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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem Background

Search for Training Specialist Educational Opportunities

The drive of training specialists to be recognized as professionals and therefore, to continue to develop as such is not a new phenomenon. As early as 1943, the American Society for Training and Development began sponsoring regional and national institutes which focused on particular skill and knowledge areas.

However, since the mid 1950's there has been "increasing pressure for university-level degree programs, related to adult education in business and industry" (Nadler, 1970a, p. 327), that would fulfill the desire for a complete curriculum devoted to training and development. One of the first university-level programs devoted to training was offered at Purdue University. This was essentially an undergraduate program. Since 1955, George Washington University has offered a graduate program in adult education and employee development.
It was not until the late 1960's that the real impetus for professional development in the form of short courses, seminars, or total curricula gained momentum. At this point, pressures within the business and industry sector, within the trainers, themselves; and within society at large led training specialists to seek additional educational opportunities.

As Odiorne (1980) explains it, "the realities of training and development are . . . emerging . . . . A new and more professionally trained trainer, higher paid, and closer to the central strategies of the organization will be more completely achieved by 1990" (p. 20). He feels that more people see training as a career in itself, rather than as just a stepping stone to higher positions. This new understanding results in a "maturity and professionalism in training never realized in the past" (p. 20).

Sisson (1978) concurs that training departments were once "dumping grounds" for sidetracked executives. Today these departments are increasingly seen as "development grounds which attract legitimate career interest on the part of a growing number of people" (16). This new interest is due, in part, to the growing areas of responsibility assigned to training specialists and the growing realization within organizations that training is a recognized area of specialization.
Because training is now a recognized career within the business sector, Cooper (1975) feels that "those assigned the responsibility . . . should have the [educational] preparation and practical experience necessary to perform tasks in a professional manner" (p. 26). This new recognition means that formal academic preparation in training and development as well as continued self-development opportunities must be available.

Lippitt and This (1971) add that one of the signs of a maturing and expanding occupation is the rapid growth in its specialized knowledge base. The acquisition of this knowledge requires extensive preparation both at academic and personal levels. The training specialist occupation is now reaching this level of maturation.

The American Society for Training and Development concurs with these observations. It has developed a series of position papers which outline the organization's strategies for the 1980's. In these papers great emphasis is placed on the educational development of the training practitioner. They also stress the changing perceptions of human resource development within the organization and state that

In this era of shifting boundaries, changing definitions, growing challenges, and new integrations, the profession and professionals [trainers] face four critical tasks: to define the parameters of the field; to identify the tasks, roles and competencies we need; to develop effective educational vehicles for new and experienced
professionals; and to position ourselves within . . . the network of human resource management functions. (Jamieson, 1982, p. 118)

Business and Industry Recognition of Trainer Expertise

At the same time that training specialists have sought to expand their educational opportunities, business and industry have begun to realize the growing contribution that trainers can make to their organizations. This is particularly true during periods of reindustrialization and of rapid changes in the makeup of the workforce.

Striner (1980) feels that

Given the order of magnitude of changes in our . . . workforce, we must adopt a philosophy . . . to see that education and training go on throughout life as a natural investment in HRD [human resource development]. Without such an investment, we will continue to be plagued by unemployment, under-employment, and low productivity. (p. 9)

Warmbrod, Persavich, and L'Angelle (1980) list more specific changes in the workforce that call for training expertise. These include: (1) the knowledge explosion, which will require life-long learning; (2) technological change, which will require training and retraining of workers; (3) recycling of workers from dying industries to new ones; (4) re-entry into the workforce of women; (5) more placement of women and minorities at higher levels of the organization, which will mean acquisition of management and leadership skills by these
groups; (6) demographic changes in American society, which will mean an aging population and fewer young people for entry-level positions.

Etzioni (1981) adds that training specialists can assist business and industry by assuring that all levels of the workforce are keeping pace with skills and knowledge acquisition. Of equal importance, trainers can assist the workforce in adapting its expertise as the reindustrialization of America gains force and direction.

Gayeski (1981) analyzes the monetary and demographic importance of training to business and industry. She states that not only are organizations involved in specific job training but that they have expanded the training activity into broader educational opportunities for their employees at the cost of many millions of dollars. For example: "General Motors now spends over $1 billion annually on training; AT&T and IBM, over $750 million per year" (p. 60).

Gayeski further states that millions of employees at all levels of the organization now participate in training and other educational opportunities. It is reported that "3.7 million people have participated in in-house courses, while another 700,000 attended classes in other institutions during off-hours" (p. 60).
Sources of Training Specialist Education

In order to meet the increasing demands of trainers for education to prepare for the expanding role that business and industry envisions for them, more types of opportunities are being developed. Many of these opportunities continue to be offered at local, state, and nationally sponsored seminars, workshops, and short courses. Sponsors of these courses are private companies that have been created for the purpose. The American Society for Training and Development and other related professional organizations also sponsor many such short courses and workshops for all levels of the training specialist occupation. In addition, many large organizations develop training of the trainer programs for their own employees.

However, there is increasing recognition by the training field that more than short courses and seminars are needed if the occupation is to be recognized, and if training specialists are to adequately meet the challenges that business and industry are proposing for them. Therefore, there is increasing realization within the training field that more college and university-level, degree-granting programs are necessary.

Mayhew (1971) feels that this push for educational opportunities at the university level is common to many occupational groups. As demand for their expertise
increases and diversifies, these groups seek to add theoretical knowledge to the practical. They seek more all-encompassing views of their occupational provinces as compared to others with which they come in contact. "This leads inexorably to formal educational requirements" (p.2).

At the same time that trainers are seeking enhanced occupational credibility, training is gaining legitimacy within higher education in its own right. Fork (1981) states that for years the academic community has viewed training as a "highly specialized endeavor which could not be compared with the more altruistic goals of education as found in established programs . . . in colleges and universities" (p. 2). However, while such attitudes might still prevail on some campuses, Fork feels that changes within both universities and the field of training are altering these conceptions.

One such change has been the shift from more traditional general education requirements, based upon the classics to "diverse courses developed in response to student demands for greater social awareness and more relevant subject matter" (p. 2). During this same period, trainers have also broadened their scope to include techniques and concerns now considered part of the literature of the human resource field. These new approaches "concerned with individual growth and learning, have found ready acceptance in business schools and
colleges of education which are themselves expanding toward
human services" (p. 2).

The results of these and other changes are that proposals for new programs and courses related to training are being more readily accepted by a number of colleges and universities which are interested in serving new populations and who are aware of the potential that training has to offer for the improvement of instruction. (Fork, 1981, p. 3)

The Role of Colleges/Schools/Departments of Education in Meeting Training Specialists' Needs

Within the university community, many colleges, schools, and departments of education are realizing that they may be suited to serving the needs of new occupationally-oriented constituencies, and at the same time, finding new funding sources. Roth (1981) explains that today the profession of teaching is practiced in a wide variety of settings, including health care institutions, community agencies, business and industry, as well as public and private schools. Among these varied settings teaching has different goals, clients, content, and time frames. However, "the need for professional educators in non-school settings is growing, and it appears that the need will continue to grow in the near future" (p. 33).

Roth elaborates on the idea that colleges, schools, and departments of education are appropriate settings for preparing business and industry trainers and that
this is the appropriate time for such preparation. He explains that the demand for teachers in K-12 schools is declining, while the need for trainers in business and industry is increasing.

The expertise to deliver trainer preparation programs is within higher education institutions, and teacher education faculty are the major sources of that expertise. This activity should not detract from the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs, and may increase higher education institutions' capability of providing services to schools and improving the teaching and learning process. (Roth, 1981, p. 33)

Fork (1981), Nash and Ducharme (1978) concur that the role of the educator is expanding beyond the traditional classroom. Although these educators are not called "teachers" or "instructors," but rather training specialists or human resource development practitioners, they are asked to perform many of the same duties as the classroom teacher.

However, Tracy (1971) and Corrigan (1980) stress that colleges, schools, and departments of education, offering training specialist programs must understand that this vocation requires additional scope in course offerings beyond those required for teacher preparation. These additional courses include: needs analysis, cost benefit analysis, presentation techniques, media development and use, self-instruction course development, and the use of computers and other technological instructional innovations. Potential trainers must also acquire
knowledge of business organizations' structures and functions, business practices, management techniques and philosophies, and leadership styles and practices. They must also gain a knowledge of the adult learner. They must understand where the training and development function fits within the organization. Without this additional knowledge, educators will not be acceptable to business organizations.

Development of Training Specialist Competency Studies

Although Tracy and Corrigan suggest courses that should be offered in a training specialist program, one of the major problems confronting trainers seeking educational opportunities is the lack of an agreed upon set of competencies; an agreed upon knowledge base for which trainers can be held accountable. This lack of an agreed upon set of competencies makes it difficult for trainers to select and evaluate the quality of single courses or total curricula created by private companies, professional organizations, or colleges and universities. It also makes it difficult for these sponsoring agencies to develop and evaluate their own offerings.

The American Society for Training and Development has long recognized this problem and has undertaken several studies to identify training specialist roles and competencies. It was intended that the results of
these studies would serve as guides for the development of courses, curricula, and for self-evaluation.

In 1976 the American Society for Training and Development established the Professional Development Committee. It was to create a framework that would help training professionals:

1. Identify what skills and expertise a [training specialist's] job requires;
2. Determine personal strengths and weaknesses relative to these requirements;
3. Identify sources and opportunities to increase job effectiveness. (White, 1979, p. 4)

To carry out these tasks, the committee contracted with Pinto and Walker, et al., to define the functions and activities of trainers. The study which they conducted also identified the basic competencies needed to perform these activities. Pinto and Walker (1978)

Additional competency studies were done by the Ontario Society for Training and Development, Kenny (1976), and the United States Civil Service Commission, Office of Personnel Management. The Office of Personnel Management study identified the roles and competencies of its internal training specialist personnel, collectively called Employee and Development Specialists. Chalofsky and Cerio (1975)

A self-assessment guide for trainers was also created by the Ontario Society for Training and Development. This guide was based upon the Ontario competency
In 1981 the American Society for Training and Development began a new study, which drew on all previous work and sought to more definitively identify roles and competencies. Specifically, the study addressed the following key issues:

1. The completeness and relevance of training roles;
2. The future contexts in which these roles will operate;
3. The major accomplishments for each role;
4. The competencies (skills, knowledge, abilities) for each role;
5. The learning resources required for developing role competencies. (The ASTD Membership Quarterly, 1981, p. 9)

Curriculum Development Process at the Postsecondary Level

Colleges, schools, and departments of education are reaching out to new potential student groups, to replace the dwindling number of 18 to 22 year olds, and to replace dwindling financial resources. At the same time, training specialists are seeking additional educational opportunities, as demands for their expertise increase within the business and industry sector. Colleges and universities are perceived as major sources of this education. However, in responding to the occupational aspirations of this new constituency, colleges, schools, and departments of education must develop strategies for reconciling the needs of these new students with students
in more traditional teacher preparation curricula. Much of this reconciliation occurs at the point of curriculum development.

How faculties of higher education make curriculum decisions can be said to lie on a continuum from the haphazard to the systematic. However, most authorities agree that curriculum decision making should be based upon an identified rationale or theory.

Vallance (1980) feels that a knowledge of curriculum theory helps the practitioner to know what he is doing and what he is omitting in particular situations. Curriculum workers need to be aware of the various strategies for coping with curriculum development. This understanding is particularly important when a curriculum committee(s) is developing a curriculum for a new type of group, such as training specialists, for whom there is no set of agreed upon competencies.

Today, two basic camps of curriculum decision making theory hold sway. The older theoretical camp has developed around the theories espoused by Tyler (1950) and elaborated by Taba (1962).

Tyler creates a theoretical model based upon his philosophy. It includes the following steps:

1. Establish objectives by considering the learner and his needs and interests, the environment, and the subject matter;
2. Form tentative objectives;
3. Screen tentative objectives, which are based upon:
   a. an educational philosophy
   b. the psychology of learning

Taba modifies these steps slightly. She emphasizes the selection and organization of content and the selection and organization of the learning experiences, as well as the identification of objectives.

These objectives-based approaches seem to work best when a clear understanding of who the learners are and what their learning outcomes should be are held by all concerned parties. Because everyone holds the same expectations, curriculum decision makers can build upon commonly held sets of objectives.

However, when educational institutions are faced with new student types, requiring new and relatively undefined curriculum outcomes, commonly held sets of expectations from all concerned parties are usually not available. Therefore, new approaches to curriculum development must be found. Faculties and administrators charged with developing training specialist curricula fall into this category.

These newer approaches in curriculum theory build upon and incorporate the components suggested by Tyler, Taba and others in the "objectives" camp. However, they stress systems approaches which look at the various
interacting components of the process. They analyze the steps in curriculum decision making as well as the outcomes of that process, which is the curriculum, itself. Alpren (1970) states that the "focus is not upon the curriculum [itself] but upon the recipient [student], the process agent [teacher, faculty and other involved parties], and societal action" (p. 307).

Representing these theoretical positions, Feyereisen (1970) lists the following characteristics of a curriculum decision making process, based upon systems theory:

1. Curriculum as a system must consider the accomplishments of its overall purpose; the organization and interaction of its components; the integration of components and subsystems, and the mutual dependence between components and subsystems.

2. Curriculum as a system must identify all external and internal variables and define the mutual interdependence between them.

The curriculum literature indicates that new training specialist constituencies might be best served by curriculum decision making processes based on systems theories.

Statement of the Problem

Employers now hold increasing expectations for the performance of training specialists. This is coupled with
the increased desire for trainers to enhance their own competencies and credibility within their organizations. In 1979 and again in 1981, the Professional Development section of the American Society for Training and Development sponsored conferences to discuss the state of the art in academic preparation of training specialists. One of the results of these conferences was the Directory of Academic Programs in T&D and Human Resource Development (1981). In all these endeavors the society was seeking to identify what academic opportunities existed for its members, and how these opportunities could be improved.

Concerns with curriculum decisions, in terms of both content and process, were continually raised at these conferences, as participants compared programs. Models and Concepts (1981) Concerns were also raised by society members as they analyzed the 1981 academic directory. They found little consistency among program offerings in terms of overall curriculum outlines or course descriptions. Gentilman (1981)

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which curriculum decision makers in undergraduate colleges, schools, and departments of education employed selected steps of curriculum decision making processes when developing training specialist curricula, and teacher preparation curricula, with which they were more familiar. These steps, employed for purposes of description and
comparison between processes, were gleaned primarily from curriculum literature, stressing systems approaches to curriculum development.

Systems approaches were considered most appropriate for analysis of a new occupationally-oriented program such as the training specialist program because systems theories stressed interaction of the various components of the process (students, process agents, and societal interaction) which must be reconciled before development of successful programs could be achieved. By identifying and comparing selected curriculum decision making steps employed by developers of training specialist and teacher preparation curricula, it was hoped that any different decision making strategies adopted by groups developing training specialist curricula would be highlighted.

This description and comparison sought to determine:
1. To what extent did undergraduate colleges, schools, and departments of education follow the selected curriculum decision making steps, chosen primarily from curriculum development literature, stressing systems approaches, when developing training specialist curricula?
2. To what extent did undergraduate colleges, schools, and departments of education follow selected curriculum decision making steps, chosen primarily from curriculum
development literature, stressing systems approaches, when developing teacher preparation curricula?

3. How did approaches toward curriculum decision making differ between the processes employed when developing training specialist curricula and the processes employed when developing teacher preparation curricula?

