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CHAPTER I

ORIENTATION

Introduction

Advisory councils have served vocational education programs for many years, but provision for a national council was not made until the Vocational Education Act of 1963 became law. The impressive performance and impact of the first national council, through its far reaching report "The Bridge Between Man and His Work,"¹ was an important factor in influencing Congress to provide for state advisory councils by way of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

If a national advisory council is to provide an overall assessment of Vocational Education, it seemed logical that this can be done most effectively if each state were to have a council responsible for making a concerted state assessment and the combination of all state reports could then be combined to get the overall national picture. The state council should function most effectively at the state level, where its members have a personal concern for the growth and development of vocational education. It would be the personal concern for vocational education which helped them make a real meaningful contribution to vocational education as it is molded and changed to meet the needs of employees and employers.

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 included landmark legislation which provided for state advisory councils. Never before had public participation been deemed by Congress as being so vital to the progress of vocational education.

Basically, the responsibilities of the state councils are to advise, evaluate and report on their state's progress in the field of vocational-technical education. More specifically, the 1968 amendment states that the state advisory councils shall:

(1) advise the State board on the development of and policy matters arising in the administration of the State plan ... including the preparation of long-range and annual program plans . . . .

(2) evaluate vocational education programs, services and activities assisted under this title and publish and distribute the results thereof; and

(3) prepare and submit through the State board to the Commissioner and to the National Council an annual evaluation report . . . which (i) evaluates the effectiveness of vocational education programs, services and activities carried out in the year under review in meetings the program objectives set forth in the long-range program plan and the annual program plan . . . and (ii) recommends such changes in such programs, services, and activities as may be warranted by the evaluation.²

As can be seen, the charge given to the state councils is far reaching and comprises no easy task.

The 1968 amendments directed the councils to organize, define their objectives, chart a course and evaluate, all in a very short period of time. This represented a monumental task. Mr. Reginald Petty

in reviewing council evaluation reports stated that: "Poor evaluation reports could have a very damaging influence on all vocational education."

In 1970, Clary reviewed activities of state councils after their first year of operation. He says:

The Councils are new. They have a designated responsibility clearly defined by Congress unlike previous advisory councils, many of which were inactive, uninfluential, or otherwise ineffective. These new Councils have specific duties and responsibilities. They are free to act—in fact, they must act. There are funds to finance activities of the Councils. Staffs are authorized to provide professional leadership and to assist the Councils in meeting their responsibilities.

The Councils are struggling with questions of status, of identity, of role, of organization, of developing effective relationships with State Boards of Vocational Education, with State Boards staffs and with other educational and manpower agencies.

In looking to the future it is important to understand the role that Congress and State legislators have in policy making and their relationship to committees of lay citizens.

In viewing the policy making process Campbell states that:

Perhaps these federal relationships to education will have more meaning for us if we recognize that policy grows out of the basic socioeconomic forces in our society which generate movements antecedent to policy, that these movements encourage political action, and that finally these activities lead to formalization of policy by governmental agencies. This flow chart is shown in Figure 1.

---

3Reginald Petty, Central States Regional Conference Advisory Councils for Vocational Education. Nebraska Advisory Council, Lincoln, Nebraska, February 9-10, 1972, p. 3.

FIGURE 1
A FLOW CHART ON POLICY FORMATION IN EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Forces</td>
<td>Antecedent Movements</td>
<td>Political Action</td>
<td>Formal Enactment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analyzing the impact that citizen committees have on legislators prior to the subsequent action which might be taken in developing policy is cited by Mrs. Henry Tardy, Legislative Chairman of the Wisconsin League of Women Voters:

We cannot prove or even assume that legislators are influenced by what we say at hearings. Do they do what we say? Sometimes . . . sometimes not. But they do listen! We continue our efforts, knowing that we have the facts; that what we have to say needs to be said; that usually no one else appears to say it in the public interest.6

We have said several times that educational policy making at all governmental levels is immersed in politics and by definition educational policy making is political action. Schools and school problems are public matters and subject to the public will.7

As citizens of a democracy we have prided ourselves in public expressions of public interest and in the identification and promulgation of each citizen's needs, compatible with the public interest. Many advisory committees have served vocational education by providing valuable information concerned with student and community needs. Committee recommendations have directly influenced the development of educational programs, which in turn has motivated students to higher levels of achievement and improved job preparation. According

---

6Ibid., p. 397.
7Ibid., p. 440.
to Gardner:

The relationship of education to the level of motivation in the society is more direct than most people recognize. The goals the young person sets for himself are very heavily affected by the framework of expectations with which adults surround him.8

President John F. Kennedy,9 in his message to Congress on February 20, 1961, requested the secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to convene an advisory body of representatives from education, labor, industry and agriculture, as well as the lay public, to be charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating the current National Vocational Education Acts and making recommendations for improving and redirecting the program.

The advisory body was called and worked for one year in study and submitted their report. Some of the findings in the report of the panel of consultants on vocational education indicated that "substantial data" were not only a problem with their study, but had also been identified by earlier committees. This is evidenced by:

Lack of data and tangible evidence, it must be admitted, make it difficult for laymen or professionals to fully evaluate the national program of vocational education. This lamentable fact was stated by the Advisory Committee on Education in 1938; it is still true. Objectives and standards are quite valueless if, as criteria of appraisal, they cannot be compared with data that indicate whether, or how efficiently, purposes are being achieved.10

Later in the report, when the panel was suggesting areas which needed improvement, they identified research as one area needing at-

10 Ibid., p. 207.
tention and the bearing it might have on the vocational program and the fact that this problem has been known and nothing done about it.

Research of an evaluative type, which is fundamental to sound development, has been also very limited. Little or no evidence has been gathered regarding the results or effectiveness of the instruction given, and various rationalizations and excuses have been offered over the years for inadequate program statistics. In 1938, the Advisory Committee on Education strongly censured the "inadequate reporting" of the program. Obviously, this major weakness has not yet been corrected.11

Even in 1972, Congressional Committees were still investigating problems in vocational education and suggesting that extra resources and effort be allocated to improving vocational education. The March 6, 1972 report by the President's Commission on School Financing recommended that "career or vocational education be given priority and status at least equal to that now accorded college preparatory courses."12

As to the function and role of an advisory committee, it is important to understand that they are not all organized to perform the same function or to function at the same level. The American Vocational Association stresses the far-reaching effect of a council when one considers not only the direct, but indirect involvement of the committee and its members in such activities as: appearing at public hearings, influence through organizations to which the member belongs, as an effective public relations instrument, as a usable link to the local or national community, or by their influence upon legislation at national, state and local level.

11 Ibid., p. 213.
Considerable experience has been obtained in using local advisory committees in vocational education programs. In 1949, Hamlin outlined five functions of the local advisory committees on vocational education as follows:

1. Assisting with the development of curricula content.
2. Evaluating, with the assistance of professionals.
3. Studying the community situation and determining the community needs.
4. Assisting in the support of securing adequate facilities and equipment.
5. Assisting with the public relations of the program.  

The same functions that Hamlin outlined for a local committee could, in the writer's opinion, also be applied to a state or national setting. If a state council were to build its framework around those criteria they could carry out many of the mandates set by Congress and attack a number of the problems identified by Clary.

If there is any single area which demands a high priority among the activities of an advisory council it would seem to be the responsibility and task of program evaluation. This concept is supported by Rupert N. Evans when, in discussing the duties of a state advisory council, he comments:

... of these duties, clearly the one which is most likely to be significant is the annual evaluation report. This report must evaluate the effectiveness of vocational education in terms of the annual and long range program plans. Further, it will recommend changes in programs, services and activities which seem to be called for as a result of the evaluation.

It is a generally accepted guideline for program evaluation that a state advisory council must have data from all levels and areas.

of a state's vocational education program. There needs to be communication with the community to sound out attitudes of business and industry, and finally to step back and get a "birds eye view" of the total state program for vocational-technical programs.

The final directive Congress gave in regard to advisory committee's tasks was to follow up their evaluation with recommendations for change and improvement of the state program. In the writer's opinion, some states seem to only be going through the motions while other states were making real progress in evaluating, making recommendations and having those recommendations acted upon by the policy-decision makers. This is expressed by the New Jersey Council in their second annual report:

... it is significant to note that all of the Council's recommendations in its 1970 report were adopted as a part of the Division of Vocational Education's own internal evaluation of activities.

On the basis of the results of this evaluation, it has been determined that the State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, during this past year has either implemented or moved on the twelve recommendations of the 1970 Report of the New Jersey Advisory on Vocational Education.15

Most state advisory councils were organized in 1969; shortly thereafter, the services of executive directors and clerical staff were secured. After the appropriations of Federal funds for councils to carry out their activities, they started to organize their evaluation efforts to obtain necessary information to assist them in the evaluation process. However, the councils were concerned with many public

relations activities during their early years of organization to gain identity and acceptability for themselves and vocational education. Having established a public relation program, the council should now turn their efforts and resources towards the organization and establishment of an effective evaluation program.

In discussing the procedure which state advisory councils should use in their evaluation activities, Evans makes the following observation:

Data for evaluation of education generally, and of vocational and technical education in particular, are very difficult to find. There is a real danger that 50 state advisory councils will demand that these data be collected in 50 different ways. It is to be hoped that the Commissioner of Education and the National Advisory Council will impose some informity on the collection of basic data while encouraging each state to go beyond these minimum requirements to more innovative evaluation techniques.\(^{16}\)

Congress asked state and national advisory councils to see that something be done in evaluating and correcting many of the problems facing vocational education. This study will attempt to determine how and to what extent the advisory councils are evaluating vocational programs and insuring the American people that their needs and demands in this area are being met. Evaluation, however, can have harmful effects if it is done improperly. It is not appropriate, therefore, that the efforts of advisory councils to evaluate education should be within well-developed guidelines and the actions by the councils themselves be evaluated.

\(^{16}\) Evans, op. cit., p. 9.
Problem

The purpose of this study is to develop guidelines for use by state advisory councils in performing evaluation.

Objectives of Study

Objectives of the study which will provide support to the major problem are:

1. To describe the administrative relationship between state advisory councils, state boards for vocational education and state departments of vocational education—through state vocational director.

2. To identify the evaluation role as perceived by state advisory councils.

3. To identify the evaluation activities of state councils in evaluating vocational programs and the state plan for vocational education.

4. To identify and assess the evaluation plans used by state advisory councils.

5. To identify criteria used by state councils in evaluating vocational programs and state plans for vocational education.

6. To determine the extent to which advisory councils are publishing and distributing evaluation results and other information.

7. To identify the persons or agencies responsible for conducting and interpreting state council evaluation studies.

Assumptions

The following basic assumptions were accepted by the investigator as being important to the problem but are not tested in this investigation:

1. That the persons in various states who did not respond to the questionnaire would not have given responses which were significantly different from persons in those states who did respond.
2. That the opinions of state directors of vocational education are valid measures of the feeling which state departments of vocational education have for state advisory councils and their evaluation activities.

3. That the opinions expressed by state advisory council chairmen were representative of the feelings of the total committee membership.

4. Sufficient experience had been acquired by state advisory councils after almost three years of operation to report their evaluation concerns and to identify the progress they had made.

5. General guidelines for evaluation could be used in widely differing circumstances by different state advisory councils to fit their state's individual and particular situations.

Limitations

The writer recognized the following limitations in this study:

1. The state director of vocational education was the only individual from the vocational education administration staff asked to respond to a questionnaire.

2. The state advisory council chairman was the only member of the council who was asked to respond to the study.

3. All states had not secured the service of a person to function in the capacity of an executive director and of those persons who were serving had tenure in office of from one month to three years.

4. Councils had limited experience of three years or less from which to base their concerns for evaluation.

5. Data were collected through a mailed questionnaire method.

6. The findings and conclusions of this study can only be generalized to state advisory councils for vocational and technical education.

7. There was a wide variation of activities and problems identified from among the different states.
Need for Study

Evaluation by councils is legislative mandate

The 1968 vocational education amendments include a legislative mandate to state advisory councils to evaluate the vocational education plans and programs. A growing number of professional educators and laymen are becoming convinced that the school system, like other service agencies, can and should be held accountable for the results of its activities. Congress asked the council to check on the educational process; we now must check on the council to see if they have performed their assignment.

Literature lacking on council evaluation efforts

A review of the literature reveals that there is a scarcity of studies related to the state advisory councils for vocational education. Very little is written concerning the council's input into the evaluation process. Although people in education have said that one of their goals was to meet the individual student's needs and prepare him for a role in the community, there is little evidence that the community has been invited to evaluate the educational process to determine the extent to which community needs are being met.

Representatives of business and industry have gone to the consumer to determine their desire in order to provide them with the quality of product expected. Crime prevention committees are examples where law enforcement agencies have used lay committees to help relate their program more closely with the community.
Usable advisory council evaluation findings

The collection of information by the council is of little value unless it is utilized or has an impact upon the educational process. This study will attempt to identify acceptability of advisory council evaluation efforts by decision makers. The study will also review the distribution of advisory council evaluation studies, and determine persons or agencies using the evaluation material.

Advisory council personnel want help

In reviewing the first annual report submitted to the United States Office of Education by each state advisory council, Bruce Reinhart noted that there was concern from the councils as to what is meant by evaluation? How can they evaluate? Where do they get reliable, valid data? By conducting a survey of the evaluation activities of the councils, data would be available when coupled with literature research would enable us to make a recommendation as to a definition of evaluation as it applies to advisory councils and to provide information which could be used by councils in organization and interpretations of their evaluation activities.

Rupert Evans complimented Congress for recognizing the need for councils to have adequate funding and staff to carry out their responsibilities. Evans noted that a council which can devote its

---

attention to policy formation and a council staff which can concentrate on evaluation can accomplish a great deal. \(^{18}\)

The councils need help through their executive staff and others so that the results or process of evaluation are as sound and efficient as possible because many of the lay citizens on a council are very busy and involved with other activities. It is important that the council members individual knowledge and expertise be used most effectively. Well-developed guidelines would assist the council in defining its objectives and establishing parameters.

During the November 1971 semi-annual joint meeting of State/National Advisory Committees, Mr. Robert White, chairman of an Ad Hoc Committee for an Evaluation Institute, reported:

\(\ldots\) that the degree of involvement, and the actual effectiveness of each State advisory council is considerably dependent on the knowledge, capabilities and effectiveness of council and the executive director. There is a feeling of need on the part of the executive directors for in-service training, particularly in the area of evaluation as conducted by the advisory councils. Few seem thoroughly satisfied with the evaluations that have been conducted within the past two years.

**The Proposal.** It is therefore proposed that a three to four day institute be planned and carried out during the summer of 1972, but be preceded by an intensive two to three day session sufficiently early to have some effect on the 1971-72 evaluations. \(^{19}\)

The Committee report was accepted by the participants and three regional workshops were planned for February 1972, with a firm com-


Commitment for planning a mid-summer 1972 evaluation institute, which would concentrate on all facets of evaluation as it relates to the council's responsibility.

It is apparent that the councils have identified one of their problems or limitations and are searching for some help and guidance. If evaluation is to provide a measure of or give direction to the vocational activities and/or needs of the State, the analysis of activities of all States should provide recommended action which could be used most efficiently and effectively by those councils in need of evaluation guidance.

Procedure for Study

The design for the study was centered around those persons in each state who, because of their position with the state department of vocational education or state advisory council, could provide data that would be most representative of the state advisory council's evaluation role.

Population

The population involved in this study included the state advisory council in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, District of Columbia, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific, established under the provisions of the Vocational Education Amendment of 1968 to meet certification to receive Federal grants under vocational education titles.
Accessible population

Only those states who had established properly certified state advisory councils for vocational education and who met the requirements of the Act for the fiscal year 1970 and 1971 were included in the study. Fifty-two of the fifty-six states met the criteria and were solicited for data. The four states who were not included in the data collection phase were: the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and Trust Territory of the Pacific. These states that did not meet the study criteria had problems unique to themselves. Because of geographic location and stage of development of their vocational programs, the problems of these states would not have been similar to the states included in the accessible population.

Information source

The State Director of Vocational Education in each of the several states was asked to respond to a questionnaire designed specifically to solicit responses to the council's activity as viewed by the state department of vocational education. The chairman of each state advisory council was asked to respond to a questionnaire designed to attract responses to the problems and opinions which would be of most concern to the persons serving the council in that capacity. The state chairman and state director were believed to be the administrative persons in a state most aware of the evaluation activities of the council and who are responsible for the interpretation of evaluation findings for implementing changes in a state.
An executive director was functioning in all but five states at the time of this study. The directors were asked to respond to a questionnaire which dealt in more detail with operation and identification of specific functions of the council than did the questionnaires submitted to the state vocational director or council chairman. The questionnaires used with each group were composed of completely different questions, with the exception of two questions which were asked both the chairmen and executive directors. The five states which did not have an acting executive director on the council staff at the time of the study were Alaska, Connecticut, South Dakota, District of Columbia and Maine.

Data collection procedure

The instruments were mailed to the council chairman, executive director and state director in each state. The participants were asked to respond to the questionnaire and return them to the sender in an enclosed self-addressed envelope. Approximately four weeks following the mailing of the questionnaire, a follow-up post card was mailed to those persons who had not responded. A second questionnaire was mailed seven weeks after the original mailing to those persons who had not responded; and a follow-up post card mailed two weeks later to the remaining non-respondents.

Names and addresses for mailing to the state directors were obtained from the secretary of the National Association of State Directors. The names and addresses of chairmen and executive directors were obtained from the Executive Director of the National Advisory Council for Vocational and Technical Education. An individual contact
was made with each state who did not list an executive director with the national office, to determine if the position had been filled so that they could be included in the study.

When this study was first under consideration in the fall of 1970, this writer requested a copy of the first annual report from several states. In 1972 a copy of the second annual report was obtained from the twelve states who had complied with the original request. These annual reports were reviewed by the writer to identify and categorize the recommendations made. A correlation between the first and second report was made to collect information concerning acceptance, implementation and trends of recommendations as the councils grew and developed.

Description of instrument

The instrument developed by the writer was basically one of forced choice ranking and opinions. However, the executive directors were asked to list and categorize some of the activities which were of concern to the council. The questions or groups of questions were directed toward responses that would provide information related to the specific objectives of the study.

No attempt was made to determine the correlation of the responses on any questions asked any one of the three groups. An attempt was made, however, to avoid asking for the same data from more than one source within a given state.
Analysis of data

A more detailed description of the analysis process will be described in Chapter III as the analysis is presented, however, a brief summary of the analysis will be presented here.

The majority of the questions from each set of questionnaires have been summarized and results presented in terms of percentages. Percentages are based on number of returned questionnaires. When presenting summarized data, the questions have been listed in rank order, rather than sequence in which they were presented in questionnaire. The responses to open-ended questions have been categorized by the writer in the final presentation.

Definition of Terms

Council Chairman: The person selected by a given state advisory council on vocational education to serve as its presiding officer.

Executive Director: The person employed by a state advisory council to administer the activities to the council's professional staff and serve as executive secretary to the council.

SACVEs: State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education.

State: The term "state" includes, in addition to the several states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

State Advisory Council: An appointed group of lay persons to advise a governmental official or agency concerning vocational education issues in a given state, as mandated by Vocational Amendments of 1968.

State Board: An elected or appointed body responsible for administration of vocational education, or for supervision of the administration in a given state as directed by that state's laws.
State Director: The person responsible to the state board for administration of vocational education in a given state.

State Plan: The term "state plan" refers to the written continuing and long range plan for vocational education developed to meet the requirement of P.L. 90-576, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This review of literature related to state advisory councils and their evaluation role has been reported in three sections. The first section deals with advisory councils and educational evaluation. The influence which lay citizens have had on education is substantiated. Several educational evaluation systems were cited to establish a definition for evaluation. The review covered some of the evaluation contributions which lay advisory committees had made to education.

The second section was concerned with congressional legislation for the creation, organization and operation of state advisory councils. This dealt with the Vocational Educational Act of 1963 and Amendments of 1968. The reactions of people to the advisory councils activities during their early years of operation was noted.

The third section discusses the completed and current research studies concerning state advisory councils.

Advisory Councils and Educational Evaluation

Lay citizens influence education

There is a scarcity of studies related to the use of lay advisory councils for the purpose of evaluating educational programs. However, one should not conclude that educators have been uninterested in the views and opinions of lay citizens, nor would it indicate that
lay citizens have not been concerned with educational programs. The feeling that the investigator received from the review of literature dealing with education evaluation, was that educators wanted to conduct the evaluation and to use their own methods. This does not mean that educationists have all of the insight into educational evaluation, program weaknesses and possible ways for improvement.

