintendents scaled this experience area somewhat greater in importance than did other personnel groups. The test of the means indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

The breakdown by school system size showed a cluster of responses around that of the total sample mean (2.26). The one-way analysis of variance showed no disagreement at the .05 level.

Totally, the means of the responses by personnel groups and by school system size clustered around that of
the total sample (2.26), falling within the range of moderately important, with no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Guidance counselor.—Personnel groups perceived this item as moderately important, with means ranging from 2.27 to 2.52. The one-way analysis of variance showed no significant difference at the .05 level.

Viewing the item by school system size showed a perceptual difference. The means by size breakdown were 2.58, 2.22, and 2.31. The Multiple Range Test indicated disagreement between small and medium systems (2.58 vs. 2.22) at the .05 confidence level. Small systems viewed the item as unimportant as an experience area whereas medium systems perceived the item safely within the range of moderately important.

Totally, the item can be categorized as moderately important with a total sample mean of 2.31. No significant difference was perceived by personnel groups whereas disagreement was found between small and medium school systems.

The remaining experience areas—social worker and/or school nurse, cadel principal, and visiting teacher and/or attendance officer, by response of the total sample, scaled as unimportant for preparational experiences for the position of LPD. Although some of the means fell below 2.50 (the range of moderately important), they are marginal enough to be of disconcern.
Table 35 presents the educational experiences described in Table 34 in terms of a total sample overview when the respondents were asked to select three items they valued as most important preparational areas for LPD's.

Some items showed a re-ordering of importance, but the most profound finding was that, supervisors of curriculum and instruction, classroom teaching, and elementary principals, received 64.8 percent (513 of 792) of the responses with respective individual percentages of 23.0, 22.2, and 19.6. Although the first two were reversed in order, the same three items commanded the greatest number of responses as important for preparational experience for the position of LPD.

It too may be noted that the experience areas of guidance counselors, secondary principals, and assistant superintendents of central office staff received 26.6 percent (211 of 792) of the responses, with respective individual percentages of 9.6, 9.3, and 7.7. The remaining items, as indicated in the table, showed very limited response (9.6 percent).

Considerations for Inservice Training Programs

The development and maintenance of adequate expertise in a given task area is of constant concern to school people—teachers and administrators—whether it be exploring new methods of instruction, strengthening content areas, or fulfilling some other need of a particular personnel group.
TABLE 35

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES DEEMED IMPORTANT AS PREPARATION FOR THE POSITION OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPER AS VIEWED BY TOTAL SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE AREAS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Number (N = 264)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Classroom Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elementary Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guidance Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Secondary Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assistant Superintendent of Central Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Visiting Teacher and/or Attendance Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assistant Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Social Worker and/or School Nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cadet Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>792</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items selected from job experience areas of Table 34. The respondents were asked to identify three experience areas deemed as most important for preparing LPD's. Responses are ranked in order of importance as perceived by the total sample.

bThe possible total number of responses = 3 x 264.
Obviously, training programs can be designed to meet many of these needs.

When planning inservice training programs, considerations must be given as to what will be taught, who will teach, where they will be taught, length of the courses, and financial sponsorship. This section deals with these considerations.

The data for this section are presented in Tables 36 through 41. The responses to the items in the respective tables are listed by their means and scaled according to the strength of their recommendations. The three-point scale includes: (1) highly recommended; (2) recommended; (3) not recommended.

Table 36 presents data exploring possible subject matter areas for inservice training programs for LPD's. Four specific content areas, plus the prerogative of a combination of these four areas, were submitted to the respondents to scale. These subject matter areas are as follows: (1) content based on research methods, (2) content based on individual school system problems, content based on curriculum and instruction theory, (4) content based on personnel practices and behavior, and (5) content based on all four of these areas. These items are descriptively treated in order of greatest importance as perceived by the total sample.

Content based on all four content areas.--Personnel groups perceived this item similarly, with means ranging
**TABLE 36**

SUBJECT MATTER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPER TRAINING PROGRAMS¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GROUPS</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SUBJECT MATTER AREAS</th>
<th>Data Group</th>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>Personel Groups</th>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes Research All Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curr/Instr Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Practices/Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sup'ts</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ass't Sup'ts</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Super/Coor'd</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LFD's</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**² (No significant difference at the .05 level.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**² (No significant difference at the .05 level.)

**TOTAL SAMPLE** | 254 | 1.66 | 2.13 | 2.13 | 2.16 | 2.29 |

¹Responses viewed by Personnel Groups and by School System Size.
²Means illustrate the responses based on a three point scale:
1) Highly Recommended; 2) Recommended; 3) Not Recommended.
³Means tested by a One-Way Analysis of Variance.
from 1.58 to 1.84, placing the item in the area of recommended and very close to being viewed as highly recommended. The one-way analysis of variance test of the means showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the means by school system size showed a cluster of responses ranging from 1.61 to 1.69. No significant difference was found at the .05 level of confidence.

Totally, the item was viewed as being a recommended content area, bordering very closely to being perceived as highly recommended, with a total sample mean of 1.66. There were no significant perceptual differences at the .05 level of personnel groups or by school system size.

The four suggested subject matter areas composing the above item, content based on research methods, content based on individual school system problems, content based on curriculum and instructional theory, and content based on personnel practices and behavior, were perceived by personnel groups and by schools systems with high agreement. The total sample means ranged from 2.13 to 2.29. The means of the personnel groups show a range from 1.92 to 2.36; the means by the school system breakdown range from 2.07 to 2.32. The one-way analysis of variance test showed no significance at the .05 confidence level. By inspection, it is very doubtful if any significance exists by grouping these items.

In Table 36, it can be noted that these items all fall within the range of recommended and all are regarded as
important subject matter areas as a conglomerate, but none of them scaled as highly recommended content areas for LPD training programs.

Table 37 explores the possible sources of instructional personnel for the LPD training programs. The instructional personnel submitted to the respondents for considerations are as follows: (1) informed personnel within the system, (2) personnel from the state office of education, (3) personnel from the United States Office of Education, (5) qualified university and/or college personnel, and (5) a combination of these personnel. These items are analyzed in order of importance as perceived by the respondents of the total sample.

A combination of personnel as mentioned in items 1 through above.—This item was perceived by personnel groups as the most important, bordering on highly recommended and falling safely within the range of recommended, with means scaling from 1.54 to 1.92. It maybe noted that LPD's viewed this item as somewhat less in importance than did other groups (Mn=1.92), although there was no significant difference at the .05 confidence level when subjected to a one-way analysis of variance.

Viewing the item by school system sized showed means of 1.50, 1.68, and 1.65, respectively, with no significant difference at the .05 level.
### Table 37

**Recommendations for Teaching the Training Programs for Local Program Developers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>Combin-</th>
<th>Informed</th>
<th>Personnel Personnel University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ation of:</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>from and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>U.S.O.E. College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Personnel within System Office Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Sup'ts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super/ Coor'd</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD's</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistical Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistical Test**

(No significant difference at the .05 level.)

TOTAL SAMPLE 294 1.66 2.12 2.35 2.52 2.52

---

*Responses are viewed by Personnel Groups and by School System Size. Means illustrate the responses based on a three point scale: 1) Highly Recommended; 2) Recommended; 3) Not Recommended.*

*Means tested by a One-Way Analysis of Variance. Items showing significance at the .05 level are denoted by asterisks.*
Totally, this item scales as recommended, bordering on the limits of highly recommended, as identified instructional personnel for teaching training programs for LPD's.

Informed personnel within the system.--Personnel groups viewed this item as recommended, with means ranging from 2.00 to 2.48. All personnel groups, with the exception of superintendents, viewed the item alike, displaying a cluster of means around 2.12. Superintendents viewed it at 2.48, bordering not recommended. The one-way analysis of variance showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the item by school system size showed means of 2.14, 2.08, and 2.18 for small, medium, and large systems, respectively, all close to the sample mean of 2.12. There is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the means by school system size.

Totally, the item falls within the range of recommended by both personnel groups and school system size. The responses are well represented by the mean of the total sample (2.12).

Personnel from the State Office Education.--Personnel groups viewed this item in the range of recommended, with means ranging from 1.85 to 2.45. The one-way analysis of variance test of the means showed a significant difference at the .05 confidence level. Duncan's Multiple Range Test indicated disagreement between assistant superintendents
(Mn=1.85) and supervisors/coordinators and principals (Mns=2.38 and 2.45). The test points out that superintendents and LPD's show no disagreement with any of the other groups (Mns=2.32 and 2.16). The important difference here centers around the perception of the assistant superintendents, who scaled this item as being of greater importance than did the other groups (Mn=1.85).

The breakdown by school system size, which showed no significant difference by test, is also characterized by the closeness of their mean responses of 2.42, 2.26, and 2.43, respectively.

Totally, this item falls within the range of recommended as an instructional source, with assistant superintendents giving greater considerations to its importance than did other groups. The breakdown by school system size indicated the area as recommended, with their mean responses being closely to that of the total sample mean (2.35).

Personnel from the United States Office of Education (U.S.O.E.).--Personnel groups viewed this as having very marginal importance, with a cluster of means ranging from 2.44 to 2.57—obviously showing no significant difference at the .05 confidence level. Although some of the means do fall below 2.50, the degree of their closeness to this point would certainly give question to the importance of the item; this item by the discretion of the researcher is placed in the range of not recommended as an instructional
source for training programs.

Viewing the item by school system size shows very close mean responses of 2.53, 2.49, 2.53, obviously with no significant difference. These responses place the item in the range of not recommended.

Totally, the item places within the range of not recommended as an instructional source area, have a sample mean of 2.52, with no perceptional difference between groups at the .05 confidence level.

Qualified university and/or college personnel.—Personnel groups placed this item in the general range of not recommended, with the exception of LPD's and assistant superintendents. The one-way analysis of variance indicates a significant difference at the .04 level and Duncan's Multiple Range Test points out that LPD's decisively disagree with principal and coordinator and/or supervisors. The mean responses for the three groups are 2.16, 2.52, and 2.6, respectively. Agreement was found within the .05 limits that LPD's, assistant superintendents, and superintendents felt this item to be a recommended instructional source for training programs; the greatest importance placed on the item was by the LPD's (Mn=2.16).

School system sizes indicated that the item, at best, was marginally recommended, with means of 2.46, 2.54, and 2.50; the sample mean was 2.52. There were obviously no significant difference between these means.
Totally, the item is marginal as a recommended area for obtaining instructional personnel to teach in the training programs for LPD's, although LPD's themselves decisively illustrated that they felt the source was worthwhile (Mn=2.16). The total sample mean was 2.52, which generally portrayed the responses of groups.

In Table 37, all of the items as a composite, form a source for recruiting instructional personnel for LPD training programs. At second choice, the mean responses indicated that qualified instructional personnel from within the system and personnel from the State Office of Education would be acceptable.

Generally, personnel from the U.S.O.E. and from universities and/or colleges were considered very marginal and could be classified as not recommended (with limited exception). It too may be pointed out that none of the items clearly scaled as highly recommended sources for instructional personnel.

Table 38 focuses on determining ideal locations for conducting training programs for local program developers.

Three choices were suggested to the respondents, plus an open-ended opportunity to express other locations. These locations are as follows: (1) conduct programs at some central point so that more than one school system could benefit from them, conduct programs in the individual school
TABLE 38

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE LOCATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GROUPS</th>
<th>TRAINING PROGRAM LOCATIONS</th>
<th>Conduct Programs at Some Central Point</th>
<th>Conduct Programs in Individual School System</th>
<th>Conduct Programs at Nearest College or University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>Number: 25</td>
<td>Mean: 1.80</td>
<td>Mean: 2.00</td>
<td>Mean: 2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Sup'ts</td>
<td>Number: 26</td>
<td>Mean: 1.69</td>
<td>Mean: 2.11</td>
<td>Mean: 2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super/ Coor'd</td>
<td>Number: 72</td>
<td>Mean: 1.81</td>
<td>Mean: 2.23</td>
<td>Mean: 2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Number: 146</td>
<td>Mean: 1.75</td>
<td>Mean: 1.98</td>
<td>Mean: 2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD's</td>
<td>Number: 25</td>
<td>Mean: 1.48</td>
<td>Mean: 2.12</td>
<td>Mean: 2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATISTICAL TEST</strong></td>
<td>(No significant difference at the .05 level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School System Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>Number: 78</td>
<td>Mean: 1.62</td>
<td>Mean: 2.14</td>
<td>Mean: 2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>Number: 140</td>
<td>Mean: 1.72</td>
<td>Mean: 2.07</td>
<td>Mean: 2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>Number: 76</td>
<td>Mean: 1.93</td>
<td>Mean: 1.98</td>
<td>Mean: 2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATISTICAL TEST</strong></td>
<td>(No significant difference at the .05 level.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>Number: 294</td>
<td>Mean: 1.75</td>
<td>Mean: 2.07</td>
<td>Mean: 2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses are viewed by Personnel Groups and by School System Size. Means illustrate the responses based on a three point scale: 1) Highly Recommended; 2) Recommended; 3) Not Recommended.

bMeans tested by a One-Way Analysis of Variance.
system, and conduct programs at the nearest college or university. The responses to these items are listed by their means and analytically treated in order of importance.

**Conduct programs at some central point.**—Personnel groups perceived this item as recommended, with means ranging from 1.48 to 1.81. LPD's scaled the item as highly recommended (Mn=1.48), although the one-way analysis of variance showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the item by school system size showed means of 1.62, 1.72, and 1.93, respectively, also displaying no significance at the .05 level, although by inspection, small systems are noted as viewing the item with greatest importance (Mn=1.62).

**Conduct programs in individual school system.**—Personnel groups viewed this item as recommended with means ranging from 1.98 to 2.23 but with no significant difference at the .05 level. The responses cluster closely to the response of the total sample (Mn=2.07).

The school system breakdown also showed a close distribution of responses, with means of 2.14, 2.07, and 1.98, respectively, illustrating close adherence to the total sample response (Mn=2.07). Obviously, there was no significance at the .05 level.

Totally, this item falls within the range of recommended, the responses being well represented by the sample mean of 2.07.
Conduct programs at nearest college or university.—Personnel groups illustrated a feeling of marginal importance to this item, with means ranging from 2.26 to 2.47. The item scaled in the upper limits of recommended, with no means exceeding 2.50 (area of not recommended). The one-way analysis of variance indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the item by school system size portrayed a very close response distribution with means of 2.39, 2.42, 2.51—with no significance shown at the .05 confidence level. Looking at the response by school size more clearly exemplifies a marginal item with large systems scaling it as not recommended (Mn=2.51).

Totally, the items falls within the marginal range of recommended with a total sample mean of 2.44.

An overview of Table 38 reveals agreement that training programs for LPD's should be scheduled to meet at some central point so that more school systems could benefit from them. There is the possibility of conducting the programs in the individual schools, but this is not felt to be as desirable as meeting at a central location. Although conducting the programs at the nearest university or college was rated in the upper limits of recommended, it cannot be fully discounted as a meeting site for LPD training programs. It may be noted that none of the items were clearly
scaled as highly recommended, although LPD's did consider the first item as such.

Table 39 presents data aimed at ascertaining the most desired times for conducting training programs for LPD's. Four alternatives, plus an open-ended opportunity, was given to the respondents to indicate their preference of time allocations for LPD training programs.

These time allocation alternatives are listed as follows: (1) short-term courses—five to six weeks length, meeting one day per week, (2) one graduate quarter meeting weekly, (3) two graduate quarters meeting weekly, and (4) "crash" programs meeting two or three times. The responses to these items are listed according to their means and treated in that order.

**Short-term courses—five to six weeks in length, meeting one day per week.**—Personnel groups perceived this item as recommended, with means ranging from 1.84 to 2.31. It may be pointed out the assistant superintendents and LPD's perceive this item as having greater importance than do other groups, with respective means of 1.84 and 1.92, although the one-way analysis of variance showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the item by school system size displayed a range of means from 1.99 to 2.28, all centering around the total sample mean of 2.08. The one-way analysis of variance showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GROUPS</th>
<th>TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short-term Courses-5 to 6 Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Groups</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Sup'ts</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super/Coor'd</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD's</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST \( ^b \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST \( ^b \)

| TOTAL SAMPLE | 254 | 2.08 | 2.33 | 2.57 | 2.67 |

\( ^a \) Responses viewed by Personnel Groups and by School System Size. Means illustrate the responses based on a three point scale: 1) Highly Recommended; 2) Recommended; 3) Not Recommended.