Research Questions

Selected curriculum decision making steps, chosen from curriculum development literature may be consistent with actual approaches employed by educational faculties when developing training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula. Therefore, the research specifically sought to determine the following:

1. To what extent did processes employed when developing training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula, with which faculties might be more familiar include the following selected curriculum decision making steps?
   a. Identifying sources of program initiative
   b. Identifying leaders and committees
   c. Identifying goals and objectives
   d. Selecting sources of information
   e. Selecting faculty development opportunities

2. In addition, the comparative analysis considered to what extent did selected political and administrative
considerations influence curriculum development processes? Specifically, the points analyzed included:

a. Commitment of the administration to the program
b. Achieving philosophical agreement among faculty over program development
c. Commitment of monetary, personnel, and physical resources to the program
d. Reconciling traditional and non-traditional students' academic and administrative needs
e. Interdisciplinary rivalry over the program's placement
f. Competition from similar programs in the same geographic area

3. Finally, a demographic context was provided in which these data were analyzed. The context consisted of those higher education institutions that had training specialist curricula in place for a minimum of two years. Descriptions of those institutions included the following information:

a. Was the college, school, or department of education divided into specialized areas? In what area of specialization was the training specialist program placed?

b. What were the number of full time equivalent faculty in the college, school, or department of education?
c. How many full time equivalent faculty were involved primarily with the training specialist program?
d. In what areas did the training specialist faculty specialize?
e. What number of training specialist faculty had business and industry-related experience?
f. How many male and female students were currently enrolled in the training specialist program?
g. What percentage of students were employed in training specialist positions while enrolled?

Significance of the Problem

Colleges, schools, and departments of education are reaching out into their communities to serve new constituencies with new career aspirations. This is necessary because there is a shrinking pool of traditional 18 to 22 year old students. Due to poor economic conditions and changing national priorities, there are also dwindling revenue sources. Therefore, it is important that faculties not only recognize the educational goals of these new students, but reconcile them with the goals and aspirations of educational faculties, other students, and administrators as they develop new curricula to meet the needs of new student constituencies.
However, decision making processes used to develop postsecondary curricula were not generally known. The significance of this study lay in the identification and comparison of selected curriculum decision making steps, chosen primarily from curriculum development literature, stressing systems approaches. The steps were employed when developing training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula, with which faculties were more familiar. These selected curriculum decision making steps were used as the basis of description and comparison between processes.

It was hoped that the study would assist future curriculum decision makers who plan to develop training specialist curricula in the following ways:

1. The study showed the extent to which actual curriculum decision makers incorporated selected decision making steps, chosen primarily from curriculum development literature, stressing systems approaches. It also showed where and why curriculum developers diverged from these selected steps.

2. It was hoped that future curriculum decision makers, faced with development of similar training specialist curricula would be able to expedite the processes if they had access to descriptions of certain aspects of training specialist curriculum development. This might save valuable personnel, financial, and time resources, while
assuring that the aspirations of all concerned parties had been satisfied.

**Definition of Terms**

1. Training specialist is one of several human resource specialists working for organizations. "The primary focus is developing the key competencies and motivations which enable individuals to perform current and future jobs" (McLaglan, 1981, p. 5). Within that primary focus, the training specialist may perform the following roles: (1) curriculum designer, (2) department manager, (3) evaluator, (4) facilities arranger, (5) individual development counselor, (6) learning facilitator, (7) management staff member, (8) management team member, (9) marketer, (10) media production specialist, (11) needs analyzer, (12) policy maker, (13) program administrator, designer, manager; (14) researcher, (15) strategist, (16) consultant, (17) transfer agent, and (18) writer.

2. Curriculum is an "organized body of information to realize objectives of a particular group of students who are registered in the program of studies of an educational institution" (Draper, 1936, p. 17).

"Curriculum identifies the elements . . . states the relationships to each other, and indicates the principles of the organization and the requirements of that organization for the administrative conditions
under which it is to operate" (Taba, 1962, p. 421).

"Curriculum is a written document; it contains statements outlining the goals for the school for which the curriculum was designed; and it contains a body of culture content that tentatively has the potential for the realization of the goals; . . . a statement of intention for use of the document as a guiding force for planning instructional strategies; and an evaluation scheme" (Beauchamp, 1980, p. 136).

3. Curriculum Design System [Curriculum Engineering] "consists of all the processes necessary to make a curriculum . . . function . . . to keep the curriculum . . . in a dynamic state. It consists of planning, implementing, and evaluating curriculum" (Beauchamp, 1980, p. 142-143).

Limitations

1. Only training specialist curricula at the undergraduate level were analyzed. Although there were many Master and Ph.D. level curricula available, it was thought that the smaller, more cohesive group of undergraduate programs would provide more accessible and easily analyzed data.

2. Only undergraduate programs labeled or described as referring to "trainers," "training specialists," or "human resource developers," were evaluated. This eliminated from the study programs offered for
organizational development personnel, media specialists, and any other groups that fit under the American Society for Training and Development membership umbrella.

3. No one model for curriculum decision making existed that was acceptable to all authorities. Therefore, the basic steps selected for analysis in the study represented a synthesis of K-12 and postsecondary liberal arts and occupational theories, described in the curriculum literature. Curriculum development based on systems approaches were selected since they seemed to offer the greatest opportunity for reconciling the various aspirations of new pupil groups, faculties, and administrators.

4. Curriculum content steps of the decision making process were not selected for analysis in this study, even though content might vary from one program to another while other steps in the process showed great similarity. This decision was made for the following reasons:
   a. There was no set of agreed upon training specialist competencies for which any program could be held accountable at the time.
   b. The real test of a curriculum content's success was the knowledge learned and the degree to which the practitioner could operate within the chosen occupational setting. Analysis and comparison of course syllabi did not, in themselves, indicate success.
c. Higher education was still new at devising curricula for this new constituency. Each institution was developing its own method for identifying curriculum content within the context of its own education programs.

5. Only those educational institutions (10 institutions) that had training specialist programs in place for at least two years were chosen for analysis in this study. It was hoped that this time period would give respondents some distance from the actual development processes and therefore, more time to objectively account for how curriculum decisions were made.

Summary

Training practitioners are seeking additional educational experiences to satisfy the increased responsibilities business and industry are placing upon them. At the same time, colleges and universities are reaching out to identify new pupil constituencies and new funding sources. This is necessary because the traditional pool of 18 to 22 year old students is shrinking. Traditional funding sources are also diminishing because of poor economic conditions and changing educational priorities. The goals and aspirations of the new constituency for new educational programs must be reconciled with those of more traditional pupils, faculties, and administrators. This
reconciliation often occurs at the point of curriculum development.

This study sought to compare the curriculum decision making processes employed by developers of undergraduate training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula with which faculties were more familiar. These programs were located in colleges, schools, and departments of education. Selected curriculum decision making steps, chosen primarily from curriculum development literature, stressing systems approaches, were included for purposes of description and comparison between processes.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter contains a review of the pertinent literature concerned with the three subject matter areas upon which this dissertation was based. These literature bases included:

1. The identification of training specialist roles and competencies, and the search for educational sources to teach these competencies.

2. The demographic and monetary changes facing higher education that are pressuring it to seek new pupil groups and new funding sources. Special attention was given to the roles of colleges, schools, and departments of education in meeting these new challenges.

3. The identification of theories of curriculum decision making, at K-12 and postsecondary levels, that suggest methods for reconciling the goals of the new pupils with those of traditional students, faculties, and administrators.

These literature bases, although distinct areas of study in themselves, illustrated a growing interrelationship between the needs of training specialists and colleges.
and universities. Training practitioners wish to expand their educational choices, in order to fulfill the growing responsibilities placed upon them by business and industry. Colleges and universities are increasingly faced with the task of replacing the dwindling pool of 18 to 22 year old students with new pupils. They must also replace dwindling monetary resources in a time of economic scarcity and changing national priorities.

The point at which both groups often reconcile their aspirations is at the level of curriculum development. The manner in which curriculum development processes are handled can determine the extent to which colleges and universities, particularly educational faculties, can fulfill the expectations of the training specialist constituencies. At the same time they can assure themselves of new sources of pupils and funding.

Training Specialists: Roles and Competencies

Difficulties surrounding the identification of training specialists' competencies is part of a larger problem: that of defining trainers' roles within business and industry. Training is an evolving occupation, and as such, its position within and importance to the organization has changed over the years. These changing perceptions are reflected in the old and new interpretations assigned to trainer roles and competencies.
**Historical Interpretations of Training Specialists' Roles**

As Pemberton (1979) sees it, in the past the training function has been forced into situations where management believed in the concept that a trainer was a person whose job it was to 'lay on training.' This concept may have been so in the forties and fifties, but as the skills became more sophisticated, so the business world realized that not only does one have to teach basic skills to operatives but one also has to teach management to managers. (p. 62)

He also traces the major roles that trainers have played in business organizations in the past few decades. In the first generation of trainers, 1900 to 1950, the primary role was one of "task instructor." The second generation, 1950 to 1960, was primarily the "peddler of new techniques." The third generation, 1960-1970, was labeled as the "problem solver" (p. 63).

McGehee (1961) states that the responsibility for planning, organizing, and conducting training was often assigned in a "haphazard manner." That managers paid too little attention to the possibility that the "individuals who were responsible for training would have an effect on training results" (p. 226-7).

However, McGehee's solution to who should hold the responsibility for training reflects an older attitude about the roles of training and the place of personnel development within the organization. He feels that the training function should belong to a staff specialist,
but that it is the ultimate responsibility of the line manager to "accept or reject the services of the specialist" and to "evaluate the outcomes" (p. 228) of the training.

**Business and Industry's Changing Perceptions of Training Specialists' Roles**

More current authorities view training and the training function as an interdisciplinary enterprise in which one or more specialized personnel carry out a variety of functions under a variety of titles. This new perception of trainers and their roles is due, in part, to the growing realization by business and industry of the importance of personnel development to the organization, particularly during this period of reindustrialization and changing workforce demographics.

Dieffenderfer (1977) lists the following areas of responsibility business and industry now assign to training specialists, as an indication of the growing importance of personnel development to this sector of society:

1. Retraining the workforce to use new technologies;
2. Assuring that workers with borderline skills are retrained before they reach obsolescence;
3. Assuring that the new demographic realities of the workforce, women, ethnic groups, and the handicapped, are trained for both entry and upper level positions;
4. Identifying and teaching new styles of supervision and management, to reflect the more participative approach;
5. Identifying new teaching and training techniques that satisfy the adult learner and thereby reduce turnover, absenteeism, and increase productivity;
6. Using forecasting information related to changes in manpower and technology to assure that the workforce is always in balance with the latest trends.

Evans (1981) adds that trainers must also develop techniques and instruments for evaluation and accountability. Because personnel development functions are now viewed as important costs of and possible assets to organizations, the training sector is expected to be accountable for its performance just like all other managers.

Pemberton (1979) suggests that business and industry organizations view trainers as "catalysts." By using techniques to modify or change those things that can or should be altered, they make organizations "better places to work in so that they can be more productive, or successful and better able to achieve their objectives" (p. 63).

**Contemporary Interpretations of Training Specialists' Roles**

Because of the expanded responsibilities assigned to training by the business and industry sector, the
perceived roles of the training specialist, as viewed by current authorities have also broadened. However, there has been no consensus on trainer roles among authorities.

Chaddock (1976) states that teaching is only one of the roles an effective trainer can assume. "If the training department is performing its mission of contributing to the achievement of organizational goals it will ... detect, analyze, and solve performance problems of those who make up the organization" (p. 3-1).

These roles may be assigned to one person or many, depending upon the size and complexity of the organization. Nadler defines the roles as:
1. "Learning specialist" - instructs, builds curriculum, develops methods and materials;
2. "Administrator" - develops personnel, supervises ongoing programs, maintains community relations, arranges facilities and finance;
3. "Consultant" - advocates, stimulates, acts as a change agent both within and without the company (p. 151).

Lippitt (1971) and Miller (1979) list similar role descriptions. They use the terms (1) learning specialist, (2) administrator, (3) information coordinator, and (4) consultant.

Jorz and Chalofsky (1976) identify five role and activity areas. These include: (1) learning specialist, (2) administrator, (3) program manager, (4) consultant,
and (5) career counselor.

Otto and Glaser (1970) have a slightly different interpretation of trainer roles. They list (1) learning specialist, (2) systems analyst, (3) communications expert, (4) internal consultant, (5) administrator, (6) developer of philosophies, policies, and procedures, (7) teacher in formal and informal settings, (8) research program designer, and (9) performance standards designer, implementer, and interpreter.

**Training Specialists' Competencies as Interpreted by Practitioners**

Authorities have been no more successful in reaching consensus on the acceptable trainer competencies that should fit these disparate titles and roles. Schachhuber (1980) states, "Training is a catch-all field. It is therefore not surprising that a variety of concepts and styles . . . and models co-exist and often contradict each other. No one seems universally acceptable" (p. 8).

Tracy (1971) categorizes trainer competencies under the following functional areas: (1) subject-matter expertise, (2) professional knowledge and skills, (3) communication skills, and (4) personal qualities.

Miller (1979), Donaldson (1978), and Gayeski (1981) suggest similar lists of professional and personal
competencies. Rose (1964) adds resourcefulness and creativity to the list. This and Lippitt (1979), Davies (1973), and Zenger (1980) all stress the importance of flexibility in designing, presenting and evaluating programs. All feel that individual differences in learners, organizations, and situations must underlie all decisions.

Knowles (1970) and Donaldson (1978) stress the need for the training specialist to acquire the andragogical philosophy and associated competencies for his work. The training specialist should adopt a participant-centered approach, based on mutual diagnosing, planning, implementing, and evaluating of the learning. He should understand not only the psychological and physical aspects of the adult learner and how these might enhance or interfere with the learning, but also understand that the adult brings a reservoir of knowledge, experiences, and skills upon which the learning can be built.

Summary

The training specialist occupation is still evolving. As the business and industry sector has increased the responsibilities of the trainer, role definitions and competencies' identification have also expanded and gone through many interpretations.
Early interpretations of the training specialist's roles stressed the subordinate position of training within the organization. Competencies emphasized "teaching" or "training" only. Today the training specialist is most often viewed as an integral component of the management team, with interdisciplinary roles and responsibilities centering on human resource development. Competencies necessary to support these roles have increased in number and complexity. However, there is still no agreed upon set of roles and competencies to which the occupation subscribes.

Postsecondary Academic Preparation

Changing Roles of Higher Education

Training specialists are seeking expanded educational opportunities to fulfill the increased responsibilities placed upon them by business and industry. At the same time, higher education is going through a period of transition and reevaluation of its own roles and responsibilities within society.

In part, this reevaluation is necessary because of a decrease in the 18 to 22 year old sector of the population. Evans (1979) It is also necessitated by a shift in national economic priorities, which means a decrease in the monetary resources available to the academic community. Doll (1980) In order to meet these challenges,
higher education is seeking new types of pupils and new funding sources. Relic (1979)

Groups to whom postsecondary education are looking for potential students and funding are occupationally-oriented persons. These people are seeking educational opportunities in order to maintain and extend their occupational expertise. One of these groups is the training specialist.