J. D. McComas points out that lay people have valid concepts and have made a considerable impact upon educational programs.

... even a cursory review of the last two decades reveals that Rickover, Zacharias, Bruner, Conant, McNamara, and other "non Educationists" have made an impact upon American education. Initially the internal response to outside stimuli for reform is of a defensive nature. ¹

Silberman, in his book Crisis in the Classroom provides an example of the interest of "non-educationists" in educational improvement and change. He was among the first, in the seventies, to challenge professional educators in their operation of schools. It seems reasonable to assume that state advisory councils representing many segments of our society who are "non-educationists" can also make significant contributions to education. This study is to provide information and assistance to state advisory councils, so that they might conduct educational evaluations and make recommendations for the improvement of vocational education.

Definition of educational evaluation

Not only has it been difficult to identify the evaluation role of advisory committees, but also to arrive at a common definition of

educational evaluation. Evaluation has been defined in many arbitrary ways. There does not seem to be a "right" definition. Each definition has been developed from the concept or role of evaluation as it related to a particular purpose or need. The problem in this study is to apply a definition of evaluation that will best serve state advisory councils as they deal with programs of vocational education in their respective states.

Tyler noted that there was much frustration regarding evaluation when he stated:

My thesis is: The accelerating development of research in the area of educational evaluation has created a collection of concepts, facts, generalizations, and research instruments and methods that represent many inconsistencies and contradictions because new problems, new conditions, and new assumptions are introduced without reviewing the changes they create in the relevance and logic of the older structure.²

The observation of Tyler's pertained to the 1960 era. A look at the situation ten years later showed a somewhat similar situation existed. The development in educational accountability and the resultant evaluation activities in the 1960's not only created the inconsistencies and contradictions noted by Tyler, but also created conflicts in arriving at a common definition of evaluation as it applies to education. After reviewing models and concepts of scientific evaluators such as Stufflebeam, Guba, Provus, Stake, Hammond, and others, Carr concluded that the state of frustration still existed. He did not arrive at a clean-cut definition of evaluation from each of the models as the following statement indicates:

A definition in and of itself is sterile, to more fully understand the concepts used in the definitions, it is necessary to examine the characteristics of the models or schemes which have developed the definitions for use in educational evaluation. Thus, only through the establishment of meaningful interrelationships between and among definition concepts can educational evaluation be recognized as a science.

An homogenization of the definition of evaluation expressed by the models viewed by Carr did, however, lean toward the concept that evaluation is a systematic procedure designed to obtain and provide information to facilitate the decision making process.

The research in this study was not concerned with the development or application of a specific model for evaluation. However, it seemed important to review concepts of evaluation models to understand evaluation as presently viewed by scientific evaluators. Stufflebeam's concept of the CIPP evaluation model is related to implementing of a decision making process at each step in the development of a program. The rationale for the CIPP evaluation model is associated with the need for sound decision making in educational programs.

The acronym CIPP stands for content, input, process and product evaluation. Context evaluation relates to planning decisions, input evaluation relates to structuring decisions, process evaluation relates to implementing decisions, and product evaluation relates to recycling decisions.

Robert E. Stake identifies the basic characteristics or arts of evaluation as description and judgment. He takes the position that no
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evaluation has taken place until the final act of judgment has been made and a recommendation made.\textsuperscript{5}

The Pittsburgh Model for Evaluation, developed by Malcolm Provus, considers the feasibility, the implication, the effectiveness and the efficiency of a program. From these activities and concepts, evaluation in the Pittsburgh Model was designed to inform the decision maker as to what decisions need to be made and then provide information to make the decision.\textsuperscript{6}

After reviewing educational evaluation schemes or strategies, Carr developed a classification of commonalities which he viewed as having implications for the development of a program to review vocational education programs. Carr grouped those commonalities into three general areas:

A. Educational evaluation is based on:
1. A selection of specific educational program aspects for study;
2. An identification or formulation of objectives related to the aspects selected for study; and
3. A delineation of the education decision-making setting, change to be effected, and decision-making information needs related to the specific aspects selected for study within a unique educational planning and decision-making structure.

B. Educational evaluation requires:
1. A translation of educational program objectives into defined educational program variables;
2. A structure for relating educational program variables relevant to the specific aspects selected for study within the unique educational setting;


3. The establishment of relative or absolute standards or criteria as a comparative base for judgment of the educational program variables; and

4. A methodology design for obtaining, analyzing, interpreting, and providing information related to the educational program variables.

C. Educational evaluation involves:

1. The specification of the educational program setting through situational context and antecedents;

2. The study of the educational program rationale;

3. A study of the educational program inputs, the structure and transactions and interactions of the educational process, and the product performance data within the variable relating structure; and

4. The making of judgments relating to congruence or discrepancy among educational program variables, relative or absolute standards or criteria, and objectives in terms of alternative strategies. 7

This suggests that the evaluations being conducted by state departments of vocational education were based on stated objectives, by standard criteria, involving the variables associated with specific vocational programs. The advisory councils are most fortunate who have access to data and findings of a state department's evaluation. The advisory councils should take full advantage of these evaluations and use them in making their own evaluation. The state department and the council should share each others findings and avoid duplicate effort. In some cases it would be to the advantage of each if they were conducting cooperative evaluation activities. If an advisory council does not have access to data from a state department evaluation, the council should conduct or encourage such a study so that results can be included in the overall state program evaluation.

Carr, op. cit., pp. 96-97.
Evaluation contribution by lay advisory committees

Very little mention is made of personnel outside of the education profession serving on evaluation teams. In cases where lay persons were included, they were identified as being representatives from business or industry and were asked to relate to specific areas. The Rhode Island State Plan for program analysis includes "industry representative" on their evaluation team with the assignment to "advise on curriculum and facilities."  

John Strauble, in discussing aerospace educational programs, pointed out the importance of the contribution lay citizens can make to a program:

In the vocational technical field, the school system can be accountable to the learner only if it is accountable to the "user"—namely, the employer. Thus the curriculum must be relevant to the job entry requirements. Utah educators "thought" they were meeting these requirements. Our workshop sessions proved that they were not. As a result, industry specialists, union representatives and curriculum developers got together and held their own workshop. In a two-week effort they arrived at a consensus on precisely what the school system should be accountable for to the employer in one segment of a basic electronics course. It was a small start, but a start at least, in accountability.  

Strauble indicates to educators that they need the assistance of people outside of education to help them identify problems, also, that they have an input into the solution of those problems so that the educational process may more fully fill the needs of the community. The state advisory council is in such a position and should have the back-
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ground to provide the same kind of input to assist those who are directing the program of vocational education.

In preparing guidelines for school evaluation, John Dal Santo comments on the problems and value of having lay citizens participate in school evaluations.

Cooperation can produce a team that has many advantages over other methods of evaluation. Although this view of evaluation is believed to be basically sound, it is noted that cooperation is no easy row to hoe. It must be developed in perspective to the situation and resources available. It requires great change regarding the attitude and understanding of each group's role in evaluation. Precise groups in reference being-consultants-school-and-community.10

Dal Santo stated: "... any educational system can be judged only by the ideals of its own community and how well it fulfills those ideals."11 The ideals of a community could be expressed through an advisory council.

The guidelines developed by this investigator are to assist state councils in organizing an evaluation plan that will identify community feelings, so that information and interpretation of that information can be passed on to legislators and other decision-makers in education.

The evaluation role to be performed by a state advisory council should be state-wide and at the same time focus on problems and programs of local schools. The evaluation by advisory councils could make a significant contribution to vocational education at the state and national level.

11 Ibid., p. 182.
Carr expressed a need for and value of lay citizens on program review committees. He asked administration in twelve schools that had their vocational programs reviewed by committees, to react to the appropriateness and adequacies of the committees. "In response to this item five schools stated that the committee needed more industrial representation ..." Industrial representation, in these cases referred to a committee categorization of business, industrial and lay representatives. The review committees in the twelve schools consisted of from four to eight members and in all but two cases had from one to three representatives of lay citizens. The two cases that did not have lay representatives were also those with the smallest committees. The value of lay people on the review committee as expressed by Carr was:

The interactions and involvement provided by committee members were rated as excellent by each school. The business, industrial and lay representatives were responsive and cooperative and were reported to have been the key to total committee involvement.\(^{13}\)

The use of lay advisory committees has been a part of vocational education from its beginning. Hamlin, in identifying the need for advisory councils in public education specifically related to vocational agriculture, stated this:

The public school is the public's and a good part of the success of public education depends on keeping people believing that this is actually the case. The advisory council is one device for saying to the public, "This is your school ... We want to use it for the attainment of values you think are important."\(^{14}\)

\(^{12}\)Carr, op. cit., p. 239.

\(^{13}\)Carr, op. cit., p. 240.

\(^{14}\)Herbert M. Hamlin, Agriculture Education in Community Schools, Interstate. Danville, Illinois, 1949, p. 11.
Harold M. Byram points out in the following statement that lay citizens share in the responsibility of evaluating educational programs.

... is based on a framework which presupposes that the initiative and operation of program evaluation is a responsibility of local or area schools and community; and that leadership for it is to be provided locally by those who are responsible for improvement of the program.15

One of the eight essential elements identified by Byram in his framework of evaluation was "a functioning citizens committee, advisory to the staff."16 This supports the importance of identifying the role of advisory councils in evaluation. One may feel that citizens serving on an evaluation committee have a greater function than merely advising when asked.

From the 1968 amendment to the vocational act, a state advisory committee is to provide leadership and program evaluation that will improve the total vocational program. This implies that their duties are more than just assisting educators in an evaluation. This study is directed toward identifying the role of advisory councils in evaluation as perceived by the chairman, and the executive directors of councils. State directors of vocational education were asked to rate the importance of selected roles of the councils.

Cardozier saw the primary function of an advisory committee as "assisting in building a program of vocational education to meet the


16Ibid., p. 5.
needs of the community." He was referring to advisory councils of local programs of vocational agriculture. It seems that Cardozier's philosophy would also apply to state-wide advisory councils for vocational education.

It is basic for advisory councils, in building programs of vocational education, to emphasize the need for good educational evaluation methods. In cases where local and/or state-directed evaluation have not been conducted, the advisory council cannot avoid taking a deeper look at the program. From the summarization of internal evaluation efforts of state-directed schemes, Carr developed the following commonalities:

1. Evaluations are designed to stimulate improvement of existing programs of instruction in light of their objectives.
2. Evaluations are based on the instructional process and involve facilities and equipment, school staff, instruction, guidance, and administration and supervision.
3. Judgments are made against criteria checklists developed from reviews of other checklists and intended as ideals against which to judge.
4. Schedules of activities involve notification of the local school to evaluate, establishment of self-evaluation committees by local schools for team approach, orientation of local staff to evaluation, self-evaluation against criteria checklists, and on-site state staff evaluation.
5. Narrative statements provide program strengths and weaknesses in summary form.

The checklist by Carr was designed as a general instrument for evaluating vocational services, but the state advisory council, confronted with insufficient data from local level, needs to have an understanding of the evaluation for that area, in the event they need to make

17 V. R. Cardozier, Public Relations for Vocational Agriculture, Demeter. Knoxville, Tenn.: The University of Tennessee, 1958, p. 5.
18 Carr, op. cit., p. 131.
basic evaluation to support their own evaluation program. The evaluation commonalities cited by Carr are of a design which indicated that the evaluation system used was educationally oriented and to have been conducted by educators. However, Carr did find some selected concepts of evaluation, which could be applied by individual state councils for the development of their evaluation program. The concepts are the kind that state councils could use in conducting their evaluation in order to make valid and meaningful recommendations for improvement of the total state vocational program. Those selected evaluation aspects

1. Coordinated evaluation effort at local, area, and state levels with feedback of information from each level;
2. Evaluation of the manpower needs and job opportunities at the local, area, and state levels;
3. Evaluation of vocational education impact upon the manpower needs of the local, area, and state levels;
4. Cost-analysis and cost-effectiveness or cost-benefit evaluation of vocational education programs;
5. Comprehensive product evaluation including competence testing and longitudinal follow-up studies;
6. Instructional program effectiveness and comparison through pre-test and post-test evaluation;
7. Student interest, attitudinal, and acceptance studies;
8. Involvement of business and industrial representatives in the evaluation process;
9. Evaluation of the availability of vocational education and the congruence with manpower needs;
10. Evaluation of vocational education teacher education programs for congruence with future needs;
11. Use of local instructional personnel as consultants in material development; and
12. Action plans resulting from local evaluations. 

Many of the evaluation concepts, referred to in the above list by Carr, suggested to the investigator the need for evaluation guidelines, to assist the council in becoming aware of such meaningful evaluation activities. The list also indicates evaluation efforts

18 Carr, op. cit., p. 131.
19 Carr, op. cit., p. 132.
conducted by other agencies which could be obtained, coordinated, and reviewed by the council in a total state evaluation effort. These activities also give the council an opportunity to inter-act with many of the segments of society interested in vocational education.

Evaluation guidelines for state advisory councils should assist them in conducting studies, obtaining information, interpreting data, and in making value judgments which result in the development of recommendations for the improvement of vocational education.

**Congressional Legislation and Educational Evaluation**

**The 1963 Vocational Education Act**

The 1963 Vocational Education Act provided for the designation or creation of a state advisory council when the state board for vocational education was not representative of the business, industry, agriculture, and education facets of the state. The Act did not provide guidelines or mandate the activities of the council. However, it did suggest the need for state advisory committees to consult with state boards in carrying out the state plan for vocational education. Section 12 of the Act, also "directs the Secretary of H.E.W. to appoint a national advisory council on vocational education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of vocational education programs." 20 Consequently, the basis was provided for state advisory councils for vocational and technical education.

---

How others viewed the councils performance

It should be made clear that the 1963 Act did not create an advisory council in each state. Former U. S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, II, in his testimony before the House of Representatives General Sub-Committee on Education, described the relationships of state boards and advisory councils:

The 1963 law made mandatory the creation of State advisory councils in all States (only) where persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the State were not represented on the State board which administers or supervises the administration of vocational education programs. 21

However, in the four or five years immediately following the 1963 Act, there was concern that the state boards and advisory committee had not become involved to the extent Congress had hoped. Samuel Burt, an authority in the use of lay advisory groups, indicated as follows:

No reports are available that permit an evaluation of the contributions that the new boards have made. On the local level the old-established ad hoc committees have continued to give assistance to the planning and administration of vocational education programs, but in many States, the boards have yet to come to grips with their statutory duties. 22

Clary documented the inactivity of councils when he reported, to his knowledge, that the North Carolina State Advisory Committee was never called together for a single meeting. 23

John A. Beaumont, former Illinois State Director of Vocational Education

23 Clary, op. cit., p. 4.
Technical Education, gave his reasoning as to why the Act specifically requests lay citizens to serve on the advisory council:

Vocational education has a long history of citizen involvement, particularly in its use of advisory committees. At the local level, especially, these committees have been a key to success or failure of occupational training and resultant placement. Congress appears to be reinforcing the principle of quality vocational education. It has placed in the Amendments a number of requirements that will assure a broader use of lay talents as well as those of professionals in the vocational education movement.24

The desire by Congress and the pressure brought from taxpayers to be involved in Governmental decisions is evidenced in the calling for lay advisory groups in other federal legislation:

The Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1970, vetoed by President Richard M. Nixon, specified that all prime sponsors of manpower training programs must appoint a manpower services council and gave nine categories which had to be represented on the council. The duties were "to review manpower programs and make recommendations to the prime sponsor."25

Clary, in reflecting on the 1963 Act, comments concerning the organization of the National Advisory Council:

The National Advisory Council was created as an ad hoc council to the secretary of Health, Education and Welfare charged with reviewing the Administration of all vocational education programs and making recommendations for administrative and legislative changes. The act also established a National Advisory Committee to the U. S. Commissioner of Education which was merely advisory in a general way in the administration of the various vocational education programs.26

26 Clary, op. cit., p. 4.
The role of the national council could be more meaningful if they could be provided complete and useful information from each of the state councils. The guidelines for this study would provide commonalities from which each state could report their findings to the national level.

The recommendations made by the National Advisory Council were the foundation for the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. Those recommendations which related to this research study were as follows:

19. IT IS RECOMMENDED, That the act provide that each State conduct a periodic statewide review and evaluation of its vocational education program. . . . The State evaluation should be conducted by persons representing business, industry, education, and the public. . . . Required State evaluations preceding the national evaluation should provide better hard data and better value judgments. As nearly as we can determine, only a very few States have conducted a formal evaluation of their programs since 1917.

25. IT IS RECOMMENDED, That the office of Education provide staff for the National Advisory Committee on Vocational Education and establish guidelines for helping the States make more effective use of State Advisory boards. . . . While there are no reports available to evaluate the contributions of State boards/advisory councils, it is apparent that in many States they have not yet come to grips with their statutory responsibilities. . . . The State advisory councils cannot function properly unless the Office of Education gives leadership to the States, through guidelines and publications, on how to successfully use advisory committees for the purpose of reviewing existing programs and policies, and in originating new programs.

The Congressional bills aimed at amending the 1963 Act had three major concerns when dealing with the section on advisory councils: (1) each state must have a complete and separate advisory

28 Ibid., p. 209.
council if it wanted Federal Vocational money, (2) the membership of the advisory committee must be increased and include more lay people, and (3) specific mandates were made concerning the function of the council.

During the 1968 hearings, Lowell Burkett, Executive Director of American Vocational Association, gave testimony before the House Education Committee.

Mr. Burkett . . . I would like to comment on some of the provisions in the bills . . . section 109 proposes to create a State advisory council, to advise with the State board, on matters of planning, administration, and evaluation of the total vocational education program. The bill would give specific representation on the council to "school systems with large concentrations of academically, socially, economically, and culturally disadvantaged students."

It does call for an advisory council to assist in the planning and we support this concept.

Mr. Meeds. If I may interrupt. You will recall the discussions we had, for the purpose of making legislative history. Is it not your recollection that the reason we went into detail in describing the vocations of people who would be on the board was to get a broad representation of communities and of the educational community in evolving the State plan so that no segment of our society would be overlooked and particularly in regard to assuring the core city representation of that board by people who were cognizant of it? So that when that State plan came forward it would take into consideration those goals which you men shunned earlier which are to meet the crisis and to prevent this type of crisis in the future?

Mr. Burkett. That is right.29

In events that led to such strong language for organization of advisory councils in each state under the 1968 Amendments, the House Committee on Education and Labor was quite firm, in specifying the position they wanted advisory councils to have. In House Report

No. 1647, they reported:

State Advisory Council

The bill requires that each State establish an advisory council, with members appointed by the Governor, broadly representative of industry, labor, education, and the public, to evaluate vocational programs funded under the act, to advise the State board on the development of the State plan and the preparation of long-range and annual program plans, and to submit through the State board an annual evaluation report to the Commissioner and to the National Advisory Council.

The establishment of such advisory councils in each State is based on the testimony of many witnesses before the committee and to fulfill the recommendations of the Advisory Council.

Membership on the State advisory councils under the language of the committee bill would assure that all aspects of expertise in occupational training and all facets of the academic, vocational, industrial, and commercial community would be brought to the assistance of the State Board in strengthening vocational education in the States.\(^{30}\)

In trying to identify the "testimony of many witnesses" referred to by the Labor committee, very little was found in the committee hearings history to document the statement. Jack Jennings, Research Aid to Congressman Perkins, did, however, report that much of the background concerning advisory council was obtained during "informal hearings" primarily by Congressmen Perkins, Pucinski, and Meeds.\(^{31}\)

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 became effective as Public Law 90-576, when signed by the President on October 16, 1968. The advisory councils to be organized under the Act were to


include as member persons representing nine specific areas of interest or concern. The 1963 Act had specified members be representative of four general areas of interest, and all four of those groups were quite closely related to the educational system. The 1968 Amendments in spelling out the membership of the council seemed concerned for more lay public representation and less control by educational interests. However, the Act did not establish any limit to the number of persons to be appointed to the council, but it has been determined by various authorities that a minimum of twelve members would be needed to meet the representation requirements.