\( ^b \) Means tested by a One-Way Analysis of Variance. Items showing significance at the .05 level are denoted by asterisks.
Totally, this item is perceived by all groups as a recommended time for LPD training programs, having a total sample mean of 2.08.

One graduate quarter meeting weekly.—Personnel groups perceived this item in the range of recommended with means scaling from 2.26 to 2.44. This close cluster of responses obviously shows no significant difference at the .05 level.

Viewing the responses by school system size also shows a very close distribution of responses with means of 2.32, 2.34, and 2.30, respectively, obviously with no significant difference.

Totally, this item is perceived as a recommended time for LPD training programs to meet; the responses are very adequately portrayed by the mean of the total sample, 2.33.

The following two items, two graduate quarters meeting weekly and "crash" programs meeting two or three times, both fall into the range of not recommended. Although the table does point out some significant disagreements, the groups—both personnel and school systems—view these items as very marginal as meeting times for LPD training programs. It may be pointed out that assistant superintendents and LPD's did perceive "crash programs" as recommended, with means of 2.30 and 2.44, respectively.

Totally, these two time areas fell within the range of not recommended with total sample means of 2.57 and 2.67,
respectively. Assistant superintendents and LPD's did perceive "crash programs" well within the range of recommended. It may be noted that none of the items were classified as highly recommended.

Table 40 focuses on identifying specific meeting times for the proposed LPD training programs. Six alternatives, plus an open-ended opportunity, were subjected to the respondents. These specific meeting times proposed to the respondents are as follows: (1) released time from school, (2) summer sessions, (3) after school and evenings, (4) short-term courses—5 to 6 weeks, (5) saturdays, and (6) "crash programs" meeting 2-3 times. The responses to these items are listed by their means and statistically treated in order of importance.

Released time from school.—Personnel groups viewed this item as recommended with means ranging from 1.84 to 2.03. LPD's scaled the item lowest (Mn=1.84), although the one-way analysis of variance showed no significance at the .05 level.

School systems by size displayed means of 2.11, 1.84, and 1.94, respectively. No significant difference was found at the .05 confidence level.

Totally, the item fell within the range of recommended as a meeting time for LPD training programs, with a total sample mean of 1.96.
TABLE 40

MEETING TIMES FOR LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPER TRAINING PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GROUPS</th>
<th>POSSIBLE MEETING TIMES FOR PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Released Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Groups</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Sup'ts</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super/Coor'd</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED's</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses viewed by Personnel Groups and by School System Size. Means illustrate the responses based on a three point scale: 1) Highly Recommended; 2) Recommended; 3) Not Recommended.

Means tested by a One-Way Analysis of Variance. Items showing significance at the .05 level are denoted by asterisks.
**Summer sessions.**—Personnel groups perceived this item as recommended with means ranging from 1.88 to 2.36. Superintendents viewed this item as having greater importance than did other groups with a mean response of 1.88. LPD's perceived the item as of least importance (Mn=2.36). The one-way analysis of variance proved no significance at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the item by school system size shows means of 2.21, 2.18, and 2.03, with no significance at the .05 level. All of these areas place well within the range of recommended as a meeting time for LPD training program.

Totally, this item is considered as a recommended meeting time for LPD training programs with a total sample mean of 2.14. Interestingly, superintendents gave this item greater importance (Mn=1.88).

**After school and evenings.**—Personnel groups viewed this item as recommended with means ranging from 2.39 to 2.50, showing a very narrow response distribution. The one-way analysis of variance indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size, indicated that small and large systems placed the item in the range of recommended with means of 2.26 and 2.35. Medium systems scaled the item as not recommended (Mn=2.57). The one-way analysis of variance indicated that the perception
of small systems (Mn=2.26) differed from the medium systems (Mn=2.57) at the .05 confidence level.

Totally the item can be classified in the range of recommended, with a total sample mean of 2.43, although viewing the item by school system size did show that medium schools perceived it as not recommended as a meeting time for LPD training programs.

**Short-term courses--5 to 6 weeks.**--This item clearly fell within the range of not recommended, by personnel groups and by school system size. Assistant superintendents were the only exception to the total sample with a mean response of 2.19. The total sample response was 2.54, with no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

**Saturdays.**--It was the consensus of personnel groups and school systems alike that this item clearly was not recommended. The total sample mean was 2.61.

"**Crash programs**" meeting 2-3 times.--This item also scaled as not recommended as a meeting time for LPD training programs with a total sample mean of 2.76. Assistant superintendents scaled this item at 2.42, which could be viewed as very marginal as important. Since the item does scale as not recommended, the difference is of little value.

An overview of Table 40 illustrates that the two most important meeting times for LPD training programs are (1) released time from school and (2) summer sessions. Meeting after school and evenings, although approaching marginal
value (Mn=2.43), can also be considered as a recommended meeting time for this program. All other items scaled-out to be of no value, with the exception of assistant superintendents in their perception of short term courses. They rated this item as a recommended meeting time for programs (Mn=2.19).

Table 41 explores the consensus of possible sponsorship for LPD inservice training programs. Four specific alternatives, plus an open-ended opportunity, were given to the respondents. These sponsorship possibilities are as follows: (1) United States Office of Education, (2) State Office of Education, (3) individual school systems, and (4) participants of the programs. These items are descriptively treated in order of greatest importance as perceived by the response of the total sample.

United States Office of Education.--Personnel groups perceived this item as a recommended sponsor for LPD inservice training programs with means ranging from 1.76 to 2.12. Superintendents viewed this item with greatest importance (Mn=1.76), although the one-way analysis of variance showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Schools systems, small, medium, and large, viewed the item as recommended with respective means of 2.21, 1.88, and 2.01. The variance test indicated that medium systems disagreed with small systems at the .05 level.
# TABLE 41

FINANCIAL SPONSORSHIP OF PROSPECTIVE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>SPONSORSHIP POSSIBILITIES</th>
<th>State Office of Education</th>
<th>Individual School Systems</th>
<th>Participants of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Sup'ts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super/ Coor'd</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED's</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

(No significant difference at the .05 level.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

* * *

**TOTAL SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aResponses viewed by Personnel Groups and by School System Size. Means illustrate the responses based on a three point scale: 1) Highly Recommended; 2) Recommended; 3) Not Recommended.

*bMeans tested by a One-Way Analysis of Variance. Items showing significance at the .05 level are denoted by asterisks.
Totally, the item is a recommended source for sponsorship of LPD inservice training programs. The total sample mean is 2.00.

State Office of Education.—Personnel groups viewed this item as recommended with means ranging from 1.84 to 2.16. LPD's and assistant superintendents perceived this item with greatest importance, both having means of 1.84. The one-way analysis of variance showed no significance at the .05 level.

Viewing the responses by school system size showed means of 2.09, 1.92, and 2.35, respectively. Significance within the item was found at the .05 level by use of the one-way analysis of variance and further pin-pointed by using Duncan's Multiple Range Test. It was found that medium and large systems differed in response with means of 1.92 and 2.35, respectively. All of the means fell within the mid-range of recommended.

Totally, the item scales as a recommended area for financial remuneration for inservice training programs for LPD's. The total sample mean is 2.08.

Individual school systems.—Personnel groups viewed this item as recommended with means ranging from 2.11 to 2.24, displaying a very narrow distribution of responses. Obviously, no significant difference was found in this cluster of means.
The means by school system size also displayed a concentration of responses; the means were 2.11, 2.16, and 2.13, respectively.

Totally, the items fall well within the range of recommended. The total sample mean clearly portrays the attitudes of all groups, personnel and school size (2.14).

Participants of the training programs.—This item clearly scaled as not recommended as a remunerative source for inservice training programs for LPD's.

An overview of Table 41 illustrates that the first three items, with close agreement, are recommended ways to financially sponsor inservice training programs for LPD's. The total sample means of these three items show very close agreement (2.00, 2.08, 2.14). As may have been expected, participant sponsorship scaled strongly in the range of not recommended as a financial sponsoring source for training programs.

Training Programs and Graduate Credit

Public school administrative personnel require a definite level of expertise in order to function adequately in their respective positions. Presently, graduate schools of education focus on academic preparation for developing and maintaining competencies in administrative task areas.  

\[2\] For description of task areas see: Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration (3d ed. rev.; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966), pp. 96-137.
The task area of local program development for federal assistance, because of its newness, has not yet evolved into a subject or discipline for graduate study. (This does not mean to imply that the problems of federal assistance to programs are not discussed.) Tables 42 and 43, derived from questions 16 and 22, are directed at ascertaining the need for developing LPD training programs for graduate credit and graduate degrees.

The data for this section are viewed by both personnel groups and by school system size. The responses are listed according to number and percent.

Table 42 presents data focused on determining the need for training programs warranting graduate credit. The responses for this table are simply classified as a need or not a need for graduate accreditation.

Personnel groups generally showed a centered division of responses with 48.1 percent feeling a need for graduate programs, although superintendents rated the need much lower than did other personnel groups (7 of 25 or 28.0 percent). The Chi Square Test of Independence indicated that no significant difference existed at the .10 percent confidence level within these groups.

The breakdown by school system size showed a cluster of percentages ranging from 40.3 to 54.1. Small systems rated the need for accreditation of less importance with a response of 40.3 percent (31 of 77). The Chi Square Test
### TABLE 42

NEED FOR DESIGNING TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR GRADUATE CREDIT
FOR LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GROUPS</th>
<th>NEED RANGE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for Graduate Credit Programs</td>
<td>Not a Need for Graduate Credit Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/Coordinators</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD's</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 5.017; this is not significant at the .10 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for School System Size = 3.020; this is not significant at the .10 level.

---

*a* Responses listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Group Size and by Respective School System Size.

*b* Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.
showed no significant difference at the .10 percent confidence level.

Totally, the respondents with the exception of superintendents, indicated a centered division of opinion as to the importance for graduate accreditation for LPD training programs. Of the 287 respondents, 48.1 percent displayed support toward a need for such credit. Superintendents (7 of 25) felt a limited need for such credit. The near 50 percent response for graduate accreditation does point out a factor of concern for graduate credit.

Table 43 deals with the depth in which graduate training should be extended toward local program development. This table focuses on ascertaining whether or not the level of sophistication in federal assistance to education has reached a point that warrants making it a specific field of study at the graduate level. The data are grouped into two response areas, (1) warrants a graduate degree area and (2) does not warrant a graduate degree area.

Personnel groups generally viewed as not warranting specialized attention the area of federal assistance to education. Superintendents and assistant superintendents viewed warranting a degree lowest of the personnel groups, both showing a response of 12.0 percent (3 of 25) in favor. Principals and LPD's perceived a degree program with somewhat more favor, with percentages of 41.5 and 40.0, respectively. The Chi Square Test in a Contingency Table
THE AREA OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO EDUCATION IN TERMS OF WARRANTING A FIELD OF STUDY FOR A GRADUATE DEGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GROUPS</th>
<th>Warrants Graduate Degree Area</th>
<th>Does Not Warrant Graduate Degree Area</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/Coordinators</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFD's</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST

Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 15.816; this is significant at the .01 level.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST

Chi Square for School System Size = 0.805; this is not significant at the .10 level.6

aResponses listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Group Size and respective School System Size.
bStatistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.
indicated a significant difference at the .01 confidence level. This difference, by inspection alone, occurs in the two concentrations of responses just cited; thus there is obvious disagreement between superintendents and their assistants (12.0 percent) and principals and LPD's (41.5 and 40.0 percent).

School systems showed a cluster of responses ranging from 28.9 to 34.7 percent, with no significant difference at the .10 percent confidence level.

Totally, the possibility of warranting a graduate degree area (major) for accreditation is looked upon by the respondents as having little importance. The sample response reflected only 33.1 percent (95 of 287) in favor of graduate accreditation for training in federal program development.

University Involvement in LPD Training Programs

If inservice training programs are to be designed and implemented for developing and maintaining competencies for personnel involved in federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools, seemingly universities and/or colleges would have a participating role in the development of these programs. This section is directed toward surveying the kind of involvement deemed necessary for universities and/or colleges to provide training need functions for local program developers. Tables 44 through 49 focus on the
following need areas: (1) academic level deemed necessary to adequately fulfill the position of LPD, (2) need for academic structure at the graduate school level for LPD's, (3) adequacy of Ohio Colleges and Universities in meeting the present academic needs of LPD's, (4) adequacy of other colleges and universities in meeting the present academic needs of LPD's, and (5) possible graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining the competencies of LPD's.

Tables 44, 45, 46, and 47, compiled from primary questionnaire questions 20, 19, 17, and 18, present the data by personnel groups and by school system size. These tables focus on need areas 1 through 4 mentioned above and are treated in that order; the responses are listed by number and percent. (Need area number 5 is discussed later in this section.)

Table 44 is aimed at ascertaining the academic level deemed necessary to adequately fulfill the position of local program developer. The preparation areas are classified by academic degrees and work beyond specific degree levels. These areas are: bachelor's degree, bachelor's plus, master's degree, and master's plus. It may be noted that the questionnaire originally allowed for a response area for doctoral degrees, but the responses were so limited (2 of 280) that it was excluded from the table. (These two responses were included in the master's plus area.)
TABLE 44

ACADEMIC LEVEL DEEMED NECESSARY TO ADEQUATELY FULFILL
THE POSITION OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>Data Groups</th>
<th>ACADEMIC PREPARATION</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>Bachelor's plus</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Master's plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/ Coordinators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST
Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 5.346; this is not significant at the .10 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST
Chi Square for School System Size = 0.818; this is not significant at the .10 level.

*a Responses listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Group Size and respective School System Size.

*b Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.
Personnel groups showed a marked response at the master's degree level, with percentages ranging from 52.0 to 63.6. Although another concentration of responses clustered around the master's plus, displaying a range of percentage from 26.8 to 36.4. These two areas together made up 83.3 percent (234 of 280) of the responses. The two response concentrations showed a limited range of percentages; there was no significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size again revealed two concentration groups, the master's level and the master's plus level. The master's level concentration had percentages of 61.7, 52.3, and 49.3 for small, medium, and large school systems. The master's plus responses showed percentages of 22.1, 32.9, and 31.0, respectively. The Chi Square Test showed significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

Totally, 83.3 percent (234 of 280) of the respondents felt that master's degree or higher was necessary for the position of local program developer.

Table 45 focuses on identifying the need for an academic structure at the graduate school level to prepare and maintain personnel for the position of local program developer. The response areas are (1) need for a structure and (2) not a need for a structure.

Personnel groups showed a range of percentages in favor of an academic structure from 44.0 to 61.0 percent.
### TABLE 1

**NEED FOR ACADEMIC STRUCTURE AT THE GRADUATE SCHOOL LEVEL TO PREPARE AND MAINTAIN PERSONNEL FOR THE POSITION OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Groups</th>
<th>Structural Need Range</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for Structure</td>
<td>Not a Need for Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/Coordinators</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFD's</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 4.783; this is not significant at the .10 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

Chi Square for School System Size = 3.389; this is not significant at the .10 level.

---

*aResponses listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Group Size and respective School System Size.

*bStatistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.
Superintendents, assistant superintendents, and LPD's perceived this item nearly the same with responses of 44.0, 45.8, and 47.8, respectively. Principals and supervisors and/or coordinators responded with 61.0 and 52.2 percent, respectively. The Chi Square Test showed no significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

School systems had response percentages of 51.3, 60.8, and 48.6, respectively with no significant difference at the .10 level.

Totally, personnel groups and school systems perceived the need for an academic structure at the graduate school level very much alike. The sample response of 55.0 percent (155 of 282) showed an attitude of need in this area.

Table 46 deals with the adequacy of Ohio colleges and universities in meeting the academic needs of local program developers. The response areas are (1) meeting the needs and (2) not meeting the needs.