However, in order to fulfill the educational expectations of this new occupational constituency, higher education, particularly undergraduate education, must undergo some changes. These changes must take place both in the philosophical understanding of the place of occupational education in postsecondary education, and in the practical approaches to developing work-related curricula. Dressel (1971) states that "the role of undergraduate higher education in relation to the . . . [occupational] activity for which it prepares, requires clarification in regard to objectives, subject matter sequence, and specificity of preparation" (p. 72). He also feels that occupational pre-service and in-service education face the same problems that concern liberal education, "in seeking a balance between the individual and the abstract knowledge, practice and theory, flexibility and rigid structure, and unity and compartmentalization" (p. 152).
Philosophical Considerations Inherent in Developing
Occupational Programs at the Undergraduate Level

Dressel (1971) expresses the opinion that there is no universal agreement within the academic community that work-related programs belong at the undergraduate level of higher education, rather than in other types of post-secondary institutions. He states:

The issue has been and will be long debated as to what occupational knowledge and competencies are appropriate for a four-year degree diploma. Community colleges and technical schools may take over responsibility for post-high school occupational training . . . but as these terminal occupational programs attain a measure of acceptance and prestige . . . there will be a tendency for the occupations involved to insist on a college degree . . . Colleges and universities will need to screen such demands and yet avoid an arbitrary negative position which would interfere with the natural growth of new and needed specialties. (p. 40)

Relic (1979) argues that the primary stumbling block to initiating a successful occupational program is "primarily attitudinal" (p. 11). An undergraduate faculty perceives a conflict between the aspirations of work-related and liberal arts education. However, Relic states that "[occupational] education, when it is well planned and well implemented, broadens student and [faculty] perspectives" (p. 11-12).

Other authorities contend that occupational programs are compatible with the philosophies of higher education, but that their proper place is in the graduate school. Houle (1980) However, Mayhew (1971) states
several reasons why undergraduate education is also an appropriate province for work-related programs.

1. It allows occupational fields to contribute to the student's general education.
2. It helps guide the undergraduate in reaching career decisions.
3. It helps prepare sub and paraprofessionals and entry level practitioners.
4. It allows for interdisciplinary experience.
5. It "brings the [occupational] schools back into the mainstream of the university" (p. 42).

Structure and Content of Occupational Program Development

Mayhew (1971) believes that many faculty and administrative personnel still interpret occupational education programs from a narrowly defined perspective that influences the ways in which they organize the structure and content of work-related courses. This older perspective emphasized:

1. Practicality over general education;
2. Narrowly defined course structure that kept the student within his [occupational] area as much of the time as possible;
3. A textbook core of required courses [that] seemed to presume a common . . . career for all graduates" (p. 14)

However, he feels that there must be a transition from this older perceptual base of program development to one that stresses newer ways of organizing information,
"so that students can perceive broad dimensions and develop skills to acquire special knowledge when necessary in the future" (p. 12). There should be time for specialization, interface with other occupational disciplines, and time to discover new areas of knowledge.

Mayhew's ideas of what constitutes the basis of an occupational perspective are not universally accepted. Just as in the case of the training and development specialists who are finding it difficult to agree upon roles and competencies for which they should be held accountable, higher education authorities are also finding it difficult to reach consensus on the structure and content of the occupational programs they develop.

McGlothlin (1960) emphasizes that the content for occupational programs should be based upon the recognized levels of performance for that area of practice. The requirements for reaching those levels should be the "primary determinants of the organization and of the content of the curriculum directed at . . . vocational objectives" (p. 30-1).

Schein (1972) contends that occupational knowledge consists of three parts, all of which should be addressed within the content of the program. These include: (1) "an underlying discipline or basic science component . . . (2) an applied science or engineering component . . . (3) a skills or attitudinal component" (p. 43).
Houle (1980) lists 14 goals of the "professionalizing" processes, all of which should be addressed in the content of occupational programs. Although these goals are meant to apply to graduate education, the underlying philosophical and practical considerations they convey are now being adopted by academicians preparing undergraduate occupational programs so that they can be assured that their students will be prepared in terms of both the knowledge and ethical aspects of their areas of practice. The list of goals includes:

1. Clarification of the "conceptual characteristics of the [occupation]" (p. 35)
2. Mastery of theoretical knowledge
3. Capacity to solve problems
4. Use of practical knowledge
5. Self-enhancement and personal dimensions in learning
6. Formal training to transmit the essential skills and knowledge of the [occupation] in a practical setting
7. Formal means of assuring that the student can meet credentialing criteria
8. Nurturance of the [occupational] subculture
9. Legal support and reinforcement of all rules pertaining to the [occupation]
10. Role of public acceptance of the practitioner and his practice
11. Ethical practice rules, policies and procedures
12. Penalties associated with unethical practice
13. Relations to other allied vocations
14. Formal and informal relations to users of the services

Collaboration in Developing Occupational Programs

Many authorities believe that both present and potential students, employers, and occupational practitioners should join with the academic community in resolving these problems of program structure and content. This is particularly true for the training specialist program.

Fork (1981) suggests that where there is insufficient information concerning agreed upon competencies, roles, and boundaries of the training field, it is recommended that "means be found for sponsoring collaborative . . . research efforts as well as joint planning efforts" (p. 8), among local chapters of the American Society for Training and Development, other knowledgeable parties, and colleges or universities sponsoring the programs.

Such an approach would assure that the perceived needs of those in the field are heard and considered in the design and development of curricula intended to prepare training practitioners—a step which too few institutions adequately take into account when designing courses or programs. Joint approaches to common concerns . . . would allow for a better understanding for the levels of preparation needed for entry and continued growth in the training field. (p. 8)
This collaborative approach is important to higher education because it helps assure that the programs developed satisfy the educational requirements of the potential new constituency. Curry (1977) This new constituency can then become a reservoir of students to replace the dwindling number of 18 to 22 year olds and a source of economic stability for colleges and universities.

From the point of view of the potential students and their employers, successful training specialist programs will assure that practitioners can assume the increasing responsibilities placed upon them by the business and industry sector. Such programs also assure that trainers remain current in all facets of their occupational sphere.

Hutcheson and Chalofsky (1981) add that the practice of training has "reached a point in its evolution where we are ready to play a more proactive role in shaping the growth of the HRD field" (p. 15). Therefore practitioners should participate fully in the development of any course, seminar, or curriculum devoted to this occupation.

Denova (1974) lists three areas in which faculty and training professionals should collaborate. These include: (1) program planning and review, (2) teacher assistance in staying current in his area of professional expertise, and in (3) securing favorable public relations for the program.
Rosetti (1981) finds that linking business and industry with the university for the purpose of program development can be useful in the following ways:
1. Validation of course content;
2. Placement of interns for practical application of course work and for full time employment;
3. Resources in the form of money, equipment and supplies;
4. Personnel exchanges between the academic and occupational sector.

Strategies for Assuring the Success of New Occupational Programs and Participants

The academic and occupational sectors must resolve problems besides those associated with the philosophy and content of work-related programs. In particular, authorities express concerns about fitting this new, less-traditional student, with his occupational orientation, into an undergraduate setting. Many of these problems coalesce around the reconciliation of the new student type within the academic and administrative environment, created primarily for 18 to 22 year old students.

Schein (1972) states that it is rare for schools to set up their administrative networks to meet the needs of people in their mid-thirties or early forties, although a growing number of people are making midlife career changes.
Coombs (1968) also feels that universities must take the initiative in accommodating new types of students and programs. Universities must adopt an "innovative approach" in "every aspect of the educational system . . . because [the new constituency can not be expected] to adjust unilaterally to the educational [sector]" (p. 166-167).

Moulton (1981) and Spitzer (1981) support all of these views. They suggest several specific actions that colleges and universities can take in order to adapt themselves to the needs of the new constituencies and their occupational expectations, while addressing the needs of faculty and administrators who participate in these programs. These include:

1. Tenure for service time on or off the campus
2. Restructuring of the credit requirements for class standing
3. More staff time available for counseling and consulting with business and industry
4. More off-campus teaching
5. Tailoring of specific courses for specific needs
6. More interdisciplinary teaching so that cooperation among faculty results
7. Less pedantic and academic approaches to course content, where appropriate
8. A whole restructuring of the infrastructure of the university administration to allow ease of registering and transfer
9. More open-entry and open-exit options for courses
10. More transfer of experience and expertise between business and industry and academic faculty
11. More use of business and industry professionals in planning and updating curricula
12. Offering more professional education for all types of business and industry personnel

Summary

Colleges and universities are now faced with the task of attracting new students and funding sources. This means that they must reach out to the occupationally-oriented sector of the population. Within this sector training specialists are particularly interested in the academic approach because they are now searching for expanded educational opportunities to fulfill the responsibilities placed upon them by business and industry.

However, satisfying the needs of the new occupationally-oriented students mean that colleges and universities, particularly at the undergraduate level, must recognize, understand, and reconcile the philosophical differences between occupational and liberal arts programs and approaches. They must also understand and
reconcile the structure and content of the occupational programs with more traditional undergraduate programs.

Because there is little consensus on any of these issues, many authors suggest that the business and industry and academic sectors must collaborate in the development of occupational programs, particularly those created for training specialists. It is also suggested that the academic community assume the initiative in adapting its courses and administrative policies to accommodate the needs of the new students.

Curriculum Decision Making Approaches

Outline of Section

Curriculum decision making theories have existed since before 1900. However, most of them up to the present have been concerned with curricula at the K-12 levels. There are few authorities who have developed theories specifically for postsecondary education.

This section was intended, therefore:
1. To review the older but still popular curriculum decision making theories;
2. To review contemporary curriculum decision making theories which are based, in part, on older concepts;
3. To identify some selected curriculum decision making steps which were derived from both the historic and contemporary theories and were relevant to postsecondary
occupational curriculum development. These steps were then used as a basis of description and comparison between training specialist curriculum decision making processes and teacher preparation decision making processes.

**Importance of the Curriculum Decision Making Process**

A point must be reached at which the desires of new, occupationally-oriented students for expanded educational opportunities are reconciled with the undergraduate faculties', administrators', and traditional students' aspirations. This point of reconciliation is often reached during the curriculum decision making process. The extent to which processes can be designed by responsible parties so that they can reach consensus on every aspect of the curricula will determine the degrees of success of the final programs.

How faculties of higher education make curriculum decisions can be said to range from the haphazard to the systematic. However, most authorities agree that curriculum decisions should be based upon some type of clearly understood rationale. Beauchamp (1982) suggests that curriculum theory, which underlies the curriculum decision making process, helps "explain phenomena . . . organizes knowledge . . . helps the researcher [or practitioner] to identify and analyze data . . . [and it can be] a means of communicating with others . . . . Theories serve as guides
to their [curriculum designers] work" (p. 26).

An understanding of the content and processes of decision making are particularly important when the curriculum workers are responsible for developing programs for new pupil groups. It is just such situations that confront undergraduate education faculties and administrators, as they develop training specialist programs within existing teacher preparation contexts.

**Historical Curriculum Decision Making Theories: Objectives and Content Types**

Of the older curriculum theories still considered viable, the concepts developed by Ralph Tyler (1950) represent the most important. His "objectivist" theory is concerned primarily with curriculum as an end product of the decision making process, rather than with the process, itself. He is concerned with the identification and development of objectives which will assure that the curriculum outcome is satisfactory to meet the learning needs of the student.

Specifically, the Tyler Model for curriculum development includes five steps:

1. Identify needs
2. Define objectives, preferably in behavioral terms
3. Identify learning experiences that will meet these objectives
4. Organize the learning experiences into a plan that has scope and sequence
5. Evaluate the outcomes of the effort in light of the objectives. (p. 3-4)
Apps (1979) explains that there are several "assumptions implicit" in Tyler's statements.

1. The needs of the learners should be the basis of the educational program.
2. "It is possible, empirically, to determine the needs of the learners and thus have a basis for writing educational objectives" (p. 116).
3. Knowledge is external to the learner and must be obtained by him from external sources.
4. Learning experiences are best organized around objectives.
5. Curriculum development is a "stepwise process" (p. 116) that begins with the identification of learner needs and ends with evaluation.

Taba (1962) built upon this theoretical base and offered her own steps for the curriculum decision making process. These steps also reflect a primary concern for the curriculum content and suggest the key questions around which objectives should be written in order to assure a quality product.

1. What are the aims of the school and the objectives of instruction?
2. What areas or subjects are to be selected?
3. What types of learning experiences are to be utilized in the curriculum?
4. How is the curriculum to be evaluated?
5. What is the overall pattern of the curriculum? (p. 8)
Neagley and Evans (1967) also emphasize the content and objectives aspects of the curriculum. However, it should be noted that for the first time, there is recognition of the importance of the selection of curriculum development committee members to the success of the final curriculum product.

Contemporary Curriculum Decision Making Theories: Systems Approaches

Many curriculum developers still use the concepts inherent in the Tyler, Taba, and Neagley-Evans models. However, since the late 1960's there has been increasing recognition that emphasis on curriculum solely as content is no longer sufficient. There must also be an identification of and an understanding of the interrelated processes inherent in curriculum decision making that conclude with the development of curriculum content.

For these reasons, authorities have devoted increasing attention to adapting systems theory to curriculum decision making. A systems theory approach allows decision makers to focus on all relevant components of the process as well as on the environmental context in which decisions are made.

Goodlad (1970) and Saylor (1974) elaborate on this thinking.

Past efforts to plan curriculum have tended to lose sight of the integral relationship of goals and learning opportunities; with a systems approach
the objectives are central in decision making activities. In the past, too, attempts to plan curriculum have also tended to be piecemeal and fragmentary; with a systems approach the planners are concerned with all relevant factors as they work out the steps to achieve the goals. Saylor (p. 17)

Feyereisien (1970) adds that the systems approach is a way of thinking about management problems. It forces the administrator to look at the totality of situations or problems, to take a long range view regarding his organization, to analyze consciously the "antecedent conditions and possible effects, to utilize cost-utility approaches to choice, and to optimize for the total organization" (p. v-vi). The curriculum manager's decision making ability can be enhanced by this approach. Although the labels vary, most theorists agree that there are three major phases to the systems approach to curriculum decision making. Although here defined separately for purposes of clarity, in practice they are intertwined and interrelated. These phases are defined as follows:

1. Systems analysis - is undertaken for the purpose of identifying rational decisions concerning the design, selection, and operation of a system. The main goal is the identification of the one best system (and subsystems) and the most efficient way of operating it. Feyereisien (1970)
2. Systems engineering- divides the overall tasks of the curriculum system into separate components where each can operate in a well defined sphere and where interaction among the groups is clear-cut. A measure of the effectiveness of systems engineering is when the total task has been completed and the work of the groups can be readily integrated into an overall working system. Beauchamp (1980)

3. Systems management- takes into consideration the need for horizontal and vertical flow of information at all levels of the organization involved in the system. This means that the flow of information will cut across more traditional information boundaries. These new paths must be defined and managed so that information flow is expedited. Feyereisen (1970)

By using a systems approach the problem under consideration can be viewed both in its totality and in its component parts. It can be manipulated so that both long term and short term effects of each alternative decision can be analyzed. It allows for an interdisciplinary approach to problem solving.

Although systems authorities believe their approaches can be applied to curriculum decision making, there is no universal systems model that they all accept. Beauchamp (1980) describes his model:
A. Input
1. educational foundations
2. community characteristics
3. personalities of persons involved
4. curriculum experience
5. subject matter from disciplines and other subjects
6. social and cultural values

B. Context and Processes for Systems Maintenance
1. choice of arena for curriculum processes
2. selection of personnel
3. selection and execution of working procedures for: determining curricula goals, selection of curriculum design, planning and writing
4. establishing implementation procedures
5. establishing procedures for appraising and revising the curriculum

C. Output
1. a curriculum
2. increased knowledge of participants
3. changed attitudes
4. commitment to act (p. 146)

English and Kaufman (1975) base their model on the reconciliation of various needs, contributed by the learner, educator, society and requirements of the educational field under consideration. It traces the reconciliation of these needs through (1) the development of objectives, (2) planning of the curriculum, (3) development of the curriculum, (4) implementation of the curriculum, (5) formative and summative evaluation.

Curriculum Decision Making: Selected Steps

No matter which theory is chosen, it is apparent that curriculum developers must ultimately decide not only which decision making steps they will select for inclusion
in their curriculum processes, but also how these steps will be designated. Such decisions influence the degree to which goals set by both students and academic institutions are realized.