Public Law 90-576 was very specific in instructing the states that they must have a state advisory council if they wanted Federal funds for vocational education:

Any State which desires to receive a grant under this title for any fiscal year shall establish a State advisory council, which shall be appointed by the Governor or, in the case of States in which the members of the State board are elected, by such board...32

The law outlines the membership of the council to distribute the representation to many areas that were interested in and concerned with vocational education. The section of the Act relating to membership stated the following:

The Council membership shall:
(A) include as members a person or persons—
"(i) familiar with the vocational needs and the problems of management and labor in the State, and a person or persons representing State industrial and economic development agencies,
"(ii) representative of community and junior colleges and other institutions of higher education, area vocational schools, technical institutes, and post-secondary or adult education agencies or institutions, which may provide programs of vocational or technical education and training,

321968 Amendments, op. cit., p. 4.
"(iii) familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, and a person or persons having special knowledge, experience, or qualifications with respect to vocational education and who are not involved in the administration of State or local vocational education programs,

"(iv) familiar with programs of technical and vocational education, including programs in comprehensive secondary schools,

"(v) representative of local educational agencies, and a person or persons who are representative of school boards,

"(vi) representative of manpower and vocational education agencies in the State, including a person or persons from Comprehensive Area Manpower Planning System of the State,

"(vii) representing school systems with large concentrations of academically, socially, economically, and culturally disadvantaged students,

"(viii) having special knowledge, experience, or qualifications, with respect to the special educational needs of physically or mentally handicapped persons, and

"(ix) representative of the general public, including a person or persons representative of and knowledgeable about the poor and disadvantaged, who are not qualified for membership under any of the preceding clauses of this paragraph;"  

Puckett reported, "Council memberships ranged from low of nine to high of thirty-five. The average council membership was approximately twenty."  

The council was instructed that one of their duties would be to advise the state board in the development of policy. Those council duties in section "B" stated: "Advise the State board on the development of and policy matters arising in the administration of the State plan . . ."  

This study will ask state councils about their relationship to state boards to determine the extent to which the two boards are using each other. (It is important to note that in the 1963 Act

33 1968 Amendments, op. cit., pp. 4-5.
35 1968 Amendments, op. cit., p. 4.
the state board could serve as the advisory council, but the 1968 Amendment called for a new and separate board in each State.)

The House Education and Labor committee, one year after the 1968 Amendments became law, once again inserted specifics for generalities in the role and function of advisory councils, through House Report No. 91-744.

... The committee is also concerned about the operation of the State Advisory Councils which were first required by the amendments of 1968. First, the Committee conceives these State councils as an essential source of new expertise on the development of new vocational programs and the more effective redirection of existing programs to greater relevancy. Second, the committee believes these councils should be independent evaluators of the effectiveness of programs within the States and independent commentators on the advisability of the provisions of the State plans. This independence, especially from the State departments of education, is essential if the councils are to make sound, objective judgments. Therefore, the committee is very concerned that the presence of State directors of vocational education on several councils and the use of State department personnel by other councils seriously erodes the effectiveness of those councils. The committee accordingly urges the Office of Education to review the operation of all the State councils.36

Although the U. S. Office of Education was instructed to review the councils operation, this study was concerned with reviewing the councils evaluation role to facilitate the development of evaluation guidelines.

Advisory council evaluation problems

In preparing for their First Annual Report, the individual state councils had many different perceptions of their objectives. This concern was voiced by the South Carolina Council when they noted

that "Neither the Act nor the National Council had provided any guidelines for the annual evaluation." 37

However, on April 21, 1970, the National Advisory Council recommended to the Commissioner of Education a set of evaluation goals to be used by state advisory councils.

Goal I Evaluation should focus on the State goals and priorities set forth in the State plan.

Goal II Evaluation should look into all parts of the human resources development programs of the State.

Goal III Evaluation should focus upon the effects the vocational education amendments of 1968 had upon the State in the year under review.

Goal IV Evaluation should focus upon the people and their needs.

Goal V Evaluation should identify the employment opportunities within the State and the vocational services required. 38

These general guidelines were used by many councils to help "sell" their written report, but were too late to help them organize evaluation programs for the year.

Puckett, McKeever and Fee found that during the sixteen months following the mandate for states to organize and have a functioning state advisory council, "only sixteen evaluation studies had been completed, however 320 were then in process and 382 were in the planning stage." 39 On paper the evaluation activities of advisory


39 Puckett, op. cit., p. 9.
councils looked promising, but what really happened following Puckett's study is an objective of the study.

**Completed and Current Research Studies Pertaining to State Advisory Councils**

**Studies completed**

Immediately following the creation of the state advisory councils, there was much anticipation and expectation of the councils' influence, particularly because of their newness. Reviews and studies related to advisory councils were just beginning to be reported.

At the conclusion of his Review and Synthesis of Research and Development Activities Concerning State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education in September 1970, Clary recommended the following:

Research studies with the level of sophistication needed to impact on Council organization, role, status, or other problems have not been completed, using current State Councils, their activities, etc., as the data base.

Studies are needed in such areas as:

1. Status
2. Representation needed
3. Role and functions
4. Relationships to other agencies
5. Organizational structure
6. Expectations of councils
7. Management and staffing patterns
8. Effective involvement of members
9. **Evaluative activities of councils**
10. Interface with the public
11. Outcomes of council recommendations.

Clary's recommendation concerning the need for additional evaluation studies was stimulative for this study.

The House Committee on Education was concerned about the implementation of their 1968 legislation and in order to get answers

---

40 Clary, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
from the field, they are planning "over sight" hearings during the spring of 1972. Among other issues the committee plans to question state directors of vocational education, advisory council chairmen and advisory council executive directors concerning the following:

1. Evaluation Activities of the State Advisory Councils
2. Use and dissemination of evaluation findings
3. Action taken by State Boards on recommendations made through annual report by councils.\(^41\)

Recommendations made in the first annual report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education indicate the need for a deeper involvement in evaluation activities, by political policy makers and for lay citizens to get involved. The plea from national council stated,

... We challenge State and local governments to throw off old habits and take a hard, fresh look at what they are doing in vocational education. We urge the public to watch carefully, and to demand and support the innovations that work.\(^42\)

Education Research Associates, in an evaluation study for the Ohio State Advisory Council, did a field study concerning the activities of local advisory committee for vocational education in Ohio Public Schools. Some of those recommendations had implication concerning evaluation activities by State Advisory Councils. Two specific recommendations were,

29. That the appraisal, or evaluation, function in vocational education operations be given a higher priority by those in leadership positions at both the State and local levels, including the leadership of the local advisory committee.

\(^41\)Jennings, op. cit.

31. That some competent agency or organization outside the State Department of Education be secured to make periodic appraisals (at least biannually) of the work of the local advisory committees in Ohio in order to determine to what extent the recommendations of this report are being implemented and to discern if there are new problem situations needing attention.  

If it is important for outside evaluation of local advisory committees, cited in recommendation 31, then it seems logical that state advisory councils would submit themselves to an evaluation of their activities. A critical evaluation of state councils seemed appropriate at this time. 

Van Dalen, in writing about evaluation expressed his philosophy as follows:

... society cannot make the most satisfactory progress if time, money, and energy are expended on faulty work. Neither can society advance if reliable findings concerning education are not widely disseminated to scholars and the general public for critical examination and appropriate application.  

If evaluation is so important, then the public has a right to question the evaluation activities of a council. 

An evaluation of the kind designed for this study will determine how well the councils are accomplishing what they were asked to do. 

If maximum benefits are to be derived at the National level there must be some commonality in the individual state evaluation effort to effect a meaningful national assessment.

---


Research underway

Although the literature was very limited in citing any specific references to evaluation of the activities of state advisory councils, there were some studies underway at the close of 1971. Max Jobe, Executive Secretary for the Maryland State Advisory Council, was studying "Administrative Aspects of a Model State Advisory Council on Vocational Education."  

Dr. Bruce Reinhart, U. S. Office of Education Vocational-Technical Division, reported he had collected and reviewed the "First Annual Reports" from each state. From this review Dr. Reinhart reported that state advisory councils were asking such questions as: What is evaluation? Where do advisory councils get valid, reliable data? How can we evaluate without good plans? Thirty percent of the councils were also saying that they need to engage in more research and evaluation activities.

The second annual report, from each council, was due in the National office October 1, 1971, and the staff is in the process of reviewing and correlating those reports.

The staff personnel for Congressman Perkins, Chairman of House Education Committee, were preparing material to use in "over sight" hearings during spring of 1972. The Puckett Report, the one tangible


47 Jennings, op. cit.
piece of literature which was available for this review, had summarized state advisory council activities. The report was a joint effort by Puckett, McKeever, and Fee for a Seminar Report in Education 925.22, conducted by Dr. Robert M. Reese, The Ohio State University, Winter Quarter, 1970. The report dealt with the organizational structure and evaluation plans of state advisory councils which responded to a questionnaire concerning activities of their advisory council. The report suggested "that the councils develop a systematic plan for total evaluation, which would be concerned with all relevant criteria affecting the field of vocational-technical education." In summarizing Puckett's report it should be noted that many advisory councils had not become fully organized or involved in evaluation efforts at the time of the study.

A summary of the literature reviewed for this study suggested to the investigator that lay advisory councils can have a profound impact if they are active and organized. Secondly, people outside the educational system want the vocational program to be meaningful to the needs of the individual employee and employer and a lay advisory council could contribute a representative opinion of the community, business and industry in an evaluation of vocational education. If advisory councils were reviewed and evaluation guidelines suggested, there should be an increase in the efficiency and effectiveness of state advisory councils for improved vocational education programs.

48Puckett, op. cit., p. 12.
CHAPTER III

THE CURRENT STATUS OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES
OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

State advisory councils are relatively new, having been mandated by the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments Act. The short period of time between 1969 and 1971 has not provided the councils with much of an opportunity to gain experience in evaluation but a few of them have initiated limited effort to do so. This chapter discusses the organization of a state advisory council and its staff. Selected characteristics of the council chairman, council executive director, and state director of vocational education are identified in order to assist in describing the administrative relationships between the advisory council and the state board/state department. The major focus is upon the evaluation activities of the council, identifying what they perceive their evaluation role to be, how evaluation is conducted, by whom, and against what criteria. Study has been made to show how, after evaluations are completed, they were being interpreted, what recommendations were made and submitted to decision makers for implementation. The chapter also reviews the council publications and distribution of evaluation findings made by the council.
Methodology

Because state advisory councils were relatively new, it was difficult to find descriptive accounts in the literature on their evaluation activities. These circumstances made it necessary to collect opinions and data from persons involved with and concerned about various councils' operations. To secure the needed information from each state which had an organized council, questionnaires were designed for the collection of data from state directors of vocational education, advisory council chairmen, and advisory council executive directors. A different set of questions was asked on each questionnaire, therefore, collecting different data from each group. A cover letter accompanied by an appropriate questionnaire was sent to state directors asking for their support in the study. This mailing was followed by a postcard reminder to those who had not answered within a three-week time period. A follow-up letter and a second copy of questionnaire was sent three weeks later. The same procedure was followed with the state council chairmen and with the state council executive directors.

Appendix A contains the mailing list of state directors and copies of correspondence and questionnaires sent to each of them. Appendix B contains materials appropriate to state advisory council chairmen, and the corresponding items sent to state council executive directors appear in Appendix C.

Response to questionnaire

Personnel in various classifications who were contacted and the number of those who responded with information pertaining to this study between December 10, 1971, and March 1, 1972, is shown in Table 1. A
summary of states participating in the study is presented in Appendix D.

TABLE 1
RESPONSES TO ADVISORY COUNCIL EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th></th>
<th>Per Cent of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>Responded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Directors of Vocational Education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Advisory Council Chairmen</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Advisory Council Executive Directors</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combined response from all groups to this mailed questionnaire was 85 per cent, which was considered a very good return, compared with responses generally received from the questionnaire mailing method of data collection.

All but two state directors responded to the questionnaire for a 96 per cent return. Forty of the 52 state council chairmen responded for a 77 per cent response. There were five states that did not have an executive director on their staff; of the 47 who did, 39 executive directors responded for 83 per cent return.

All questionnaires returned were usable for this study. There were incidences of specific questions for which no response was reported, therefore, all totals and percentages of responses will relate only to completed items.
In order to collect and assemble the data which would give an overall picture of the advisory council in its role of evaluation, it was deemed necessary to identify selected characteristics of the personnel who provided the data for the study and of the administrative relationships of the council to other vocational education groups.

State directors of vocational education and state advisory councils

Although the state director of vocational education does not serve as a member of the council, nor is his department controlled by the council, it is evident that there must be a close working relationship between them for maximum benefits to be derived in the development of the vocational education program for a state.

The years of tenure in office of state directors is shown in Table 2. In comparing the state director's tenure with the dates of advisory council legislation, it is found that 26 (52%) of the persons in these positions had served from one to three years or, in other words had assumed their positions since advisory councils were created by the 1968 Amendments Act. Additionally, 15 state directors (30%) had assumed their role after the enactment of the 1963 Vocational Education Act, which Act suggested the organization of an advisory council. The mean tenure for state directors was five years with a mode of one year and median of three years. These data indicated that state directors were relatively new in their position as were the members of state advisory councils.
TABLE 2

TENURE OF STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;no response&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mean = 5 yrs., Mode = 1 yr., Median = 3 yrs.)

Tenure of advisory council chairmen

The tenure of state council chairmen as members of the state council and the length of time they had served in their position are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3

TENURE OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL CHAIRMEN (1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure in Years</th>
<th>Tenure as Chairman</th>
<th>Tenure as a Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mean 2.77 yrs., Median 1 1/2 yrs., Mode 1 1/2 yrs.)
Although 97 per cent of the council chairmen had experienced membership on the council for one year or more, 18 (47%) of them were new to the chairmanship on the council during the preceding year. Twelve council chairmen had served as chairman continuously since the organization of their respective councils.

The organization dates which will be presented later in Table 6 indicate 34 (85%) of the councils were organized in 1969. This would indicate that many people serving as chairman of the council had served on the council since its organization. They may not have brought with them a large number of years experience, but it covers the total period of time the council has existed.

**Tenure of advisory council executive directors**

The organization of a council staff and hiring of an executive director closely followed the organization of state advisory councils. Again this resulted in people being appointed to positions and experiencing a novel role requiring definition and experience in new responsibilities. The executive director can be described as the individual hired by the advisory council to organize and administer the operation of a council, its staff, office and facilities, to coordinate the activities of the council with related agencies in an overall effort to advance vocational education in the state. The executive director should see that the councils' plans for evaluation are carried out and assist in the collection and organization of data to be presented to the council members for their consideration. The director will carry out those activities as directed by the council chairman, and attempt to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the council.
Table 4 shows that 32 executive directors had been in their positions for two years or less. Eight (22%) of the executive directors had previously served as members of the state advisory council before assuming their staff positions with the council. The experience as a former council member should be very valuable to the executive director in his work to carry out the council's program.

TABLE 4
TENURE OF ADVISORY COUNCIL EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS (1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure in Years</th>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mo.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mo.-1 yr.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mean 1 1/2 yrs., Median 1 1/2 yrs., Mode 2 yrs.)

Advisory council history

State directors were asked if their state had an organized state advisory council prior to the creation of the present council, as mandated by the Vocational Education Amendment of 1968. The answer to the question was "yes" from 37 states and 13 answered "no". As shown in Table 5, of the 37 states who had a council prior to 1968, 29 (78%) were organized after the 1963 Vocational Education Act suggested the need for such a council in each state.
President Johnson signed the 1968 Vocational Amendment Act into law on October 16, 1968. Table 6 shows how quickly states moved to organize an advisory council following the mandate in the Act.

TABLE 6
DATES STATES ESTABLISHED ADVISORY COUNCILS UNDER THE PROVISION OF THE VOCATIONAL AMENDMENTS OF 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 (1st 6 mo.)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 (2nd 6 mo.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be wrong to think that states were more than eager to organize their councils, so that they could go about their duties of advising, evaluating, and reporting recommendations. Rather, it was the states' intention of complying with that section that stated: "any State which desires to receive a grant under this title for any fiscal year shall establish a State Advisory Council . . ."¹

The three councils organized in 1968 and the 27 during the first six months of 1969 were organized in time to meet the organizational deadline for that current fiscal year. The 85 per cent of the states who reported organizing their councils during the first nine months of the 1968 Act were not required to submit an evaluation report covering the 1968 fiscal year, but such an evaluation report was due for the 1969 fiscal year. Clary noted that "all fifty States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands had an organized council by September 1970." The National Council reported that all but one had submitted their "first Annual report" to the U. S. Commissioner and National Council following the close of the 1969 fiscal year.

The state advisory councils were appointed by the Governor or state board for vocational education in each state. Eight councils reported that their respective states had taken additional steps through legislative action for the authorization, organization and operation of the councils. This legal action is of significant importance, as will be discussed later, relating to state funds received by the council. Of the eight councils operating under a state statute, seven noted that their state legislation mandated the performing of evaluation duties. This gave an indication of the importance which the legislative bodies gave to the function of evaluation.

---


Agency to whom councils reported

The administrative bodies to whom advisory councils are responsible varies widely among the states. The 1968 Amendment Act stipulated that councils were to advise and report their evaluation recommendations to the state board for vocational education. The majority of the states noted that the councils did indeed report to the state board. While most councils were established and members appointed by the Governor, there were other state councils established by state statute or by action of the state board for vocational education. The councils were usually responsible to the agency which established them. From the indications reported in Table 7, some councils reported to more than one agency.

TABLE 7
AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION TO WHOM COUNCILS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Board for Vocational Education</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Office</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of State Director of Vocational Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some councils reported to more than one agency.

The investigator noted that councils who indicated that they reported to the state director of vocational education, included him in a multiple listing. It would be irregular for a council to by-pass the state board and report directly to the director. The councils
reported to the state legislature in an informational capacity rather than part of an administrative structure.

Organization of council staff

Many councils were quick to comply to that section of the 1968 Amendment which provided for the obtaining of professional staff. Section 104 stated: "State Advisory Councils are authorized to obtain the services of such professional, technical and clerical persons as may be necessary to enable them to carry out their functions under the title . . . ." The organizational dates of council staffs are listed in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969 (1st 6 mo.)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 (2nd 6 mo.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 (1st 6 mo.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 (2nd 6 mo.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Five councils had not completed their organization of a council staff by December 31, 1971.

Table 6 reported that 97 per cent of the councils reporting had completed their council organization by the end of 1969, however, Table 7 indicates that only 68 per cent of the councils had obtained the service of a full or part time professional staff during the same period of time. Council staffing followed the council organization by approximately six months in most cases.

4Vocational Amendments of 1968, op. cit., p. 5.
Relationships of state advisory councils with state departments of vocational education

The House Committee on Education and Labor was concerned about state directors of vocational education serving on state councils and the use of state department personnel by some councils. House Report No. 91-744 submitted by the committee and passed into law December 11, 1969, expressed the committees concern in the matter: "The Committee conceives those State Councils as an essential source of new expertise on the development of new vocational programs to greater relevancy." The report urged the U. S. Office of Education to enforce the stipulation that state directors not be included on the council membership. This legislation did not suggest to the investigator that the council and state department should divorce themselves completely from each other, but each should be independent from one anothers control. In reviewing activities of cooperation between the two groups, it is noted in Table 9 that attendance of state directors at regular advisory council meetings was very high, with 62 per cent attending frequently. However, Table 10 shows the council members seldom attended vocational education department meetings.

During the several council meetings which this investigator observed in Ohio, the state director was in attendance. The members of the council called upon him in a consultant capacity when they needed specific information or explanations of a program or philosophy.

The participation of council members in planning and policy making meetings was lower than was the case with state directors

---

5Vocational Amendments of 1968, op. cit., p. 4.
participating in council meetings. However, Table 11 does show that the council received invitations to attend such meetings more often than their attendance would indicate.

TABLE 9
ATTENDANCE BY STATE VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS AT REGULAR MEETINGS OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*Invitation only)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondent answer

TABLE 10
ATTENDANCE OF STATE COUNCIL MEMBERS AT STATE DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PLANNING AND POLICY MAKING MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the council chairman resided in a different area of the state than where the state department of vocational education was located, it seems reasonable to assume that he would not be asked to attend or able to participate in all meetings. It was noted that council staff members, the executive director in most cases, were extended an invitation to attend meetings more often than was the chairman.
TABLE 11
INVITATION TO STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS AND STAFF TO PARTICIPATE IN STATE DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PLANNING AND POLICY MAKING MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Council Members Responses</th>
<th>Council Staff Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proximity in geographic location of the council office to the department of vocational education suggests a reason for higher rate of invitations extended to the council staff. The 1969 Report calling for interdependency of the two groups suggested that each maintain their own identity. However, it was noted that the council office staff was located in the same building with the vocational department 26 per cent of the time. In 1971 only three state advisory councils received state financing in addition to the Federal funds granted to the councils. In 50 per cent of the states the councils' funds were administered through the department of vocational education. Many councils noted that the vocational departments acted "only" as fiscal agents in the handling of advisory council funds. The funds for still other councils were administered directly or by such agencies as the state department of education, research coordinating unit, a university or a state business office.
In other administrative relationships, 25 per cent of the state councils reported that their publications were reviewed by the state department of vocational education prior to public distribution. This number is quite low considering the number of evaluation efforts and publications that were undertaken as a cooperative activity by the two groups.