Personnel groups showed a overwhelming response indicating that Ohio institutions are not meeting the academic training needs of LPD's. The percentages of responses ranged from 80.0 to 89.4—all concentrated around the sample response of 86.7 percent. The Chi Square Test of Independence showed no significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

Viewing this area by school system size showed a closer concentration of responses than did the personnel
## TABLE 16

ADEQUACY OF OHIO COLLEGES AND/OR UNIVERSITIES IN MEETING THE ACADEMIC NEEDS OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL GROUPS</th>
<th>ADEQUACY RANGE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting the Needs</td>
<td>Not Meeting the Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/Coordinators</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEF's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST

Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 2.287; this is not significant at the .10 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TEST

Chi Square for School System Size = 0.296; this is not significant at the .10 level.

---

*Responses listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Group Size and by respective School System Size.

*Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.*
groups, with percentages of 88.2, 86.7, and 85.1. Obviously, no significance was found at the .10 confidence level.

Totally, it was clearly indicated by personnel groups and school systems alike that Ohio colleges and universities are not meeting the academic training needs of local program developers. The total sample response of 86.7 percent (247 of 285) reflects this conclusion.

Table 47 reviews the adequacy of colleges and universities, other than those of Ohio, in meeting the academic training needs of local program developers—as perceived by this sample. The response areas used to record the data are (1) meeting the needs and (2) not meeting the needs.

Personnel groups illustrated a very concentrated percentage of responses in the area of not meeting the training needs, with percentages ranging from 87.5 to 92.0. The Chi Square Test of Independence obviously showed no significance at the .10 confidence level.

School systems also showed a narrow range of difference with percentages of 92.1, 88.0, and 88.7, with no significance shown at the .10 confidence level.

Totally, 89.3 percent (250 of 280) of the sample agreed that universities and colleges outside of Ohio are not meeting the training needs of the local program developers.
### ADEQUACY OF COLLEGES AND/OR UNIVERSITIES, EXCLUDING OHIO, IN MEETING THE TRAINING NEEDS OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

#### TABLE 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA GROUPS</th>
<th>ADEQUACY RANGE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting the Needs</td>
<td>Not Meeting the Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STATISTICAL TEST

Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 0.321; this is not significant at the .10 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STATISTICAL TEST

Chi Square for School System Size = 0.895; this is not significant at the .10 level.

---

*a* Responses listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Group Size and respective School System Size.

*b* Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.
Table 48, derived from question 23 of the primary questionnaire, focuses on possible graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining competencies for the position of local program developer. (As described in the beginning of the section, Table 48 treats area number 5.) The responses are listed by the means. A three-point scale is used to weight the items. The scaling factors are as follows: (1) highly needed as a curriculum area, (2) needed, but of a lesser nature, and (3) not needed at all. The items are ranked according to the response of the total sample and descriptively treated in that order.

Research methods with emphasis on designing and writing proposals. — Personnel groups responded to this item similarly with means ranging from 1.20 to 1.36— all scaling well within the range of highly needed as a curriculum area. LPD's gave the item less importance (Mn=1.36) although the one-way analysis of variance indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

School systems viewed the item within a narrow range of responses with means of 1.24, 1.23, and 1.30, respectively. The one-way analysis of variance showed no difference at the .05 level of confidence.

Totally, this item was perceived as a highly needed curriculum area as is well portrayed by the total sample mean of 1.25. Very little difference exists between all of
TABLE 1

POSSIBLE GRADUATE COURSE AREAS FOR PREPARING AND MAINTAINING COMPETENCIES FOR THE POSITION OF LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSSIBLE COURSE AREAS</th>
<th>PERSONNEL GROUPS</th>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup'ts</td>
<td>Ass't</td>
<td>Super/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Research Methods—Emphasis on Designing &amp; Writing Proposals</td>
<td>1.2b</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication-School-Lay Groups-Agency-State-Federal Offices</td>
<td>1.2b</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Structure-Administrational Procedure (Concerning Red Aid)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Social Order</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Psychology-Behavior Patterns &amp; Testing</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instructional-Theory</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social Psychology</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.59b</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMeans illustrate responses based on a three point scale: (1) Highly Needed as Curriculum Area; (2) Needed, but of a lesser Nature; (3) Not needed at all.

bMeans tested by a One-Way Analysis of Variance. Items showing significance at the .05 level are denoted by asterisks.
the groups, with no significance shown at the .05 confidence level.

Communication with school staff, lay citizen groups, community agencies, state and federal offices.—Personnel groups perceived this item as highly needed as a curriculum area. The means ranged from 1.28 and 1.32, displaying a very narrow distribution of responses. Obviously, no difference was shown at the .05 confidence level.

Schools systems had means of 1.33, 1.23, and 1.38, respectively. Although large systems viewed the item as of less importance (Mn=1.38), there was no significance shown at the .05 confidence level.

Totally, the item clearly scaled as highly needed as a curriculum area for LPD training programs. The total sample mean of 1.30 reflects the general perception of all of the groups.

Organizational structure and administrative procedure concerning the procedurement of federal assistance. Personnel groups perceived this item on the marginal limit of highly needed as a curriculum area for LPD training programs with means ranging from 1.30 to 1.61. Principals and supervisors and/or coordinators perceived the item to have greater importance than did the other personnel groups (Mns=1.30 and 1.40, respectively). The one-way analysis of variance indicated a significant difference at the .05 confidence level. Duncan's Multiple Range Test further
indicated that assistant superintendents and principals disagree perceptually with means of 1.61 and 1.30, respectively. Other groups are shown in agreement with the principals. Assistant superintendents clearly scaled the item in the range of needed, but of a lesser nature (Mn=1.61). Although superintendents and LPD's both show means of 1.56, they show agreement with the groups having lower means.

School systems viewed the item in the range of highly needed as a curriculum area for LPD training programs with means of 1.32, 1.40, and 1.46, respectively. The one-way analysis of variance test showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Totally, the item scaled as highly needed as a curriculum area for LPD training programs with a total sample mean of 1.40. Assistant superintendents gave the item least importance (Mn=1.61), placing it in the range as needed, but of a lesser nature.

The social order.--Personnel groups perceived this item in the range of needed, but of a lesser nature, with exception to LPD's and supervisors and/or coordinators. The latter two groups had means of 1.36 and 1.40, both falling within the range of highly needed. The one-way analysis of variance showed a significant difference in these groups at the .05 confidence level. Duncan's Multiple Range Test further pointed out that LPD's and supervisors and/or
coordinators did show disagreement with the other groups. LPD's and supervisors and/or coordinators definitely perceived the item as highly needed, whereas superintendents, assistants superintendents, and principals rated the item as needed but of a lesser nature with means of 1.56, 1.76, and 1.65, respectively.

Viewing the item by school system size showed a concentrated distribution of responses with means ranging from 1.53 to 1.58. The analysis of variance within these means indicated no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Totally, the item scaled as needed but of a lesser nature as a curriculum area for LPD training programs with a sample mean of 1.56. LPD's and supervisors and/or coordinators rated the social order as a highly needed course area.

Fundamentals of curriculum development.—Personnel groups scaled this area as needed but of a lesser nature with a range of means from 1.48 to 1.80. Superintendents viewed the item as of least importance (Mn=1.80), whereas LPD's scaled the area as of greatest importance (Mn=1.48). The one-way analysis of variance indicated no difference at the .05 confidence level in the perception of the item by personnel groups or school system size.

School systems perceived this area as a needed course for LPD training programs with means of 1.71, 1.57, and 1.61,
respectively. The close distribution of responses showed no significance at the .05 level.

Totally, this suggested course area was scaled as a needed curriculum offering for LPD training programs. The sample mean illustrates the trend of responses for all groups (Mn=1.61).

The remaining three course areas, psychology based on behavior patterns and testing, instructional theory, and social psychology, show response distributions so closely related that treating them individually is of little value. In fact, the responses between the items were so close that it was impossible to detect a significant difference by simple inspection.

These three curriculum areas have sample mean responses of 1.72, 1.75, and 1.78. A one-way analysis of variance by item showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level, both by personnel groups and by school system size. These items all scale safely within the range of needed, but of a lesser nature as curriculum areas for local program developer training programs.

An overview of the table shows that the first three items—(1) research methods with emphasis on designing and writing proposals, (2) communication with school staff, lay citizen groups, community agencies, state and federal offices, and (3) organizational structure and administrative procedure concerning the procurement of federal
assistance—all scaled as highly needed curriculum areas for LPD training programs, although some perceptual difference did occur in responses of assistant superintendents (they perceived this item with less importance, \( Mn=1.61 \)).

Items 4 through 8 all scaled as needed curriculum areas, but of a lesser nature. None of the groups viewed them as not needed.

Table 49 presents the possible course areas so described in Table 48 in terms of a total sample overview. The respondents were asked to choose three items having the most value as possible graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining competencies for local program developers.

Although Table 49 shows a slight change, the first three items still maintain that importance. Items one through four command 76.2 percent (629 of 825) of the responses, and items five through eight only received 23.8 percent (196 of 825) of the responses.

Research methods maintains the top item in both charts whereas items two and three show a reversal in ranking. The social order is scaled fourth in both charts.

Clearly, research methods, organizational structure and administrative procedure, communication, and the social order, are deemed to be the most important suggested graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining competencies for the position of local program developer.
TABLE 49

PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMPETENCIES
FOR LOCAL PROGRAM DEVELOPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSSIBLE COURSE AREAS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Number (N = 275)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research Methods—Emphasis on Designing and Writing Proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Structure and Administration Procedures Involving Federal Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communication—School Staff, Lay Groups, State Office, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Social Order</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fundamental of Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instructional Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Psychology—Behavior Patterns and Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS 825 100.0

*Items selected from possible course areas of Table 48. The respondents were asked to identify three subject matter areas that would most maintain and prepare the competencies of LFDP's. Responses are ranked in order of importance as perceived by the total sample.

*The possible total number of responses = 3 x 275.
The Future of Federal Funds for Public Schools

Within the last decade the federal government has greatly increased its involvement in education. Such acts as the Area Redevelopment Act of 1962, the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Appalachia Regional Act of 1965, the Assistance for Public Schools Affected by Major Disasters-1965, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are prime examples of this vast federal involvement.³

Unquestionably, the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 marked outstanding legislative impact in terms of federal aid to public schools. The ESEA-1965 alone freed well over a billion dollars in their five categorized titles to upgrade the quality of education in the public school systems.⁴

Early in this project, interviews with school people generally pointed out that federal assistance to public schools does not present a threat to education; rather, the fear of the recession of federal funds is felt to pose a greater menace to quality public schools.


Since this dissertation deals with the problems, duties, and training needs of people involved in program development, it is seemingly important to survey the attitudes of school people as to how the future of federal aid to public schools is viewed. This section consists of a brief one-question attitude search focused on the extent of future public school dependency on federal assistance.

Table 50, compiled from question 21, views federal aid in terms of becoming imperative for financing elementary and secondary schools. The two response areas simply view the data as (1) growing necessity for federal aid and (2) growth for more federal aid not perceived. The data are viewed by personnel groups and by school system size, listed in number and percent.

Personnel groups viewed federal aid to public schools as a growing necessity in financing education. The percentages ranged from 75.0 to 84.0, displaying a very concentrated distribution of responses. The Chi Square Test showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

Viewing the responses by school system size showed responses of 74.0, 80.7, and 82.2 percent as perceiving growth in federal assistance. Small systems seem to feel that federal aid was more temporary than did medium and large systems, although the Chi Square Test indicated no significant differences at the .05 confidence level.
### Table 50

**THE GROWING IMPETUS OF FEDERAL AID IN TERMS OF BECOMING IMPERATIVE FOR FINANCING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Groups</th>
<th>Federal Assistance Growth</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growing Necessity for Federal Aid</td>
<td>Growth Not Perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/Coordinators</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFD's</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

- Chi Square for Personnel Groups = 0.783; this is not significant at the .10 level.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Systems</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Systems</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICAL TEST**

- Chi Square for School System Size = 1.847; this is not significant at the .10 level.  

---

*a* Responses listed by number and percent in terms of respective Personnel Group Size and respective School System Size.  

*b* Statistics tested by a Chi Square Test of Independence in a Contingency Table.
Totally, it was perceived by personnel groups and by school system size that there is a growing necessity for federal aid in financing public schools. The sample response of 79.3 (226 of 285) reflected this attitude of a growing need for federal assistance.

Summary of Findings of Category IV

The purpose of this category is to determine the pre-service and inservice training needs of local program developers. The five areas of concern explored in this section are (1) important preparational experiences for LPD's, (2) considerations for inservice training programs, (3) training programs for graduate credit, (4) university involvement in training programs, and (5) the future import of federal funds for public schools.

Important preparational experiences for LPD's.--The job experiences deemed most important as preparation for LPD's (Table 34) were classroom teaching, supervising curriculum and instruction, elementary principal, and secondary principal. Classroom teaching was the only item that clearly scaled as definitely important but the other items listed herein did safely fall within the range of moderately important (sample means of 1.74, 1.88, and 1.96 on a three-point scale). Table 35 pointed out that supervisors of curriculum and instruction, classroom teaching, and the elementary principalship received 513 of the 792 responses (64.8 percent).
The areas of assistant superintendent of central office staff, assistant principal, and guidance counselors did scale within the range of moderately important with sample means of 2.19, 2.26 and 2.31. The cadet principalship, social worker and/or school nurse, and visiting teacher and/or attendance officer were viewed as unimportant as preparational experiences for the position of local program developer.

The items viewed as moderately important showed some disagreement when compared by school system size. The items of supervising curriculum and instruction, assistant superintendent of central office staff, and guidance counselor, illustrated a significant difference at the .05 level—all perceptual differences occurring within the small school systems. They viewed the first two of these items as of greater importance and the last item of lesser importance than did the medium and large school systems.

**Considerations for inservice training programs.**--This section focused on the content areas, the teachers for these areas, locations of the programs, the length of the courses, and financial sponsorship of LPD training programs. (All responses in this section are listed by their means, based on a three-point scale.)

Table 36 treated the content areas for prospective training programs, suggested four areas, plus a combination of these areas for the respondents to consider. These
areas are as follows: (1) content based on research methods, (2) content based on individual school system problems, (3) content based on curriculum and instruction theory, (4) content based on personnel practices and behavior, and (5) content based on all four of these areas.

Personnel groups and school systems alike viewed these suggested content areas as recommended, but decisively scaled content based on all four of these areas as of the greatest importance; the sample mean response of 1.66 fell closely to being scaled as highly recommended as a content area for LPD training programs.

Table 37 explored the possible sources for instructional personnel. The possible considerations of such personnel submitted to the respondents were as follows: (1) informed personnel from within the school system, (2) personnel from the state office of education, (3) personnel from the U.S.O.E., (4) qualified university and college personnel, and (5) a combination of these personnel.

A combination of the personnel showed the greatest response falling very closely to being highly recommended on the three-point scale (Mn=1.66). Item 1, informed personnel from within the system, was recorded as the next most important source of instruction with a sample mean of 2.12. The two items, by personnel groups and school size, showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level concerning perceptual disagreement. Item 2, personnel from the
State Office of Education, ranked also in the range of recommended, did show a significant difference within the personnel groups. Agreement was shown between superintendents, assistant superintendents, and LPD's. Agreement was also shown between principals and supervisors and/or coordinators. But disagreement was shown at the .05 level between these two groups. Personnel from the U.S.O.E. and university and college personnel scaled as being not recommended areas for instructional sources for LPD training programs, although LPD's and assistant superintendents did feel that university personnel were of a source value (Means=2.16 and 2.38 on a three-point scale).

In viewing these areas by school system size, no significant difference existed at the .05 confidence level.

Table 38 focused on determining ideal locations for LPD training programs. Three alternatives plus an open-ended opportunity was given to the respondents. The suggested locations were as follows: (1) conduct programs at some central point so that more than one system could benefit from them, (2) conduct programs in the individual school systems, and (3) conduct the programs at the nearest college or university. On the three-point scale, these items received sample mean responses of 1.75, 2.07, and 2.44, respectively, with no significant difference at the .05 level occurring within personnel groups or school system sizes. Although all of these items fall within the
range of recommended, conducting programs at some central point obviously reflected the most desired locations for training programs.