Steps selected for discussion in this study represented a compilation of variables identified in both historical and contemporary curriculum theories, previously discussed, with primary emphasis on systems approaches as they evolved out of these various theories. Although most of these theories represented decision making at the K-12 grade levels, it was intended that the selected steps would go toward building a satisfactory approach to development of undergraduate, occupationally-oriented curricula.

Steps selected for discussion in this study included: (1) identifying sources of program initiative, (2) selecting curriculum leaders and committees, (3) selecting goals and objectives, (4) selecting sources of information, (5) selecting faculty development opportunities, (6) recognizing political and administrative dimensions of curriculum decision making.

Sources of program initiative. Shein (1972) states that the origin of the idea for an occupationally-oriented program can determine its ultimate success. Such a program must, at least in part, originate with potential students and their potential employers. An occupational
program initiated solely by an academic institution, with no input from outside sources, can not assure the program's relevance or viability.

Feasibility studies and needs assessments are tools that an academic institution can employ to assure that all concerned parties will be involved right from the program's conception. Finch and Crunkilton (1979) suggest that needs assessments should supply academic institutions with at least three types of data: (1) potential students' needs and interests, (2) potential employers' needs (manpower projections), and (3) community and/or academic institution's expectations.

Warmbrod (1981) suggests that feasibility studies should survey all parties directly and indirectly interested in the program's development. The study may include some or all of the following issues: (1) faculty capabilities, (2) potential student interest, (3) concurrence with college, school, department of education philosophy, (4) material resource capabilities; (5) financial resource capabilities, (6) employment opportunities, (7) similar programs in the area.

Data obtained from feasibility studies and needs assessments become the basis upon which other curriculum decisions can be built. They also serve as a continuing check to curriculum developers to assure that the program being developed will meet the needs of students, employers
and the academic institution.

Curriculum leaders and committees. The choice of who will participate in the curriculum development process is often cited as an important step to consider. Saylor (1974) feels that the selection of participants in the curriculum process helps set the tone for much that goes after. There must be adequate representation of all interested groups. "All persons directly involved in the consequences of decisions made by the group should be represented . . . The group should have whatever organization is most promising for achievement of its goals" (p. 92).

Doll (1970) feels that committees should vary in size and complexity according to the tasks to be accomplished and that their duties should be clearly specified. He lists two general types of committees and their functions:

1. Central Steering Committee surveys curriculum needs; gets action started; facilitates communication; approves accomplishments of ad hoc committees; locates personnel, time, materials and facilities; coordinates activities; arranges for evaluation.

2. Ad Hoc Committees perform special functions as outlined in clearly defined specifications; membership is based on "competence" and "interest" (p. 258); activities should terminate at prearranged times.
According to Dieffenderfer (1977b) the selection and use of advisory committees assumes great importance when designing occupationally-oriented curricula.

[Advisory committees] are groups of citizens with expertise in the world of work who are appointed in order to provide . . . instructors with advice concerning preparation of students for employment. As such, they have a key contribution to make to curriculum development, especially to its articulation with other programs and activities. (p. 2.6)

Warmbrod (1980) states that advisory committees can be drawn from a variety of sources, depending upon the type of problem under consideration. These include: (1) large and small companies, (2) professional, technical, and trade organizations, (3) chambers of commerce, (4) business-sponsored civic groups, (5) business-education coordinating councils, (6) labor organizations, (7) government agencies, (8) faculty contacts at other universities and technical schools.

Saylor (1974) believes that the choice of committee leader, whether for standing or ad hoc committees, is also important. He feels that a good leader recognizes that everyone in the group has the potential for leadership and may, at any time, lead the group. At the same time, the leader exerts a personal leadership that seeks to keep the various factions of the group directed toward the overall goals of the project.
**Goals and objectives.** Mehlinger (1975) states that "curriculum development is mostly the art of making good judgements, and decisions made in the first stage of the project can bless or curse the project throughout the duration" (p. 132). This means that the decision makers must be given clear statements of the problem in order to focus their research and from which they can develop specific goals and objectives.

Dressel and DeLisle (1969) stress that goals and objectives form the foundation upon which the rest of the decision making process rests.

A comprehensive [curriculum] pattern involves an interrelated composite of many features whose cumulative impact reflects the program rationale and its goals and values . . . . A comprehensive pattern should start from a well expressed philosophy and statement of goals so that each requirement and feature is seen as a meaningful part of the total pattern. (p. 45)

Tyler (1950) feels that objectives should be based on several informational sources, each contributing to the total picture. These sources include studies of: (1) learners, (2) contemporary life outside school, (3) objectives from school specialists, and (4) psychology of learning information.

Ammons (1964) asserts that whatever sources are chosen for selection and development of goals and objectives, they should be evaluated against the following criteria: (1) validity, (2) appropriateness, (3)
feasibility, (4) precision, (5) consistency, and (6) comprehensiveness.

**Sources of information.** Information sources are used for more than goals and objectives development. They also form an important component within the curriculum process from which many types of decisions are reached.

Mayhew (1973) suggests that all curriculum systems must obtain answers to such questions as "where, when, with what, and with whom" (p. 14), you intend to accomplish your curriculum development tasks. "The purpose of this type of analysis is to provide cues and suggestions leading to a system design or system modification" (p. 14-15).

English and Kaufman (1975) state that information serves as an "anchor or bridge" (p. 49), that identifies the current state of affairs and the required state of affairs" to which the curriculum bridge is to be built. It provides the rationale of the outcome gaps to which the curriculum is the 'answer' to changing learner skills, knowledge, and attitudes" (p. 49).

Saylor and Alexander (1974) describe eight data categories from which information should be drawn. These include: (1) data about students, (2) social and cultural factors, (3) data about the learning process, (4) availability and organization of knowledge. Additionally, they suggest gathering information from the (5) legal
structures controlling the schools, (6) resources and facilities, (7) professional advice, and (8) research reports.

Obviously, the sources chosen depend upon the type of curriculum under consideration; the level of education for which the curriculum is designed; and the type of student for which it is intended. However, many experts agree that some form of occupational analysis should be included for the development of occupationally-oriented curricula.

Finch and Crunkilton (1979) describe an occupational analysis as a listing of all tasks [skill statements or competencies] that make up a particular job, and that are necessary for proficiency in a given occupation. Where, how, by whom this analysis is accomplished, and how its results are used are the duties of the various standing and ad hoc curriculum committees.

**Faculty development.** How faculty development will be achieved and the types of activities that will be involved become a critical component of the curriculum decision making process. This is particularly true for programs which draw on new types of subject matter, for new types of constituences with which the faculty may not be familiar. However, it is important that faculty renewal become an integral component of all curriculum design and revision endeavors.
McGlothlin (1964) believes that

A faculty member in an [occupational program] must demonstrate knowledge of his field, interest and competence in teaching, and conviction of the significance of the subject he teaches and the profession he serves. He must continue to learn, either through scholarship which consolidates and interprets new knowledge as it appears, or through active research which adds to knowledge. (p. 66)

Gardner (1976) supports this view and feels that those in higher education, particularly adult education, must "reach out to touch the student's world. We, in education, must clearly understand the work environment from which the student arrives. Industrial training directors need to know the values and attitudes of faculty" (p. 44).

Warmbrod (1980) suggests several ways in which academicians involved in work-related programs can achieve professional development and also strengthen linkages with the business and industry sector. These approaches include: (1) workshops and conferences, (2) personnel exchange programs with occupational counterparts, (3) interacting advisory committees, (4) resource persons exchanges, (5) site visits.

Political and administrative considerations. Unspoken, yet potentially influential components of the curriculum decision making process are political and administrative considerations inherent in the process that can affect faculty, students, administrators, and
all other interested groups. These influences may be particularly pervasive when decision makers are developing new types of programs for new student constituencies.

According to Doll (1970) "the curriculum leader must realize that he is deep in politics . . . of the strategic planning [type] which requires balancing pressures and cooperative making of policy" (p. 90).

Mackenzie (1962) states that

Much folklore of [occupational] education seems to assume that the process of curriculum development is a purely rational one . . . While this may occur to some extent, it is probably more correct to view the [process] as operating through a political context. [Elements of this context include:] availability of assets, interaction among sources, social interaction among participants. (p. 76-77)

Fork (1981) narrows the discussion to the many potentially damaging political considerations associated with the creation of training specialist curricula. He states

The interdisciplinary nature of training presents a unique set of challenges to those in higher education interested in developing new curricula and courses and agreeing upon the academic homes for such offerings. (p. 3)

He specifically lists the following politically sensitive issues that must be considered by faculties and administrators designing these new curricula for new constituencies:
1. "The problem of economics makes it difficult for institutions to make long-range commitments to any new program area which will require additional faculty, resources, or administrative time" (p. 3-4).

2. "The threat of retrenchment can sometimes impede [development of new programs], because it fosters severe competition between program areas and can result in highly defensive positions adopted by various departments" (p. 4).

3. "The high risk involved with committing limited institutional resources to starting-up a new program that is politically sensitive and of questionable academic quality" (p. 4), makes it difficult to establish a new training program.

4. "When administrators and other decision-makers are . . . informed that there are no agreed-upon competencies or even an established curriculum, . . . it is no wonder that some institutions have taken a cautious attitude" (p. 5).

5. "Politically, problems can arise over the issue of where such a program is to be housed . . . in large institutions where more than one department has been actively involved with any of the various aspects of HRD" (p. 6). Any decision to center such authority in one department will result in strained relations with others.
6. Individual faculty members may be philosophically opposed to the new course or program and also opposed to altering their teaching methods or courses to meet the new program's goals.

Case (1976) brings up another area that must be considered. He feels that the issue of who is to administer the new training specialist program must be addressed. This is particularly difficult because the training specialist curriculum is usually interdisciplinary in content. Barriers blocking a satisfactory solution to program placement include:

1. The autonomy that is vested in each academic department and in each academician to develop and "own" its own curriculum.

2. The faculty reward system which rewards this segregation of curriculum content.

Hoyt (1979) contributes a final caution when he warns that unless faculty understand and are motivated to participate in the new occupationally-oriented curriculum development process, no other campus changes that are undertaken to support the new program will succeed. This faculty participation is particularly important if decision makers anticipate significant changes in existing programs, teaching schedules or administrative procedures.
Summary

Curriculum theories have evolved over the decades. Early theories were concerned primarily with development of objectives which would assure content success. Contemporary theories are built upon systems theories, which identify and integrate all aspects of the curriculum decision making process. There is now ample justification in the curriculum literature for selection of certain curriculum decision making steps as being important to development of postsecondary, occupational curricula.

For purposes of this study the following selected steps were chosen from curriculum development literature, primarily stressing systems approaches, as a basis of description and comparison: (1) identifying sources of program initiative, (2) identifying leaders and committees, (3) identifying goals and objectives, (4) selecting sources of information, (5) selecting faculty development opportunities, (6) recognizing political and administrative influences.

These selected steps, gleaned from the curriculum literature were used to develop a questionnaire. It was sent to representative faculty and administrators in colleges, schools, and departments of education, offering undergraduate training specialist programs. The questionnaire compared curriculum decision making processes employed by developers of training specialist programs.
and teacher preparation programs. The selected curriculum decision making steps were included as a basis of description and comparison between processes.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was an exploratory, descriptive-survey. The approach offered the best method for assessing to what extent and in what ways agreement existed between curriculum decision making processes used to develop training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula, with which it was presumed faculty were more familiar. Selected curriculum decision making steps were gleaned from curriculum development literature, primarily stressing systems approaches, and employed for purposes of description and comparison between the processes.

This chapter includes discussions of the following methodological components necessary to accomplish a descriptive-survey study:

1. Development of a questionnaire for collection of descriptive-survey data;
2. Rationale used for population selection;
3. Forms of data analysis employed
The questionnaire (Appendix A) was constructed mainly from selected decision making steps, chosen from curriculum development literature, primarily stressing systems approaches. Specifically, the two parts of the questionnaire included:

**Part I: Background Data**

A. College, School, or Department of Education Data
   1. Name of college, school, or department of education
   2. Was the college, school, or department differentiated into areas of specialization? In which area was the training specialist program placed?
   3. Number of fulltime equivalent faculty
   4. Total enrollment in college, school, or department

B. Training Specialist Program Data
   1. Program name
   2. Number of years program had been offered
   3. Was the program developed as a new or revised program?
   4. Undergraduate degree offered

C. Training Specialist Faculty Data
   1. Number of fulltime faculty involved with the program
   2. Professional specializations of faculty
3. Number of faculty with experiences in business
   and/or industry

4. Academic fields of faculties from outside of edu-
   cation who participated in the program

D. Training Specialist Student Data

1. Number of students enrolled
2. Number of male and female students
3. Percentage of students employed in training
   specialist-related occupations while enrolled

Part II: Curriculum Decision Making Process

Selected curriculum decision making steps, gleaned
from the curriculum literature, and primarily stressing
systems approaches, were used as a basis of description
and comparison for faculties developing training specialist
curricula and teacher preparation curricula of their
choosing. It was hoped that by leading respondents
through selected curriculum decision making steps, it
would be possible to highlight the extent to which the
training specialist curriculum development processes
concurred with processes employed in developing teacher
preparation curricula, with which it was presumed faculty
were more familiar.

The following selected curriculum decision making
steps were chosen from the curriculum literature:
1. Identifying sources of program initiative
2. Selecting curriculum leaders and committees
3. Selecting goals and objectives
4. Selecting sources of information
5. Selecting faculty development opportunities
6. Recognizing political and administrative considerations

For each selected curriculum decision making step, respondents were asked:
1. Was the step included when making curriculum decisions about the teacher preparation curriculum?
2. Was the step included when making curriculum decisions about the training specialist curriculum?

If the answer was "yes" to either or both of these questions, respondents were asked a series of "contingency" (Babbie, 1973, p. 146) questions. These questions more explicitly determined how the step was used in reaching curriculum decisions, for both the training specialist and teacher preparation curricula.

Depending upon the nature of the step considered, some of the contingency questions determined: (1) various types of participants involved in carrying out the step; or (2) types of information sources included in fulfilling that step's requirements. These questions were arranged in an "open-ended" (Dillman, 1978, p. 87-88) format so that respondents could, first report whether each component was applicable to completion of the step, and then could list participants or information sources
specific to their experiences.

Other questions asked respondents to rate the importance of types of participants or information sources to completion of the step. The following rating scale was employed to calculate median point indications of importance:

1 - Very Important
2 - Important
3 - Somewhat Important
4 - Not Very Important
5 - Not Important

**Population Selection**

The type of training specialist program analyzed in this study was very specific and the number of potential subjects meeting the criteria for inclusion was small (10 programs). Therefore, the population rather than a sample drawn from the population was analyzed. The population was drawn from the 1981 ASTD Directory of Academic Programs in Training and Development. Because the directory was more than one year old, officers of the Professional Development section of the American Society for Training and Development were contacted to see if additional programs existed that might meet the study's criteria for inclusion. These officers were not able to supply any additional programs at the time.
The following criteria were employed in selecting the population institutions:

1. Only undergraduate programs were selected. Although Master and Ph.D. level programs existed, it was felt that using the smaller number of undergraduate programs would yield more consistent, easily comparable data. It also facilitated data collection.

2. Only programs identified as created for "trainers," "training specialists," or "human resource practitioners" were chosen for inclusion. This eliminated programs developed for personnel directors, media specialists, and others which appeared in the directory but which had different educational objectives.

3. Only programs that had operated for at least two years were selected. This time requirement was considered necessary so that respondents would have acquired sufficient distance from the curriculum development processes to objectively recall how decisions were made.

Data Collection

Because the population was small, it was necessary to insure a high response rate to the questionnaire. For that reason, phone calls were made to an appropriate contact person at each undergraduate college, school, or department of education in the population, explaining the study and soliciting cooperation in answering the
questionnaire.