**Perception of the evaluation role of state advisory councils**

To determine the perception of the evaluation role which a council was to perform, guiding statements were presented to council chairmen and executive directors for their response. The statements and responses are presented in Table 12 in rank order determined by a mean score.

**Evaluation budget**

When asked about their commitment to evaluation as indicated by the amount of their budget being spent on evaluation, the council responded with a wide array of answers. The percentage of budget which various councils spent on evaluation in 1971 is shown in Table 13.

It is important to understand that all states did not receive the same amount of funds from the U. S. Office of Education and that some states receive additional funds from their own state to use in conducting evaluations. The amount of federal funds allocated to each state council for the year 1972 is listed in Appendix E. This allocation to the states ranged from a low of $31,964 per year to a high of $95,892. The data presented in Table 13 also indicated a very wide interpretation of "evaluation activities". The state which reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
<th>Mean* Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual council members expertise should be utilized in analyzing and interpreting contractual evaluation studies</td>
<td>47 44 5 4 0</td>
<td>4.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The State Advisory Councils recommendations for change at the State or Local level cannot be made without good evaluation findings</td>
<td>38 41 8 9 4</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All Council Evaluation activities should be statewide</td>
<td>37 30 8 23 2</td>
<td>3.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The administrative organization of the State Department of Vocational Education is one area which should be evaluated by the Council</td>
<td>14 54 17 11 4</td>
<td>3.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Professional evaluators should be responsible for conducting evaluation studies under the direction of the Council</td>
<td>18 46 9 22 5</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Evaluation of final or annual vocational program reports is the responsibility of the Advisory Council</td>
<td>16 41 20 22 1</td>
<td>3.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The evaluation effort of the Advisory Council should be primarily directed toward the vocational student enrolled in the program, to see if the program is meeting his needs</td>
<td>17 34 11 34 4</td>
<td>3.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Evaluation is primarily for the purpose of finding weak spots in the existing State and Local program</td>
<td>12 41 6 37 4</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The members of the Council should conduct the evaluations rather than Professional Evaluators</td>
<td>12 35 21 24 8</td>
<td>3.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The evaluation effort of the Advisory Council should be primarily with employers in business and industry who employ vocational graduates</td>
<td>4 20 15 57 4</td>
<td>3.263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
<th><em>Mean Score</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Council's evaluation should be primarily concerned with identifying</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the public's opinion about vocation education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The State Advisory Council should usually concern itself with evaluating</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vocational programs offered in individual schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Council members should check all program plans from individual schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to see that they follow the state plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating: SA Strongly Agree, A Agree, ?, Disagree, SD Strongly Disagree*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cent of Budget</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL'S BUDGETS SPENT FOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES
spending 100 per cent would surely have included office overhead, staff salaries, and council meeting expenses as part of their evaluation cost, other councils may have included these indirect costs as something other than evaluation. The majority of the states reported that they were spending from 25 to 54 per cent of their budgets for evaluation activities.

Size of evaluation committees

State Advisory Councils were asked if their organizational structure included an evaluation committee, to which 30 (77%) of them answered "yes". The size of the committee ranged from 3 to 12 members, as shown in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3- 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common size committee was 5 to 6 members; only two councils reported having more than 8 members on the committee. It was expected that councils who were organized with several working committees would have council members serving on more than one committee and the committee would function satisfactorily with 4 to 6 members.
Professional educators serving on evaluation committee

The distribution of council members on the evaluation committee who were representatives of professional education, is summarized in Table 15.

**TABLE 15**

**DISTRIBUTION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS ON STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the evaluation committee size and number of members who were also professional educators, indicates that approximately 50 per cent of them represented professional education. The investigator felt the expertise of professional educators would be utilized on an evaluation committee and the chairman had balanced the committee membership, so it was not overloaded with professional educators.

**Number of evaluation committee meetings held**

The number of meetings which the evaluation committee held is revealed in Table 16.

The majority of the evaluation committees held from 2 to 8 meetings during the previous year. While two committees met oftener than once a month, 23 (77%) of them met only once every two months or less. The most common meeting pattern, reported by the councils, was
those who held two meetings per year. The number of committee meetings would have varied widely depending on the evaluation plan used by the council. If the committee was conducting evaluations themselves, they would need to meet more often than if they had contracted with someone else to perform evaluations for them.

**TABLE 16**

**NUMBER OF EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD DURING THE YEAR (1971)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- 4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- 6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- 8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-more</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of evaluation committee reports to council membership**

The number of committee reports made to the council membership by the evaluation committees is presented in Table 17.

The indication from Table 17 suggests that the evaluation committees made relatively few committee reports to the council. A comparison of the number of meetings held and reports given showed that three reports were given to the council membership for every four committee meetings held. This degree of communication should have kept the membership aware of the committees' activities and plans, and at
the same time, provided other members of the council with information concerning council evaluation activities.

TABLE 17
NUMBER OF COMMITTEE REPORTS MADE TO COUNCIL BY EVALUATION COMMITTEE (1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation plans

One of the criteria used by the council to evaluate the state plan for vocational education was to see if the objectives stated in the state plan were being met by the program. In order to check the organization and planning for evaluation activities, the councils were asked about their immediate and long-range plans. About two-thirds of the councils had written plans for the current year, but only about one-fourth of them had made long-range plans covering two to five years. The relationship of the immediate and long-range plans are viewed in Table 18.
TABLE 18  
THE NUMBER OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS HAVING WRITTEN PLANS FOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have Written Plans</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>2-5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;yes&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation activities

Council executive directors were asked to identify the stage of development for 16 selected evaluation activities. The directors responded by classifying the councils' action on the specific activity as being completed, underway, planned, or not planned. Only 25 councils provided completed responses to this question, the data from the councils which were incomplete were not included in the summary of the item. The 25 councils reported 61 evaluations had been completed, 105 were underway, an additional 95 were being planned, and 143 incidences where no plans had been made concerning the specific activities identified. A summary of the stage of implementation for each of the selected evaluation activities is presented in Table 19. Evaluations concerning program availability, public opinion surveys, and expansion of vocational offerings accounted for 25 (41%) of the evaluations completed. Of the studies being reported as underway, the largest effort was with evaluations concerning vocational education at the elementary school level, vocational education for the school dropout, graduate follow-up study, and state manpower needs.
TABLE 19
STATUS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL'S IN EVALUATION
OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Evaluation Activities</th>
<th>Number of Evaluations*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Program availability</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Public opinion survey</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Expansion of vocational offerings</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Preparation of voc-teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Graduate follow-up study</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. State manpower needs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Student placement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Effectiveness of local advisory committee</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Innovative programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Employer involvement in cooperative education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Teacher competency and satisfaction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Vocational education at the elem. school level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Correlation of public and private training programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Vocational education for veteran</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Vocational education for the school dropout</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Vocational retraining needs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on returns from 25 councils.*
Evaluation efforts in several areas were being conducted annually. This indicated to the investigator the councils' concern to follow-up completed evaluations a year or two later to check the validity of their findings the previous time or to get a reading on any change or trend which might have taken place during the time lapse.

The councils reported they had the least concern for conducting evaluations pertaining to vocational retraining needs, vocational needs for the veteran, employer involvement in cooperative education, and the determination of the effectiveness of local advisory committees. An effort was being made by some councils in cooperation with the national council to evaluate the vocational needs of veterans and to prepare recruitment material aimed at getting the veteran into vocational programs.

**Number "one" priority evaluation project**

Council chairmen were asked to identify the evaluation project that would receive their "number one" priority, assuming that funds were available to conduct the project. The answers to this question were categorized by the investigator wherever possible and responses identified in Table 20.

The career guidance and counseling area was identified, more than any other single area, as the project which the chairmen would give a "number one" priority. The councils' concern for the area, centered around certification requirements for counselors, in-service training for counselors, and interest in having counselors present a broader picture of career and vocational information to the students. Career Education was the second ranking selection, although only three
chairmen identified it specifically. The concern for career education was to be expected because of the emphasis the U. S. Office of Education was putting into the program starting in 1971. The need to update guidance and counseling would relate very closely with the expanded definition of career education. The statements expressed by the councils indicate a desire for an evaluation project that would provide information to be used in implementing the career education concept. This investigator feels that all education is career education. There does, however, appear to be a need for career information and the career choice process being presented at all levels of education. The balance of the projects were related to concerns about follow-up studies with former students, product evaluation of vocational programs, cost analysis of vocational education, the distribution of vocational offerings to determine their accessibility to all people, and the development and implementation of an evaluation instrument or system. This would indicate the councils emphasis was directed toward the individual specific needs of their state.

**Most important evaluation activity**

When asked to list the evaluation activity which had been of greatest importance to the council, the chairmen responded with a wide range of answers. The conducting of public hearings and preparation of annual reports were cited most often, but headed the list in only six states. Those activities listed in Table 21 generally cover evaluation activities dealing with (1) the evaluation of state plans, (2) specific vocational programs, (3) public relations activities, (4) product evaluation, and (5) those projects related to guidance and counseling.
### TABLE 20

**EVALUATION PROJECTS IDENTIFIED AS HAVING "NUMBER ONE PRIORITY" BY STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Number One&quot; Priority Evaluation Project</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career guidance and counseling</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up of students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State system for data collection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Product&quot; evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative effectiveness of state vocational education program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of professional personnel development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal access to all students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of qualitative of program for all public private schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs and programs for disadvantaged and handicapped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective input of local industry and educators to the council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward vocational technical students and graduates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work study program &quot;space&quot; (Conn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check for duplication of program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum revision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Identified by chairmen, assuming funds were available.
### TABLE 21
EVALUATION ACTIVITIES WHICH HAD BEEN OF GREATEST IMPORTANCE TO STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Activity</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State public hearing and annual evaluation report</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of state plan to see if it meets objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making public aware of the council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting program evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of guidance programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;None&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall evaluation of vocational education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation between state department of vocational education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining effectiveness of vocational education program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation program for vocational education program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career guidance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining the image of vocational education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public relations on vocational education and opportunities in the world of work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying program priorities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to the disadvantaged</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;On site&quot; evaluation by council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devising a data retrieval system</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space utilization of vocational programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer evaluation of vocational education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining secondary education into &quot;one track&quot; program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Status&quot; study of vocational education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problems encountered in conducting evaluations

The council chairmen responded almost unanimously when asked to identify their problems connected with conducting evaluation activities. Those responses seemed to say "money", "time", "data", and "people". The problems of concern to the councils are revealed in Table 22. Although there seemed to be a clear identity of the problems connected with the evaluation role, there was no single answer to the problem. The need for money would have to be solved by state funding or through grants from foundations. Many councils indicated they were trying to select executive directors and staff personnel who could make a definite contribution to the evaluation role. The "data" problem would need to be approached in several ways. This investigator felt the single most important aspect would be to have an organized plan and a system for conducting an evaluation activity which would provide sufficient and accurate data that could be easily analyzed to provide information usable by the council.

Who conducts evaluations

To determine the process advisory councils were using to obtain the necessary information in specific areas of evaluation, the directors were asked to identify the agency or person responsible for conducting selected evaluation activities. The summary of this involvement, as presented in Table 23, revealed that the state department of vocational education was involved in 57 per cent of the evaluation activities. The council staff was working with 34 per cent of the evaluations, and council members were involved with 17 per cent of the evaluation activities. The council was using a contractual agreement with persons
### TABLE 22
PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS IN CONDUCTING EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Response*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untimely</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks qualitative value</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining from state agencies</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Money</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding qualified staff to conduct evaluation</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council members availability</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower to conduct evaluation</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation of individual schools to provide data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and coordination with state department of vocational education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of resources</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;None&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each council chairman reported only one major problem.*

or agencies to provide evaluations in 12 per cent of the cases. It is also noted that there was some overlapping and cooperation between the different agencies in conducting many of the evaluations. The cooperative effort is important to prevent duplication of time and money and at the same time bring together a broader thinking about the scope and definition of the evaluation activity.

The Iowa SACVE reported a cooperative evaluation effort between the council staff and department of vocational education to determine
the program availability of vocational education. The council staff, state department of vocational education, and a contractual agency were working together to determine the extent of vocational education at the elementary school level in their state.

**TABLE 23**

**PERSONS OR AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR CONDUCTING SELECTED EVALUATION ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council staff</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council member</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted for</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education department</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on responses from 25 councils to 16 activities.

**Types of evaluations conducted by each agency**

The 25 councils, identified the agency responsible for conducting the evaluation activities associated with each of the 16 selected evaluation activities presented in Table 24. The council staff had the highest "responsibility" for evaluations concerning program availability, preparation of vocational teachers, and conducting public opinion surveys. Their least concern was for evaluations of innovative programs, teacher competency, and need for vocational retraining.

Council members were reported to have been involved in the preparation of 38 evaluations. Conducting of public opinion surveys was the single activity most often carried out by the council members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Evaluation Activities</th>
<th>Person or Persons Responsible for Evaluation Effort</th>
<th>Ratio No. Completed to No. Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Staff</td>
<td>Council Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. State manpower needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Student placement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Program availability</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Public opinion survey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Graduate follow-up study</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Effectiveness of local advisory committee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Innovative programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Preparation of Voc-teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Teacher competency and satisfaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Expansion of vocational offerings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Employer involvement in cooperative education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Vocational retraining needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Correlation of public and private training prog.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Evaluation Activities</td>
<td>Person or Persons Responsible for Evaluation Effort</td>
<td>Ratio No. Completed to No. Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Staff</td>
<td>Council Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Vocational education for the elem. school level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Vocational education for the school dropout</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Vocational education for veteran</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on returns from 25 councils.*
Evaluations involving student placement, graduate follow-up, teacher competency, employer involvement in cooperative education, and vocational education in the elementary schools were identified as having been conducted only once by any council. The four activities most often contracted for were preparation of vocational teachers, state manpower needs, public opinion surveys, and graduate follow-up studies. The contractual evaluation studies generally involved a situation that was state-wide in scope, and they were not addressed to local level evaluations such as innovative programs or study for the expansion of vocational education.

The state department of vocational education was reported responsible for a majority of the specific evaluation activities. In only two cases was it noted that one of the other agencies was responsible more often than was the vocational department. Graduate follow-up studies, student placement and vocational education for elementary schools were cited as being the evaluations most often the responsibility of the state department. The number of completed evaluation activities which have been published is also listed in Table 24. The overall ratio shows that of the 61 activities completed, 50 had been published. Further discussion on the councils' publication role is presented later in this chapter.

How evaluations were conducted

The methods and techniques for conducting evaluations were as numerous and varied as were the councils involved. Council meetings were scheduled at the site of vocational programs to give the members an opportunity to see the programs in operation. This method of
evaluating a vocational program had some merits, but often the councils were only shown the positive aspect of the programs. Council members were asked to visit, unannounced on their own, a vocational program in operation. This afforded the member the opportunity to see a program functioning as it would from day to day without all the attention focused on a formal meeting and guided tour.

As noted previously, the public hearings conducted by the council provided an opportunity for people to express their views and opinions concerning vocational education.

Each council was required by the 1968 Act to hold at least one open public hearing each year. Many states conducted more than the required one meeting, moving to different geographic areas of the state to provide the public with easier access.

The Ohio SACVE, for example, in 1971 held eight regional hearings in addition to the annual statewide hearing. The hearings conducted in the form of a "rap session" provided an opportunity for people to express their opinions and feelings, but for the councils to profit from these sessions they should also have an organized pattern to obtain data or information which could be translated into an evaluation report.

The councils asked vocational administrators and leaders of business and industry to express their needs and plans to the council, in order to provide council members with a functioning knowledge of the different aspects of the program. The council staff had conducted on-site interviews to collect information about the vocational programs
in several areas of their state. The staff also requested follow-up study of vocational graduates.

**Contract evaluations**

With 67 per cent of the councils contracting with a public or private agency to perform some phase of the evaluation, it seemed important to the investigator to try to identify those agencies and the kinds of evaluation they were conducting. The vast majority of the contracts were being carried out by University research teams or professional independent evaluators as shown in Table 25.

**TABLE 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent evaluators</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State department of education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research coordinating foundation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional planning laboratory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the independent evaluators identified were: Battelle Institute, Arthur D. Little, Inc., Educational Associates, Spindletop, Humrro, and American Consultant Service. Although many of the contracted evaluations were of a statewide nature and covered several areas, there was need to provide in-depth information on specific vocational areas.
This investigator questioned the use of the state vocational department as a contracting agency. The council might have received some fringe benefits from hiring the state vocational department, but the council should not pay the state department to perform a self-evaluation. After all, the state vocational program was their primary concern.

The nature of the evaluation studies performed by contractual arrangements as identified by executive directors were these:

- Annual evaluations
- Evaluation of guidance service
- Vocational student follow-up
- Program cost analysis
- Appraisals of vocational programs in post-secondary education
- Public opinion surveys
- Development of evaluation models
- Survey to determine career curriculum

The annual evaluation was identified most often as the activity which the council had contracted to have completed. This seems reasonable, at least during the first two years of council operation, since this was a required evaluation task. In some instances the professional evaluators were hired by the councils to act as a consultant and to provide input data. It was the investigator's opinion that the council should add their own interpretation to all evaluation findings.

Cooperative evaluations

About one-half of the councils were cooperating with other agencies to collect information and perform evaluation functions. The cooperating agencies as identified by the executive directors are shown in Table 26.
Table 26
AGENCIES COOPERATING WITH STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>NumL</th>
<th>Cooperative Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The state department of education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state department of vocational education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A state university</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department of economic development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department of labor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state manpower agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research coordinating unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional evaluation organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the specific evaluation reports are exchanged between states, the state councils and staff members could gain greatly from the exchange of ideas and answer questions concerning "how did you do it?" This investigator felt that this process would help make it possible to more specifically identify the "how" part of the question.

Not only did the cooperative effort avoid the duplication of data gathering, but it provided an opportunity for interaction between the agencies. Each agency gained from the others contribution to the effort, and if the council would involve more people, it seems likely that they would have a built-in public relations program in addition to assisting the vocational program with a broader base.

One council expressed an interest in cooperating with Ph.D. candidates for the conducting of evaluations. This was contrary to the response all councils gave in expressing their acceptability of different evaluation agencies. Table 37 ranks evaluation by graduate students as seventh on the list or next to the last. It was the opinion
of the investigator that good information could be obtained at a reasonable cost from graduate students. Many of the universities who contract to do evaluation use the graduate student to research those projects.

### Types of evaluation systems used

When councils were asked to identify the type of evaluation system being used to evaluate vocational education, their answers indicated that they were not too clear in identifying with specific systems. Table 27 revealed the evaluation systems identified by the executive directors.

#### Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Own method&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.O.E. guideline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 40 councils responding to the question, 13 (33%) left the question blank for a "no response" and an additional four said they did not have a program, however, 11 councils said they had devised systems of their own. This may indicate 11 different systems, but at least the councils appeared to have a plan.
Bruce Reinhart, while serving on the national advisory council staff, reviewed the potential information sources available to advisory council and commented that there were some viable systems with great potential setting on the shelf not being used. The Starr system which he alluded to was being used by only one state and they were under a contractual agreement for field testing. Reinhart concluded his summation of information source by noting "In the main, most agencies are too busy with their own thing."^7

It may be time to look seriously at several specific systems to see if they can be implemented by other councils in their evaluation role.

Guidelines used to determine evaluation criteria

The guidelines that were available to the councils were very brief and left a great deal of interpretation to the council. When asked what evaluation criteria guideline they were using to determine their evaluation role, the responses indicated that the guidelines published by the national council and those of the national and state ad hoc committee were each being utilized 80 per cent of the time. Other criteria used are identified in Table 28.

All councils reported using some form of a suggested guideline to determine their evaluation role.