Table 39 presented data aimed at ascertaining the most desired time for conducting LPD training programs. Four alternatives were submitted to the respondents: (1) short term courses--4-6 weeks, (2) one graduate quarter, (3) two graduate quarters, and (4) "crash programs" meeting two or three times. It was found that items 1 and 2, with sample means of 2.08 and 2.33 (three-point scale), were recommended as possible time allocations for these training programs. Items 3 and 4 scaled were not recommended--although assistant superintendents did read value into "crash programs" (Mn=2.30).

Table 40 contains data on preferred meeting times for LPD training programs. The suggested alternatives are as follows: (1) released time from school, (2) summer sessions, (3) after school and evenings, (4) short-term courses--5 to 6 weeks, (5) Saturdays, and (6) "crash programs" meeting 2-3 times. Items 1, 2, and 3, having sample means of 1.96, 2.14, and 2.43, all scaled as recommended, with the most importance placed on released time from school (Mn=1.96). Medium school systems showed a significant difference at the .05 level in item 3; they viewed this meeting time as not recommended.
Short-term courses, Saturdays, and "crash programs" all scaled as not recommended meeting times for LPD training programs.

Table 41 explores the consensus of possible sponsorship for LPD training programs. The four choices submitted to the respondents are as follows: (1) U.S.O.E., (2) State Office of Education, (3) individual school systems, and (4) participants of the programs. The first three items scaled as recommended with respective sample means of 2.00, 2.08, and 2.14. Significant differences were shown in the responses by school system size in items 1 and 2, which in both cases medium school systems viewed with greater importance (Mns=1.88 and 1.92). The last item, sponsored by the program participants, was looked upon with disfavor (Mn=2.87), falling into the range of not recommended as a program sponsoring source.

Training programs and graduate credit.--This section was directed toward ascertaining the need for developing LPD training programs for graduate credit and degree area.

Table 42 focused on the need for designing programs for graduate credit for LPD's. It was found that the respondents, with the exception of superintendents, indicated a near 50 percent response for accreditation; 48.1 percent were in favor and 51.9 percent viewed it negatively. Superintendents perceived graduate credit as of less importance than did other personnel groups (28.0 percent or
The Chi Square Test of the data showed no significant difference at the .05 confidence level with either personnel groups or school systems.

Table 43 dealt with the depth to which graduate training should be extended toward local program development. The possibility of warranting a graduate degree area or graduate accreditation is looked upon as having little importance. Only 33.1 percent (95 of 287) of the respondents favored graduate accreditation for LPD training programs. It was obvious that superintendents and their assistants gave accreditation lesser value than did other groups, both showing responses of 12.0 percent (significant at the .01 level). School systems did not show any significant difference at the .10 level.

University involvement in LPD training programs.—This section dealt with the involvement by the universities and colleges to provide training need functions for LPD's.

The need areas treated in this section are as follows: (1) academic level deemed necessary to adequately fulfill the position of LPD, (2) need for academic structure at the graduate school level for LPD's, (3) adequacy of Ohio colleges and universities in meeting the present academic needs of LPD's, (4) adequacy of other colleges and universities in meeting the present academic needs of LPD's, and (5) possible graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining the competencies of LPD's.
It was pointed out in Table 44 (area 1) that 83.3 percent (234 of 280) of the respondents felt that a master's degree or higher was necessary for the position of LPD. No significant difference was found at the .10 confidence level in the responses by personnel groups or by school system size.

Table 45 (area 2) indicated that personnel groups and school systems perceived the need for an academic structure at the graduate school level for federal program development with a sample response of 55.0 percent (155 of 282). The Chi Square Test showed no significance at the .10 confidence level.

Table 46 (area 3) very strongly illustrated by personnel groups and by school system size, that Ohio colleges and universities were not meeting the academic training needs of LPD's. The sample response of 86.7 percent (247 of 285) responding negatively to this question clearly reflects this conclusion.

The Chi Square Test indicated no significant difference at the .10 confidence level in personnel groups and school system size.

Table 47 (area 4) focused on reviewing the adequacy of other colleges and universities in meeting the academic training needs of LPD's. The respondents strongly agreed that these institutions are not meeting the LPD's training needs, which is exemplified by the sample response of 89.3
percent (250 of 280). The responses by personnel groups and by school system size tested no significant difference at the .10 confidence level.

Table 48 (area 5) viewed possible graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining the competencies of LPD's. The responses were listed by their means and scaled according to (1) highly needed, (2) needed, and (3) not needed as a curriculum area. The areas deemed as highly needed or needed are described as follows:

1. Research methods with emphasis on designing and writing proposals. This item was regarded as most important with a sample mean of 1.25. It clearly scaled as highly needed. The statistical test showed no significance at the .05 level of confidence.

2. Communication with school staff, lay citizens groups, community agencies, state and federal offices. This item scaled as highly needed as a curriculum area with a sample mean of 1.30 having no significant difference at the .05 level.

3. Organizational structure and administrative procedure concerning federal assistance. This item scaled as a highly needed course area with a sample mean of 1.40. Principals and assistant superintendents showed a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence, with respective means of 1.30 and 1.61. No difference was shown in comparing school systems size.
4. The social order—scaled as needed with a sample mean of 1.56. LPD's and supervisors and/or coordinators viewed the item as highly needed, as was pointed out by Duncan's Multiple Range Test. Superintendents, assistant superintendents, and principals agreed in their perception of the item as needed.

The first three items clearly scale as highly needed course areas for LPD training programs, with sample means falling below 1.50.

These first four items received 76.2 percent (629 of 825) of the responses, which clearly categorizes them the most important suggested course areas for LPD training programs.

Items 5 through 8, fundamentals of curriculum development, psychology based on behavior patterns and testing, instructional theory, and social psychology, all scale within the range of needed, but of a lesser nature. No significant difference at the .05 confidence level was found in breakdown of the individual items by personnel groups and by school system size.

The data viewed in Table 49 was used as a check for Table 48. The respondents selected three possible course areas in which they felt were most important. It was verified that items 1 through 4 were deemed to be the most important graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining the competencies of the position of local program developer.
The future of federal funds for public schools.--
This section focused on a one-question attitude search concerning the future dependency of public schools on federal assistance.

It was perceived by personnel groups and by school systems that the need for federal assistance to public schools is growing; 79.3 percent (226 of 285) shared this attitude. No significant difference was found at the .10 confidence level.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings presented by the data.

The Problem and Methodology

Through recent federal legislation, the abundance of monies made available for elementary and secondary school programs, but a dream a decade ago, has created complexity, confusion, and competition for their allocations.

It was found that administrative changes were made in order to obtain federal assistance for programs, although no uniform structure for utilizing federal funds prevailed among these studied school systems—even those of comparable size.

The newness of the federal monies has created a gamut of problems. The selection of capable personnel, their organizational placement, definition of duties, and preservice and inservice training needs are concerns facing this new area of school business.

The purpose of this study has been to investigate the duties, problems, and training needs of the personnel who direct the development of federally assisted programs in
selected city schools systems in Ohio. For the purpose of the study, the person coordinating the activities necessary for federal assistance under present legislative acts is referred to as the local program developer (LPD).

An in-depth consultation with knowledgeable people in public education aided the researcher in designing this descriptive study.

The project design focused on organizing the study to treat four specific categories:

1. Organizational structure utilizing the services of local program developers.
2. Background of the local program developers.
3. Duties and problems of the local program developers.
4. Preservice and inservice training needs of the local program developers.

These categories were investigated by three structured questionnaires:

1. The Superintendents Report Form, aimed at gaining permission to use that particular school system for study and identify the key personnel for the administration of the primary questionnaire.
2. The Federal Program Developers Report Form, focused on obtaining the LPD's perception of selected pertinent information.
3. The primary questionnaire, Duties, Problems, and Training Needs of Federal Program Developers, which was administered to the entire sample with the purpose of identifying, (1) organizational practices concerning this new position, (2) the duties and problems of the LPD's, and (3) the LPD's preservice and inservice training needs.
The sample was composed of forty Ohio city school systems, based on a population of 25,000 or more, obtained from The County and City Data Book, 1962. (This included all of the Ohio cities having a population of 25,000 or more.)

Of the 40 selected city school systems, 30 (75.0 percent) consented to the study. The superintendents in these districts identified 447 personnel as sample members. Of the 447 people, 295 completed valid primary questionnaires (66.0 percent).

These personnel included (1) superintendents, (2) assistant superintendents in charge of curriculum and instruction, (3) supervisors/coordinates, (4) principals having involvement in federally assisted programs, and (5) the local program developers.

The data from these questionnaires were broken down by the above personnel groups and by school system size (Table 6, p. 36).

Small school systems (10) ranged from ADM's of 5,022 to 8,915. Medium systems were based on ADM's of 9,900 to 27,177; there were 15 such systems. Large systems (5) ranged from 57,466 to 152,000 pupils.

The data were coded and processed according to the breakdown described above. Frequency distributions in terms of arithmetic means and percentages were used to compare the responses.
Data presented in terms of the mean responses were statistically tested by a one-way analysis of variance to the .05 confidence level. When significant differences appeared within an item, the Duncan Multiple Range Test was administered to further pin-point specific levels of agreement and/or disagreement between the data groups.

Data presented in terms of percentage were statistically tested by the Chi Square Test in a Contingency Table. When differences appeared within the item (at the .05 level), further Chi Square Tests were administered to specifically identify the agreement and/or disagreement between the data groups.

Category I: Organizational Structure Utilizing Local Program Developers

This section of Chapter III investigated the organizational structures of public school systems in terms of utilizing the services of the personnel involved in the planning, designing, and coordinating federally assisted programs. This area placed emphasis on (1) socioeconomic variables and approved programs, (2) the placement of the local programs developer in the organizational hierarchy, (3) changing the structure in order to utilize these new personnel, (4) the adequacy of the present organizational arrangement, and (5) the effectiveness of the new personnel in a new created task.
Socioeconomic considerations and ESEA program.--It was difficult to generalize from the data that federally assisted programs were dependent upon the socioeconomic needs of a given community. But it was apparent that wealthy school systems--systems that were more financially able to maintain quality programs--had fewer programs. This was especially true in Title I programs (Title I projects are focused on the problems of the culturally deprived children).

With exclusion of the large school districts, it was found that 5 of the wealthier systems had nearly as many Title III programs as did 16 systems of much greater socioeconomic need. The communities of these 5 systems (based on the 1960 census) had median incomes of greater than $7,500 dollars, 1 percent or less Negro population, and 11.5 years of education or higher; they enjoyed the success of 10 Title III programs, whereas the 16 needier districts only had 13 approved projects under this Title. It was further noted that the systems of lesser wealth and greater socioeconomic need did experience more approved Title I programs.

Viewing the 30 school system sample, it was found that 272 programs were funded under Title I, whereas only 40 programs were funded under Title III, during the 1965-1968 funding period.
Title II programs, aimed at library improvement, tended to be a perfunctory type allocation. The data illustrated that there was no apparent discrimination concerning the size, geographical areas, or socioeconomical variables.

Titles I and III seemingly commanded more time and skill on the part of local program developers. These are the areas relying heavily on the ability of the planner and designer of the projects with the major emphasis placed on innovation.

As expected, it was found that programs generally increase in number as the Average Daily Membership increases.

Title and placement of local program developers.— It was found that the smaller the school system, the closer the responsibility of developing programs for federal assistance is to the superintendent of schools. Medium school systems had specifically assigned personnel for working with federal assistance. These personnel were responsible to the superintendent of schools. It was noted that as the size of the system increases, the LPD's tend to become the responsibility of assistant superintendents; in most cases, they become responsible to the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction.

Large school systems not only had a specific person coordinating the activities concerning federal assistance,
but also had staffs of personnel responsible to the LPD's (indicated by personal interviews). It is evident that the larger the school system, the farther away from the LPD is from the superintendent of schools. In fact, the five largest city schools had near-autonomous departments—a definite appendage branching from the office of the assistant superintendent (curriculum and instruction).

Changing the organizational structure.—It was found that 62.2 percent of the sample respondents felt that their systems experienced change in order to use the services of the LPD's. Superintendents, who would logically know of any change in structure, viewed change at the 56.0 percent level (14 of 25). LPD's rated change somewhat higher (72.0 percent or 18 of 25). The perceptual differences may be attributed to the definition of change. Change may merely mean an addition to the staff.

It was pointed out that more change occurred in large systems (71.1 percent) than in small and medium (61.5) and 5.79 percents), which verifies the findings in the Title and Placement of LPD's that large systems developed near-autonomous appendages.

All changes perceived in small, medium, and large clustered heavily into three groups:

1. A formation of a totally new appendage (36.3 percent)

2. Manifested in a special person responsible to the superintendents of schools (26.4 percent)
3. An addition to an already established department (24.0 percent)
These three areas received 86.7 percent of the responses. A fourth group, made up of a special person responsible to the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction, received 12.3 percent of the responses.

Adequacy of present administrative organization.—Personnel groups viewed the adequacy of the present administrative arrangement for utilizing the services of LPD's at the 80.0 percent or above level—with exception to the LPD's themselves. They perceived their adequacy at the 76.0 percent level (responses include highly adequate and moderately adequate). Assistant superintendents showed a higher perception of adequacy than did other groups; 48.0 percent of them considered their systems highly adequate.

Viewing adequacy by school system size showed little perceptual differences with the responses clustering around 80.0 percent.

It was found that the 28 (9.7 percent) respondents viewing their systems as inadequate in using the LPD's, felt that the following modes of change would improve their structures:

1. Create a special department for the services (50.0 percent)

2. Assign the LPD directly to the assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction (43.0 percent)

3. Assign the LPD directly to the superintendent of schools (6.3 percent)
Generally it was felt that a special department had greater merit than did other suggested methods, although assigning the LPD's to the assistant superintendent did command 43.0 percent of the responses; these responses (item 2) were from medium school systems. It was also noted that some of these recommended changes were already functional in other systems.

This same area was briefly treated in the Federal Program Developers Form, obtaining just the LPD's point of view. LPD's of small, medium, and large school systems felt that the present administrative arrangement was adequate at the 68.0 percent level of those that did not view their structures as adequate (6 of 25), the common theme of improvement focused on allotting more time to perform the duties related to federal assistance programs— the feeling being the federal program development on the local level, is a full-time job and should be regarded as such.

Effectiveness of newly appointed LPD's. — It was found that personnel groups viewed the LPD in his newly appointed role as effective at the 74.0 percent level. The contrasting responses were between the superintendents and the LPD's with respective percentages of 91.3 and 60.0 of the 25 LPD's, 9 of them felt they were ineffective in their new job role. Although these percentages differed, no significance found at the .10 confidence level in the personnel groups.
School systems indicated a perceptual difference at the .05 level. Medium systems rated effectiveness lower (68.9 percent), than did small and large systems (75.6 and 80.0 percent).

Viewing the total sample showed 23.9 percent of the respondents felt that the LPD was ineffective in his newly appointed role.

**Category II: The Background of the Local Program Developers**

The data in this section, obtained from the Federal Program Developers Report Form, focused on identifying the educational and experiential backgrounds of local program developers. (Due to the limited sample number of 25, the data were treated as total rather than by the practiced breakdowns.)

**Systems appointments.**—It was found that 92.0 percent (23 of 25) of the LPD's were appointed from within the school systems. Of these appointments, 60.9 percent (14) were from the principalship; this includes the assistant principals. It was also found that 21.8 percent (5) of the LPD's were from the curriculum and instruction supervisory staff, thus 19 of the 25 or 82.7 percent of the LPD's were personnel selected from the principalship and curriculum supervisory positions.

Of the remaining LPD's, two were appointed directly from the classroom; the positions of visiting teacher and
or attendance officer, evaluators of programs, and guidance counselors, together, showed appointments of two people. Two LPD's were appointed from other school systems.

It was found that the LPD's were veterans within the systems; 87.5 percent (21 of 25) had 10 or more years of service, and 91.7 percent (22 of 25) had 7 or more years of service with their respective school system.

**Formal training and experience of the LPDs.**—The data showed that 96.0 percent (24 of 25) of the LPD's had at least a master's degree, and 68.0 percent (17) of these personnel had additional work beyond the master's degree. Two of the LPD's had doctoral degrees.