People chosen as contacts were, in most cases, also the questionnaire respondents. They were faculty members or administrators indicated by the American Society for Training and Development academic directory as having comprehensive knowledge about their curriculum development processes.

After agreements were secured from all persons, questionnaires were mailed, along with cover letters (Appendix B), explaining the nature of the study and requesting cooperation. Stamped, self-addressed envelopes were included, to facilitate return of questionnaires to the sender.

Three weeks initial response time was allowed for return of the first mailing. At the end of that time, a follow-up letter (Appendix B) and questionnaire were sent to each non-respondent. Ten days after this mailing, additional phone calls were made to all non-respondents.

Out of the possible 10 participating institutions, nine respondents returned completed questionnaires. After the questionnaires were reviewed, additional follow-up telephone interviews were held with selected respondents, in order to enhance the written responses. Thank you letters were sent to all who participated (Appendix B).
Data Analysis

Parts I and II of the questionnaire were analyzed separately. The following methods were employed:

Part I Data

Response data obtained from Part I supplied background information. They described types of colleges, schools, and departments of education; students; and faculties involved with the undergraduate training specialist programs. The information also provided a context in which to analyze data from Part II of the questionnaire. Therefore, the information was reported in numerical tables, supported by descriptive paragraphs.

Part II Data

Response data obtained from Part II were used to determine the extent of agreement between training specialist curriculum decision making processes and those employed when developing teacher preparation curricula, with which it was presumed faculty were more familiar. Selected curriculum decision making steps, chosen from curriculum development literature, primarily stressing systems approaches, were included as a basis of description and comparison between processes.

Analyses were conducted to determine:

1. The number of respondents who indicated that a designated process step was included when developing the
training specialist and/or the comparison teacher preparation curricula. These data were reported in numerical tables.

2. The number of respondents who indicated that suggested categories of participants or information sources were involved in completion of the selected process step, when developing the training specialist and/or teacher preparation curricula. These data were reported in numerical tables, supported by descriptive paragraphs for each institution. The paragraphs described and compared the specific types of participants or information sources respondents included in completion of the curriculum decision making step.

3. In some cases, respondents were asked to rate the importance of designated categories of participants or information sources to completion of the decision making step, when developing the training specialist and/or teacher preparation curricula. Median points were calculated for each response and reported in statistical tables. Descriptive paragraphs, comparing the responses of the institutions, supported these tables.

Summary

Selected steps of the curriculum decision making process were gleaned from curriculum development literature, primarily stressing systems approaches. These
steps were used to develop the major portion of a descriptive-survey questionnaire, sent to faculty and administrators in colleges, schools, and departments of education, offering undergraduate training specialist programs. The purpose of the questionnaire was to compare the curriculum decision making processes employed when developing training specialist curricula with those processes included when developing teacher preparation curricula, with which it was presumed respondents were more familiar. The selected curriculum decision making steps were included as a basis of description and comparison between processes.

In keeping with the exploratory, descriptive-survey nature of the study, data from Part I of the questionnaire were analyzed to determine pupil, faculty, and program profiles. Content analyses were employed on data obtained from Part II of the questionnaire to compare the various selected steps of the curriculum decision making processes.
CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF FINDINGS

This chapter consists of reporting the findings of exploratory, descriptive-survey questionnaires, sent to faculty and administrators in colleges, schools, and departments of education, offering undergraduate training specialist curricula. It was intended that this questionnaire would highlight some of the decision making processes used in the design of training specialist curricula and comparison teacher preparation curricula, with which it was presumed respondents were more familiar.

Questionnaires were sent to representative faculty and administrators in 10 undergraduate training specialist programs, which met criteria for inclusion in the study, as outlined in Chapter III. These 10 programs represented the population at the time.

Nine out of 10 possible respondents returned completed questionnaires with information about training specialist programs. Seven out of the nine respondents included information about teacher preparation curricula. In many cases, data about these programs were presented as procedures generally followed when developing teacher
preparation curricula, rather than as procedures specific to one such process.

The survey questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part I asked for background data including:

1. Composition of college, school, or department of education, students, and faculty;
2. Description of the training specialist program, faculty, and students.

Part II compared curriculum decision making processes employed when developing training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula, with which respondents were presumed to be familiar. Selected steps of the curriculum decision making process, chosen from curriculum development literature, primarily stressing systems approaches, were included as the basis of description and comparison. These steps included: (1) identifying sources of program initiative, (2) selecting leaders and committees, (3) setting goals and objectives, (4) selecting information sources, (5) determining faculty development opportunities, (6) recognizing political and administrative influences.

Respondents indicated whether each selected step was applicable or not applicable for developing their training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula. If a step was applicable, respondents were asked to either supply specific information about
components of the step or to rate components of the step, according to their level of importance to the step's completion.

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Part I: Background Data on Colleges, Schools, and Departments of Education; Undergraduate Training Specialist Programs, Faculties, and Students

Respondents were asked to supply information about their colleges, schools, and departments of education and about the undergraduate training specialist programs they offered. Records from the 1981-82 school year were used as the basis of this information. Responses were elicited in a series of open-ended questions. Data obtained from Part I are reported in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 contains background data about colleges, schools, and departments of education offering undergraduate training specialist programs. Salient points of the table are discussed below.

Colleges of Education

In five of the responding institutions the undergraduate training specialist programs were located within colleges of education. Colleges were differentiated into areas of academic specialization. One can find the number of fulltime faculty and total student enrollment differ
### TABLE 1
**BACKGROUND DATA: COLLEGES, SCHOOLS, DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION OFFERING UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING SPECIALIST PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Colleges, schools, departments of education (a)</th>
<th>Colleges, schools, departments differentiated into areas of academic specialization</th>
<th>Number of Total fulltime student equivalent enrollment faculty</th>
<th>Area of specialization into which the training specialist program was placed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>educational technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>educational studies (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>education for industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>industrial education/technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>vocational/technical education/technical instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2,157 (c)</td>
<td>curriculum and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>adult education/human resource development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>390 (e)</td>
<td>2,900 (e)</td>
<td>human resource development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** All data are based on 1981-82 school year

(a) N = 9
(b) program is interdisciplinary within the college of education
(c) undergraduate only
(d) information not available
(e) the enrollment figure may indicate total enrollment in the institution, or a combination of schools of which education is a part
(f) education component not differentiated into areas of specialization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges, schools, department of education (a)</th>
<th>New program or revision of existing one</th>
<th>Number of years program has been offered</th>
<th>Number of fulltime faculty experiences</th>
<th>Number of students responsible for program</th>
<th>Faculty experiences</th>
<th>Number of degree students offered</th>
<th>Percentage faculty employed in current degree training</th>
<th>Undergraduate training from specialist other positions</th>
<th>Academic areas enrolled in program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>revision 9 (b)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>new 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (c) 25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>new 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>new 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>revision 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>new 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>new 7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>new 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>new 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All data are based on 1981-82 school year.

(a) M = 9
(b) Includes doctoral assistants
(c) In department of education only
(d) As a degree-granting program
widely in size from student enrollment of 91, supported by six faculty for college A; to student enrollment of 2,157 (this figure was not clearly explained by the respondent), supported by 151 faculty for college F. It should be noted that although training specialist programs were placed in different areas of specialization in each college, a vocational orientation characterized all areas, except for college B.

Schools of Education

In two of the responding institutions the undergraduate training specialist programs were placed in schools of education. Respondents from both schools of education indicated that their programs were differentiated into areas of academic specialization. Numbers of fulltime equivalent faculty and total student enrollments differed markedly in such a way as to make comparison between the two institutions impossible. It should be noted that both schools placed their training specialist programs in human resource development-related areas of specialization. This differed from the vocational orientation of most of the colleges of education.

Department of Education

Finally, only one responding institution placed the training specialist program in a department of education. It was not differentiated into areas of
specialization. It should be noted that the student enrollment for the department was larger than enrollments for colleges A and B.

Table 2 consists of background data on the undergraduate training specialist programs, faculties, and students in colleges, schools, and departments of education. Important aspects of this table are discussed below.

**Colleges of Education**

Respondents from colleges of education D and F indicated that 80 and 85 percent, respectively, of their training specialist students were employed in training-related positions while enrolled in the program. All colleges except B and C stated that faculty from other academic areas participate in the training specialist programs. All colleges except A and B listed the Bachelor of Science as the degree offered for the training specialist program. Respondents indicated that colleges of education had both the oldest undergraduate training specialist program, college D, and the newest, college B. Four out of six respondents stated that training specialist programs were formed as new rather than as revised programs.

Academic backgrounds of faculty members responsible for the programs were quite diverse. It should be noted that colleges C, D, and E were the only responding
institutions indicating faculty specializations in vocational education. This was consistent with the fact that training specialist programs located in colleges of education were most often placed in vocationally-oriented areas of specialization.

College A faculty specialized in media development, curriculum design, instructional design, teacher preparation, and human resource development and training. College B added adult education to that list. College C specialized only in vocational education. College D respondents indicated specializations in vocational education, adult education, and teacher preparation. Faculty from college E specialized in vocational education, adult education, curriculum design, instructional design, evaluation, and teacher preparation. College F faculty held partial specializations in the same areas as college E and added media development, test construction, and human resource development and training.

Only colleges C and E indicated that all faculty involved with training specialist programs had either business and/or industry experience. All other colleges of education, except college F indicated that at least some of their faculty members had business and/or industry experience. No college faculties had experiences in social services or government occupations.
It should be noted that in colleges B and F female students outnumbered male. In all other colleges, women were represented in total enrollment.

Schools of Education

One can find that the percentage of students employed in training specialist positions while enrolled in the training specialist program reached forty percent in school H. Respondents from both schools of education indicated that faculty members from other academic disciplines participated in the program.

Both school-based training specialist programs were created as new and in terms of longevity, both fell between the oldest (20 years), and the newest (3 years), programs represented by colleges B and D, respectively.

Faculty from school G held specializations in adult education, teacher preparation, and human resource development and training. The respondent from school H indicated that faculty held partial specializations in all designated areas except teacher preparation. Faculty experiences for school H included the only personnel with experiences in social services and government out of all responding institutions.

While colleges B and F had differences in female and male enrollment figures, discrepancies between the numbers of male and female students was even greater in
schools G and H. Women far outnumbered men in both of these programs.

Department of Education

The respondent from department I indicated that twelve percent of students were employed in training specialist related positions while enrolled in the program. Faculty members from other academic areas participated in the program. The program was developed as new. Faculty held specializations only in teacher preparation, which was consistent with the fact that this program was located in an undifferentiated department of education. Both faculty members had business experiences. One can find that the number of women enrolled in this program is also greater than male enrollment.

Part II: Comparison of the Curriculum Decision Making Processes Followed in Developing Training Specialist Curricula and Selected Teacher Preparation Curricula

The data presented from Tables 3 through 17 made it possible to identify and compare selected steps followed by respondents in developing undergraduate training specialist and selected teacher preparation curricula, with which it was presumed respondents were more familiar. Selected curriculum decision making steps, gleaned from curriculum development and primarily stressing systems approaches, were included for purposes of description and
comparison between processes.

For each selected step, respondents were asked to indicate whether the step was included when developing training specialist curricula and/or teacher preparation curricula of their own choosing. This information is contained in Tables 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16.

If respondents indicated that a step was necessary when developing either or both curricula, then a series of contingency questions was asked about the step. These questions elicited more detailed information about designated components of the step. Components were presented as categories of information sources that were included, personnel who were represented, or other relevant data related to completion of that step.

The following process was used to obtain that information:
1. Respondents were asked to indicate whether each category of activity was applicable or not applicable to completion of the step when developing training specialist curricula and/or teacher preparation curricula.
2. For each category of activity designated as applicable, respondents were then asked to supply more detailed information about those activities.
   (a) They listed specific types of information sources that were included, personnel who were represented or other relevant data related to that category. Tables
7, 9, 11, and 15 pertain to this information.

(b) They rated the importance of each category to completion of the step. The following rating scale was provided:

1 - Very Important
2 - Important
3 - Somewhat Important
4 - Not Very Important
5 - Not Important

One can find these data in Tables 4, 13, and 17.

Sources of Program Initiative

The sources of program initiative step, selected as important to curriculum decision making, contained the following components: origins of program concept, and inclusion of feasibility studies. Respondents were asked to identify the origins of their training specialist programs. They were also asked to consider whether feasibility studies had been conducted, who participated in the studies, and which feasibility study issues were rated as important to completion of the step. This information was requested for development of both their training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula, included for purposes of comparison.

When asked to indicate the origin of the idea for the training specialist program, seven out of the total of
nine respondents stated that the idea originated within the colleges, schools, and department of education with which they were affiliated. Of the two programs originating outside the education unit of the institution, respondents indicated that training directors from business and industry, in one instance, and personnel from the state department of education, in the other case, were responsible for originating the idea. In only one case did a respondent state that it was the first time a program concept had originated outside the education unit of his institution.

TABLE 3

INCLUSION OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Training specialist curricula (a)</th>
<th>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) N = 9
(b) N = 7
(c) Several institutions supplying information on generalized teacher preparation processes noted that inclusion of feasibility studies varied with the specific curriculum under consideration and was not a consistently employed component of all processes.
Another component of the program initiative step was the inclusion of feasibility studies. One can find in Table 3 that three out of nine respondents indicated that they did conduct feasibility studies when developing training specialist curricula. Three out of seven respondents who provided data on the process used to develop teacher preparation curricula reported that they conducted feasibility studies as part of those processes.

For respondents who did not conduct feasibility studies when developing training specialist and/or teacher preparation curricula, most indicated that their programs had developed through an "evolutionary" process, growing from a few experimental courses to degree-granting programs. Therefore, informal means were employed to initiate these programs rather than formalized feasibility studies.

When asked to specify categories of feasibility study participants, all three training specialist curriculum development respondents who conducted such studies indicated that faculty, administrators, business and industry representatives, and personnel from government agencies were utilized. Specific faculty mentioned included those with specialties in guidance and counseling, educational foundations, instructional media, physical education, health, elementary and secondary education, educational technology, and curriculum and instruction.
Administrative representatives included deans of colleges or schools of education, and university, college, or school financial officers. Business and industry contributed training and development directors, training program managers, and directors of personnel to the feasibility studies. Government agency personnel were not specifically identified, but several respondents indicated that representatives from social service agencies participated in their feasibility studies.

Two out of the three respondents who conducted feasibility studies as part of training specialist curriculum development processes also stated that students, community and civic group representatives, and members of professional organizations were included in the studies. Specific student and community and civic group representatives were not indicated. Members of professional organizations who participated included persons from local chapters of the American Society for Training and Development and the National Society for Performance and Instruction.

Three respondents indicated that feasibility studies were conducted as a part of teacher preparation curriculum development processes. Participants included faculty specialists in curriculum development, guidance and counseling, and research and evaluation. Deans of Academic Affairs and department chairmen represented
administrations. Student participants included undergraduate and graduate students from industrial technology, vocational, and secondary education. Respondents indicated that representatives from state social service agencies also participated in feasibility studies.

Another segment of information included by respondents conducting feasibility studies, as part of their curriculum development processes, was the rating of importance of selected issues considered in such studies. From the data in Table 4, it can be seen that issues to which respondents assigned median ratings of "Very Important" to development of training specialist curricula included potential student interest, faculty capabilities, and employment opportunities. Financial resource capabilities fell between "Very Important" and "Important" in the ratings. Congruence with college, school, department philosophy; and location of similar programs in the area were categories of issues judged to be "Important." Congruence with university, college philosophy, and material resource capabilities were categories rated between "Important" and "Somewhat Important."