---

TABLE 28
GUIDELINES USED BY STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS TO DETERMINE EVALUATION CRITERIA USED IN THEIR STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National advisory council guideline</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc committee guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually developed guideline by council</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines from other evaluation efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines from other councils or research</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinating units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation criteria

The council was asked to respond to the use of selected criteria which their council used to evaluate the effectiveness of vocational programs. The councils first criterion was to determine if the vocational program was available to all students. Their second criterion dealt with the placement of vocational students. The quality of the training program ranked high as a criterion, but it seemed to be a difficult criterion to measure against performance objectives. It has been this investigator's observation that the performance of vocational students created a demand factor by employers, and unless the supply was very short, that was an effective way to determine if the program were of the quality necessary to prepare a good employee. However, this feeling was not expressed strongly by the councils. As Table 29 reveals, only 51 per cent of the councils reported using employer satisfaction as a criteria measurement for vocational program effectiveness.
TABLE 29
SELECTED CRITERIA USED IN EVALUATIONS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BY ADVISORY COUNCILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program availability to students</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of student placement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of training program</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of employer satisfaction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for additional on-the-job training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-enrollment of dropout students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee success (satisfaction, promotion, etc.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (student attitude, follow-up data, public hearings, etc.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation from evaluation findings

The impact of an advisory council's function was expressed in the recommendation which they submit with their annual report. The recommendations were to have been an outcome of the council's evaluations of all facets of vocational education combined with the interpretive expertise of the council members for the improvement of vocational education in their state. If recommendations do not get into the proper channels, so that they can be utilized by decision-makers, they are of little value. Although copies of the council recommendations eventually get into the hands of many individuals, it was thought important to determine those agencies to whom the council submitted their recommendations as soon as they were formulated. As reported in Table 30, 90 per cent of the councils submitted copies of their recommendations.
directly to the state board for vocational education and 41 per cent had the Governor and state department of vocational education on their list to receive official a first-hand copy.

**TABLE 30**

**AGENCY TO WHICH STATE VOCATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS SUBMITTED THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State board for vocational education</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State director of vocational education</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State department of education</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state department of education was also included on some councils initial contact list. After having been submitted to the designated agencies, the recommendation became public information, hopefully reviewed and implemented into vocational education programs at many levels and points.

**State director's evaluation of council recommendations**

Because the state directors of vocational education were in such a key position to react to the councils' recommendations, it seemed justifiable to ask them for an evaluation of some selected characteristics of the recommendations. The state directors implied, in Table 31, that the council was quite concerned that their recommendations help develop the objectives for the state plan for vocational education, but showed very little concern for including the activities and efforts of
TABLE 31
STATE DIRECTORS RATING OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
<th>Mean Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In agreement with the objectives of state plan for vocational education</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Substantiated by facts rather than &quot;arm chair&quot; opinion</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Specific enough to give identifiable direction</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Directed toward long-range objectives</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In need of legislative action to be implemented</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Concerned about efforts and activities of private vocational education programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale: Most Some Few None
4  3  2  1

private vocational programs in their recommendation. This is understandable, when considering that the charge given the councils was to advise and evaluate those programs which were receiving or being supported by federal funds. Many private schools have not received federal funds, so have not received the councils fullest attention. The council was, however, asked to be concerned about the overlapping and duplication of vocational programs, public or private.
Implementations of recommendations

Eventually the councils are going to be faced with the task of evaluating the action taken on their previous recommendations, as a guide for the development of future recommendations. It would, therefore, seem wise for the council to determine the extent to which a recommendation can be objectively evaluated. The recommendation which suggests that "action should be taken to improve vocational education," is so all encompassing and hard to pinpoint when it has been implemented. The council which recommended that "teacher education should assume a responsibility for the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged and handicapped, as an integral part of their responsibility," can review (very easily) that recommendation in the years hence and assess the extent to which the recommendation was implemented. A recommendation stipulating that, "appropriations must be made sufficiently early to permit realistic planning for each fiscal year," is very realistic and could contribute to an improved vocational education program. It should not be a problem to check a year later to determine if such a request had been met.

This investigator feels recommendations submitted by councils after an analysis of their evaluation activity should express their desire that evaluations were not to prove, but to improve vocational education.

Publication of evaluation findings

During 1970 and 1971 the councils published an average of two documents concerning the findings from their evaluations. It was reported by the councils in Table 32 that the number of publications
TABLE 32
EVALUATION PUBLICATIONS PREPARED BY ADVISORY COUNCILS IN 1970 AND 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Publications</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be expected that councils would increase their publication of evaluation findings as the number of evaluations increased. Table 24 showed that 61 evaluations had been completed and 50 of them were published. The same councils said that they had 113 evaluations underway; if the same ratio exist between evaluations completed and findings published, it is possible to expect 92 publications covering those planned evaluations.

Nature of council publications

The advisory councils reported they had released 92 publications during the preceding year. Advisory council annual reports accounted for 40 of the 92 publications. A majority of the publications released were of a fact reporting nature, which presented the factual data from evaluations conducted by or for the council. Many publications were
prepared to provide information that met several classifications as to purpose. Annual Reports were examples of publications which presented facts, met legislative requirements, and were used for public relation purposes. The nature of those publications identified are presented in Table 33.

**TABLE 33**
NUMBER AND NATURE OF ADVISORY COUNCIL PUBLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact reporting</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet legislative requirements</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 92 publications identified by executive directors.

The nature of the advisory council publications indicated the council's concern was primarily with presenting of the facts which they had assembled, public relations for the improvement of the vocational education image, and to meet the legislative mandates to the council.

**Distribution of evaluation findings**

The advisory council had included a wide cross section of people in their publication distribution plan. This would indicate that the publications were prepared with the intention of having value for more than one specific audience. However, there were some publications which were prepared for specific audiences such as veteran or
school dropout. The number of publications distributed to each audience, identified in the questionnaire by executive directors, is presented in Table 34.

TABLE 34
PERSONS AND AGENCIES RECEIVING ADVISORY COUNCIL PUBLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Publication*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal mailing list</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News media</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education personnel</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 92 publications identified by executive directors.

Ratings of evaluation studies by state directors

To obtain some kind of a rating on the value of selected advisory council evaluation activities, state directors were asked to rate the importance, from their viewpoint, of specific evaluation activities. It was deemed important to get the reactions of the state directors because they were indirectly going to be involved with the outcome of many of the evaluation findings. The eight evaluation activities submitted to the state directors for ratings were arranged in a final rank order in Table 35. The councils evaluation was seen as being most important when they were concerned with determining the extent to which vocational education was meeting the needs of the disadvantaged, when they were determining public opinion about vocational
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Evaluation Studies</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mean* Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To determine extent to which vocational training is meeting the needs of disadvantaged and handicapped</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To determine opinion of the public, as consumer of a vocational education product</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To survey the availability of vocational education for all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To identify new areas of vocational training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To evaluate the vocational training programs and facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To determine manpower needs of the state</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To determine correlation of public and private vocational training efforts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To analyze state department of vocational education administrative operation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale: Much Some Very Little No

4 3 2 1
education and their interest in ascertaining the availability of vocational education for all. These areas noted by the state directors correlate very closely with the areas which the national advisory council said needed attention. In the past vocational education has not had a major concern for those issues and maybe today so much attention is given to them that the normal majority is being neglected. The council's concern for correlating public and private vocational programs received a low rating of importance, but as the council gets its operation established, that issue should move up on the list. Especially when private schools are asking for a larger share of the federal funds for conducting vocational programs. It was expected by the investigator that the state directors would give the lowest rating to those council evaluation activities which hit closest to home. As the council's reputation and impact builds up, the administration should appreciate the council's desire to improve vocational education at every level.

The council's concern for different groups of vocational education

In consideration for the different groups in the vocational education complex, it seemed important to the investigator to determine the state advisory council's involvement with such groups as: the vocational student, employer, employee, professional vocational staff, the unemployed, and parents. What concern did the state advisory council have for the different groups in vocational education? That question was asked the state director, to get his views as to how well the council was including and involving the different groups of society in
the consideration of their vocational education needs. The response was about as expected with the greatest concern being for those most closely affected by the vocational program, that being the vocational students. Table 36 lists the employer as being of second most concern. This reflects the fact that many of the council members represent employers and their aim is to improve vocational education, so that it will more fully meet the needs of the employer. The unemployed group had a very wide range of concern from the different states, some states were rated as having a high concern, while the rating was very low for others. The state's unemployment rate and attention given to the problem politically could have accounted for that difference. Parents were of least concern to the council, probably because the council felt that it was more important to look at vocational education through the eyes of the student, employer, and professional person providing the program.

Acceptability of council-sponsored evaluation

An advisory council faced with the decision as to whom they should have conducted their evaluations, must also ask, what will the acceptability of prestige of the evaluation be once it is completed? To help answer that issue, the councils were asked to rate the several different groups who might perform an evaluation task for them. The acceptability responses are reported in Table 37.

The councils said evaluation would receive the highest rating of acceptability if the councils conducted the evaluation themselves. Private researchers and industrial institutions were the next most acceptable, probably because they were the organizations with which
TABLE 36
STATE DIRECTORS PERCEPTIONS OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS CONCERN FOR DIFFERENT GROUPS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
<th>Mean* Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vocational student</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Professional vocational staff</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale: Much 4, Some 3, Little 2, No 1

the council chairmen had personal previous experience. The question of an evaluations acceptability and prestige could probably have been more accurately evaluated had resources been available to this investigator for contacting those people in leadership positions who were the decision makers concerned with vocational education. This would have meant contacting representatives of state and national legislature bodies, state boards for vocational education, governors, vocational directors, vocational teachers, and also the individual vocational student who was affected by the specific evaluation findings. In many cases in the past, the council may have selected those who were available and agreeable to perform the evaluation for them, with no consideration for the acceptability of the evaluation report.
TABLE 37
LEVEL OF ACCEPTABILITY RATINGS FOR SELECTED EVALUATION GROUPS PERFORMING EVALUATIONS FOR STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Evaluating Group</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
<th>Acceptability</th>
<th>Mean* Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>By state council staff</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>By state council members</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>By private research evaluation consultants</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>By industrial institutions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>By university research foundations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>By state department of vocational education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>By graduate students for research projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>By university faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale: Highly Acceptable (HA), Acceptable (A), Questionable (Q), Not Acceptable (NA)

Effectiveness of advisory council

As a voluntary lay citizen serving in an advisory capacity with the state advisory council, the chairman was asked to express a feeling about the council's effectiveness, compared with other committees on which he had served. "Very effective" was the rating from 14 (37%) of the chairmen, as noted in Table 38.

This table indicated that the council chairmen were pleased with the results of their contribution to vocational education and society through the activities of the state advisory council. It is
this investigator's opinion that state advisory councils for vocational and technical education will continue to grow and make a contribution to the improvement of vocational education, providing they are given the resources in money, manpower, and time to conduct evaluations which will provide sufficient valid and timely data from which to make basic value judgments concerning vocational education. There must be confidence in the council by decision-makers in leadership positions who can implement and direct action taken on council recommendations. The council will succeed whose evaluation objective is not to prove, but to improve vocational education.

TABLE 38
A RATING OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL EFFECTIVENESS BY COUNCIL CHAIRMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-so</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENT OF TENTATIVE GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

One of the major objectives of this study was to synthesize a tentative set of guidelines which could be used by state advisory councils for vocational and technical education in the planning, conducting, analyzing, and reporting of evaluation activities. This chapter describes the process followed by the investigator in developing guidelines believed to be helpful to state councils in the performance of their role in evaluation.

Efficient and effective management of advisory councils' programs makes it essential to have guidelines to assist the councils in fulfilling their legal responsibilities as specified in the Vocational Amendments of 1968 and any additional legal requirements stipulated by the individual states.

The literature reviewed indicated little direction as to what course of action advisory councils should take in performing their evaluation task. The guidelines which will be presented in this chapter were developed within the frame of reference that guidelines are to serve as suggested standards or principles to be used in making judgments or determining policy or courses of action to be taken. The guidelines are not intended to be absolute, all-encompassing rules within which councils must operate in carrying out their evaluation role, but instead they are presented as helpful suggestions.
Three criteria for identifying the guidelines were based on: (1) legal requirements, (2) rational or philosophical justification, and (3) experiences and plans of those people who had been involved in evaluation.

After reviewing the responses to the questionnaires collected for this study concerning the councils evaluation activities, a list of items relating to evaluation was compiled. This list was refined and grouped into seven areas of general concern to councils. The major areas identified in grouping the guidelines were:

1. Goals and objectives to be met through evaluation
2. Starting and initiating evaluations
3. Development and use of evaluation systems
4. Coordination and cooperative effort necessary to perform evaluations
5. Analysis of information and making recommendations
6. Preparation and distribution of evaluation reports
7. Assessment of the councils' evaluation programs

Guidelines related to goals and objectives of evaluation

The degree to which state councils are successful in meeting their responsibilities and the subsequent influence of their activities on redirecting and improving vocational education will largely be dependent upon the ability of the councils to establish their evaluation objectives and priorities.
GUIDELINE 1: **The central purpose of evaluation activities of advisory councils should be to improve vocational education**

Some of the purposes of the Vocational Amendments of 1968 were to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education and to develop new programs of vocational education. The state advisory council should be concerned with the collection of information as a part of their evaluation activities which would enable them to make sound decisions concerning the improvement of vocational education.

The councils have encouraged the development of exemplary programs and have expressed their views concerning the influence, adaptability, and soundness of many of these new programs. The advisory council should generate ideas useful in improving program operation at national, state, and local levels; otherwise there would be no reason for the council to be involved with the program.

GUIDELINE 2: **The Councils' evaluation should be made in terms of the purpose of the state plan for vocational education**

The most important document detailing vocational education in a state is its state plan. In view of this fact, it seems essential that evaluation studies be concerned with the provisions of the state plan.

Some questions which might be answered through council-sponsored evaluations are:

1. How appropriate are the program objectives for the current year and for a 5-year period?

2. What measures will be taken to determine whether state program objectives have been achieved?

3. Are the objectives measurable?
4. Are program goals and objectives based upon manpower requirements and vocational-technical education needs?


There were requests for new thrusts and program emphasis specified in the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and its 1968 Amendments such as:

1. The disadvantaged
2. Handicapped students
3. Economically depressed and high unemployment areas
4. Areas of high population density
5. Involvement of private sector
6. Area of high youth unemployment and school dropouts
7. Involvement of educational and non-educational public and private agencies and institutions.

Unless specific interest is accorded these areas they may continue to be neglected. Councils must also determine the efficiency with which Federal funds are being disbursed by the states for vocational education programs and services. The Fifth National Advisory Council Report emphasized the need for vocational education to take action on meeting the needs of the special groups mentioned instead of merely talking about helping them.

GUIDELINE 4: The advisory council should function as an independent evaluator of vocational education.

House Report No. 91-744 directed the U. S. Commissioner of Education to check the membership list of each state to see that members of the state boards or state directors were not serving as active
members of any state advisory committee. It was the intent of Congress that the advisory council should serve as an independent evaluator. If the committee membership is "stacked" with people from within the administration of a states vocational education program, it would be difficult indeed to provide a truly independent evaluation of the vocational program. The data collected for this study at the latter part of 1971 did not report any state board members or state directors holding membership on these councils. There are, however, other relationships which a council has with the state department of vocational education which could threaten their independence.

Those issues relating to independent action which should be considered by the council are:

1. Where can the advisory councils' offices be conveniently located to facilitate their operation and yet protect their independence? (or "objectivity")

2. Who should be the fiscal agents to control the councils' funds?

3. To what extent can the councils cooperate with state departments of vocational education and still maintain their independence?

The writer would suggest that the councils should consider their efficiency and effectiveness before making hard and fast rules of operation. Among the councils responding to this study, 20 were using the state department as a fiscal agent for receiving and distributing their budget, and 10 councils were housed in the same building as the state department of vocational education. It does not seem that the councils' operational methods are at issue, but instead whether they may limit their ability to be independent evaluators.
Guidelines for starting and initiating evaluation

After identifying the goals and objectives which the councils expect to accomplish through their evaluation efforts, it seems logical that they should attempt to implement their recommendations.

GUIDELINE 5: The council staff should become familiar with evaluation techniques in order to assist in the planning and organizing evaluation activities that will provide reliable, accurate, valid and timely data.

The Department of HEW rules and regulations provide authorization to each state council to obtain the services of personnel for a council staff as may be necessary to enable the council to carry out its function. One of the major functions of the council was to perform evaluations. Therefore, the staff should be arranged so as to make a strong contribution to that cause. The fact that a majority of the councils receive an annual budget of less than $32,000 to staff, office, and conduct evaluations indicates that the staff members themselves must make a major contribution to the council evaluation effort when funds are not available to contract for evaluations. An executive director who is knowledgeable in evaluation techniques could perform much of the organizational ground work and data collection steps in order to maximize effective use of the valuable time of individual council members.

GUIDELINE 6: The council should develop carefully formulated evaluation plans which will focus on immediate and long-range evaluation activities.

Councils were required to make annual evaluations and to review states' present plans and their 5-year plans. This assignment is coupled with the fact that council members are appointed for 3-year
terms on a rotating basis to insure continuity of the evaluation process. Formal plans can be changed and adjusted to meet the specific demands of people and programs, but at the same time the formal plans provide a foundation from which to launch alternate plans. The plans might include consideration of such questions as these:

1. How will the state plan be evaluated?
2. Who will coordinate manpower needs studies?
3. What activities will be contracted for?
4. What system will be used for data collection?
5. What are the optional dates for starting and completing specific evaluations?
6. Where and when will public hearings be held?
7. Who should be responsible for analyzing evaluation data?
8. What kinds of evaluation reports will be published?
9. What manpower and financial resources are available to carry out the specific evaluation activities?
10. How will employer reactions to vocational education be obtained?

A written plan would aid the council in the distribution and utilization of its resources. The plans should be updated and revised periodically to meet the councils' varying needs and requirements.

GUIDELINE 7: The council should help establish standards or criteria by which vocational program effectiveness can be measured.

After identifying their objectives, the state councils should establish standards or criteria against which to measure program effectiveness. These criteria must be stated in terms of pre-established program goals and objectives—those set forth by the state board in the annual and long-range program plans. The criteria should describe the
conditions and/or kinds of change expected or desired as a result of implemented programs and services. The changes or outcomes must be quantified to indicate the degree of change which will be recognized as acceptable and to provide a basis for comparison. Outcomes should be stated at several levels of specificity—appropriate at the local, state, and federal levels. The standards should be both quantitative and qualitative in nature. The following criteria are examples of those the state councils may wish to use:

**Quantitative criteria:** Enrollments, expenditures, programs, services, activities, and personnel, indicating increases, reductions or changes in the following:

1. schools offering programs
2. number of instructional programs offered
3. utilization of facilities
4. number of teachers
5. student-teacher ratio
6. services to students with special needs:
   a. rural youth
   b. urban youth
   c. suburban youth
   d. inner city youth
7. availability of guidance and counseling programs
8. secondary students placed in post-secondary programs
9. number and retention of students placed in jobs related to fields of study
10. unemployment, particularly in the 16 to 21 age group
11. dropout rate by grade and level
12. programs and services for physically or mentally handicapped persons
13. vocational secondary enrollments in relation to the total secondary enrollment

14. vocational post-secondary enrollments in relation to the total secondary enrollment

15. adult vocational enrollments

16. opportunities for training and retraining adults

17. opportunities for training in new and emerging occupations

18. employer and student participation in cooperative programs

19. enrollments in exemplary and other special programs provided under Parts C through I of the Vocational Amendments of 1968

20. expenditures for target groups and area program emphasis in the Act.

**Qualitative criteria:** Improving the quality or effectiveness of programs, services, and activities in a manner such as the following:

1. improving ancillary services to rural, urban, suburban, inner city, disadvantaged, and handicapped youth

2. increasing the relevancy of all programs in terms of actual job knowledge and skill requirements in the employment market

3. reducing the evident gaps between vocational and general education curriculums

4. strengthening state and local administration and supervision and teacher education

5. improving guidance, counseling, and placement services

6. extension and improvement of ancillary services including: teacher training and supervision, development of instructional materials, program evaluation, and state administration and leadership

7. improve the articulation between the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels of education
8. improving the cooperative relationships between vocational education and non-educational organizations and institutions—profit and non-profit.

GUIDELINE 8: State advisory councils should be provided opportunities to discuss and exchange ideas on evaluation procedures.

State boards of vocational education were required by federal policy to include the advisory council evaluation reports in their annual reports submitted to the U. S. Commissioner of Education. It would seem that the summation and comparison of those reports could best be accomplished if such information were provided in a uniform and basic form.

Advisory council members and executive directors have expressed an interest in the need for some type of program wherein they could exchange views and plans for performing evaluations. In view of this widespread need it seemed to the writer that programs should be presented at the national, regional, and state levels. Councils can perform most efficiently when they know what is expected of them. An exchange of ideas and methods relative to evaluation could provide an opportunity for council to analyze and adjust their own evaluation techniques.

GUIDELINE 9: The expertise of individual council members should be utilized in planning, conducting, and interpreting evaluations.