It may be pointed out that for the principalship and supervisory staff positions, the basic requirements include a master's degree as academic preparation.

The primary professional experience showing the greatest concentration of responses was classroom teaching; of the 25 LPD's, 19 or 76.0 percent had 5 or more years in the classroom. The mean response for this experience was 6.96 years.

The principalship also showed a high concentration of responses, their means exceeding 5.50 years of experience. Guidance counselors, visiting teachers and/or attendance officers, appeared to be areas of limited importance in reference to training and recruiting local program developers.
Inservice training programs.--It was found that work schedule flexibility was a limited problem area for the LPD's. Of the 25 LPD's, 18 or 72.0 percent had time schedules that permitted them to utilize available inservice training programs. Only 6 or 24.0 percent indicated that their schedules did not have this flexibility.

The inservice training opportunities most available to LPD's are listed in order of greatest response:

1. Workshops provided by the state office of education (88.0 percent)

2. Visitations to other school systems in the state (84.0 percent)

3. University and/or college personnel brought in to provide information and consultation services (80.0 percent)

4. Seminars provided by colleges and universities (68.0 percent)

5. Visitations to school systems in other states (48.0 percent).

Only 12.0 percent (3) of the respondents indicated the availability of national conferences on curriculum development (ASCD).

In viewing the same items in terms of value, LPD's ranked them as follows:

1. Visitations to other school systems in the state (31.4 percent)

2. Workshops provided by the state office of education (24.3 percent)

3. Seminars provided by colleges and universities (17.1 percent)
4. University and/or college personnel brought in to provide information and consultation services (12.9 percent)

Visitations to school systems in other states, national curriculum conferences (ASCD), and an open-ended others, together received 12.9 percent of the responses.

An open-ended opportunity for the LPD's to express improvement revealed that their involvement in planning and designing inservice programs was foremost important; 50.0 percent (8 of 16) indicated this concern. Two LPD's felt that the present programs were adequate but there was a need for more meetings. Two LPD's indicated that some specific guidelines should evolve from the present programs to enhance the development of future inservice training programs.

**Category III: Duties and Problems of Local Program Developers**

The purpose of this section was to identify the professional duties and the problem areas of the local program developers. The data were viewed through three major areas:

1. Duties of the local program developers
2. The effectiveness of program implementation
3. Problem areas of the local program developers

**Duties of the local program developers.**—Eleven items (Table 26) were submitted to the respondents in order to ascertain the ideal or theoretical role of the LPD's. Of these 11 items, 8 were scaled (3-point scale) as important
ideal functions of LPD's. Those items and their mean responses are as follows:

1. Liaison between school, state and federal offices (1.25)
2. Coordinator of all federal programs (1.37)
3. A proposal writer (1.38)
4. A program designer (1.43)
5. A budgetary planner (1.46)
6. Collector and disseminator of information (1.59)
7. Identifier of needs (1.60)
8. An innovator (1.61)

It was clearly evident that the first five items scaled as important functions of the LPD's (Mns=1.25 to 1.46). Because items 6 through 8 scaled so closely to these first functions (Mns=1.59, 1.60, and 1.61), the researcher included them as important functions of the LPD.

The remaining items in the table were these:

9. An evaluator (1.75)
10. Advisor to curriculum planners (1.78)
11. Supervisor of programs (2.03)

They can be scaled as lesser functions in terms of the LPD's ideal role and are considered as having limited value.

Significant differences (.05 confidence level) in the personnel group breakdown was only noted in item 7--identifier of needs. It was found that assistant superintendents and LPD's (Mns=1.38 and 1.37) very definitely perceived
this area as an important function, whereas superintendents, supervisors/coordinators, and principals viewed the item in the range of a lesser function ($M_{ns}=1.80$, 1.59, and 1.64).

Significant differences (.05 level) by school system size appeared in items 3, 5, 6, and 8. Items 3, 5, 6 (proposal writing, budgetary planning, and collector and disseminator of information) were viewed by large school systems as of lesser importance than by small and medium systems. Small and medium systems placed the item in the range of an important hypothetical function of LPD's.

In item 8, the innovator, medium systems significantly scaled the area as a lesser function of the LPD's ($M_{n}=1.75$).

Briefly overviewing the ideal role of the LPD (Table 26), the first 8 items are viewed as important ideal functions of the LPD's.

Using the same items listed above as role identifiers for the functional (practiced) duties of the LPD's, it was found that all eleven areas could be viewed with positive concern. The items, in order of greatest sample percentage response, are listed as follows:

1. Collector and disseminator of information (92.7)
2. Liaison between school, state, and federal offices (92.6)
3. Budget planner (84.6)
4. Proposal writer (79.4)
5. Coordinator of all federally assisted programs (77.3)
6. Program designer (68.5)
7. Identifier of needs (59.1)
8. Program evaluator (58.4)
9. Innovator (54.2)
10. Curriculum advisor (51.4)
11. Program supervisor (48.3)

As is indicated by the sample responses, all of these items can be considered as functional (practiced) duty areas of the LPD's, although special consideration should be placed on items 1 through 6, with responses range from 92.7 to 68.5 percent.

Significant differences at the .05 confidence level only appeared in item 6 (program designer) when viewing the responses by personnel groups. It was found that assistant superintendents and LPD's viewed this item with greater importance than did the other groups (92.0 and 80.0 percent as opposed to the total sample response of 68.5).

Agreement was found when comparing the ideal (theoretical) role with the functional (practiced) duties of the LPD's. Some reordering did occur within the areas in Tables 26 and 28, but the first six positions were occupied by the same items. Thus the following items are viewed as ideal as well as functional duty areas of the local program developers:

1. Collector and disseminator of information
2. Liaison between school, state and federal offices
3. Budget planner
4. Proposal writer
5. Coordinator of all federal assistance programs
6. Program designer

It was also noted (Table 29) that these same six items commanded the greatest time and effort on the part of the local program developers. These six items, although reordered, received 80.3 percent of the responses. The remaining five items, given below received only 19.7 percent of the responses:

7. Program supervisor
8. Identifier of needs
9. Evaluator of program
10. Innovator
11. Curriculum advisor

In viewing the role of the local program developers after the projects had been approved for assistance (Table 30), the following areas were found to be common duties:

1. Evaluate programs as part of a team
2. Chart phases of programs
3. Supervise programs as part of a team
4. Aid in choosing program coordinators

The four items received total sample responses ranging from 76.9 to 56.5 percent, with only small school systems showing a significant difference (.05 level) in first item. Small schools viewed the evaluation of programs
as part of a team with less importance than did all other groups, although they did respond at the 65.4 percent level.

The remaining items (4 through 8) received less than 25.0 percent of the responses per area.

Items 5, 6, and 7, given below, had total sample responses of 24.1, 20.7, and 19.4 percent:

5. Independently supervise the programs
6. Independently evaluate the programs
7. Choose a coordinator for the programs

The researcher deemed these areas as unimportant as practiced duties of the LPD's after programs had been federally funded.

It must be noted that item 8, no longer involved, was rated last with 17.3 percent. This definitely can be viewed as an indication that LPD's should remain involved in the programs that were, in some capacity, initiated by them.

The respondents were also surveyed as to what they felt the ideal duties of the LPD's should be after federal funding. The same items as used in Table 30 were again submitted to them as identifiers for these theoretical (ideal) duty areas.

It was found that items 1 through 4 were considered to be the ideal functions of the LPD:

1. Evaluate programs as part of a team (88.8 percent)
2. Supervisor programs as part of the team (81.6 percent)
3. Chart phases of programs (76.9 percent)
4. Aid in choosing program coordinators (62.6 percent)

Items 5 through 7 commanded responses of 20.1, 8.5, and 7.8 percent, and were deemed as having little value as duty areas.

Item 8, no longer involved, receiving 5.1 percent of the responses, again indicated that LPD's should remain involved in the programs.

It is important to note that the actual duties as related to the ideal functions of the LPD's, after programs have been approved for funding, show definite agreement. Items 1 through 4 in both, Tables 30 and 31, were the same although a reversal in ordering did appear in items 2 and 3. It was also illustrated that items 5 through 7 were viewed as of little importance as duty areas. And in both cases no longer involved (item 8) had low responses, indicating that local program developers should remain involved in their projects after funding.

The effectiveness of program implementation. — In viewing the effectiveness of program implementation (Table 32), three evaluative judgment areas were used: (1) effective, (2) not effective, (3) too early to evaluate.

It was found that 68.4 percent or 61 of 294 respondents viewed the present implementation of programs as effective; 20.7 percent (61) felt it was too early to evaluate such effectiveness. No significant difference was shown at the .10 confidence level.
Problem areas of the local program developers.—A list of eighteen problem areas (Table 33), selected as concern factors from interviewees and recent research, were submitted to the respondents to scale. These items were scaled as: (1) a serious problem, (2) a moderate problem, (3) a slight problem, or (4) unimportant as a problem. The responses were listed by their means.

It was found that none of these items were scaled as a serious problem to LPD's. (This somewhat surprised the researcher in that the interviewees used in structuring the study specifically identified many of these items as major problem areas.) It was also found that none of these items was scaled as unimportant.

Of these 18 items, 9 scaled as moderate problem areas. These items and their sample means are as follows:

1. Time consuming paper work (1.64)
2. Adequate facilities for programs (2.15)
3. Scheduling activities (2.22)
4. Time factors relative to other activities (2.22)
5. Planning and designing programs (2.28)
6. Budget projects (2.40)
7. Writing proposals (2.46)
8. Evaluating existing programs (2.51)
9. Gathering supporting data for programs (2.51)

Statistical significance at the .05 confidence level was found only in the personnel groups. Item 2, adequate
facilities for programs, was viewed by superintendents as a greater problem than in the other personnel groups. In item 6, budgeting projects, superintendents, assistant superintendents and principals perceived this area as a greater problem than did supervisors/coordinator, and LPD's. Evaluating existing programs (item 8) was perceived by superintendents as being a greater problem.

By using the total sample mean as an indicator, the remaining areas (items 10 through 18) scaled as slight problems, although some sample groups did indicate some of these factors as moderate problems. These are listed and descriptively treated as follows:

Availability of professional staff (item 10) was scaled by superintendents as a moderate problem area with a mean response of 2.24.

Communication with school staff (item 11) was perceived by large school systems as a moderate problem with a mean of 2.43.

Communication with lay citizen groups (item 12) was also viewed by large systems as a moderate problem area for LPD's with a mean of 2.42.

The remaining items were all scaled as slight problems and deemed by the researcher as having limited value:

13. Implementing approved programs (Mn=2.94)
14. Advisors to supervisors of curriculum and instruction (Mn=3.10)
15. Communication between school, state, and federal offices (Mn=3.13)

16. Knowledge of social and community structure (Mn=3.20)

17. Availability of state and U.S.O.E. guidelines (Mn=3.21)

18. Consultation services from state level (Mn=3.26)

Consequently these items were not descriptively treated in the text.

**Category IV: Preservice and Inservice Training Needs of Local Program Developers**

The purpose of this section was to ascertain the preservice and inservice training needs of local program developers. The five areas explored in this area were:

1. Important preparational experiences for LPD's
2. Considerations for preservice and inservice training programs
3. Training programs for graduate credit
4. University involvement in training programs
5. The future of federal funds for public schools

**Important preparational experiences for LPD's.**--This area dealt with the professional experiences deemed important as preparation for LPD's. Ten items (Table 34) were submitted to the respondents to rate, using the following three-point scale: (1) definitely important, (2) moderately important, or (3) unimportant for the position.

The job experiences deemed most important were (sample mean listed with item):
1. Classroom teacher (Mn=1.39)

2. Supervisor of curriculum and instruction (Mn=1.74)

3. Elementary principal (Mn=1.88)

4. Secondary principal (Mn=1.96)

Classroom teaching was the only area clearly scaled as definitely important, although items 2, 3, and 4, did safely fall within the range of moderately important. Item 2, supervisor of curriculum and instruction, showed the only significant perceptual difference at the .05 level; large systems gave this item (Mn=1.94) less importance than did small and medium systems (Mns=1.62 and 1.74).

It also must be noted that items 5 through 7 scaled within the upper range of being moderately important:

5. Assistant superintendent-central office staff (Mn=2.19)

6. Assistant principal (Mn=2.26)

7. Guidance counselor (Mn=2.31)

Again, significant differences were only shown by school systems. Small systems rated item 5, assistant superintendent of central office staff, as more important than did medium and large systems with respective means of 1.94, 2.18, and 2.43. Small systems scaled item 7, guidance counselor, as of lesser importance (Mn=2.58) than did medium and large systems (Mns=2.22 and 2.31). In both cases the significant difference tested at the .05 confidence level. The researcher deemed all seven of these areas as at least
moderately important preparational experiences for LPD's, with the greatest emphasis placed on items 1 through 4. Items 8 through 10 scaled as unimportant preparational experiences for the position.

It was further pointed out in Table 34, that supervisors of curriculum and instruction, classroom teaching, and the elementary principalship, received the most responses (513 of 792 or 64.8 percent) when the respondents were asked to select the three most important preparational areas for the position of LPD.

Considerations for inservice training programs.--The purpose of this section was to identify the most beneficial content areas, teachers, locations, meeting times, and sponsorships for LPD training programs. All responses in this section were listed by their means, based on a three-point scale: (1) highly recommended, (2) recommended, or (3) not recommended.

The subject matter areas submitted to the respondents were as follows (Table 37):

1. Content based on research methods
2. Content based on individual school systems problems
3. Content based on curriculum and instruction theory
4. Content based on personnel practices and behavior
5. Content based on all four of these areas
6. Other
It was found that all of these areas scaled as recommended, but the item receiving the greatest response was content based on all four of these areas. This item scaled very closely to being in the range of highly recommended, with a total sample mean of 1.66. No significant difference was shown in any of the groups at the .05 confidence level.

The instructional personnel selection submitted to the respondents as candidates for teaching the LPD training programs were as follows (Table 37):

1. Informed personnel from within the systems
2. Personnel from the state office of education
3. Personnel from the U.S.O.E.
4. Qualified university and a college personnel
5. A combination of these personnel
6. Other

It was found that item 5, a combination of these personnel, scaled as the selected area, bordering on the margin of highly recommended (Mn=1.66) and safely placing as a recommended source of instructional personnel. At a second choice, the mean responses indicated that qualified instructional personnel from within the system, and personnel from the State Office of Education would be acceptable. Personnel from the U.S.O.E. and from colleges and universities were scaled as not recommended. But most important, these items, as a composite, were recommended
sources of instructional personnel for LPD preservice and inservice training programs.

The suggested training program locations submitted to the respondents, are as follows (Table 38):

1. Conduct programs at some central point so that more schools systems may benefit from them.
2. Conduct programs in the individual school systems
3. Conduct programs at nearest college or university
4. Other

The obvious recommendation from the three described areas above, was to meet at some central point. The sample means for these response areas were 1.75, 2.07, and 2.44, respectively, with no significance shown at the .05 confidence level.

Time allocations for training programs were viewed through the following areas (Table 39):

1. Short-term courses, 4-6 weeks
2. One graduate quarter
2. Two graduate quarters
4. "Crash programs" meeting 2 or 3 times
5. Other

It was found that areas 1 and 2, above, were recommended as program meeting times. The sample means for these two areas were 2.08, and 2.33. Items 3 and 4 clearly scaled as not recommended time allocations for LPD training programs.
Specific meeting times for these training programs were viewed through the following areas (Table 40):

1. Released time from school
2. Summer sessions
3. After school and evenings
4. Short-term courses
5. Saturdays
6. "Crash programs" meeting 2-3 times
7. Other

Items 1, 2, and 3, having sample means of 1.96, 2.14, and 2.43, all scaled as recommended meeting times—with the greatest importance placed on released time from school (Mn=1.96).

A significance at the .05 confidence level appeared in the school system breakdown; medium systems viewed item 3, after school and evenings, as not recommended.

Short-term courses, Saturdays, and "crash programs" scaled as not recommended meeting times for LPD training programs.