Respondents supplying information on the importance of feasibility study issues to development of teacher preparation curricula, indicated that potential student interest was rated as "Very Important." Financial resource capabilities category was rated between "Very
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of feasibility study issues</th>
<th>Curriculum development processes</th>
<th>Potential student interest</th>
<th>Congruence with university, college philosophy</th>
<th>Congruence with college, school, department philosophy</th>
<th>Material resource capabilities</th>
<th>Financial resource capabilities</th>
<th>Faculty capabilities</th>
<th>Employment opportunities</th>
<th>Similar programs in the area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training specialist curricula (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Median point calculations were based upon the following rating scale:

1 - Very Important
2 - Important
3 - Somewhat Important
4 - Not Very Important
5 - Not Important

(a) N = 3
(b) N = 3
Important" and "Important." Congruence with university, college philosophy; location of similar programs in the area; and material resource capabilities were all categories rated as "Important." Congruence with college, school, department philosophy; faculty capabilities; and employment opportunities were all rated between "Important" and "Somewhat Important" to the outcome of feasibility studies.

Leaders and Committees

The selected curriculum decision making step concerned with designation of leaders and committees included the following elements: identification of curriculum development leaders, development of standing and/or ad hoc committees, and inclusion of advisory groups in curriculum development processes. Respondents were asked to indicate whether leaders were designated when developing training specialist curricula and/or teacher preparation curricula, and to identify how they were selected. Respondents were also asked whether standing and/or ad hoc committees were created when developing curricula, and specifically, which categories of participants were included on these committees. Information about inclusion of advisory groups in curriculum development processes were also solicited from respondents. They were asked to indicate which categories of advisory group
participants were represented. These data were requested of respondents who developed training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula, contributed for purposes of comparison.

TABLE 5
LEADER DESIGNATION AND SELECTION IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents designating leaders for:</th>
<th>Method of selecting training specialist leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Training specialist curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) N = 9
(b) N = 7
(c) 2 respondents did not designate process employed

As indicated by the data in Table 5, eight out of nine respondents stated that leaders were designated for developing training specialist curricula. Five out of seven such persons were appointed by department chairmen, college deans, or university vice presidents, depending upon the rank of the designated leader. Academic specializations of these leaders included human resource development, health care education, industrial training, curriculum development, guidance and counseling, teacher
training, instructional design, business, management, educational administration and supervision, and special education. Most respondents indicated that leaders held multiple specializations.

Respondents stated that on three out of seven occasions, leaders were designated for development of teacher preparation curricula. Academic specializations were not requested for these people.

### TABLE 6
CREATION OF STANDING AND/OR AD HOC COMMITTEES IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents creating standing and/or ad hoc committees for:</th>
<th>Training specialist curricula (a)</th>
<th>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) N = 9  
(b) N = 7  
(c) Several institutions supplying information on generalized teacher preparation processes noted that inclusion of committees varied with the specific curriculum under consideration and was not a consistently employed component of all processes.

A second component of the leaders and committees step was concerned with committees represented in the processes. From Table 6 it can be seen that six out of
TABLE 7
STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEE PARTICIPANT CATEGORIES IDENTIFIED IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of committee participants</th>
<th>Faculty Administrators</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Community/civic groups</th>
<th>Professional organizations</th>
<th>Business/industry representatives</th>
<th>Government agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges, schools, department of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training specialist curricula (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. X indicates membership on a standing and/or ad hoc committee from that category of possible participants
(a) N = 6
(b) N = 5
nine responding institutions created standing and/or ad hoc committees when developing their training specialist curricula. Five out of seven respondents who contributed information on processes used to develop teacher preparation curricula indicated that committees were involved.

Table 7 represents specific standing and/or ad hoc committee participant categories identified in curriculum development processes. Respondents were asked to specify which categories were represented in the development of training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula. Salient points of the table are discussed below.

- **Colleges of education.** College A did not use committees in the process of developing the training specialist curriculum.

  A comparison teacher preparation curriculum was designated but no committees were used in its development.

  College B respondent indicated that the committee which guided the development of its training specialist curriculum included faculty from educational counseling, education foundations; elementary, secondary and special education; health and physical education; recreation and athletics; instructional media; and reading. The dean of the College of Education represented the administration. Students were not included on committees. Nor were
community and civic group personnel, professional organization members, business and industry representatives, and government agencies people.

No teacher preparation curriculum was designated by this respondent for purposes of comparison.

College C respondent cited faculty from industrial education as participating on the committees guiding the training specialist curriculum development process. The head of the Industrial Education Department represented administration. Students and people from community and civic groups participated but no specific representatives were designated. American Society for Training and Development members, represented professional organizations. Trainers from business and industry were included. No government agency personnel participated.

Committees for the teacher preparation curriculum development process included faculty from teacher education. The head of the Industrial Education Department represented administration. Students from primary and secondary education programs were included. Community and civic group personnel were not represented. Members of professional teacher organizations were included but not specified. Business and industry representatives were not included. Government agency personnel were drawn from the state Department of Education.
College D respondent indicated that faculty from curriculum development, evaluation, and vocational education were involved in developing the training specialist curriculum. Students from vocational programs were also included. Community and civic groups were represented by secondary school administrators and a secondary school principal. Several industrial trainers and heads of corporations represented business and industry. Representatives from the Society of Manufacturing Engineers were included. Personnel from the State Department of Education: Trades Consultation Bureau were represented.

Committee participants in the teacher preparation curriculum development process varied with the specific curriculum under consideration. However, faculty, administrators, and students from the area under consideration were usually included. Community and civic groups, professional organizations, business and industry personnel, and government agency representatives were usually not included.

College E respondent stated that faculty from industrial training and curriculum development served on committees overseeing development of the training specialist curriculum. Administrators from existing technical and training programs were involved. Students from vocational and technical education participated. Persons from community and civic groups were drawn from a
private industry council. Local members of the American Society for Training and Development served as professional organization representatives.

A generalized teacher preparation curriculum was contributed by this respondent. He indicated that full-time and adjunct faculty and administrators involved with the specific curriculum under consideration usually participated in its development. Both graduate and undergraduate students in programs closely allied to the curriculum under consideration also were included. Usually representatives from community and civic groups, professional organizations, business and industry, and government agencies were not included in the teacher preparation curriculum development process.

College F did not use committees when developing the training specialist curriculum.

Committees were included, however, in developing the teacher preparation curriculum. Membership on the committees included faculty from unspecified fields. A teacher certification officer represented the college administration. Students were drawn from members of a curriculum development committee, appointed by the dean. Community and civic groups were not represented. Local members of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers represented professional organizations. Business and industry and government
agency personnel were not involved.

**Schools of education.** School G respondent indicated that she had just recently assumed responsibility for the training specialist program and was not completely familiar with its development. Faculty who had been involved with its development were no longer at the institution and therefore, could not be consulted. However, she indicated that faculty from higher education and adult education were involved in developing the program. Undergraduate students from vocational and adult education areas were also included. Members of the American Society for Training and Development were involved. Representatives from various public sector and non-profit agencies were included in the training specialist program's development. No representatives from administration, or community and civic groups were included.

No comparison teacher preparation curriculum was contributed by this respondent for purposes of comparison.

School H respondent stated that participants on committees developing their training specialist curriculum included faculty from human resource development. No administrators, students, or community and civic group representatives were included. Local members of the
American Society for Training and Development represented professional organizations. Business and industry contributed training and development professionals to the committees. The government agencies category was not represented.

This respondent contributed information on generalized comparison teacher preparation development processes. He indicated that usually faculty and administrators from the specific curriculum area under consideration were included. However, students, community and civic groups, professional organizations, business and industry, and government organizations usually did not contribute curriculum development representatives.

Department of education. Department I respondent indicated that committees were not formed as a part of the process for developing their training specialist curriculum.

Information on the process used to develop a teacher preparation curriculum was included. However, no committees were involved in its development.

Summary. College respondents indicated that the categories of persons most often represented on committees overseeing development of training specialist curricula were faculty and administrators. The professional organizations category came next in representation.
Students, persons from community and civic groups, and business and industry representatives were also involved but to a lesser extent. For those respondents including data on teacher preparation curricula, faculty, administrator, student, and professional organization categories were most often represented on committees. No other categories were mentioned.

Participants most often cited by respondents in schools of education who developed training specialist curricula were faculty, members of professional organizations, and business and industry representatives. Administrators, students, people from community and civic groups, and government agency personnel were involved to a lesser extent. Faculty and administrators were included in the teacher preparation curriculum development process volunteered by the school respondent.

The department of education respondent stated that no committees were involved in developing the training specialist curriculum. A teacher preparation curriculum was offered for purposes of comparison, but no committees were included in its development.

A third component of the leaders and committees step, selected for purposes of description and comparison, involved the inclusion of advisory groups. As is evident from Table 8, six out of nine respondents indicated that advisory groups were formed when developing training
TABLE 8

INCLUSION OF ADVISORY GROUPS IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Training specialist curricula (a)</th>
<th>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) N = 9
(b) N = 7
(c) Several institutions supplying information on generalized teacher preparation processes noted that inclusion of advisory groups varied with the specific curriculum under consideration and was not a consistently employed component of all processes.

specialist curricula. Five out of seven respondents providing data on teacher preparation curricula indicated involvement of advisory groups in those processes.

Table 9 represents specific advisory group participant categories identified in curriculum decision making processes. Respondents were asked to identify which categories were involved in development of training specialist and teacher preparation curricula. Salient points of the table are discussed below.

Colleges of education. College A respondent indicated that advisory group participants who guided development of the training specialist curriculum
### Table 9

**Advisory Group Participant Categories Identified in the Curriculum Development Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of advisory group participants</th>
<th>Colleges, schools, department of education</th>
<th>Faculty Administrators</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Community/ civic groups</th>
<th>Professional organizations</th>
<th>Business/ industry representatives</th>
<th>Government agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training specialist curricula (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Teacher preparation curricula (b)**

| Colleges                                 |                                           |                       |          |                        |                           |                                  |                    |
| D                                        |                                           | X                     | X        | X                      | X                         | X                                | X                  |
| E                                        |                                           | X                     | X        | X                      | X                         | X                                | X                  |
| F                                        |                                           | X                     | X        |                        |                           |                                  |                    |
| School                                   |                                           | X                     |          |                        |                           |                                  |                    |
| H                                        |                                           |                        |          |                        |                           |                                  |                    |
| Department                               |                                           | X                     | X        |                        | X                         |                                  |                    |

Note: X indicates membership in an advisory group from that category of possible participants.

(a) N = 6

(b) N = 5
included faculty from business, health, research and evaluation. The college Dean of Academic Affairs represented administration. Students were drawn from secondary education, business, and arts and sciences disciplines. No people from community and civic groups were included in the groups. American Society for Training and Development members, at unspecified levels, represented professional organizations. Training directors and instructors were included. No government agency personnel participated.

A teacher preparation curriculum was designated but no advisory group was included in its development.

College B respondent stated that faculty were not included on its advisory group developing the training specialist curriculum. Administrators and students were not represented either. People from community and civic groups were included but not specified. Professional organization representation was derived from the national, state, and local membership of the American Society for Training and Development and the National Society for Performance and Instruction. Business and industry personnel included training and development, and human resource development practitioners. Government agencies were also represented by training and development, and human resource development practitioners.
A teacher preparation curriculum was not designated for purposes of comparison.

College C did not include an advisory group in its training specialist curriculum development process.

A teacher preparation curriculum was indicated but an advisory group was not used in its development.

College D respondent indicated that faculty from curriculum development, evaluation, and vocational education participated in the development of the training specialist program. Students from other vocational programs were also included. Administrators from secondary schools as well as a secondary school principal represented the community and civic groups category. Representatives from the Society of Manufacturing Engineers were included from the professional organizations. Business and industry contributed industrial trainers as well as employees from several organizations. The state Department of Education was represented by the Bureau of Consultants in the trades areas.

Advisory group representatives usually included in the generalized teacher preparation curriculum development process contributed by this respondent, for purposes of description and comparison, included faculty, administrators and students from closely allied programs.

College E respondent stated that the advisory group personnel who contributed to development of their
training specialist curriculum were drawn from a general advisory group that advised all curriculum development in the vocational-technical section of the college. Faculty and administrators were drawn from various technical and vocational areas as needed. Undergraduate and graduate students from related fields and those with an interest in entering the training specialist program were included. The American Society for Training and Development also contributed participants. Business and industry representatives included training directors. Government agencies volunteered personnel from the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act program and the local Private Industry Council.

This respondent indicated that when developing most teacher preparation programs with a vocational or technical orientation, representatives from this same advisory group pool would be included. The specific group makeup would depend upon the curriculum under consideration.

College F respondent indicated that an advisory group was not used in the development of their training specialist curriculum.

A teacher preparation curriculum was included for purposes of comparison. The respondent stated that faculty from unspecified disciplines participated in the group. Teacher certification officers represented
administration. Student representatives were selected from a curriculum development committee, appointed by the dean. People from community and civic groups did not take part. Local members of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers represented professional organizations. Neither business and industry nor government agencies were included on this advisory group.

**Schools of education.** School G respondent stated that she was not sure whether an advisory group was included when developing the training specialist curriculum.

A teacher preparation curriculum was not included for purposes of comparison.

School H respondent explained that all faculty from human resource development were included on the advisory committee that developed the training specialist curriculum. Neither administrators nor students were included. Community and civic group representatives included the Urban League, senior citizens' organizations, nursing home personnel, mental health clinic and community placement personnel. These groups were involved because the training specialist program was developed to serve primarily public, non-profit organizations. The American Society for Training and Development contributed members
to the advisory group. Business and industry were represented by directors of training, coordinators of human resource development, a director of executive development, a senior training designer, director of personnel, and a director of instructional technology. Government agencies included personnel from the state bureau of employment services, the state director of employment counseling, personnel director for state government units, personnel from the state Department of Social Services, the juvenile court system, and vocational rehabilitation services were also included.

This respondent stated that in general, only faculty and administrators were involved with advisory groups developing teacher preparation curricula. The specific representatives would depend upon the curriculum under consideration.

Department of education. Department I respondent indicated that faculty from teacher education participated on the advisory group that developed their training specialist curriculum. Administrators, students, and community and civic groups categories were not represented. Professional organizations contributed members of the local chapter of American Society for Training and Development. Corporate training specialists represented business and industry. No government agency personnel
were involved with these groups.

This respondent did contribute a teacher preparation curriculum for purposes of comparison. Faculty from teacher education were included. School district supervisors and principals represented the administration. Primary and secondary education majors constituted student representation on the advisory group. No people from community and civic groups were included. Personnel from teachers' unions constituted professional organization involvement. Neither business and industry nor personnel from government agencies were included on the advisory group.

Summary. Colleges of education respondents indicated that categories of persons most often represented on advisory groups overseeing development of training specialist curricula were members of professional organizations and representatives from business and industry. Faculty participants, administration representatives, students, people from community and civic groups, and personnel from government agencies were all involved to a lesser extent. For those respondents who included data on teacher preparation curricula, advisory group participants included faculty, administrators, students, and members of professional organizations. Business and industry and government agency personnel were included
Advisory group participants most often cited by the respondent in a school of education who developed a training specialist curriculum were faculty, professional organization members, and business and industry representatives. People from community and civic groups were also included. The school respondent who volunteered data on a teacher preparation curriculum stated that faculty and administrators were included in the advisory group.

The department of education respondent indicated that representatives from faculty, professional organizations, and business and industry all contributed to development of their training specialist curriculum by serving on the advisory group. The teacher preparation curriculum, contributed for purposes of comparison indicated that faculty, students, administrators, and professional organization members served on the advisory group.