The distribution of council members from several sectors of the society insures a diversified representation of people who are knowledgeable in their respective areas. The utilization of the expertise of such members insures that the total vocational program can be relevant to the needs of the different sectors of society.
Persons who represent or are knowledgeable about inner city problems can assist in the evaluation activities related to those groups of people. The same would apply to persons who represent the people of minority races. The representatives of post-secondary technical education can assist in identifying those areas to include in a manpower study for persons with technical training. The representatives of public school systems can assist in identifying information which could be provided through or by the school system without duplication by the advisory council.

Guidelines for the development and refinement of an evaluation system

State advisory councils have been established to complement other forms of evaluation. It was assumed professional educators would continue to direct their own evaluations. It is therefore important that the council conducts those evaluations for which they have a unique qualification.

GUIDELINE 10: The council should develop or use appropriate evaluation models.

State advisory councils were constituted to represent the consumers of vocational education, and much of the evaluation should be centered on the product, rather than the process of vocational education. The councils should use systems whereby they utilize the evaluation efforts of others. Even though they utilize the information of others, the conclusions and recommendations must be their own. Information illuminates "what is," and provides the basis in projecting the future. Only as the professional evaluator applies his values to the information
can the difficult issues of "what ought to be" be addressed and the future be shaped to fit vocational education's objectives.

GUIDELINE 11: The council should obtain the professional, technical, and clerical personnel necessary to carry out their evaluation studies and secure contracts for such additional services as may be necessary to complete the evaluation task.

It is difficult to perceive how a state council can carry out its evaluation mission without employing personnel competent in the gathering and interpretation of information for evaluation. The Vocational Amendments of 1968 authorized councils to obtain needed services. It appears that councils have two options for information development: (1) to conduct evaluations utilizing their own professional and technical staff, and (2) to contract with independent consultants to conduct evaluation studies.

In selecting independent consultants, councils should consider the acceptability or prestige of the findings and reports as they will be viewed by decision-makers and others who will be utilizing the information. If services are provided by a non-staff professional knowledge to approve the design and methodology of the study and to monitor and make assessments of the final results. In the end the councils are responsible for the outcome of any studies; therefore, careful selection of outside evaluators is vital.

GUIDELINE 12: All available evaluation studies of vocational education should be utilized.

Councils should request all available information from governmental agencies and other sources, and they should, when necessary, request that specific studies be made by the state departments of
education. It is the completeness and thoroughness with which councils gather information that will give meaning and weight to their recommendations. The councils' evaluation role should center around the utilization of information, rather than the development of information. However, their staff must have the skills and management ability to obtain information from original sources in order to insure an independent element in the total evaluation.

**Guideline for coordination and cooperation efforts needed to carry out evaluation**

State advisory councils would not be able to develop their roles of evaluation unless mutual respect, cooperation, and trust permeates the relationship between the state councils, the state agencies, and the school systems.

**GUIDELINE 13:** Cooperative efforts of the councils with other agencies should be encouraged to provide maximum utilization of resources and to avoid duplication.

The state councils were asked to review vocational programs to identify duplication within educational systems and between public and private institutions. Similar efforts should be made to see that the councils cooperate and coordinate with other agencies to secure all of the information necessary to perform their evaluation role. The relationship between all participating parties should acknowledge each entity's authority, power, and role. Very seldom does the climate provide for an ideal setting; administrative statesmanship is required of participating leaders if the students of our nation are to receive better vocational education.
Guidelines related to the analysis of information and making of recommendations

GUIDELINE 14: Evaluations should be based upon adequate data which is accurate, timely, and of a quality worthy of the council's consideration for analysis.

A lack of data necessary for the evaluation of state programs has been a problem of the councils, but the generation of additional data alone may not be the solution. The data collected by or for a council should be of sufficient magnitude to give a true representation of the populations or problems under consideration. This data should be accurate and timely in order to provide a valid and reliable base for the council to use in backing up their actions. Councils need both subjective and objective data for their evaluations.

Not all of the information councils receive is in the form of "hard" data. They can utilize opinions, suggestions, and criticism. Pre-planning is the most important step in getting the most use from the information and data collected. Councils should decide ahead of time what data would be useful, how they would use it, when it would be needed, and what analysis process should be used. The councils should take advantage of the computerized analysis programs available to perform statistical analysis of data.

GUIDELINE 15: Advisory councils' recommendation for change resulting from council evaluation should be stated in a behavioral frame of reference.

The principle objective of making recommendations is to implement change. Unless instructions are explicit in the recommendations, however, the decision-makers may well be confused as to what necessary action needs to be taken for implementation. Means of implementation
must be specified as well as ends. Only when these steps are explicitly specified can councils operate with direction and confidence in the implementation of its recommendations. The recommendations should also be very clear in addressing the problem to the specific audience which had the authority to take appropriate action.

GUIDELINE 16: Recommendation based on evaluation studies should include vocational education involvement with all facets of the education process.

Vocational education must be unlocked from its stereotyped position in the world of work and in educational training programs in order to encompass the career education concept and eliminate the "tracking system" for vocational or college preparation programs, to utilize the school resources more fully, and to provide better opportunities for adults.

Recommendations which would show relevance to this concern include:

1. fuller utilization of educational facilities (extended day, weekend use, 12-month school, etc.)
2. implementation of career education in K-12
3. establishment of pilot programs where in the academic and vocational programs are combined
4. involvement of business and industry in the instructional process (use of personnel/facilities).

Recommendations should generate interaction between vocational education and other educational elements in the school system such that will be working toward a single cooperative goal. The process of providing students with the many opportunities and experiences necessary to assist them in their individual development should make full use of
the facilities and resources available through all areas of the educational system.

**Guideline for preparation and distribution of evaluation reports**

Council evaluations are conducted to secure information and to assist people in the decision making process.

**GUIDELINE 17:** Evaluation finding should be prepared and distributed to appropriate audiences as soon as possible after the collection of data.

Data must be prepared to fit the needs of specific audiences. For instance, a publication reviewing the school drop-out problem might be prepared one way to attract the drop-out back to school, and another way if its purpose is to convince school administrators to design and conduct a program to hold and attract the drop-out prone students.

The purpose of some reports is to supply statistical data, while others are designed for public relations purposes.

If publication costs make it unfeasible for councils to publish different versions of a report to meet specific needs, then the information should be made available to those agencies that do prepare for such specific audiences as school drop-outs, veterans, technicians, parents, high school graduates, the unemployed, the underemployed, and the many facets of business and industry.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to review the rationale, methodology, and major findings of this study which was conducted to identify the status of state advisory councils evaluation activities and to develop guidelines for carrying out the evaluation role by state advisory councils. The conclusions which are drawn are based upon the findings of the study and the review of literature. Recommendations for action and additional study are presented as a guide to future development and research in this area.

Summary of Study

Statement of the problem

The purpose of the study was to develop guidelines to be used by state advisory councils in the performing of their evaluation role.

Objective of the study

The following are specific objectives which would provide support to the major problem:

1. To describe the administrative relationship between state advisory councils and state board for vocational education and state departments of vocational education through state vocational director.

2. To identify the evaluation role as perceived by state advisory councils.
3. To identify the evaluation activities of state councils in evaluating vocational programs and the state plan for vocational education.

4. To identify and assess the evaluation plans used by state advisory councils.

5. To identify criteria used by state councils in evaluating vocational programs and state plans for vocational education.

6. To determine the extent to which advisory councils are publishing and distributing evaluation results and other information.

7. To identify the persons and agencies responsible for conducting and interpreting state council evaluation studies.

Need for the study

The need for the study was based on the following points:

1. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 mandated the organizing of state advisory councils.

2. State councils were authorized and requested to perform evaluations.

3. The literature was lacking concerning state advisory councils evaluation efforts.

4. The evaluation process used by the state advisory councils has not been providing satisfactory information.

5. Advisory councils personnel have indicated a need for assistance in identifying, planning, conducting, and analyzing their evaluation role.

6. Advisory council reports and recommendations tended to show a lack of adequate evaluation information.
Procedure for the study

The study was centered around three persons in each state who, because of their position relative to the state advisory council, were asked to provide data concerning the council's evaluation activities.

Review of literature

To bring the investigator up-to-date on the evaluation role of the state advisory councils, a review was made of the existing literature. There was very little written specifically concerning the councils and their evaluation role. However, the literature did reveal information related to the problem. The subject concerning the use of lay citizens in serving on advisory councils indicated they were very useful and could bring outside views into the understanding and interpretation of the council's activities. Educators had developed several models for evaluating education, but they were not in very close harmony as to what educational evaluation was and how it was to be carried out. The federal legislation related to the authorization and operation of the state councils was also reviewed to aid the investigator in identifying the council's evaluation role.

Population

The study was national in scope. It included all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the five Islands Governments supported under the Vocational Acts.

Accessible population

Only those councils who had been properly certified with the U. S. Office of Education for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 were in-
cluded in the study. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico met the criteria and were solicited for data.

**Information sources**

The state directors of vocational education in each state were asked to respond to a mailed questionnaire concerning how they saw the advisory council functioning in their states. Replies were received from 96 per cent of the state directors. Advisory council chairmen were contacted with a mailed questionnaire, and 77 per cent of that group responded. Forty-seven state advisory councils had hired an executive director to assist in the operation of their council, and 83 per cent of the executive directors responded to the questionnaire mailed to them.

**Data collection procedure**

The instrument for data collection was a specifically designed questionnaire which was sent to each of the three groups the second week of December, 1971. By March 1, 1972, after follow-up correspondence and the mailing of a second questionnaire to some individuals, an 85 per cent response had been received.

**Analysis of data**

The three different questionnaires required responses to individual questions. Each of the questions were summarized and data presented in the form of tables throughout chapter III. In some instances values were assigned to the responses for specific questions, so the writer could determine a mean value for the question. Whenever possible, questions requiring rating responses were presented in rank
order with the highest rating being noted first. Most of the analysis was reported as census data.

After reviewing the literature, attending a national conference for national/state advisory councils, and analyzing the questionnaire, the writer prepared a list of tentative guidelines which focused on the state advisory councils' total evaluation role. Persons knowledgeable in the operation and function of vocational education and state advisory councils, were consulted and asked to review and react to the tentative guidelines. The people who reviewed the guidelines were: Mr. Warren Weiler, Executive Director Ohio State Advisory Council; Dr. Bruce Reinhart, former member of the National Advisory Council Staff; Dr. Ralph J. Woodin, Professor of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University; Dr. J. Robert Warmbrod, Professor of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University; Dr. Hugh D. Laughlin, Professor Education Administration, The Ohio State University; and Dr. Jerry J. Halterman, Director of Ohio Agricultural Technical Institute.

The writer made appropriate changes in and refinement of the guidelines as recommended by the consultants. The final set of guidelines prepared are presented later in this chapter.

Major Findings

Following are the major findings of this study:

Available research

No previous research on the specific topic existed; one or two minor studies had touched on the evaluation as the total state advisory council role was reviewed. Most of the specific information available
on the subject of advisory council evaluation was in the form of conference or convention reports and addresses.

**History and characteristics of state advisory councils**

Of the 50 states submitting responses, 37 had advisory council prior to the Vocational Amendments of 1968, and 32 of those councils were organized after the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The Vocational Amendments of 1968 mandated a new separate council from the one recommended by the 1963 Act. Ninety-four per cent of the councils reported that they were officially organized in accordance with the Vocational Amendments of 1968 by the end of 1969.

Because the councils were new, the people who were serving as council chairmen and executive director of the councils had very short tenures. Fifty-one per cent of the council chairmen had served in that position for less than two years, although 60 per cent of the chairmen had been members of the council for three years or more. The executive director had a mean tenure of only one and one-half years. The most direct contact the advisory councils had with the state departments of vocational education was through the state directors of vocational education, and here also were individuals who were new to their present positions and responsibilities. Fifty-two per cent of the state directors had assumed their position since the advisory council was called for in the 1968 Amendments. Only 18 per cent of the directors had served prior to the Vocational Education Act of 1963.
Relationships between advisory council and state directors of vocational education

The state directors were in attendance at most of the regular meetings of the state advisory councils on invitation from the council. The advisory council members and staff attended very few state department of vocational education planning and policy making meetings, and the executive director usually represented the councils rather than the chairmen.

Perception of evaluation role

The council chairmen and executive directors perceived their evaluation role to be statewide in nature with council members utilizing their unique public interest background to represent the public as a consumer of vocational education in the evaluation process. They also saw themselves utilizing and interpreting the evaluation findings of other agencies, rather than collecting basic information for evaluation or evaluating local vocational programs.

Council budget spent for evaluation

A majority of the councils spent between 25 and 55 per cent of their budgets for evaluation activities, and 30 per cent of the councils committed most of their budgets to evaluation. During the fiscal year of 1972, only three councils reported receiving additional state funds to supplement their federal allocations. The federal allocation ranged from $31,964 to $95,892, with a majority of the states receiving the minimum amount.
Councils' evaluation committee

An evaluation committee was part of the organizational structure in 77 per cent of the councils, and that committee normally consisted of five or six members with about one-half of them being representatives of professional education. The most common meeting pattern reported was to hold two meetings per year, and most committee meetings were followed by a report to the council membership.

Councils with written evaluation plans

About two-thirds of the councils had a formal evaluation plan to follow for the 1971-72 year, but only about one-fourth of them had long range plans covering two to five years.

Evaluation activities

Concerning the status of their evaluation with 16 selected evaluation activities, 25 councils reported they had completed 61 studies, had 105 underway, and an additional 95 were planned. Program availability and public opinion surveys were the programs which had the highest incidence of completion, while studies underway were concerned with vocational education at the elementary school level, follow-up of vocational graduates, and vocational education for the school dropout. Future evaluations dealing with the preparation of vocational teachers was the single most important concern of the councils. The councils reported that they had very little concern for conducting evaluation with vocational retraining needs or vocational teacher competency and satisfaction.
Evaluation problems

The councils reported data, money, people, and time were the major problems encountered in trying to carry out a satisfactory evaluation program. One-third of the councils reported data (insufficient, inaccurate, untimely, of poor quality, and poor cooperation for securing) as the area causing them the biggest problem.

Who conducts evaluation

The council staffs were involved with one-third of the studies while the vocational education departments were responsible for or assisted with one-half of the evaluation studies completed covering 16 selected evaluation activities. The council members themselves were responsible for 15 per cent of the studies. The council planned to utilize their council staff more and to contract for more studies in the future.

Staff studies were primarily concerned with the assessment of program availability and public opinion surveys, while the council members major thrust was with public opinion surveys. Contractual studies were directed towards graduate follow-up, manpower needs, and the preparation of vocational teachers. The state departments of vocational education was concerned with student placement, graduate follow-up, innovative programs, and the expansion of vocational education programs.

Statewide evaluation systems

When asked what kind of an evaluation system the respective states were using, 33 per cent of the councils did not respond to the
question, and 28 per cent said they had developed their own system, while 28 per cent said they were using one of four systems identified in the questionnaire.

**Evaluation criteria**

The guidelines provided by the national advisory council, state and national ad hoc committees, and those developed by the individual councils determined the criteria used by the councils in their evaluation. Program availability, percentage of student placement, quality of training program, and degree of employer satisfaction were the criteria most often used by the council.

**Advisory councils recommendations**

The councils submitted their recommendations to the state board for vocational education with additional copies being distributed to other vocational and educational agencies.

State directors of vocational education reported that they felt the councils were quite concerned in providing recommendations which were a result of a good evaluation of vocational education, related to the objectives of the state plan, substantiated by fact, and specific enough to give identifiable direction.

**Publication and distribution of evaluation findings**

During 1970 and 1971 each advisory council published an average of two documents concerning the findings from their evaluations. Eighty per cent of the evaluations conducted by the councils were prepared for publication and distribution.
personnel received 78 per cent of the publications and 65 per cent were
distributed to the general public, only 14 per cent of the publications
were distributed to the youth.

Rating of evaluation studies
by state directors

State directors gave the highest rating to advisory councils' evaluations that determined the extent to which vocational training was meeting the needs of the disadvantaged and handicapped, determined public opinion of vocational education, and surveyed the availability of vocational education for all. The lowest rating was given to evaluations which were concerned with evaluating the state department of vocational education.

Councils concern for different vocational groups

State directors said the councils major concern was for the vocational student, followed by employers, then for the employee. The council had less concern for the unemployed and parents in their relationships with vocational education.

Acceptability rating of evaluation studies

The councils felt that the public, especially those decision-makers who would utilize their evaluation data and findings, would give the greatest acceptability or prestige to those evaluations conducted by the council staff and members themselves. Private research evaluators were ranked third, followed by evaluators from industrial institutions.
Effectiveness of advisory councils

The chairmen were pleased with their efforts on the councils and the effectiveness which the councils were having towards improving vocational education.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn by the investigator, based on his interpretation of the data presented in this study.

1. A large majority of states had developed satisfactory relationships between state advisory councils, state boards for vocational education, and state departments of vocational education. There was, however, a considerable range in these relationships from state to state.

2. The councils perceived their role in evaluation as representing the general public in assessing in the state the effectiveness and accessibility of all types of public vocational education.

3. Evaluation activities of state advisory councils have most commonly included: holding public hearings to secure appraisals of programs, reviewing all available evaluation studies, contracting for additional studies when needed, and developing recommendations for the improvement of vocational education programs.

4. Relatively unsophisticated evaluation models were used by these state councils.

5. No single evaluation system was used by more than four states. Although there had been at least three comprehensive evaluation systems developed for statewide use, most councils/states seemed to be developing their own individual plans for evaluation.
6. The major criteria used in evaluating vocational education were expressed in terms of: (1) percentage of student placement, (2) program availability to all students, (3) quality of training programs, and (4) degree of employer satisfaction.

7. A majority of the councils had disseminated evaluation findings through publications and most annual reports of the councils included summaries of statewide evaluations.

8. Advisory councils were performing most of their own evaluation studies and these were supplemented by contracted evaluation studies. State departments of vocational education provided considerable additional information.

9. The evaluation activities of most state councils could be enhanced if they would adopt the following guidelines:

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

Guidelines on Goals and Objectives of Evaluation

Improve vocational education

GUIDELINE 1: The central purpose of evaluation activities of advisory councils should be to improve vocational education.

Evaluate state plan

GUIDELINE 2: The councils' evaluation should be made in terms of the purpose of the state plan for vocational education.

Check implementation of vocational acts

GUIDELINE 3: Evaluation activities of the advisory councils should reflect the purposes of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and its 1968 Amendments.
Independent evaluator

GUIDELINE 4: The advisory council should function as an independent evaluator of vocational education.

Guidelines for Starting and Initiating Evaluations

Staff knowledgeable in evaluation

GUIDELINE 5: The council staff should become familiar with evaluation techniques in order to assist in the planning, organizing and evaluation activities that will provide reliable, accurate, valid and timely data.

Formal plans

GUIDELINE 6: The council should develop carefully formulated evaluation plan which will focus on immediate and long-range evaluation activities.

Evaluation criteria

GUIDELINE 7: The council should help establish standards or criteria by which vocational program effectiveness can be measured.

In-service meetings for council

GUIDELINE 8: State advisory councils should be provided opportunities to discuss and exchange ideas on evaluation procedures.

Utilize members expertise

GUIDELINE 9: The expertise of individual council members should be utilized in planning, conducting, and interpreting evaluations.

Guidelines for the Development and Refinement of an Evaluation System

Evaluation system

GUIDELINE 10: The council should develop or use appropriate evaluation models.

Contractual evaluations

GUIDELINE 11: The council should obtain the professional, technical, and clerical personnel necessary to carry out their evaluation studies and secure contract for such additional services as may be necessary to complete the evaluation task.
Utilization of outside evaluations

GUIDELINE 12: All available evaluation studies of vocational education should be utilized.

Guidelines for Coordination and Cooperation

Efforts Needed to Carry Out Evaluation

Cooperative evaluations

GUIDELINE 13: Cooperative efforts of the councils with other agencies should be encouraged to provide maximum utilization of resources and to avoid duplication.

Guidelines Related to the Analysis of Information and Making of Recommendations

Complete data

GUIDELINE 14: Evaluation should be based upon adequate data which is accurate, timely and of a quality worthy of the councils' consideration for analysis.

Recommendations measurable

GUIDELINE 15: Advisory councils' recommendation for change resulting from council evaluations, should be stated in a behavioral frame of reference.

Recommendations includes all

GUIDELINE 16: Recommendation based on evaluation studies should include vocational education involvement with all facets of the education process.

Guideline for Preparation and Distribution of Evaluation Reports

Timely distribution

GUIDELINE 17: Evaluation finding should be prepared and distributed to appropriate audiences as soon as possible after the collection of data.
Recommendations

The following recommendations are made by the investigator as a result of having made this study.