Financial sponsorship for LPD training programs was viewed through the following identifiers (Table 41):

1. United States Office of Education
2. State Office of Education
3. Individual school systems
4. Participants of the programs
5. Other
The first three areas scaled as recommended with respective sample means of 2.00, 2.08, and 2.14.

Significant differences (.05 level) appeared in the school system breakdown. On items 1 and 2, medium school systems viewed the areas as having greater importance ($M$s=1.88 and 1.92).

The last item, sponsored by the program participants, was rejected with complete agreement ($M$=2.87), falling well into the range of not recommended as a sponsoring source for LPD training.

**Training programs and graduate credit.**—This section was directed toward finding out the need for developing LPD training programs for graduate credit and degree area.

It was found (Table 42) that the respondents, with exception to superintendents, indicated a near 50.0 percent response for programs designed for accreditation; 48.1 percent were in favor and 51.9 percent responded negatively. Superintendents perceived graduate credit as having less importance than did other personnel groups, although no significant difference existed at the .10 confidence level.

When the respondents were asked if the federal assistance area warranted a field of study at the graduate degree level (Table 43), it was found that the majority of the sample (66.9 percent or 192 of 287) were not in favor of its inclusion. It may be further pointed out that superintendents and their assistants rated this item extremely
negative; 88.0 percent felt that the area of federal assistance did not warrant a graduate degree field (this was significant at the .01 level). Totally, the possibility of warranting a graduate degree field (major or minor) to the federal assistance area was looked upon with little importance.

**University involvement in LPD training programs.**—

This section was directed toward surveying the kind of involvement necessary on the part of the universities and/or colleges to provide a training function for local program developers.

It was found (Table 44) that 83.3 percent (234 of 280) of the respondents felt that a master's degree or higher was necessary for the LPD position. This was a uniform opinion of the sample with no significant differences shown at the .10 confidence level.

It was indicated in Table 45 by a slight majority (55.0 percent) that there was a need at the graduate school level for an academic structure dealing with LPD training programs. This shows some conflict with previous opinion concerning accreditation. It seems that a structure may be needed, but not to the point of becoming an entire field of study.

When the respondents were asked if the colleges and universities in Ohio are meeting the academic training needs of the LPD's (Table 46), their response was very decisively
negative, 86.7 percent or 247 of 285 so indicating.

The adequacy of other colleges and universities (excluding Ohio) in terms of meeting the LPD's training needs, was surveyed (Table 47). The respondents strongly agreed that these institutions were also not providing adequate training programs (89.3 percent or 250 of 280).

Graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining the competencies of LPD's would logically follow the establishment of the needs for training programs.

Table 48 viewed the eight suggested course areas submitted to the respondents. These items were rated by a three-point scale as (1) highly needed, (2) needed, or (3) not needed as a curriculum area. The areas deemed as highly needed or needed are described as follows:

1. Research methods with emphasis on designing and writing proposals. This item was regarded as the most important which is clearly indicated by its sample mean, 1.25. (No significant difference among groups at the .05 confidence level was indicated.) It clearly scaled as highly needed.

2. Communication with school staff, lay citizen groups, community agencies, state and federal offices. This item scaled as a highly needed curriculum area with a sample mean of 1.30. No significant difference among groups was indicated at the .05 confidence level.

3. Organizational structure and administrative procedures concerning federal assistance. This item scaled as a highly needed course area with a sample mean of 1.40.
Principals and assistant superintendents showed a significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

4. The social order scaled as a needed curriculum area with a sample mean of 1.56. LPD's and supervisors/coordinators viewed the item as highly needed. The other personnel groups agreed in their perception.

The first three items clearly scaled as highly needed course areas for LPD training programs, with sample means falling below 1.50.

The first four items received 76.2 percent (629 of 825) of the responses, which clearly categorizes them as the most important suggested course areas for LPD training programs.

Items 5 through 8 all scaled within the range of needed, but of a lesser nature:

5. Fundamentals of curriculum development
6. Psychology based on behavior patterns and testing
7. Instructional theory
8. Social psychology

No significance at the .05 confidence level was noted in any of these items.

Table 49, used to verify the above data, indicated that the first four items (research methods, communication, organizational structure, and the social order) were deemed to be the most important suggested course areas for preparing and maintaining the competencies for the position of local
program developer.

The future of federal funds for education.—A brief one-question inquiry indicated that the need for federal assistance to public schools is growing; 79.3 percent (226 of 285) of the respondents shared this attitude. No significance was shown at the .10 confidence level in differences among groups.

Summary of the Response Pattern

The purpose of this section is to review the responses of the data in terms of the sample breakdown.

Table 51 presents all of the tables and their items that were statistically tested as having a significant difference at the .05 confidence level. The significant differences by table and item are denoted by asterisks; the directions of those differences are indicated by the greater than (>) and the less than (<) symbols.

Findings.—Of the 24 tables statistically tested, 12 displayed significant differences.

Of the 128 items tested within those tables, only 36 registered a significance at the .05 confidence level.

More significant differences appeared in the superintendancy and in large schools, showing 11 and 14, respectively.

It may be noted that supervisors-coordinators, and principals had less perceptual differences than all other groups; their combined total was 6.
### TABLE 51

PERCEPTUAL DIFFERENCES IN DATA AS SHOWN IN THE BREAKDOWN BY PERSONNEL GROUPS AND BY SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCES</th>
<th>PERSONNEL GROUPS</th>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ass't Super/</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables and</td>
<td>Supt's Supt's</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Coor'd Principals</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 16</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 28</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 30</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 33</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 51 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCES^</th>
<th>PERSONNEL GROUPS</th>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table and Items</td>
<td>Supt's Supt's Cc'd Principals PD's System System System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 33(con'd)</th>
<th>Item 17</th>
<th>Item 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 34</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 7</th>
<th>Item 8</th>
<th>Item 9</th>
<th>Item 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
<td>*&lt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 37</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 39</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*&lt;</td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 40</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 41</th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*&lt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 51 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCES</th>
<th>PERSONNEL GROUPS</th>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tables and Items</td>
<td>Supt's Ass't Super/ Frin- Small Medium Large Super/ Coor'd Principals LFD's Systems System System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 43</th>
<th>*&lt;</th>
<th>*&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 48</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
<td>*&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>*&lt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(&lt; =3)</td>
<td>(&lt; =2)</td>
<td>(&lt; =1)</td>
<td>(&lt; =1)</td>
<td>(&lt; =2)</td>
<td>(&lt; =3)</td>
<td>(&lt; =2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>(&gt; =6)</td>
<td>(&gt; =5)</td>
<td>(&gt; =1)</td>
<td>(&gt; =3)</td>
<td>(&gt; =3)</td>
<td>(&gt; =2)</td>
<td>(&gt; =3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Significant differences by Table and Item are viewed at the .05 confidence level and are denoted by asterisks. The directions of differences are indicated by the greater than (> ) and less than (< ) symbols.

*b* Total Tables Statistically Tested = 24
Total Items Statistically Tested = 128
Total Tables Having Significant Differences at the .05 Level = 12
Total Items Having Significant Differences at the .05 Level = 36
It was also noted that of the 54 tested significances, 29 indicated differences greater than (>) their comparing groups, and 25 showed differences in the less than (<) direction.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following discussion categorically presents the conclusions as they emerged from the findings. The recommendations are presented as a composite, based on the conclusions of the study.

Conclusions

Category I: Structure utilizing the local program developers

Socioeconomic considerations and ESEA programs.-- School system wealth and size are definite determinants in obtaining federal assistance for public school programs in the Ohio school systems included in this study. Wealthier districts, as based on high median incomes and less poverty potential, had fewer Title I programs (these are focused on the educationally deprived). These same systems displayed more success in Title III programs (aimed at supplementary centers to upgrade the quality of elementary and secondary education).

Viewing the 30 school systems in the sample, 272 programs were funded under Title I, whereas only 40 programs were funded under Title III in a three-year period. There are two prime factors to consider in Title I funding.
First, the systems that can qualify socioeconomically, direct their energies toward the programs for the educationally deprived. The total monies set aside by Congress ($987 million) for this latter purpose illustrates the primacy of this category. Secondly, as was pointed out by personal interviews with LPD's, innovation is essential but grantors are not as critical as in Title III allocations.

Title III monies are somewhat more limited; $75 million were originally set aside by Congress for the purpose of supplementing education at the elementary and secondary levels. Obviously, wealthier systems can qualify for these programs, whereas their socioeconomic composition may forfeit the chances for Title I funding. The essential factor here is the ability of the district to plan and design an innovative project for upgrading the quality of education. The funds for these programs are seemingly more competitive, thus creativity, skill, and time on the part of the local program developers are the ingredients for Title III success. In fact, the project funded under Titles I and III are dependent upon the creativity, time, and skill of the program developers.

Gaining funds from Title II programs (library materials) tends to be a more perfunctory process than seeking funds under Titles I and III. Of the 30 school systems in the sample, 90 Title II programs were funded in the three-year period—each system receiving three grants. This
indicates that Title II programs present limited complications concerning application and time and also demand little innovative sophistication.

In relation to school system size, Eikenberry concluded that "the largest and wealthier districts have a decided advantage over smaller districts, particularly in relation to legislative programs which require matching funds that have requirements related to sufficient numbers of students."¹

Large systems had a diversity of programs in Titles I and III. They generally displayed more success in Title III projects. These systems definitely all involved the point of having full-time personnel to handle the duties connected with obtaining federal funds for programs. In short, the larger the school system, the more sophisticated and specialized are the functions of local program development for federal assistance.

The lack of staff sophistication should not be a determining factor in participating in the available Titles awarding assistance. Adequate training would alleviate much of this problem.

Title and placement of the local program developers.—

The organizational placement of the LPD's varied in relation to the size of the system. The smaller the school system, the closer the responsibility of developing programs

¹Eikenberry, op. cit., p. 208.
is to the superintendent of schools. As the systems increase in size, this responsibility becomes more remote to the superintendent and more directly responsible to the assistant superintendents—usually in the department of curriculum and instruction.

The large school systems, as defined in this study, actually have near-autonomous departments working in this new area of federal program development. Staffs of people functioned in these departments.

As the systems increase in size, the more specialized becomes the titles of the positions. Small systems relegate the federal programming duties to already established positions, i.e., assistant superintendents, whereas the medium and large systems have specifically skilled personnel to handle these chores.

Local program developers organizationally function in a staff capacity, being either responsible to the superintendent or assistant superintendent, depending on school system size.

Changing the organizational structure.—There was a perceptual disagreement in school systems concerning organizational change for utilizing the services of LPD's. Superintendents view change as somewhat more important than do other groups; logically they should know of definite changes more readily than other personnel. These perceptual differences may be attributed to the definition of change, change
to some personnel could merely mean an addition to the staff.

The trend in organizational transition for utilizing LPD's, as pointed out in this study, is that the larger the system, the more change occurred. Change presented itself in (1) formations of new appendages, (2) special appointed personnel responsible to the superintendents, (3) additions to already established departments, and (4) special persons assigned to the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction.

The adequacy of present administrative organization in relation to the services rendered by the LPD's was rated very effective, to the 80.0 percent level.

Those personnel viewing their systems as inadequate, recommended two major modes of change to improve the present structures: (1) creating a special department for federal program development and (2) assigning the LPD's directly to the assistant superintendents in charge of curriculum and instruction. The systems perceived as adequate already practiced these recommended functional changes.

LPD's, viewing themselves slightly lower in adequacy, recommended that more time be allotted to their duty areas, that the position of local program development for federal assistance was a full-time job and should be regarded as such.
The effectiveness of newly appointed personnel in carrying out responsibility for federally assisted programs was rated near the 75.0 percent level, showing definite agreement with the adequacy of the administrative structure. Perhaps those respondents viewing the LPD's as ineffective were plagued with extraneous duties and limited time allocations, preventing the LPD's from being more effective; again this refers back to the position of local program development being a full-time job. Those personnel indicating adequacy and effectiveness undoubtedly had the time and the freedom to work with federally assisted programs.

Category II: The background of local program developers

System appointments.—Local program developers were overwhelming selected from within the school systems (92.0 percent or 23 of 25). The majority of the appointees were recruited from the principalship (14 of 25), although 5 were appointed from the curriculum and instruction supervisory staff. In either case these personnel are directly involved in working with numbers of people—and in a supervisory capacity. This may allow for the high ratings of adequacy and effectiveness that were received by the LPD's.

Formal training and experience of the LPD's.—Of the appointed personnel to this position, 96.0 percent (24 of 25) had at least a master's degree, and 68.0 percent (17) had worked beyond a masters. It may be pointed out that the
former positions of these people demanded the master's degree as academic preparation.

A high majority of the LPD's (19 of 25) had five or more years in the classroom and as much time in the principalship (Mn=years = 5.50).

A profile of the LPD describes the position as having personnel appointed from within the system, with advanced academic training, considerable time in the classroom, and additional time as an administrator. These factors undoubtedly contribute to the effectiveness of the position as well as contribute to the adequacy of organizational functioning of the LPD's.

Inservice training programs.—The data indicated that 18 of the 25 LPD's had flexible schedules (released time) for attending training sessions. The training programs that were available to them and considered to be the greatest value, are as follows (ranked in order of importance):

1. Visitation to other school systems in Ohio
2. Workshops provided by the state office of education
3. Seminars provided by colleges and universities
4. University and/or college personnel brought in to provide information and consultation services.

It was noted that national curriculum conferences (ASCD) and visitations to school systems in other states were of limited value to Ohio LPD's.
It was indicated (50.0 percent) that FPD's felt that their involvement in planning and designing these programs would promote program improvement. Although limited in response, it was indicated that some specific guidelines should evolve from the present programs to enhance the quality and development of future inservice training.

Category III: Duties and problems of local program developers

Duties of the local program developers.—Based on a three-point scale, the eight most important ideal functions of the federal program developers are: (1) liaison between school, state, and federal offices, (2) coordinator of all federal programs, (3) a proposal writer, (4) a program designer, (5) a budgetary planner, (6) collector and disseminator of information, (7) identifier of needs, and (8) innovator.

As the consensus indicated, the first six of these items were considered the most important practiced duties of the LPD's. These six areas were also identified as the factors commanding the greatest time and effort on the part of the local program developers.

Large school systems generally perceived these items of slightly lesser importance. This perhaps can be attributed to the fact that large systems have developed more sophisticated techniques with specifically assigned personnel to handle the tasks of program development.
The ideal and practiced role of the LPD's after projects have been federally funded are: (1) evaluate programs as part of the team, (2) supervise programs as part of a team, (3) chart the phases of programs, and (4) aid in choosing program coordinators.

Definite agreement exists when comparing the ideal role and the functional role of LPD's. This is further verified when viewing the effectiveness of program implementation; nearly 70 percent of the respondents indicated that the present implementational procedures were effective. This also relates to previous conclusions, that the organizational structure was certainly viewed as adequate (80.0 percent level) and that LPD's were effective in their newly appointed position (75.0 percent level).

The team-approach philosophy is apparent throughout these items, which again manifests reasons for a high degree of organizational effectiveness. It seems to be evident that much of the groundwork has been laid for developing guidelines for local program development of federally assisted programs, although the chore of formulating these guidelines still exist.

Problem areas of the local program developers.---Based on a four-point scale, nine moderate problem areas were identified by the sample. These areas are (1) time consuming paperwork, (2) adequate facilities for programs, (3) scheduling activities, (4) time factors relative to other
activities, (5) planning and designing programs, (6) budgeting projects, (7) writing proposals, (8) evaluating existing programs, and (9) gathering supporting data for programs. These problem areas can generally be classified into two groups: (1) administrative problem areas and (2) research techniques.

Limited significant differences at the .05 confidence level appeared in the sample groups. None of the groups scaled these nine items out of the range of moderately important.

Superintendents stressed the availability of professional staff as a problem area. Superintendents are charged with the responsibility of staff selection and appointments; consequently this area is a natural concern for the chief administrator.