**Goals and Objectives**

Another step of the curriculum decision making process, chosen for purposes of description and comparison was concerned with the designation of goals and objectives. Respondents were asked to indicate whether development of goals and objectives were included in their
curriculum development processes, and then to designate specific categories of goals and objectives included in the step. Respondents supplied this information for both training specialist curriculum development, and teacher preparation curriculum development processes, included for purposes of comparison.

TABLE 10
INCLUSION OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents including goals and objectives for:</th>
<th>Training specialist curricula (a)</th>
<th>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) N = 9
(b) N = 7
(c) Several institutions supplying information on generalized teacher preparation processes noted that inclusion of goals and objectives varied with the specified curriculum under consideration and was not a consistently employed step of all processes.

Table 10 contains information on respondents who indicated that goals and objectives were included as part of their curriculum development processes. It is apparent from the data that goals and objectives were an integral part of the development of seven out of nine training specialist curricula. For those respondents
TABLE II
GOAL AND OBJECTIVE CATEGORIES IDENTIFIED IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of goals and objectives</th>
<th>Societal goals and objectives</th>
<th>Higher education goals and objectives</th>
<th>Student goals and objectives</th>
<th>Employer goals and objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges, schools, department of education</td>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training specialist curricula (a)</td>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</td>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. X indicates inclusion of goals and objectives from that category of possible choices.
(a) N = 7
(b) N = 5
contributing information on development processes used for teacher preparation curricula, five indicated that goals and objectives were included.

One can find data pertaining to specific goal and objective categories identified in curriculum development processes in Table 11. Important points of the table are discussed below.

**Colleges of education.** College A respondent indicated that societal, higher education, student, and employer goals and objective categories were all considered when developing the training specialist curriculum. However, no specific goals and objectives were indicated for any category.

A teacher preparation curriculum was designated by this respondent. Unspecified societal, higher education, and student goals and objectives were included in this process. Employer goals and objectives were not indicated.

College B respondent stated that societal goals and objectives were included in their training specialist curriculum development process. However, no specific goals and objectives were indicated for the category. Specific higher education goals and objectives involved the development of a "valid" and "credible" program. Non-specific student and employer goals and objectives were
also mentioned in the formulation of the training specialist curriculum.

A teacher preparation curriculum was not included by this respondent.

College C did not incorporate societal goals and objectives into the development of its training specialist curriculum. However, nonspecific higher education, student, and employer goals were included in this process.

The respondent did not include goals and objectives in a teacher preparation curriculum.

College D respondent stated that none of the suggested goal and objective categories was considered when developing the training specialist curriculum.

A generalized teacher preparation curriculum development process was included for purposes of comparison, but no goal and objective categories were cited.

College E respondent indicated that all four suggested goal and objective categories were represented when developing their training specialist curriculum. These goals and objectives were modified for each student depending upon interest.

All goals and objective categories were also included when discussing a generalized teacher preparation curriculum. However, specific goals and objectives differed with the curriculum under consideration.
College F respondent also stated that societal, higher education, student, and employer goals and objectives were recognized as important when developing the training specialist curriculum. But no specific goals and objectives were indicated.

This respondent specified the development process used for the teacher preparation curriculum. Again, all four suggested categories were included but no specific goals and objectives were cited.

Schools of education. School G respondent cited all four goal and objective categories as important to the development of their training specialist curriculum. However, specific goals and objectives were not indicated for any category because they could not be located.

A teacher preparation curriculum development process was not included.

School H did not incorporate goals and objectives into its training specialist curriculum development process.

This respondent stated that in general, goals and objectives were not identified for teacher preparation curriculum development processes.
Department of education. Department I respondent did not include either societal or higher education goals and objectives in the training specialist curriculum development process. "Assuring that student needs were met by maintaining program flexibility," was cited as a specific student goal and objective. "Meeting employer needs," was designated as a specific employer goal and objective.

This respondent did contribute a teacher preparation curriculum for purposes of comparison. Specific societal goals and objectives included "passing on the culture and knowledge of the society, and achieving social mobility." Higher education goals and objectives were not included in this process. A student goal and objective included "flexibility of program design to accommodate student needs." A specific employer goal and objective stated the "desire to employ competent teachers."

Summary. Colleges of education indicated that the categories of goals and objectives most often included in development of training specialist curricula included higher education, student, and employer categories. Societal goals and objectives were represented to a lesser extent. All respondents including data on teacher preparation curriculum development processes indicated that societal, higher education, and student goals and
objectives were most often represented. Employer goals and objectives were included to a lesser extent.

The one school of education respondent who indicated that goals and objectives were involved in development of the training specialist curriculum included societal, higher education, student, and employer goal and objective categories. The respondent did not contribute a teacher preparation curriculum development process for purposes of comparison.

The department of education respondent stated that only student and employer goals and objectives were incorporated into the training specialist curriculum development process. The teacher preparation curriculum presented by this respondent included societal, student, and employer goal and objective categories.

**Information Sources**

Another curriculum decision making step, selected from curriculum development literature was concerned with inclusion of information sources. Respondents were asked to indicate whether information sources were included in curriculum development processes and then to rate the importance of selected information source categories to completion of the step. Respondents supplied these data for both training specialist and teacher preparation curriculum development processes.
Table 12 pertains to the number of respondents including information sources in their curriculum development processes. As can be seen, all nine respondents providing data on training specialist curricula indicated that information sources were represented in the processes. All but one of the respondents volunteering data on teacher preparation curriculum development processes indicated that information sources were utilized in those processes.

Data pertaining to the median ratings of information source categories are found in Table 13. Categories of information sources rated as "Very Important"
TABLE 13
RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC INFORMATION SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of information sources</th>
<th>Curriculum development processes needs analysis</th>
<th>Occupational professional information literature</th>
<th>Student Information</th>
<th>Governance Information</th>
<th>Learning Theories/Institutions</th>
<th>Potential Input</th>
<th>Faculty Input</th>
<th>Community/civic groups Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training specialist curricula (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Median point calculations were based upon the following rating scale:

1 - Very Important
2 - Important
3 - Somewhat Important
4 - Not Very Important
5 - Not Important

(a) N = 9
(b) N = 6
by respondents developing training specialist curricula included: needs analysis information, occupational information, data about learning theories and techniques, and information obtained from community and civic groups. Ideas contributed by faculty and potential employers were rated between "Very Important" and "Important." Information obtained from professional literature, students, and government regulations were judged "Important."

Respondents volunteering data on teacher preparation curriculum development processes did not rate any category of information as "Very Important." Information obtained from government regulations, potential employers, and faculty was judged to be "Important." Learning theories and instructional techniques category was rated between "Important" and "Somewhat Important." Data obtained from people in community and civic groups were rated between "Somewhat Important" and "Not Very Important" information sources. Information obtained from professional literature and students was rated "Not Very Important."

**Faculty Development Opportunities**

Another selected curriculum decision making step was concerned with the availability of faculty development opportunities to support curriculum development processes. Respondents were asked to indicate whether
faculty development opportunities were made available and then to specify which categories of opportunities were selected to complete the step. Respondents supplied these data for both training specialist curriculum development processes and teacher preparation curriculum development, included for purposes of comparison.

### TABLE 14

**AVAILABILITY OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents making faculty development opportunities available for:</th>
<th>Training specialist curricula (a)</th>
<th>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) N = 9  
(b) N = 7  
(c) Several institutions supplying information on generalized teacher preparation processes noted that inclusion of faculty development opportunities varied with the specific curriculum under consideration and was not a consistently employed step of all processes.

Table 14 designates the number of respondents who made faculty development opportunities available as part of their curriculum development processes. As indicated by the data, six out of nine respondents specified that faculty development opportunities were made available to support training specialist curriculum development. For
those supplying information on teacher preparation curricula, three out of seven indicated that faculty development opportunities were considered as part of the decision making processes.

Table 15 represents specific faculty development opportunity categories identified in curriculum development processes. Salient points of the table are discussed below.

**Colleges of education.** College A respondent indicated that attendance at workshop and conferences, academic courses, and personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts categories of faculty development opportunities were not selected to support development of the training specialist curriculum. Professional memberships in the American Society for Training and Development were included. Professional literature subscriptions in the *Training and Development Journal* were also made available. Exchanges with resource and advisory personnel were designated for development purposes. Funding sources for support of faculty development opportunities were not cited.

A teacher preparation curriculum was included for purposes of comparison. Attendance at workshops and conferences for performance based teacher education were cited as faculty opportunities made available to support
### TABLE 15

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY CATEGORIES IDENTIFIED IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of faculty development opportunities</th>
<th>Colleges, schools, department of education</th>
<th>Workshops/conferences</th>
<th>Academic courses</th>
<th>Personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts</th>
<th>Professional memberships</th>
<th>Professional literature</th>
<th>Resource/advisory personnel exchanges</th>
<th>Funding opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training specialist curricula (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. X indicates participation in a faculty development opportunity from that category of possible choices.

(a) N = 6
(b) N = 5
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development of this curriculum process. The academic courses category was not included. Personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts in performance based teacher education did occur. The respondent indicated that professional memberships were not included in the development process. However, technical education literature subscriptions were made available. There were no personnel exchanges with resource or advisory personnel. Unspecified federal grants supported some faculty development opportunities.

College B stated that faculty developing the training specialist curriculum attended American Society for Training and Development, National Society for Performance and Instruction, Training magazine, and Education in Non-School Settings sponsored workshops and conferences. An internship in management and human resource development was designated as an academic faculty development opportunity. There were no personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts. Professional memberships included national, state, and local memberships in the American Society for Training and Development, and the National Society for Performance and Instruction. Professional literature subscriptions included Training and Development Journal, Journal of Performance and Instruction, and Training. Books by Leonard Nadler were also mentioned in this category. Resource and advisory
personnel exchanges were not cited. Funding sources to assist with faculty development included Funds for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education and monies from the Shelby Cullum Davis Foundation.

No teacher preparation curriculum was designated by this respondent.

College C respondent indicated that faculty development opportunities were not made available to support the training specialist curriculum development effort.

A teacher preparation curriculum was included for purposes of comparison but no faculty development opportunities were included.

College D respondent indicated that faculty development opportunities were not made available when the training specialist curriculum was being developed. However, some opportunities are now employed to support faculty members involved with this program. Various American Society for Training and Development and National Society for Performance and Instruction workshops and conferences have been attended. Depending upon the extent of faculty expertise, academic course work in areas that enhance or upgrade skills are made available. These courses are directly related to the skill areas in which their training specialist students must achieve competency. Personnel exchanges take the form of "job
shadowing" personnel in specific occupational skill areas. Professional memberships are also made available in the American Society for Training and Development, various professional education societies, and technical societies directly related to the occupational areas in which their training specialist students will be employed. Funding sources are obtained from state grants and the regular institution budget.

This respondent indicated that in general, faculty development opportunities were not made available to support development of teacher preparation curricula.

College E respondent stated that faculty developing the training specialist curriculum attended local, state, and national American Vocational Association meetings and conferences, regional American Society for Training and Development meetings, and various technical education meetings. Professional memberships were available in the Adult Education Association and the American Society for Training and Development. Professional literature included the Training and Development Journal and other American Society for Training and Development publications. Books by Malcolm Knowles and various adult education books and monographs were also mentioned. Funding was obtained from the regular institution budget.

A generalized process for developing teacher preparation curriculum was described by this respondent. He
indicated that one professional out-of-state meeting was paid for each year. Faculty attended as many local meetings as they wished. Professional memberships and subscriptions to professional literature were made available in various technical and vocational areas, depending upon faculty requests. Funding sources were obtained from the institution budget.

College F stated that faculty development opportunities were not considered when developing the training specialist curriculum.

A teacher preparation curriculum process was included, however, no faculty development opportunities were made available to support the process.

Schools of education. School G respondent stated that faculty developing the training specialist curriculum attended various American Society for Training and Development workshops, as well as workshops in guidance and counseling and quality assurance. Personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts occurred, depending upon the specific faculty member's area of interest or need. Professional memberships were cited by this respondent, but no specific memberships were listed. Professional literature sources made available included the Training and Development Journal, and various books and articles by Allen Tough, Malcolm Knowles, and James R. Kidd.
Resource and advisory personnel exchanges were mentioned but no specific types were volunteered.

No comparison teacher preparation curriculum was included by this respondent.

School H indicated that one workshop on human resource development, sponsored by the American Society for Training and Development was attended. Academic courses were not offered to faculty developing the training specialist curriculum. Personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts occurred at national American Society for Training and Development conferences. Membership in the American Society for Training and Development was cited as the professional membership supplied by this school. Professional literature subscriptions included Training and Development Journal, and Training magazine. The Training and Development Handbook was also mentioned. Unspecified exchanges with resource and advisory personnel also supported curriculum development efforts. Department of Labor and matching institutional grants were cited in the funding sources category.

This respondent volunteered that in general, faculty developing teacher preparation curricula were given minimal faculty development opportunities. There was a stipend available for one professional conference a year. Some professional society dues were paid and some subscriptions to professional literature were also paid,
depending upon the area of interest of the faculty member involved.

**Department of education.** Department I respondent stated that faculty development opportunities were not made available to support development of their training specialist curriculum.

A teacher preparation curriculum was included but no faculty development opportunities were indicated to support this process.

**Summary.** Colleges of education respondents who indicated that faculty development opportunities were made available to support development of training specialist curricula stated that professional memberships and subscriptions to professional literature were most often included. Attendance at workshops and conferences, academic courses, resource and advisory personnel exchanges, and funding resources categories were represented to a lesser extent. For the colleges reporting that faculty development opportunities were a part of the teacher preparation curriculum development processes, categories cited included: workshops and conferences, personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts, professional memberships and literature subscriptions, and funding sources.
Schools of education respondents stated that workshops and conferences, personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts, professional memberships, professional literature subscriptions, and exchanges with resource and advisory personnel were all made available to faculty developing training specialist curricula. Funding sources category was mentioned to a lesser extent. The respondent contributing information on a teacher preparation curriculum development process stated that some professional membership dues and professional literature subscriptions were paid, depending upon faculty interest.

The department of education respondent indicated that faculty development opportunities were not made available to assist with development of their training specialist curriculum. A teacher preparation curriculum was included for purposes of comparison. However, no faculty development opportunities were represented to support its development.

Political and Administrative Influences

A final curriculum decision making step, selected from curriculum development literature for purposes of description and comparison, was the recognition of political and administrative influences on curriculum development processes. Respondents were asked to designate whether political and administrative influences were
recognized when developing curricula, and then to rate the importance of specific political and administrative issue categories to completion of the step. Respondents contributed these data for both training specialist and teacher preparation curriculum development processes.

TABLE 16
RECOGNITION OF POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE INFLUENCES IN THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Training specialist curricula (a)</th>
<th>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) N = 9  
(b) N = 7  
(c) Several institutions supplying information on generalized teacher preparation processes noted that recognition of political and administrative influences varied with the specific curriculum under consideration and was not a consistently employed step of all processes.

Table 16 represents respondents recognizing political and administrative influences on curriculum development processes. Seven of nine respondents responsible for developing training specialist curricula indicated that political and administrative influences were
recognized. Five out of seven respondents contributing information on teacher preparation curricula stated that political and administrative influences were accounted for during development processes.

One can find data pertaining to median ratings of specific political and administrative influence categories in Table 17. Respondents indicated that securing administrative support was rated "Very Important" when developing training specialist curricula. Achieving faculty philosophical agreement over the program, overcoming interdisciplinary rivalry over program placement, and reconciling traditional and nontraditional students' needs fell between "Very Important" and "Important" in the ratings. Considered "Important" was the need to secure enrollment quotas. Insuring monetary support was rated between "Important" and "Somewhat Important." Competition from similar programs in the area was rated between "Somewhat Important" and "Not Very Important."