It is recommended:

1. That these guidelines be disseminated and used by state advisory councils in planning, developing, conducting, and analyzing evaluation studies and in the preparation and publication of evaluation findings.

2. The councils contract for the services of professional evaluators when information from sophisticated research studies are needed.

3. A commonly accepted format be developed and adopted by the councils for the collection and reporting of evaluation findings, to facilitate the summarization and comparison of each state's evaluations.

4. The councils' evaluations findings and recommendations should be published and disseminated to decision makers in leadership positions influenced with vocational education.

5. That the state councils strive for state funding to supplement federal funds for the operation of advisory councils as independent evaluators of vocational education.

6. That the councils endeavor to improve their relationship with the state departments of vocational education for acceptance and appreciation of each other but to maintain their independent lay public status in the evaluation role.

Recommendations for Further Study

Recommendations for additional study are an outgrowth of this study and are offered as guides to future research. The investigator
realizes that this study has been concerned with councils which were relatively newly established, and their existence and function is currently based primarily upon the general guidelines which Congress has laid down or specified for them. Nevertheless, there are some areas in need of additional research, such areas include:

1. To develop an evaluation system to be used by state advisory councils with automation utility for storage, analysis, and retrieval of vocational-related information.

2. To develop a model for councils to use in recording and reporting annual reports to the U. S. Commission of Education.

3. To determine and identify the effect which advisory council recommendations have had as a changing force in vocational education.

4. The development of an evaluation training seminar for advisory council members and staff.

Advisor councils have indicated a concern that the following areas be investigated to provide information which would assist them in expanding their responsibility to meet the needs in career education and post-secondary programs, such studies could include:

1. A study to determine the economic impact a community received from supporting and establishing area vocational/technical education programs.

2. To make an in-depth study regarding the expansion of vocational education to include career education.

3. To explore the educational effectiveness of vocational education, program cost and necessary training period of public vs. private institutions.
APPENDIX A

STATE DIRECTORS
CORRESPONDENCE AND QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTORY OF STATE DIRECTORS
OF
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

October 11, 1971

ALABAMA
T.L. Faulkner
State Director of Voc-Education
State Department of Education
State Office Building Room 607
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

ALASKA
Mr. Luis D. Ridle, Director
Vocational Education
Pouch F
Alaska Office Building
Juneau, Alaska 99801

ARIZONA
Mr. J.R. Cullison, Associate Supt.
Public Instruction and State
Director of Voc-Tech Education
State Department of Voc-Education
1333 West Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85013

ARKANSAS
J. Marion Adams, Associate
Commissioner for Vocational,
Technical and Adult Education
Arch Ford Building
Capitol Grounds
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

CALIFORNIA
Mr. Wesley P. Smith, State Director
Vocational Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

COLORADO
Dr. Marvin G. Linson, Director
Division of Occupational Education
207 State Services Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

CONNECTICUT
Dr. Joseph F. Murphy, Director
Division of Vocational Education
Room 333 - State Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

DELWARE
Daniel E. Koble, Jr., State
Director of Vocational Education
P.O. Box 697
Dover, Delaware 19901

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Dr. Paul E. Cawein, Assistant Supt.
Career Development Programs
415 12th Street Suite 1001
Washington, D.C. 20004

FLORIDA
Dr. Carl W. Proehl, Director
Division of Vocational Education
204 Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

GEORGIA
Mr. George W. Mulling, State Dir.
Vocational Education Division
312 State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

HAWAII
Mr. Samuel S. Shigetomi, State Dir.
Vocational Education
Department of Public Instruction
2327 Dole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

IDAHO
Mr. Roy D. Irons, Director
State Vocational Education Dept.
518 Front Street
Boise, Idaho 83702
ILLINOIS
Dr. Sherwood Dees
State Director of Vocational and Technical Education
405 Centennial Building
Springfield, Illinois 62706

INDIANA
Mr. Don K. Gentry, State Director Vocational Education
700 North High School Rd. Rm. 204
Indianapolis, Indiana

IOWA
Mr. W. O. Schuermann, Assoc. Supt. Vocational Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa

KANSAS
Mr. John E. Snyder, Assistant Commissioner Vocational Education
Division of Vocational Education
122 East Tenth
Topeka, Kansas 66612

KENTUCKY
Dr. Carl F. Lamar
Assistant Supt. for Voc-Education
State Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

LOUISIANA
Mr. Thomas S. Dereloy, Asst. Supt. Vocational Education
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 44664
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

MAINE
Mr. Elwood A. Padham, Director
Bureau of Vocational Education
Maine State Dept. of Education
Education Building
Agusta, Maine 04330

MARYLAND
Mr. James L. Reid, Assistant State Superintendent Vocational Education
600 Wyndhurst Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21210

MASSACHUSETTS
Dr. Charles H. Buzzell, State Director Vocational Education
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

MICHIGAN
Dr. Jack Michie, Director of Vocational Education
State Dept. of Education
Box 928
Lansing, Michigan 48904

MINNESOTA
Mr. Robert P. VanTrics, Asst. Commissioner Division of Voc-Tech Education
Centennial Office Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

MISSISSIPPI
Mr. Troy V. Majure, State Dir. Vocational & Technical Education
Box 771
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

MISSOURI
Mr. Beauford W. Robinson, Asst. Commissioner Director of Voc-Tech Education
Box 480 - Jefferson Building
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

MONTANA
Mr. Benjamin A. Ulmer, Director Development of Occupational Vocational Skills
Capitol Building
Helena, Montana 59601
NEBRASKA
Mr. Glen H. Strain, Assistant Commissioner
Vocational Education
10th Floor, State Capitol
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

NEVADA
Mr. R. Courtney Riley, State Director
Vocational, Technical and Adult Education
Heroes Memorial Building
Carson City, Nevada 89701

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Mr. Neal D. Andrew Jr., Chief Division of Vocational-Technical Education
Stickney Avenue
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

NEW JERSEY
Mr. Stephen Poliacik, Acting Asst. Commissioner
Vocational Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

NEW MEXICO
Mr. E.A. Vigil, State Director
State Department of Voc-Education
State Capitol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

NEW YORK
Dr. Robert S. Seckendorf, Assistant Commissioner
Occupational Education
New York State Education Dept.
Albany, New York 12224

NORTH CAROLINA
Dr. Charles J. Law Jr., State Director
Division of Occupational Education
418 Education Building
Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

NORTH DAKOTA
Carrol E. Burchinal, State Dir.
Executive Officer of Voc-Education
State Office Building
900 East Boulevard
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

OHIO
Dr. Bryl R. Shoemaker, Director Division of Vocational Education
Room 612 65 S. Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

OKLAHOMA
Dr. Francis Tuttle, Director Vocational-Technical Education
Oklahoma State Department
1515 West Sixth Street
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

OREGON
Mr. Leonard E. Kunzman, State Director
Vocational Education
Oregon Board of Education
942 Lancaster Drive N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

PENNSYLVANIA
Dr. John W. Struck, State Dir.
Vocational Education
P.O. Box 811
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

RHODE ISLAND
Mr. Peter Bowen, Acting Assoc. Commissioner
Vocational-Technical Education
Roger Williams Building
Providence, Rhode Island

PUERTO RICO
Dr. Marla S. Lacot, Assistant Secretary
Vocational-Technical Education
Box 810
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00900
SOUTH CAROLINA
Dr. Cecil H. Johnson, Director
The Office of Vocational Education
808 Rutledge Building
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

SOUTH DAKOTA
Mr. Emmett B. Oleson, State Dir.
Vocational Education
Division of Vocational Education
State Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

TENNESSEE
Mr. William M. Harrison, Assistant Commissioner
Vocational Education
205 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

TEXAS
Mr. John R. Guemple, Associate Commissioner
Occupational Education & Technology Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

UTAH
Mr. Walter E. Ulrich Jr., Administrator
Vocational and Technical Education
1400 University Club Building
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

VERMONT
Cola D. Watson, Director
Division of Vocational-Tech Educ.
Department of Education
State Office Building
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

VIRGINIA
Mr. George L. Sandvig, Director
Division of Vocational Education
State Depar. of Education
Eighth Street Office Building
Richmond, Virginia 23216

WASHINGTON
Mr. Ernest G. Kramer, State Dir./Executive Officer,
Division of Vocational Education
P.O. Box 248
Olympia, Washington 98501

WEST VIRGINIA
Mr. Fred W. Eberle, State Dir.
Division of Vocational Education
Department of Education
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

WISCONSIN
Mr. Eugene Lehrmann, State Dir./Executive Officer
137 East Wilson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

WYOMING
Mr. Bruce C. Perryman, State Dir.
Division of Occupational Education
State Capitol Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001
Dr. Marvin G. Linson, Director
Division of Occupational Education
207 State Services Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Dr. Linson:

One of the critical concerns of federal and state leaders in vocational and technical education centers upon the effectiveness of state advisory councils for Vocational Education in carrying out the assignments given them through the legislative provisions of the 1968 Vocational Act.

I am undertaking a study to examine the performance of these state councils in the area of evaluation. This study has been discussed with Dr. Calvin Dellfield, Executive Director, and Members of the National Advisory Council Staff, and has their approval.

As one who is familiar with activities, plans and accomplishments of your state advisory council, you are in a position to contribute greatly to this study which hopefully will develop information which is pertinent to this concern.

If you would take a few minutes and respond to the (short) attached survey form, I would appreciate it. We, including my advisors in the Agriculture Education Department of The Ohio State University, are desirous of sharing the results of the project with participants and shall include your name on our distribution list.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Reid
Administrative Associate
The Ohio State University

RAR/dlc
STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
EVALUATION ACTIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is an instrument to assist in the collection of information from State Directors of Vocational Education, concerning their state's State Advisory Council for Vocational Education. Data collected is to be used in preparation of tentative guidelines for the evaluation role to be performed by State Advisory Councils for Vocational and Technical Education.

1. State __________________

2. How many years have you served as State Director? __________

3. Did your state have an organized State Advisory Committee for Vocational Education prior to the creation of the present council as mandated by the 1968 Vocational Act. __________

If "yes", for how many years had they functioned? __________

4. If your state's advisory council was to conduct the following evaluation studies, how would you rate the importance of each study to the state total Vocational Education Program? (Circle your rating)

1. of much importance
2. of some importance
3. of very little importance
4. of no importance

1 2 3 4 To determine opinion of the public, as consumer of a vocational education product.
1 2 3 4 To determine manpower needs of the State.
1 2 3 4 To identify new areas of vocational training.
1 2 3 4 To determine correlation of public and private vocational training efforts.
1 2 3 4 To survey the availability of vocational education for all.
1 2 3 4 To determine extent to which vocational training is meeting the needs of disadvantaged and handicapped.
1 2 3 4 To analyze State Department of Vocational Education administrative operation.
1 2 3 4 To evaluate the vocational training programs and facilities.
5. How often does the State Director attend regular meetings of the Council?

- Always
- Frequently
- Occasionally
- Never

6. From your observation of the Council's evaluation activities, to what degree do you feel they have concerned themselves with the several segments of the population involved in Vocational Education?

1. Have much concern for
2. Have some concern for
3. Have little concern for
4. Have no concern for

1 2 3 4 Employee
1 2 3 4 Employer
1 2 3 4 Vocational Student
1 2 3 4 Parents
1 2 3 4 Professional Vocational Staff
1 2 3 4 Unemployed

7. ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNCIL EVALUATION FINDINGS.

Choose one of the following responses which best describes your evaluation of recommendations made by the council.

1. Most of them
2. Some of them
3. Few of them
4. None of them

Are the recommendations made by Council in their annual report:

1. Specific enough to give identifiable direction?
2. Substantiated by facts rather than "arm chair" opinion?
3. Directed toward long range objectives?
4. In need of legislative action to be implemented?
5. In agreement with the objectives of State plan for vocational education?
6. Concerned about efforts and activities of private vocational education programs?
Recently you were sent a form concerning evaluation activities of State Advisory Councils. If you have completed this form and sent it to us, thank you.

If you have not had a chance to complete the form, we would appreciate your doing so in the near future. Data from this survey will be used as a basis for developing Guidelines for Council Evaluation Activities.

Richard A. Reid
Graduate Associate

POST CARD REMINDER
Dear Mr. Kramer;

This letter is a follow-up on "Advisory Council Evaluation Questionnaire" mailed to you previously. As of this date your response has not been received.

The evaluation task assigned to the council is an important one and one which could have great impact for good on the growth and development of vocational education. Many councils know what their specific evaluation tasks are and how to go about them in their state but are limited by funds available to complete the assignment. It is hoped that the collective thinking reflected in data from this study will provide assistance for the councils in determining what should and could be done within the council's limited resources.

In order to get a good overall assessment of the council's evaluation activities, it is important that we have opinions and responses from state directors. To develop a program which councils can live with, need to also reflect some feelings of the state department, for this reason, we need the input from your state. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire dealing with your area of responsibility in vocational education. A return of the completed questionnaire would be most appreciated in completing this study.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Reid
Administrative Associate
The Ohio State University

RAR:eld
Enclosure
APPENDIX B

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN
CORRESPONDENCE AND QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTORY OF COUNCIL CHAIRMEN
OF
ADVISORY COUNCILS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

June 1971

ALABAMA
Mr. Henry R. Morgan, Chairman-SAC
P.O. Box 4288
Huntsville, Alabama 35802

ALASKA
Mr. Louis J. Licari, Chairman-SAC
Resident Director
Sitka Community College
Box 1090
Sitka, Alaska 99835

ARIZONA
Mr. F. R. Vihel, Chairman-SAC
1810 West Adams
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

ARKANSAS
Mr. James A. Dildy, Chairman-SAC
Director of Industrial & Area Development
Arkansas Power & Light Company
Box 551
Little Rock, Arkansas 72202

CALIFORNIA
Dr. Allison J. McNay, Chairman-SAC
School & College Relations
Standard Oil Company of California
San Francisco, California 94070

COLORADO
Mr. Stow L. Witwer, Chairman-SAC
Rural Route #1
Box 152
Greeley, Colorado 80631

CONNECTICUT
Mr. Douglas Fellows, Acting Chairman-SAC
University Hartford
200 Bloomfield Avenue
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117

DELAWARE
Mrs. Martha G. Bachman, Chairman-SAC
Box 897
Dover, Delaware 19707

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Dr. Francis Gregory, Chairman-SAC
Senior Vice President
Warner & Warner International Assoc.
1100 17th Street N.W., Suite 602
Washington D.C. 20036

FLORIDA
Mr. Walter H. Clausen, Chairman-SAC
Manager, Engineering Technical Service
Honeywell Inc.
13350 U.S. Highway 19
St. Petersburg, Florida 33733

GEORGIA
Dr. Charles McDaniel, Chairman-SAC
Superintendent of Education
Clarke County School District
P.O. Box 1708
419 Opoc Street
Athens, Georgia 30601

HAWAII
Mr. James M. Misajon, Chairman-SAC
1110 University Avenue
Varsity Building Room 410
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814
IDaho
Dr. James L. Taylor, Chairman-SAC
College of Southern Idaho
P. O. Box 1238
Twin Falls, Idaho 83301

Illinois
Mr. Randolph R. Scott
Principal, Washington Elementary School
1100 Piggot
East St. Louis, Illinois 62201

Indiana
Mr. James H. Fallace, Chairman-SAC
Assistant Director
Day, Gary Area Technical-Vocational School
1800 East 35th Avenue
Gary, Indiana 46409

Iowa
Mr. Robert Skinner, Chairman-SAC
Executive Vice President
Iowa Grain & Feed Association
201 Shops Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Kansas
Mr. Jack McGlothlin, Chairman-SAC
United Transportation Union
704 Turner Road
Pittsburg, Kansas 66762

Kentucky
Mr. George A. Joplin III, Chairman-SAC
President and Managing Editor
Commonwealth-Journal Daily Newspaper
102 North Maple Street
Somerset, Kentucky 42501

Louisiana
Dr. Vernon F. Galliano, Chairman-SAC
President
Nichols State University
Box 2001 Nichols Univ. Station
Thibodaux, Louisiana 70301

Maine
Mr. John Donovan, Chairman-SAC
Bowdoin College
Government Department
Brunswick, Maine 04011

Maryland
Mr. Henry B. Kimmey, Chairman-SAC
Employment Supervisor
1507 Gas & Electric Building
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

Massachusetts
Mr. Joseph W. Martorana, Chairman-SAC
4711 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48201

Minnesota
Mr. Burleigh E. Saunders, Chairman-SAC
Manager, Administrative Services
Defense Systems Division UNIVAC
555 Wabasha Suite 201
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

Mississippi
Mr. Robert D. Morrow, Sr.
Chairman-SAC
Felicity Street
Brandon, Mississippi 39042

Missouri
Mr. William E. Clark, Chairman-SAC
Superintendent of Schools
101 North Johnson
Moberly, Missouri 65270

Montana
Mrs. Linda Skarr
Chairman-SAC
501 S. Third Avenue
Bozeman, Montana 59715

Nebraska
Mrs. Virginia Vierregg, Chairman-SAC
1016 West Division Street
Grand Island, Nebraska 68801
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Chairman, SAC/Position</th>
<th>Address/Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>Mr. Max M. Blackham, Chairman-SAC Director Industrial Relations</td>
<td>Kennecott Copper Corporation, McGill, Nevada 89318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>Mr. Jesse W. Fulton, Chairman-SAC Addressograph and Multigraph Corp.</td>
<td>1200 Babbitt Road, Euclid, Ohio 44117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>Mr. Paul H. Goldsmith, Chairman-SAC Industrial Relations Manager</td>
<td>Hitchiner Manufacturer Co., Inc., Milford, New Hampshire 03055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>Mr. Roy Craig, President, Clinton Production Credit Assoc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 157, Clinton, Oklahoma 73801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>Mr. J.W. Helmstaedter, Chairman-SAC Personnel Supervisor</td>
<td>New Jersey Bell Tel. Co., 540 Broad St., Room 905, Newark, New Jersey 07101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>Mr. Howard R. Baker, Chairman-SAC Vice President, Builder Developer</td>
<td>9055 S.W. Beaverton Highway, Portland, Oregon 97225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>Mr. Melvin A. McCutchan, Chairman-SAC Job Coordinator, National Alliance of American Businessmen</td>
<td>1211 National Building, 5th and Marquette, Albuquerque, New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>Dr. Wilson Wade, Chairman-SAC President</td>
<td>Cheyney State College, Cheyney, Pennsylvania 19319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>Mr. William F. Carroll, Jr., Chairman-SAC State Director Office of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>289 Promenade Street CIC Bldg., Providence, Rhode Island 02908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>Mr. Robert A. Harley, Chairman-SAC President, Harley Bag Sales, Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 5497, Spartanburg, South Carolina 29301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>Mr. William L. Hemphill, Chairman-SAC Finance and Administrative Officer United Dairies</td>
<td>P.O. Drawer M-2, Greensboro, North Carolina 27402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>Mr. Arthur A. Link, Chairman-SAC U.S. House of Representatives</td>
<td>Alexander, North Dakota 58831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH DAKOTA
Mr. Glenn A. Barnes, Chairman-SAC
Superintendent, Todd County
Independent School District
Box 268
Mission, South Dakota 57555

WISCONSIN
Mr. John N. Kramer, Chairman-SAC
1038 Lincoln Avenue
Fennimore, Wisconsin 53809

TENNESSEE
Dr. Fred Thornton, Chairman-SAC
Supervisor Mechanical Training
Tennessee Eastern Company
P.O. Box 511
Kingsport, Tennessee 37664

VERMONT
Mr. Pelton Goudey, Chairman-SAC
5 Maple Street
Randolph, Vermont 05060

VIRGINIA
Dr. Rufus W. Reamer, Chairman-SAC
Department of Vocational Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute/
State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24060

WASHINGTON
Mr. Craig Merrill, Chairman-SAC
First National Bank, Personnel Dept.
Seattle, Washington

WEST VIRGINIA
Mr. Rob R. Walters, Chairman-SAC
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
Director, Product Diffusion
P.O. Box 1346
Charleston, West Virginia
December 13, 1971

Mr. Max M. Blackham, Chairman-SAC
Director Industrial Relations
Kennecott Copper Corporation
McGill, Nevada 89318

Dear Mr. Blackham:

One of the critical concerns of federal and state leaders is the effectiveness of state advisory councils for Vocational Education in carrying out the assignments given them through the legislative provisions of the 1968 Vocational Act.

I am undertaking a study to examine the performance of these state councils in the area of evaluation. This study has been discussed with Dr. Calvin Dellfield, Executive Director, and members of the National Advisory Council Staff, and has their approval.

As one who is familiar with the activities, plans and accomplishments of your state advisory council, you are in a position to contribute greatly to this study.