Large school systems expressed belief that communication with school staff, and communication with lay citizens groups were moderate problems. The size of a metropolitan area school alone lends itself to these kinds of problems. The central offices of Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Dayton city schools can be said to have near-autonomous departments within their structures.
Category IV: Preservice and Inservice training needs of local program developers

Important preparational experiences of the local program developers.—The four major experiences deemed important for the position of local program developer by the respondents are (1) classroom teacher, (2) supervisor of curriculum and instruction, (3) elementary principal, and (4) secondary principal. It may be noted that these positions afford basic school business understanding (classroom teacher) and basic supervisory and administrative experience.

The assistant superintendency of central office staff, assistant principal, and guidance counselor, were areas considered as moderately important experiences for the LPD position. Totally, all of these areas afford a basic cross-section of experiences for understanding school business.

Considerations for inservice training programs.—The weight of opinion was that subject matter for local program developer training programs should include (1) content based on research methods, (2) content based on individual school problems, (3) content based on curriculum and instructional theory, and (4) content based on personnel practices and behavior.

It is interesting to note that these subject matter areas link closely with the identified problem areas. It
can be visualized that these content areas may very well center around the problems of the local program developers.

Content based on research methods may be relegated to planning and designing programs, writing proposals, evaluating existing programs, and gathering supporting data for programs.

Content based on curriculum and instructional theory may focus on the problems of adequate facilities for programs, planning and designing programs, and evaluating existing programs. The two latter areas display an overlap or related quality with content based on research methods.

Content based on personnel practices and behavior, may focus on the problems of time consuming paper-work, scheduling activities, and time factors in relation to other activities. This entire content area centers around the efficiency of time utilization.

Content based on the individual problems of school systems may be directed toward budgeting projects or any issue confronting federal program development peculiar to given school districts.

In viewing the possible instructional personnel for LPD training programs, it was strongly perceived that a combination of four sources was recommended. These sources are (1) informed personnel from within the systems, (2) personnel from the state office of education, (3) personnel from the U.S.O.E., and (4) qualified university personnel.
In the first source, implications of LPD involvement in their programs is evident; this was stressed earlier in the chapter.

Consensus showed that the locations of these training programs should be at some central point in order to maximize the number of school systems to benefit from them.

The two most desirable time allocations for LPD training programs, as pointed out by the respondents, are (1) short-term courses meeting 4 to 6 weeks and (2) one graduate quarter.

The three meeting times most recommended by the sample were (1) released time from school, (2) summer sessions, and (3) after school and evenings. Released time from school represented the most preferred meeting time, whereas after school and evenings actually scaled as marginal.

The sample opinion indicated that the financial sponsorship of these LPD training programs should be the responsibility of (1) the United States Office of Education, (2) the state office of education, and (3) individual school systems. The funding of programs by the participants received strong opposition.

It was indicated that the most desired mode of finance was the U.S.O.E., which logically shows feasibility. The National Science Foundation (NSF) funded training programs for the physical and biological science teachers when
the federally assisted science courses became part of the public high school curriculum. NDEA grants have also focused on training personnel for educational purposes. Allocations for LPD preservice and inservice training programs could budgetarily be designed for given geographical and demographical areas.

Training programs for graduate credit.—At this point, it is questionable that LPD training programs warrant graduate credit, although nearly 50 percent of the sample felt in favor of such credit. Certainly, graduate courses do focus on some of the previously identified content areas, e.g., research methods, curriculum and instruction guidelines, and personnel practices and behavior, but some special focus may be directed toward some of the new impinging forces on these areas.

It was generally felt (51.9 percent) that the area of federal assistance to public schools has not yet reached the level of warranting a specific field of study at the graduate level. Superintendents very strongly expressed the lack of this need. This opinion may have resulted from the remoteness of medium and large system superintendents from the local program developers. It also could be attributed to the limited involvement of the small systems in federally assisted programs.

University involvement in federal program developers training programs.—Over 80 percent of the respondents
indicated that a master's degree or higher was necessary for the position of local program developer. This high percentage reflects the academic preparation of the present LPD's.

Although it was previously pointed out that a specific field of study was not needed at the graduate level, there is concern (55.0 percent of the responses) for an academic structure at the graduate school level dealing with the problems of LPD's. This perhaps could take the form of a curriculum advisory committee used to reflect some of the needs in the already established course areas.

A near 90 percent response expressed that the colleges and universities in Ohio are not meeting the training needs of LPD's. Nearly the same response reflected the belief that similar institutions outside of Ohio were also falling short in meeting these training needs.

Over three-fourths of the sample indicated that the most important graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining competencies of local program developers are (1) research methods with emphasis on designing and writing proposals, (2) communications with school staff, lay citizen groups, community agencies, state and federal offices, (3) organizational structure and administrative procedures concerning federal assistance, and (4) the social order. Referring back to considerations for inservice training programs in regards to content areas, a definite relationship
is evident. Briefly those areas were (a) content based on research methods, (b) content based on individual school system problems, (c) content based on curriculum and instructional theory, and (d) content based on personnel practices and behavior.

Items 2 and 4, communication with school staff, lay citizen groups, community agencies, state and federal offices, and the social order, could easily be included in the content area based on individual school problems. Items 1 and 3 are obviously related to the past-cited content areas.

The future of federal funds for education.—An 80.0 percent agreement in response indicated that the need for federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools is on the increase. This indicates to the researcher that the function of federal program development at the school system level is also going to be accelerated.

In this particular study, supervisors/coordinators and principals show little variation from the median response.

When a significant difference is shown, assistant superintendents and LPD's are more likely to agree in perception. This may be attributed to the fact the LPD's and assistant superintendents are closest to the problem areas.

Large systems indicated more perceptual difference than any other group and generally viewed the situations
with less importance. These systems are better equipped to deal with the problem of federal assistance.

Superintendents showed the second greatest number of significant differences, viewing their responses with greater importance. Because of the limited significant differences found within these sample groups (54 of 128), it is the assumption of the researcher that school administrators have common basic concepts concerning federal program development for their school system.

General Recommendations

It was pointed out in the study that the need for federal assistance to education is on the increase. This indicated to the researcher that the function of local program development for federally assistance is also going to be accelerated. If this assumption is true, LPD training programs have definite merit; these conclusions and recommendations can afford a basis for guidelines for such program. The following premises and recommendations are based on the conclusions of the study:

1. Regardless of the size and wealth of school systems, the personnel coordinating the activities for federal assistance should be skilled to the level of obtaining the maximum aid for those districts. It is recommended that adequate preservice and inservice training programs be designed to prepare and maintain the competencies of local program developers.
2. School systems with more than 12,000 pupils are reaching a ratio point where specific staff are assigned the duties of coordinating federal assistance programs. It is also noteworthy to remember that these duties are time consuming. In order to fully realize the advantages of federal aid, these responsibilities should be relegated to a full-time staff person whose primary duties are federal program development.

3. Effectiveness and organizational adequacy of the local program developers are based on freedom from extraneous duties and mobility within the structure. Federal program development in medium school systems (and larger) is a full-time job and should be regarded as such. It is recommended that LPD's, in districts of more than 12,000 pupils, be freed of extraneous duties in order to direct their full energies to program development. It is also recommended that organizational freedom be explored so that supporting data and resources are available for program development.

4. Personnel appointed from within the school system, possessing a master's degree or higher, having several years in the classroom, and having several years experience as an administrator have proven to be effective program developers. It is recommended that these criteria be considered in the selection of future LPD's.

5. Visitations to other school systems in Ohio, workshops provided by the state office of education,
seminars by colleges and universities, and university personnel brought in to provide information and consultation services are considered to be valuable inservice training programs. It is recommended that these areas be continued as training methods for LPD's and be further explored and developed.

6. It has been found that the ideal and the practical duties of the local program developers show very close agreement. These duties are (1) liaison between school, state, and federal offices, (2) coordinator of all federally funded programs, (3) a proposal writer, (4) a program designer, (5) a budgetary planner, and (6) a collector and disseminator of information. Effectiveness of the LPD's in their present role has been considered very high (above the 75.0 percent level). This leads the researcher to assume that these identified duties, ideal and practiced, formulate a compatible work situation for the LPD's. It is recommended that these six items be used as a nucleus to structure job descriptions for local program developers. This recommendation is especially important to systems that are newly creating a federal assistance department or to systems experiencing job identification problems for local program developers.

7. After the programs have been federally funded, opinion indicated that the ideal and practiced roles of the LPD's are to (1) evaluate programs as part of a team,
(2) supervise programs as part of a team, (3) chart the phases of the programs, and (4) aid in choosing a program coordinator. Based on the high rating of job effectiveness, as previously cited, it is recommended that these duties be recognized as a pattern of action for local program developers. The data also indicated that LPD's want to remain involved in the funded programs. These functions definitely afford avenues of creative involvement. These factors should also be included as basic job description.

8. The identified problem areas of local program developers generally fell into two groups: (1) administrative problems and (2) research techniques. Opinion also suggested that graduate training courses focus on these two areas, as well as materials based on contemporary social problems. It is recommended that graduate schools consider these contemporary problem areas and thereby structure a segment of the curriculum to meet these needs.

9. The opinion of the respondents indicated that the subject matter areas for LPD preservice and inservice training should focus on (1) research methods, (2) curriculum and instructional theory, (3) personnel practices and behavior, and (4) individual school system problems as they pertain to federal assistance. It is recommended that these subject matter areas be used as a nucleus for local program developers' preservice and inservice training programs.
10. It was indicated by the respondents that the instructional personnel for local program developer training programs should be composed of qualified people from (1) the school systems, (2) the state office of education, (3) the United States Office of Education (U.S.O.E.), and (4) university personnel. It is recommended that qualified people be recruited from these areas as instructional personnel for programs; their duties would include speaking, acting as workshop designers, serving as seminar chairmen, and performing any other professional function conducive to successful training programs. It is also recommended that these programs be designed, coordinated, and administered by local programs developers.

11. The research indicated that the geographical location for these training programs should be based on accessibility. Meeting at some central point—university, college, hotel, etc.—would maximize the benefit to a greater number of school systems.

12. The weight of opinion illustrated that the most desired durations for these training programs were (1) short-term courses meeting 4-6 weeks and (2) one graduate quarter. It is recommended that these time allocations be given first consideration.

13. The respondents indicated that (1) released time from school, (2) summer sessions, and (3) after school and evenings were the preferred meeting times for training
programs. Released time from school was most desired. It is recommended that these time blocks be given consideration, as meeting times for local program developer training programs, with preference shown to released time from school.

14. Financial sponsorship for many training programs concerning public education has been practiced by the federal government, through the National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Defense Education Act (NDEA) grants. It is recommended that the possibility of federal funding for local program developer training programs be explored. These expenses could be budgeted in the funded programs to the schools.

15. Although federal assistance to education has not reached the level to warrant specific fields of study, there is a need for a structure at the graduate school level to deal with the subject areas of local program developers. It is recommended that an advisory committee be formed, composed of university personnel and local program developers in the field, to reflect the new needs to the already established course areas. This would allow the colleges and universities to become more effective in this curriculum area. (It was previously reflected that colleges and universities were inadequate in this capacity.)

16. It was pointed out in the study that the need for federal assistance to education is on the increase. This
indicates that federal program development and the number of personnel involved in this development will increase. It may prove highly beneficial for LPD's to have an association in the National Education Association (NEA) or become a subsidiary of an already established association such as the American Association of School Administrators or the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. This would afford a communication system to keep the school districts abreast of movements, innovations, problems, and progress, allowing for a more effective way to share information, facilitate progress, and minimize wasted effort, the end result being sophistication to the area of federal program development.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

1. Because of finance, time, and the breadth of the problem, this study was limited to surveying the duties, problems, and training needs of local program developers in 30 Ohio city school systems, with community populations of 25,000 or greater. Ohio has over 800 city, county, and exempted village school systems. This study has only sampled the opinions of an organizationally select group—the city school systems. County systems that perform services to local systems may very well view duties and problems differently. If this is the case, then certainly the training programs for LPD's (if needed) would change their foci. A comparative study of county and city systems in
reference to the duties and problems concerning federal program development may afford a more substantial basis for developing future guidelines for the personnel involved in federally assisted programs. It may prove interesting as well as beneficial to survey these same areas in the exempted village school systems.

2. Study of thirty school systems and their staff involved in federal program development does not allow for a substantial statistical analysis by personnel groups within system size; the numbers are too small to adequately test. This study could be increased in sample size to the point of comparing the responses of superintendents of small systems to superintendents of medium systems, etc. This would afford a statistical comparison of perceptions by personnel groups according to school system size.

3. Although there are many commonalities in school systems throughout the United States, the demographical differences present problems peculiar to geographical areas in order to compare the duties, problems, and training needs of local developers of federally assisted programs.

4. The research indicated that part of the functional role of the local program developer should be to evaluate and supervise programs as part of a team. The composition, duties, and evaluative criteria of such a team merits study. Since this topic is supervisory in nature, the study may focus on the changing trends in school supervision.
5. The principalship proved to be an important training ground for local program developers. It is also common knowledge that superintendents draw heavily on the principalship for central office promotions. The identification of key experiences in this task area, which enhances the success of school administrators, warrants study.
APPENDIX A
Dear

Under the guidance of Dr. Alexander Frazier, Professor of Education I am undertaking a dissertation which solicits your cooperation. I have selected your district along with thirty-nine (39) other city school systems in Ohio to comprise the study sample.

The purpose of this study is to identify the duties, problems, and training needs of the personnel assigned the task of coordinating the activities necessary to receive federal assistance for educational programs. Through this identification, it is intended that a set of guidelines be developed for more effectively utilizing such personnel.

The instruments of the study will be structured questionnaires. Depending on the size of the school system and the availability of the positions in the system, the questionnaires would, upon your approval, be administered to the following people:

1) the superintendent of each city school system
2) the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction
3) elementary and secondary school principals involved in federally assisted programs
4) supervisors of curriculum and instruction involved in federally assisted programs
5) title coordinators in large metropolitan city school systems. In schools systems having limited programs, the program coordinators of individual programs will fill out the questionnaires.
6) the federal program developer (FPD)—a person specifically assigned the task of coordinating the activities necessary to receive federal assistance for educational programs.
The total assistance I need from you in this project is:

1) consent to consult with the aforementioned staff in your system.

2) completion of your enclosed questionnaires and return in the stamped envelope. (Upon approval of the project, the superintendent is to complete both the superintendent's report form and the form titled, Duties-Problems-Training needs of the Federal Program Developers. The two-page data form for the FPD is enclosed for your scrutiny only. These questionnaires represent all of the instruments to be used in the study.)

You may be assured that the information which is provided by your district will be kept in confidence and that your district will not be specifically identified with any information presented in the study.

I certainly realize the importance of 15 minutes in a superintendent's day, but I will reciprocate by making the results of the study available to you in abstract form, hoping that the implications may have importance to your system.

Your return of the questionnaires as promptly as possible would be greatly appreciated. This will allow the data to be collected before the termination of the school year, avoiding the annual rush on administrative duties. It, too, will allow the results to be forwarded to you at an earlier time. Thank you for your attention and support.

Very truly yours,

James L. Jesse
Program Coordinator

JLS:ea
Dear

Several weeks ago a letter and questionnaire packet were sent to your office soliciting cooperation on a dissertation. Although the responses have been generally good, I feel that the timing may have been poor since the American Association of School Administrator's convention met the week following the initial mailing.

Enclosed is a copy of the first letter and the materials sent to forty (40) city schools which gives account of the purposes and procedures of the study.

Thank you for your attention and support.

Very truly yours,

James L. Jesse
Program Coordinator

JLJ/ea
Enc.
INITIAL LETTER TO SELECTED PARTICIPANTS

Under the guidance of Doctors Alexander Frazier, Paul Klohr, and Frederick Staub, Professors of Education, I am undertaking a dissertation which solicits your help. This study involves forty (40) Ohio city school systems.

The purpose of this study is to identify the duties, problems, and training needs of the personnel assigned the task of coordinating the activities necessary to receive federal assistance for educational programs. Through this identification, it is intended that a set of guidelines be developed for more effectively utilizing such personnel.

The primary instrument of the study, titled, Duties-Problems-Training Needs of the Federal Program Developers, will be administered to all participants on the project. This instrument, designed in check-list form, should require less than fifteen (15) minutes of your time. Only the Federal Programs Developer (FPD), will have an additional short questionnaire.

You may be assured that the information which is provided by your office will be kept in confidence and that your district will not be specifically identified with any information presented in the study.

I certainly realize the importance of fifteen (15) minutes in a schoolman's day, but I will reciprocate by making the results of the study available to your system in abstract form, hoping that the implications may have importance to your system.

Your return of the questionnaire as promptly as possible, in the enclosed-stamped envelope, would be greatly appreciated. This will allow the data to be collected before the termination of the school year, avoiding the annual rush on administrative duties. It, too, will allow the results to be forwarded to your system at an earlier time. Thank you for your attention and support.

Very truly yours,

James L. Jesse
Program Coordinator

Enc.
FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO SELECTED PARTICIPANTS

Your superintendent has granted permission to use the school system as a data source for a dissertation.

The purpose of this study is to identify the duties, problems, and training needs of the personnel assigned the task of coordinating the activities necessary to receive federal assistance for educational programs. Through this identification, it is intended that a set of guidelines be developed for more effectively utilizing such personnel.

The primary instrument of the study, titled, Duties-Problems-Training Needs of the Federal Program Developers, will be administered to all participants of the project. This instrument, designed in check-list form, should require less than ten (10) minutes of your time. Only the Federal Programs Developer (FPD), will have an additional short questionnaire.

You may be assured that the information which is provided by your office will be kept in confidence and that your district will not be specifically identified with any information presented in the study.

I certainly realize the importance of ten (10) minutes in a schoolman's day, but I will reciprocate by making the results of the study available to your system in abstract form, hoping that the implications may have importance to your system.

Your return of the questionnaire as promptly as possible, in the enclosed-stamped envelope, would be greatly appreciated. This will allow the data to be collected before the termination of the school year, avoiding the annual rush on administrative duties. It, too, will allow the results to be forwarded to your system at an earlier time. Thank you for your attention and support.

Very truly yours,

James L. Jesse
Program Coordinator

JLJ:ea
Enc.
PERSONAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

An Open-Ended Semi-Structured Questionnaire

I. Do you feel that the area of federal assistance to public schools has evolved to the point of having specific personnel for planning and designing programs?

II. Do you feel that the degree of involvement differs in the socio-economic makeup of the system? In the size? In the location? In the wealth of the system?

III. Do you feel that there is a need for preservice and inservice training programs for these people involved in the coordination of federal assistance programs?

IV. What would you consider the greatest problem areas to federal program development?

V. What would you perceive the duties of a federal program developer to be?

VI. How do you perceive the administrative placement of these personnel?

VII. Do you feel that this area of federal assistance (coordinating the activities for approved programs) is in need of study?

VIII. What would you consider as study areas for such a project?
NOTE: This report is to be completed only by the superintendent of schools.

With this one-page report form, is a questionnaire, titled, Duties, Problems, and Training Needs of Federal Program Developers, to be administered to all participants of the study.

For the purpose of common definition, the title of Federal Programs Developer (FPD) will be used to identify the person delegated the responsibility of coordinating the activities necessary to receive federal assistance for approved programs—whether it be the assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction, or a designated classroom teacher, either full or part time.

Complete the following questions by checking ( ) or filling in the appropriate answer or answers to each item.

1. Name ___________________________ School District __________________________

2. Average Daily Membership of the district as of October 1, 1967 ______________

3. Years of service in the district as superintendent __________________________

4. Briefly diagram the line and staff placement of the Federal Programs Developer. (You may use an already available line and staff chart.) INCLUDE: (a) the department in which the FPD is now working, and (b) the person to whom the FPD is directly responsible.

5. Fill in the names and school addresses of the following people as they may exist in your system: (Because of the number of people involved in federal programs in large metropolitan area schools, e.g., Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, etc., it may be easier for the secretary to list the names and positions of the personnel on a separate sheet.)

   1) elementary and secondary school principals involved in federally assisted programs

   2) supervisors of curriculum and instruction involved in federally assisted programs

   3) Title coordinators (large metropolitan city school systems). Smaller school systems list the individual program coordinators

   4) the Federal Programs Developer (FPD)—the person delegated the task of coordinating the activities necessary to receive federal assistance for approved programs. In some school districts, he may be known as the Federal Programs Coordinator.

_____________________________________________________________________

Superintendent's signature
FEDERAL PROGRAM DEVELOPER'S REPORT FORM

NOTE: This report form is only to be completed by the Federal Programs Developer (FPD) - the individual assigned the task of coordinating the activities necessary to receive federal assistance for approved programs.

With this report form is a questionnaire, titled, Duties, Problems and Training Needs, designed to be administered to all participants of the study. BE SURE TO COMPLETE BOTH FORMS!

Complete the following questions by checking (√) or filling in the appropriate answer or answers to each item.

1. Name _____________________________ School District __________________

2. Is the present organizational arrangement for utilizing the services of the FPD satisfactory?
   0) __ Yes  1) __ No  2) __ Undecided

3. If the answer to No. 2 is "No", what would you propose to improve the situation? Explain __________________________________________________________

4. How many ESEA projects is your district actively pursuing?
   0) ___ Title I  1) ___ Title II  2) ___ Title III

5. How many ESEA projects have been phased-out in your district since the 1965 enactment?
   0) ___ Title I  1) ___ Title II  2) ___ Title III

6. Were you promoted from within the system?  0) __ Yes  1) __ No

7. If the answer to No. 6 is "Yes", from what service were you promoted?
   0) ___ classroom teacher  5) ___ supervisor of curriculum and
   1) ___ guidance counselor  instruction
   2) ___ elementary principal  6) ___ visiting teacher and/or attendance officer
   3) ___ secondary principal  7) ___ other (specify)
   4) ___ assistant principal

8. Number of years of service within the system:
   0) ___ 1-3  1) ___ 4-6  2) ___ 7-9  3) ___ 10 or more
9. Your highest educational level:

0) ___ bachelor's degree 1) ___ Bachelor's + 2) ___ Master's degree
3) ___ master's + 4) ___ doctorate

10. Number of years your primary professional responsibility has been in each of the following areas:

0) ___ classroom teacher 1) ___ elementary school principal
2) ___ secondary school principal 3) ___ guidance counselor
4) ___ assistant principal 5) ___ visiting teacher/attendance officer
6) ___ supervisor of curriculum/instruction
7) ___ assistant superintendent, central office staff

11. Does your present working schedule allow you to take advantage of the available in-service training opportunities?

0) ___ Yes 1) ___ No 2) ___ Don't know

12. Which of the following in-service training practices are available to you? (Check all items that pertain to your situation.)

0) ___ visitations to other school systems in the state
1) ___ visitations to school systems in other states
2) ___ seminars provided by the local college or university
3) ___ workshops provided by the state office
4) ___ university personnel invited to your system to provide information services
5) ___ other (specify) _____________________________________________________

13. From No. 12, list three (3) factors that you feel are of greatest benefit to in-service training? (Use the numbers of the items.)

0) ___ 1) ___ 2) ___

14. If improvement is needed in the in-service training function, how would you, as the FPD, improve it? Explain ____________________________________________
Complete the following questions by checking ( ) or filling in the appropriate answer or answers to each item.

NOTE: The initials "FPD" will be used in the place of the title, Federal Programs Developer—the individual delegated the responsibility of coordinating the activities necessary to receive federal assistance for approved programs. In some areas, he may be commonly known as the Federal Programs Coordinator.

1. Name ___________________________ School District ________________________

2. Position ________________________________________________________________

3. Length of service of your present position in the district _____________________________

4. Was it necessary to change the organizational structure in order to utilize personnel to coordinate the activities involved in federally assisted programs?
   0) __yes  1) __No  2) __Undecided

5. If the answer to No. 4 is "Yes," was the change—
   0) __an addition to an already established department
   1) __a formation of a totally new appendage to the organization, e.g.,—the department of special services, or the department of special programs
   2) __manifested in a special person working independently, responsible to the superintendent.
   3) __manifested in a special person working independently, responsible to the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction
   4) __manifested in a special person working independently, responsible to the director of pupil personnel.
   5) __other (specify) ____________________________

6. Is the present organizational structure for utilizing the services of the FPD—
   0) __highly adequate 1) __adequate  2) __inadequate  3) __undecided

7. If the answer to No. 6 is less than highly adequate, what would you propose to improve the function of the FPD?
0) assign him to be directly responsible to the superintendent
1) assign him to be directly responsible to the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction
2) assign him to the department of pupil personnel
3) create a special department for this service
4) other (specify)

8. Was the FPD in your system reasonably effective in his new job role in a relatively short period of time (3 months) after his appointment?

0) Yes 1) No 2) Moderately so 3) Undecided

9. Below are listed possible educational experiences that you may deem important to prepare a person for the position of Federal Programs Developer (FPD). Score these areas as you view them by placing the number in the space provided, using the following scale:

1. definitely important--needs this experience to function
2. moderately important--but can gain these insights on the job
3. unimportant for the position

0) classroom teacher
1) guidance counselor
2) supervisor of curriculum and instruction
3) visiting teacher and/or attendance officer
4) social worker and/or school nurse
5) elementary school principal
6) secondary school principal
7) assistant principal
8) cadet principal
9) assistant superintendent--central office staff
10) other (specify)

10. From the list in No. 9 (above), which three (3) items do you feel command the greatest importance for preparation for the position of FPD? (Use the number of the item.

0) 1) 2)

11. Below are listed possible duties of FPD in various school systems. As you view the position, what do you see as the duties of the FPD? Score these areas by placing the number in the space provided, using the following scale:
1. an important function of the position
2. a function, but a lesser function
3. not a function

0) a proposal writer
1) a program designer
2) an innovator
3) a collector and disseminator of information
4) an identifier of needs
5) a budgetary planner for programs
6) a coordinator of all federally assisted programs
7) an advisor to curriculum planners
8) an evaluator of programs
9) a supervisor of programs
10) a liaison between the school system and the State and Federal offices
11) Other (specify)

12. In your school system, what are the duties of the FPD? (Check as many items as are appropriate to answer question.)

0) proposal writer
1) program designer
2) innovator
3) collector and disseminator of information about federal assistance
4) identifier of needs for program
5) a budgetary planner for programs
6) coordinator of all federally assisted programs
7) advisor to curriculum planners
8) evaluator of programs
9) supervisor of programs
10) a liaison between the school system and the State and Federal offices
11) Other (specify)

13. From the list in No. 12 (above), which three (3) items do you feel command the greatest amount of effort and time? (Use the number of the item.)

0) 1) 2)

14. Below are listed possible problem areas in planning and designing programs for federal approval and financial aid. If the listed problem area is represented in your district, place a number in the space provided, using the following scale:

1. a serious problem
2. a moderate problem
3. a slight problem
4. unimportant as a problem
0) __ planning and designing programs (basic research methods)
1) __ writing proposals
2) __ gathering supporting data for designing programs
3) __ meeting and communicating with lay citizen groups
4) __ availability of the professional staff for planning and consultation
5) __ communicating with staff through line and staff structure
6) __ time factor in relationship to other activities
7) __ scheduling activities to meet deadlines
8) __ time consuming paper-work involved in having programs approved
9) __ adequate facilities for additional programs
10) __ project budgets
11) __ evaluating existing programs
12) __ implementing programs after approved for federal assistance
13) __ availability of State of Ohio and USOE Guidelines
14) __ communicating with State and Federal offices
15) __ consultation services (assistance) from the state level
16) __ knowledge of social and community structures
17) __ advising the supervisors and curriculum planners
18) __ other (specify) ________________________________

15. In view of your responses to No. 14, what training recommendations would you make? Using the following scale, answer questions A through F, placing the number in the space provided:

1. Highly recommended
2. Recommended
3. Not recommended

A. What would be the training program subject matter?

0) __ subject matter constructed on individual problem
1) __ subject matter generally based on research methods
2) __ subject matter based on personnel practices and behavior
3) __ subject matter based on curriculum theory and construction
4) __ subject matter based on all four of these points
5) __ other (specify) ________________________________
B. Who would teach the training programs?

0) university or college personnel which have served as consultants in the areas
1) someone within the system that has gone to state and federal offices to study the problems (sent by system)
2) someone from the state office that is sophisticated in the problem areas
3) someone from the USOE that has expertise in the areas
4) combination of these people
5) other (specify)

C. Where would these training programs be conducted?

0) at the nearest university or college
1) in the individual school system
2) some central point so that more than one school may benefit from the information
3) other (specify)

D. How long should these training programs be?

0) one graduate quarter, meeting once a week
1) a short-term course (5-6 weeks), meeting once a week
2) a "crash" program, meeting 2 or 3 times for an overview
3) two graduate quarters, meeting once a week
4) other (specify)

E. When should these training programs meet?

0) after school or evenings
1) Saturdays
2) release time from school
3) summer sessions
4) meet periodically in short-term (5-6 weeks) courses
5) meet periodically in "crash" programs (2 or 3 times)
6) other (specify)

F. The training programs should be financially sponsored by:

0) participants
1) school system of the participants
2) state office of education
3) USOE
4) other (specify)
16. Should these training programs be designed to award graduate credit?
   9) ___ Yes  1) ___ No  2) ___ Undecided

17. Does the college or university in your geographical area offer courses that aid in the meeting of the immediate needs of the position of FPD?
   0) ___ Yes  1) ___ No  2) ___ Undecided

18. Are other colleges and universities in Ohio meeting these needs?
   0) ___ Yes  1) ___ No  2) ___ Undecided

19. Is there a need for an academic structure at the graduate school level to prepare and maintain people for the position of FPD?
   0) ___ Yes  1) ___ No  2) ___ Undecided

20. Academically, what do you feel is the highest degree necessary to adequately fulfill the position of FPD?
   0) __ bachelor's degree  3) __ master's +
   1) __ bachelor's +  4) __ doctorate
   2) __ master's degree

21. Will federal assistance to educational programs grow in impetus, and become an imperative element in financing elementary and secondary schools?
   0) ___ Yes  1) ___ No  2) ___ Undecided

22. Is the sophistication in the area of federal assistance for educational programs developing to a point to warrant an area for a graduate degree?
   0) ___ Yes  1) ___ No  2) ___ Undecided

23. Below are listed possible graduate course areas for preparing and maintaining competencies for the position of the FPD. Serving as a consultant how would you score the following areas? (Use the available scale)

   1. highly needed as a curriculum area
   2. needed, but of a lesser nature
   3. not needed at all
0) research methods—emphasis on proposal writing and project design
1) organizational structure and administrative procedures of federal and state financial aid
2) the social order—emphasis on characteristics of social groups, social classes, the educationally deprived, and poverty
3) social psychology—emphasis on the relationship of man to his society
4) communications—working with school staff, lay groups, community agencies, community action groups, state and federal agencies
5) psychology—emphasis on behavior patterns, testing, and the implications of both factors in designing programs
6) fundamentals in curriculum development
7) concepts of what is teachable (instructional theory)
8) other (specify)

24. From the list in No. 23 (above), which three (3) of these items do you feel are of most academic importance to the position of FPD? (Use the number of the item.)

0) ___ 1) ___ 3) ___

25. After the programs have been designed and approved for federal assistance, what do you think the duties of the FPD should be? (Check all items appropriate to answer question.)

0) ___ choose a coordinator for the program
1) ___ aid in choosing a coordinator for the program
2) ___ independently supervise the program
3) ___ supervise the program as part of a team
4) ___ independently evaluate the program
5) ___ evaluate the program as part of a team
6) ___ chart the phases and progress of the program
7) ___ be no longer involved in the program
8) ___ other (specify)

26. After the programs have been designed and approved for federal assistance, the duties of the FPD in your school system are to: (answer all items that pertain to his present role.)

0) ___ choose a coordinator for the program
1) ___ aid in choosing a coordinator for the program
2) ___ independently supervise the program
3) __ supervise the program as part of a team
4) __ independently evaluate the program
5) __ evaluate the program as part of a team
6) __ charts the phases and the progress of the program
7) __ to be no longer involved in the program
8) __ other (specify) ________________________________

27. Is the present manner of implementing the program (putting it into action after approval for federal assistance) satisfactory?

9) __ Yes  1) __ No  2) __ Too early to evaluate
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