If you would take a few minutes to personally respond to the (short) enclosed survey form, I would appreciate it. A more detailed questionnaire will be directed to your state Executive Director. We are desirous in sharing the results of the project with participants and shall include your name on our distribution list.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Reid
Administrative Associate
The Ohio State University

RAReme
STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
EVALUATION ACTIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is for collecting information from State Council Chairmen concerning evaluation activities of their State Advisory Council for Vocational Education. Data collected will be used in preparation of guidelines for the evaluation activities of State Advisory Councils. Respond to "Evaluation Activities" as evaluation which took place or will take place because of some action by the State Advisory Council.

1. State ___________________

2. How many years have you served on the State Advisory Council? _____ How long have you served as Chairman? __________

3. On what date was State Council organized? ______________

4. How frequently do Advisory Council members participate in staff meetings of the Department of Vocational Education for planning and policy-making?
   Always
   Frequently
   Occasionally
   Never

5. Has your State legislative body legally authorized the organization and operation of the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education? ______ yes no
   If "yes":
   Date of legislation __________________________
   Statute Number __________________________
   Does it mandate an evaluation effort by Council? ______ yes no

6. To whom does your Council report? (Check appropriate agencies)
   State Board for Vocational Education
   Governor
   State Director Vocational Education
   State Department of Education
   State Legislature
   Other (specify) ______________________

7. If funds were available, what evaluation project would receive your "number one" priority? __________________________
8. What evaluation activity of your Advisory Council has been of
greatest importance to vocational education in your State?

9. What seems to be the Advisory Council's greatest problem in con­
ducting State-wide evaluation activities?

10. Compared with other lay citizen committees on which you have
served, how would you rate the effectiveness of the State Advisory
Council? If you have no previous experience on lay committees,
check here ______

_____ Very Effective
_____ Effective
_____ So-so
_____ Ineffective
_____ Has no effectiveness

11. What percent of the Council's total budget is being spent for eval­
uation activities? __________

ACCEPTABILITY
OF COUNCIL SPONSORED EVALUATION

How would you rate the prestige or acceptability of an evaluation
study or report conducted by each of the groups indicated below. Circle
the response which indicates your rating.

HA=Highly Acceptable
A=Acceptable
Q=Questionable
NA=Not Acceptable

1. By State Council Staff---------------------------HA A Q N
2. By State Council members---------------------HA A Q NA
3. By State Department of Vocational Education----------HA A Q NA
4. By University Research Foundation-------------------HA A Q NA
5. By University Faculty--------------------------HA A Q NA
6. By Graduate Students as Research Projects---------HA A Q NA
7. By Industrial Institutions------------------------HA A Q NA
8. By Private Research Evaluation Consultants--------HA A Q NA
PERCEPTION
OF THE EVALUATION ROLE OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL

On the basis of your experience with State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education, and their evaluation activities, how would you react to the following guideline? Circle the response which indicates your feeling about each statement.

SA=I Strongly Agree
A=I Agree
?=I'm Undecided
D=I Disagree
SD=I Strongly Disagree

1. The State Advisory Council should usually concern itself with evaluating vocational programs offered in individual schools. SA A ? D SD

2. All Council evaluation activities should be statewide. SA A ? D SD

3. The members of the Council should conduct the evaluations rather than Professional Evaluators. SA A ? D SD

4. The Council's evaluation should be primarily concerned with identifying the public's opinion about vocational education. SA A ? D SD

5. Individual council members expertise should be utilized in analyzing and interpreting contractual evaluation studies. SA A ? D SD

6. Professional evaluators should be responsible for conducting evaluation studies under the direction of the Council. SA A ? D SD

7. The administrative organization of the State Department of Vocational Education is one area which should be evaluated by the Council. SA A ? D SD

8. Council members should check all program plans from individual schools to see that they follow the state plan. SA A ? D SD

9. The evaluation effort of the Advisory Council should be primarily with employers in business and industry who employ vocational graduates. SA A ? D SD
10. The evaluation effort of the Advisory Council should be primarily directed toward the vocational student enrolled in the program, to see if the program is meeting his needs. 

11. Evaluation is primarily for the purpose of finding weak spots in the existing State and Local program. 

12. The State Advisory Council's recommendations for change at the State or Local level cannot be made without good evaluation findings. 

13. Evaluation of final or annual vocational program reports is the responsibility of the Advisory Council. 

Please make any additional comments you would care to about the evaluation role of the council. (Thanks for your cooperation.)
January 28, 1972

Mr. Glenn A. Barnes, Chairman-SAC
Superintendent, Todd County
Independent School District
Box 268
Mission, South Dakota 57555

Dear Mr. Barnes:

This letter is a follow-up on "Advisory Council Evaluation Questionnaire" mailed to you previously. As of this date your response has not been received.

The evaluation task assigned to the council is important and one which could have great impact for good on the growth and development of vocational education. Many councils know what their specific evaluation tasks are and how to go about them in their state but are limited by funds available to complete the assignment. It is hoped that the collective thinking reflected in data from this study will provide assistance for the councils in determining what should and could be done within the councils limited resources.

In order to get a good overall assessment of the council's evaluation activities, it is important that we have opinions and responses for the advisory council in your state. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire dealing with your area of responsibility on the council. A return of the completed questionnaire would be most appreciated in completing this study.

Thanks for your cooperation,

Sincerely,

Richard A. Reid
Administrative Associate
The Ohio State University

Enclosure
APPENDIX C

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CORRESPONDENCE AND QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTORY OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS
OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

June 1971

ALABAMA
Dr. Richard A. Baker
Executive Director-SAC
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

ALASKA
XXXX NOT STAFFED

ARIZONA
Mrs. Virginia Trosper
Executive Director-SAC
2233 E. San Juan
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

ARKANSAS
Mr. Lanny Hassell
Executive Director
Continental Building
Room 416
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

CALIFORNIA
Mr. Karl W. Kolb
Executive Director-SAC
1500 - 5th Street - Room 360
Sacramento, California 95814

COLORADO
Mr. Irwin A. MacKay
Executive Secretary-SAC
207 State Services Bldg.
1525 Sherman Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

CONNECTICUT
XXXX NOT STAFFED

DELAWARE
Mr. George B. McGorman
Executive Secretary-SAC
P.O. Box 897
Dover, Delaware 10901

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
XXXX NOT STAFFED

FLORIDA
Mr. Wm. Bruce Howell
Executive Secretary-SAC
Room 254 Knott Bldg.
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

GEORGIA
Mr. Don Cargill
Executive Secretary
Room 303
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

HAWAII
Mr. Robert J. Toothman
Executive Secretary-SAC
567 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

IDAHO
Mr. Vernon Exner
Executive Officer
413 Idaho Street
Boise, Idaho 83702

ILLINOIS
Mr. William Nagel
Executive Director-SAC
222 South College
Springfield, Illinois 62706
INDIANA
Mr. H. Robert Hewlett
Administrative Consultant-SAC
Asst. State Supt., Office of the
State Supt. of Public Instruction
Room 227 - State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

IOWA
Mr. Harlan E. Giesc
Executive Secretary-SAC
1209 East Court, Room 304
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

KANSAS
Mr. Murle M. Hayden
Executive Director-SAC
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, Kansas 66612

KENTUCKY
Mr. Billy R. Howard
Executive Director
Executive Building
200 St. Clair Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

LOUISIANA
Mr. D.H. Whittington
Executive Director
318 St. Denis Hgh.
Natchitoches, Louisiana 71457

MAINE
XXXX NOT STAFFED

MARYLAND
Mr. Max E. Jobe
Executive Director-SAC
1123 North Eutaw Street, Suite 304
Jackson Towers
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

MASSACHUSETTS
Mr. Kenneth J. Kelly
Executive Director-SAC
294 Washington St. Room 304
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

MICHIGAN
Dr. Warren L. Lasell
Executive Director-SAC
Consultant, Bureau of Research
Box 928
Lansing, Michigan 48904

MINNESOTA
T. Jerome Enright, Jr.
Consultant-SAC
President, Enright & Associates, Inc.
555 Wasbash - Suite 201
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

MISSISSIPPI
Mr. James L. Easom, Sr.,
Executive Secretary-SAC
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 71
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

MISSOURI
Mr. Gordon R. Kutscher
Executive Secretary
Missouri Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

MONTANA
Mr. William A. Ball
Executive Director-SAC
State Arsenal Building
Helena, Montana 59601

NEBRASKA
Dr. Chalmers A. Cromer
Executive Director-SAC
UHS University - Room 61A
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68503

NEVADA
R. Courtney Riley
Executive Director-SAC
640 E. John Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
NEW HAMPSHIRE
Andrew J. Moynihan
Executive Director-SAC
15 Pleasant Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

NEW JERSEY
Mr. Randolph J. Girandola
Admin. Secretary-SAC
Department of Education
225 West State Street
P.O. Box 2019
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

NEW MEXICO
Mrs. Connie Jordon
Executive Secretary-SAC
Capitol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

NEW YORK
Mr. Bertiam Black
Chairman, SAC
Director of Mental Hospital
Rehabilitation Services
Bronx State Hospital
1500 Waters Place
Bronx, New York 10461

NORTH CAROLINA
Joseph R. Clary
Executive Director-SAC
P.O. Box 5312
Raleigh, North Carolina 27410

NORTH DAKOTA
Mr. DeForest Rall
Executive Secretary
Box 8123, University Station
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

OHIO
Mr. Warren G. Weller
Executive Director-SAC
112 West North Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

OKLAHOMA
Mr. Roy P. Stewart
Executive Director
Suite 24, Lincoln Plaza
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

PUERTO RICO
Antonia Figueroa-Colon
Executive Director-SAC
Human Resources Development Consultant
P.O. Box 818
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919

RHODE ISLAND
Mr. Truman Weller
Roger Williams Building
Hayes Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

SOUTH CAROLINA
Dr. Robert H. White
Executive Director-SAC
P.O. Box 762
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

SOUTH DAKOTA
XXXX NOT STAFFED

TEXAS
Mr. Alton D. Ice
Executive Director-SAC
P.O. Box 1886
Austin, Texas 78767

UTAH
Mr. Jack C. Higbee
Executive Director-SAC
710 East Second South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84102
VERMONT
Mr. Richard Collins
Executive Director-SAC
52 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

VIRGINIA
Mr. Arthur L. Walker
Consultant
Seaboard Building - Suite 433-35
3600 W. Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23230

WASHINGTON
Robert Putman
120 East Union, Room 207
Olympia, Washington 98504

WEST VIRGINIA
Mr. James A. Cross
Executive Director-SAC
1703 Washington Street E.
Charleston, West Virginia 25311

WISCONSIN
Merle E. Strong
Consultant
The University of Wisconsin
School of Education
Dept. of Educational Administration
Warf Building - 610 Walnut Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

WYOMING
Mr. Clinton L. Harris
Executive Secretary-SAC
P. O. Box 380
Cody, Wyoming 82414

OREGON
Mr. F. C. Bachman
Executive Secretary-SAC
313 Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon 97310

PENNSYLVANIA
Mr. Severino Stefanon
Executive Secretary-SAC
P. O. Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126
Mr. Warren G. Weiler  
Executive Director - SAC  
112 West North Street  
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Dear Mr. Weiler:

One of the critical concerns of federal and state leaders is the effectiveness of state advisory councils for Vocational Education in carrying out the assignments given them through the legislative provisions of the 1968 Vocational Act.

I am undertaking a study to examine the performance of these state councils in the area of evaluation. This study has been discussed with Dr. Calvin Dellfield, Executive Director, and members of the National Advisory Council Staff, and has their approval.

As one who is familiar with the activities, plans and accomplishments of your state advisory council, you are in a position to contribute greatly to this study.

If you would take time to respond to the enclosed survey form, I would appreciate it. A less detailed questionnaire will be directed to your state council chairman. We are desirous in sharing the results to the project with participants and shall include your name on our distribution list.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Reid  
Administrative Associate  
The Ohio State University

RAR:dlc
STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
EVALUATION ACTIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is for collecting information from State Advisory Council Executive Directors concerning the evaluation activities of the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education. Data collected are to be used in preparation of guidelines for evaluation by State Advisory Councils. Respond to "Evaluation Activities" as evaluation which took place or will take place because of some action by the State Advisory Council.

1. State ________________

2. How many years have you served in Executive position for the Council? ______ Did you serve on the Council previously? ______ yes no

3. On what date was Council Staff organized? ________________

4. How many Council members are also members of the State Board for Vocational Education? ________________

5. Are Advisory Council offices located in the same building as State Department of Vocational Education? ______ yes no

6. Are Federal funds for SACVE administered by State Department of Vocational Education? ______ yes no

7. Does State Department of Vocational Education review Advisory Council publications prior to public distribution? ______ yes no

8. Are Advisory Council members invited to participate in department of Vocational Education planning and policy-making meetings?

_________ Always
_________ Frequently
_________ Occasionally
_________ Never

9. Are members of the Advisory Council Staff invited to attend Department of Vocational Education planning and policy-making meetings?

_________ Always
_________ Frequently
_________ Occasionally
_________ Never
10. How frequently does the State Director of Vocational Education attend regular meetings of the Council?

- Always
- Frequently
- Occasionally
- Never

11. To which of the following does the Advisory Council submit recommendations?

- State Board for Voc-Education
- Governor
- State Director of Voc-Education
- State Department of Education

12. Does the Council receive any financial support (in addition to Federal appropriation) from State funds?  yes  no

If so, how much? $____________ (fiscal year ending June, 1971)
PERCEPTION
OF THE EVALUATION ROLE OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL

On the basis of your experience with State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education, and their evaluation activities, how would you react to the following guidelines? Circle the response which indicates your feeling about each statement.

SA=I Strongly Agree
A=I Agree
?=I'm Undecided
D=I Disagree
SD=I Strongly Disagree

1. The State Advisory Council should usually concern itself with evaluating vocational programs offered in individual schools.

2. All Council evaluation activities should be statewide.

3. The members of the Council should conduct the evaluations rather than Professional Evaluators.

4. The Council's evaluation should be primarily concerned with identifying the public's opinion about vocational education.

5. Individual council members expertise should be utilized in analyzing and interpreting contractual evaluation studies.

6. Professional evaluators should be responsible for conducting evaluation studies under the direction of the Council.

7. The administrative organization of the State Department of Vocational Education is one area which should be evaluated by the Council.

8. Council members should check all program plans from individual schools to see that they follow the state plan.

9. The evaluation effort of the Advisory Council should be primarily with employers in business and industry who employ vocational graduates.
10. The evaluation effort of the Advisory Council should be primarily directed toward the vocational student enrolled in the program, to see if the program is meeting his needs. SA A ? D SD

11. Evaluation is primarily for the purpose of finding weak spots in the existing State and Local program. SA A ? D SD

12. The State Advisory Councils recommendations for change at the State or Local level can not be made without good evaluation findings. SA A ? D SD

13. Evaluation of final or annual vocational program reports is the responsibility of the Advisory Council. SA A ? D SD

ACCEPTABILITY OF COUNCIL SPONSORED EVALUATION

How would you rate the prestige or acceptability of an evaluation study or report conducted by each of the groups indicated below. Circle the response which indicates your rating.

HA=Highly Acceptable
A=Acceptable
Q=Questionable
NA=Not Acceptable

1. By State Council Staff-------------------------HA A Q NA
2. By State Council members------------------------HA A Q NA
3. By State Department of Vocational Education-------HA A Q NA
4. By University Research Foundation----------------HA A Q NA
5. By University Faculty-----------------------------HA A Q NA
6. By Graduate Students as Research Projects---------HA A Q NA
7. By Industrial Institutions----------------------HA A Q NA
8. By Private Research Evaluation Consultants-------HA A Q NA
STATE COUNCIL'S EVALUATION PLAN

1. Does the Council have a committee for evaluation? yes no
   If "yes"
   How many members serve the committee? 
   How many members of committee are professional educators? 
   How many committee meetings have they held during last year? 
   How many committee reports were made to the Council last year? 

2. How many publications concerning evaluation have been published by Council during the last two years? (Any available copies which could be supplied to this researcher would be appreciated).

3. Does the Council have a written plan for evaluation activities to be undertaken by Council during the coming year? yes no

4. Does the Council have a written long range plan for evaluation activities to be undertaken over a period of two-five years? yes no

5. Has Council contracted with any public or private agency to conduct evaluation studies? yes no
   If "yes", with whom and what was nature of service?

6. Is Council cooperating with other agencies on any evaluation efforts? yes no
   If "yes", with whom and what was nature of service?

7. What accepted national evaluation system is being used by vocational education in your State?
   STARR  CIPP  EPIC  OTIS
   Oregon System  Other (specify)
CRITERIA USED FOR EVALUATION

There has been some question as to specific scope that Congress had in mind when the Evaluation role was assigned to the Council. Would you please check the guidelines which your Council has used to determine its evaluation role.

- Ad-hoc committee guidelines (May 1971).
- Council developed guidelines for their own individual needs.
- No specific criteria used.
- Adopted guidelines from other evaluation efforts. Specify ______
- Other (specify) ____________________________

Check each of the criteria which your Council used to evaluation the effectiveness of vocational programs?

- Percentage of student placement.
- Degree of employer satisfaction.
- Employee success depends on satisfaction, promotion, etc.
- Quality of training programs.
- Program availability to student.
- Re-enrollment of drop-out student.
- Need for additional on-job training by employer.
- Other (specify) ______________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
Please indicate the Council's action on the following possible evaluation activities, and indicate the person or persons involved in conducting the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle</th>
<th>Date Project Started</th>
<th>Person or persons responsible for evaluation effort</th>
<th>Is Completed Report Published? Yes = No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. State manpower needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>B. Student placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Program availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Public opinion survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Graduate follow-up study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Effectiveness of local advisory committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Innovative programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>H. Preparation of Voc-teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>I. Teacher competency and satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Expansion of vocational offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>K. Employer involvement in cooperative education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Vocational retraining needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Correlation of public and private training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Vocational education at the elem. school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>O. Vocational education for the school dropout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Vocational education for veteran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PUBLICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF EVALUATION FINDINGS**

Please list the publications which the council has released during the last year that are the results of evaluation studies, also respond to the audience for which distribution is intended, and the nature of each publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>NATURE OF PUBLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fact Finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative Mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- General Public
- Personal Mailings
- News Media
- Vocational Educators
- Employees
- Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PUBLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 8-
Recently you were sent a form concerning evaluation activities of State Advisory Councils. If you have completed this form and sent it to us, thank you.

If you have not had a chance to complete the form, we would appreciate your doing so in the near future. Data from this survey will be used as a basis for developing Guidelines for Council Evaluation Activities.

Richard A. Reid
Graduate Associate
Mr. Clinton L. Harris  
Executive Secretary-SAC  
P.O. Box 380  
Cody, Wyoming 82414  

Dear Mr. Harris:

This letter is a follow-up on "Advisory Council Evaluation Questionnaire" mailed to you previously. As of this date your response has not been received.

The evaluation task assigned to the council is an important one and one which could have great impact for good on the growth and development of vocational education. Many councils know what their specific evaluation tasks are and how to go about them in their state but are limited by funds available to complete the assignment. It is hoped that the collective thinking reflected in data from this study will provide assistance for the councils in determining what should and could be done within the councils limited resources.

In order to get a good overall assessment of the council's evaluation activities, it is important that we have opinions and responses for the advisory council in your state. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire dealing with your area of responsibility on the council. A return of the completed questionnaire would be most appreciated in completing this study.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Reid  
Administrative Associate  
The Ohio State University

Enclosure
APPENDIX  D

SUMMARY OF STATES PARTICIPATING IN STUDY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Director</th>
<th>Council Chairman</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>State Director</td>
<td>Council Chairman</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>State Director</td>
<td>Council Chairman</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
GRANTS TO STATES
ALLOTMENTS  FY 1972
## Vocational Education Grants to States

### Allotments FY 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Outlying Area</th>
<th>State Advisory Councils</th>
<th>State or Outlying Area</th>
<th>State Advisory Councils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>$ 53,743</td>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>69,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>95,892</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>95,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>80,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>95,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>36,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>76,494</td>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>69,752</td>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>95,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>44,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>95,892</td>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>35,155</td>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>58,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>35,155</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>95,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>48,733</td>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>56,722</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>65,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>41,258</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>39,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>95,892</td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>45,639</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>50,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>37,105</td>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>56,519</td>
<td>AMERICAN SAMOA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>GUAM</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>PUERTO RICO</td>
<td>44,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 2,690,000</td>
<td>TRUST TERRITORY</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIRGIN ISLAND</td>
<td>31,964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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