For those supplying data on teacher preparation curriculum development processes for purposes of comparison, securing administrative and monetary support were judged to be "Very Important." The securing enrollment quotas category fell between "Very Important" and "Important." Achieving faculty philosophical agreement over the program was rated as "Important." Reconciling the needs of traditional and nontraditional students was
TABLE 17

RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE INFLUENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of political and administrative influences</th>
<th>Curriculum development processes</th>
<th>Administrative support</th>
<th>Enrollment quotes</th>
<th>Monetary support</th>
<th>Faculty philosophical agreement over program</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary rivalry over program placement</th>
<th>Traditional/nontraditional students' needs</th>
<th>Competition from similar programs in the same geographic area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training specialist curricula (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher preparation curricula (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Median point calculations were based upon the following rating scale:
1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Somewhat Important
4 - Not Very Important
5 - Not Important

(a) N = 7
(b) N = 5
rated "Somewhat Important." Overcoming interdisciplinary rivalry over program placement was judged to be "Not Very Important."

Summary

The purpose of this exploratory, descriptive-survey was to compare the actual curriculum decision making processes followed when developing undergraduate training specialist curricula, located in colleges, schools, and departments of education; and processes followed when developing teacher preparation curricula of respondents' choosing, with which it was presumed they were more familiar. Selected curriculum decision making steps, gleaned from curriculum development literature, and primarily stressing systems approaches, were included as a basis of description and comparison between processes. It was hoped that points of consensus and/or divergence between decision making procedures would be highlighted.

A two-part questionnaire was sent to faculty and administrative representatives in 10 undergraduate training specialist programs in colleges, schools, and departments of education. This group comprised the population of such programs as of the 1981-82 school year. Nine out of 10 possible respondents returned completed questionnaires, contributing data on training specialist programs. Seven out of the nine respondents offered
information on comparison teacher preparation curriculum decision making processes. In many cases, this information was offered as procedures generally followed when developing teacher preparation programs rather than as procedures specific to one such process.

Part I of the questionnaire consisted of a series of questions eliciting background data about colleges, schools, and departments of education; their students, and faculties. Information about training specialist programs, faculties, and students was also requested.

Part II of the questionnaire asked respondents to apply selected curriculum decision making steps, chosen from curriculum literature to ones followed at their institutions for developing training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula, chosen for purposes of comparison. The selected steps included: (1) identifying sources of program initiative, (2) selecting leaders and committees, (3) setting goals and objectives, (4) selecting information sources, (5) determining faculty development opportunities, and (6) recognizing political and administrative influences.

For each step respondents were asked to indicate whether the step was included in developing training specialist curricula and/or teacher preparation curricula. If the step was involved, respondents were asked to either supply specific information about components of
the step by listing participants, information sources, or other relevant data needed to accomplish the step; or to rate the importance of each step's activities to the overall completion of the step.

Sources of Program Initiative

The program initiative step selected as important to curriculum decision making, included the following components: origins of program initiative, and inclusion of feasibility studies. Respondents were asked to identify origins of their training specialist programs. They also indicated whether feasibility studies were conducted, who participated, and which categories of feasibility study issues were rated as important to completion of that step. This information was requested for development of both training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula, provided for purposes of comparison. Below is a discussion of how respondent colleges, schools, and the department of education handled this step.

Seven out of nine respondents stated that the idea for training specialist curricula originated within colleges, schools, or the department of education with which they were affiliated. Three out of nine indicated that feasibility studies were conducted when developing training specialist curricula. Specific categories of
feasibility study participants included: faculty, administrators, business and industry representatives, and personnel from government agencies. These categories were mentioned by all three respondents. Students, community and civic group representatives and members of professional organizations were involved to a lesser extent. Three respondents indicated that feasibility studies were conducted as part of the processes used to develop teacher preparation curricula. Participant categories used for those endeavors included: faculty, administrators, students, and government agency personnel.

Respondents who stated that feasibility studies were incorporated in their curriculum development processes were then asked to rate categories of feasibility study issues according to their importance in completing the step. Respondents developing training specialist curricula assigned the rating of "Very Important" to the following categories: potential student interest, faculty capabilities, and employment opportunities. A rating between "Very Important" and "Important" was assigned to the financial resource capabilities category. Congruence with college, school, department philosophy, and the existence of similar programs in the area were designated as "Important." A rating between "Important" and "Somewhat Important" was given to the following categories: congruence with university or college philosophy and
material resource capabilities.

The respondents contributing information on teacher preparation curricula, for purposes of comparison, rated potential student interest as "Very Important." Financial resource capabilities was rated between "Very Important" and "Important." Congruence with university or college philosophy, material resource capabilities, and existence of similar programs in the area were judged as "Important." Rated between "Important" and "Somewhat Important" were the following categories: congruence with college, school, department philosophy; faculty capabilities; and employment opportunities.

Leaders and Committees

The leaders and committees step, selected from curriculum literature included the following components: identification of leaders, development of standing and/or ad hoc committees, and inclusion of advisory groups. Respondents who developed training specialist curricula and teacher preparation curricula were asked to indicate whether leaders were designated for these processes, and how they were selected. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether standing and/or ad hoc committees were created and specifically, which categories of participants were included. Information about inclusion of advisory groups was also solicited. Respondents were
asked to designate specific categories of advisory group participants included in their curriculum development processes.

Eight out of nine respondents who developed training specialist curricula stated that leaders were designated. Five of these leaders were appointed by college deans, or department chairmen. Three out of seven respondents stated that leaders were designated when developing teacher preparation curricula.

Six out of nine institutions indicated that standing and/or ad hoc committees were developed as part of training specialist curriculum development processes. The categories of committee participants most often cited by these respondents included: faculty, administrators, professional organization members, and representatives from business and industry. Students, people from community and civic groups, and government agency personnel were included to a lesser extent.

For institutions presenting data on teacher preparation curricula, five stated that committees were included as part of the development processes. The following committee participants were cited: faculty, administrators, students, and representatives of professional organizations.

For respondents developing training specialist curricula, six out of nine stated that advisory groups
were included as part of the development processes. Categories of participants most often mentioned included: faculty, people from community and civic groups, professional organization members, and business and industry representatives. Categories cited less often were administrators, students, and government agency personnel. Five respondents contributing information on teacher preparation curricula stated that the following categories were included: faculty, administrators, students, and professional organization members. To a lesser extent, business and industry and government agency personnel were included.

Goals and Objectives

Another step selected as important from the curriculum literature, was the setting of goals and objectives. Respondents who developed training specialist and teacher preparation curricula were asked to indicate whether development of goals and objectives was included as part of development processes. Respondents then designated specific goal and objective categories included in these processes.

Seven out of nine respondents describing their training specialist curriculum development processes indicated that goals and objectives were an integral part of the processes. Categories of goals and objectives
most often cited were: student goals and objectives, and employer goals and objectives. Societal and higher education goals and objectives were included less frequently. Five out of seven respondents presenting data on teacher preparation curricula indicated that goals and objectives were included. Categories most often mentioned were societal, and student goals and objectives. Less frequently involved were higher education and employer goals and objectives. Very few specific goals and objectives were volunteered by any respondent.

**Information Sources**

Inclusion of information sources was also selected from curriculum development literature as an important curriculum decision making step. Respondents developing training specialist and teacher preparation curricula were asked to indicate whether information sources were included in these development processes, and then to rate the importance of selected information source categories to completion of that step.

All nine respondents involved with development of training specialist curricula indicated that information sources were represented in the processes. These respondents rated the following information source categories as "Very Important": needs analysis information, occupational data, learning theories and instruction
information, and information from community and civic groups. Data from potential employers and faculty were rated between "Very Important" and "Important." Information from professional literature, students, and government regulations were all rated "Important."

Six out of seven respondents supplying information on teacher preparation curricula indicated that information sources were represented. No category was rated as "Very Important" by these respondents. Potential employer and faculty information were judged to be "Important." Data about learning theories and techniques were rated between "Important" and "Somewhat Important." Data from needs analysis and occupations were rated "Somewhat Important." Information from community and civic group personnel was rated between "Somewhat Important" and "Not Very Important." Information obtained from professional literature and from students was rated "Not Very Important."

Faculty Development Opportunities

Inclusion of faculty development opportunities was also considered an important curriculum decision making step. Respondents developing training specialist and teacher preparation curricula were asked to indicate whether faculty development opportunities were offered to support their curriculum development processes.
They were also asked to specify which categories of opportunities were selected to complete the step.

Six out of nine respondents developing training specialist curricula stated that faculty opportunities were made available to support the development processes. Categories of opportunities most often cited included: professional memberships and professional literature subscriptions. Categories involved to a lesser extent included: workshops and conferences, exchanges with occupational counterparts and with resource and advisory personnel. Funding resources to support faculty development were also cited. One respondent indicated that academic courses were made available to support faculty development.

Three out of seven respondents supplying information on teacher preparation curriculum development processes indicated that faculty development opportunities were included. The categories cited most often included: attendance at workshops and conferences, professional literature subscriptions, and funding resources to support development opportunities. Personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts, and professional memberships were cited to a lesser extent.
Political and Administrative Influences

A final curriculum decision making step, chosen from curriculum literature for purposes of description and comparison, was the recognition of political and administrative influences. Respondents were asked to designate whether political and administrative influences were recognized when developing training specialist and teacher preparation curricula, and to rate the importance of specific political and administrative categories to completion of the step.

Seven out of nine respondents developing training specialist curricula indicated that political and administrative influences were recognized as part of the processes. Securing administrative support was rated "Very Important." Achieving faculty philosophical agreement over the program, overcoming interdisciplinary rivalry over program placement, and reconciling traditional and nontraditional students' needs were rated between "Very Important" and "Important." Reaching enrollment quotas was judged to be "Important." Securing monetary support was rated between "Important" and "Somewhat Important." Competition from similar programs in the same area was rated between "Somewhat Important" and "Not Very Important."

Five out of seven respondents stated that political and administrative influences were recognized when
developing teacher preparation curricula. Securing administrative and monetary support were both rated "Very Important." Reaching enrollment quotas was rated between "Very Important" and "Important." Securing faculty philosophical agreement over the program was rated as "Important." Reconciling traditional and non-traditional students' needs was judged to be "Somewhat Important." Interdisciplinary rivalry over program placement, and competition from similar programs in the same geographic area were rated "Not Very Important."
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the curriculum decision making processes identified by colleges, schools, and departments of education when developing undergraduate training specialist curricula; as compared with processes employed when developing teacher preparation curricula, with which they were presumed to be more familiar. It was hoped that points of consensus and divergence between processes would be highlighted.

Selected curriculum decision making steps, gleaned from curriculum development literature, and primarily stressing systems approaches, served as a basis of description and comparison between training specialist and teacher preparation curriculum decision making processes. These steps included:

1. Identifying sources of program initiative
2. Selecting leaders and committees
3. Setting goals and objectives
4. Selecting information sources
5. Determining faculty development opportunities
6. Recognizing political and administrative influences
A survey questionnaire was developed based, in part, on these selected curriculum decision making steps. It was sent to faculty members and administrators in 10 colleges, schools, and departments of education, offering undergraduate training specialist programs. These 10 institutions constituted the population offering such programs at the time. Nine of the 10 respondents returned completed questionnaires, contributing data on training specialist programs. Seven out of the nine respondents offered information on comparison teacher preparation curriculum decision making processes. In many cases, this information was offered as procedures generally followed when developing teacher preparation programs rather than as procedures specific to one such process.

The questionnaire was developed in two parts. Part I asked for background data about colleges, schools, and departments of education; faculties, and students. It also elicited information about training specialist programs, faculties, and students.

Part II led respondents through selected curriculum decision making steps, chosen from curriculum literature, mentioned above. Respondents indicated whether each step was applicable for developing their training specialist and/or teacher preparation curricula. If a step was applicable, respondents were asked either to supply specific information about components of the step,
or to rate the components according to their level of importance to the step's completion.

The report of these findings was presented in Chapter IV. It is the purpose of this chapter to (1) offer conclusions about the data; (2) make recommendations about procedures followed in developing this study; (3) suggest areas of future study resulting from information derived from this analysis. However, the limited number of respondents who participated in this study, means that all conclusions must be taken cautiously.

**Conclusions**

**Part I: Background Data on Colleges, Schools, and Departments of Education; Undergraduate Training Specialist Programs, Faculties, and Students**

1. There seemed to be little consistent pattern to the selection of discipline or subject matter area in which training specialist programs were placed. While the majority of programs were located either in vocationally-oriented or adult/human resource development-oriented areas, some were also placed in purely education specializations.

2. All training specialist programs, except one, were under 10 years old. There may be two reasons for the awareness of this new occupational area by postsecondary education. One reason might be the growing emphasis placed on additional educational opportunities to
increase competence by both training specialist practitioners and prospective practitioners. Another reason hinges on the growing need postsecondary education is experiencing in replacing the dwindling number of traditional 18 to 22 year old students.

3. There were fairly high percentages of students enrolled in training specialist programs who were employed in training specialist-related positions at the same time. This may indicate that many of these students fit the nontraditional student category, which includes older, more occupationally experienced people, holding full or parttime employment while attending school.

4. Most colleges, schools, and departments of education indicated that faculty members from other academic disciplines participated in training specialist programs. This could indicate an interdisciplinary nature to these programs. It may also indicate a perceived need on the part of training specialist curriculum developers to seek expertise outside of their own educational faculties. However, there was no indication of the types or extent of participation derived from these other faculty members.

5. Most training specialist programs were offered as new rather than as revisions of existing programs. This may indicate that such program development was a unique undertaking for these faculties and administrators. They may have felt that they could not adapt existing teacher
preparation or other education programs and still satisfy the needs of this new occupational student constituency, prospective employers, or their own faculties, and administrators.

6. The high number of female students enrolled in many of the training specialist programs may indicate that women are choosing this occupation as an alternative to traditional career paths, especially teacher preparation. Perhaps they see this occupation as a way of securing a foothold in business and industry that would not be possible with credentials in elementary or secondary education alone.

7. The extent of business and industry experiences indicated by faculty members responsible for training specialist programs differed among the various responding institutions. For those programs in which only a few faculty members indicated business and/or industry backgrounds, it may be assumed that the predominant faculty experiences were in teacher and vocational education.

Several respondents indicated that this lack of business and industry experience, particularly in occupational areas where their training specialist graduates would be employed, was recognized as detrimental to their programs' success. This recognition was leading to increased professional development opportunities, specifically attendance at workshops and conferences,
and greater reliance on professional literature.

Part II: Comparison of the Curriculum Development Processes Followed in Preparation of Training Specialist Curricula and Selected Teacher Preparation Curricula

1. Respondents indicated that, in general, they employed more structured approaches when developing training specialist curricula than when developing teacher preparation curricula. This conclusion can be drawn because each selected curriculum decision making step, chosen from curriculum development literature for purposes of description and comparison, was represented to a greater extent in training specialist curriculum development processes than in teacher preparation development processes.

Based on the limited number of institutions that participated in this study, it might be concluded that faculties and administrators recognized a lack of depth of experience in training specialist curriculum development. This perceived deficiency may have led them to lean more heavily on structured curriculum development processes to decrease insecurity and to increase their chances of developing successful programs.

2. In retrospect, respondents not only indicated that selected curriculum decision making steps were employed overall to a greater extent when developing training specialist curricula than teacher preparation curricula,
but they also indicated that steps were selected for inclusion at different frequencies for each process.

Steps selected by developers of training specialist curricula in order of most frequent inclusion were:
(a) using information sources
(b) designating leaders
(c) stating goals and objectives, recognizing political and administrative influences
(d) creating standing and/or ad hoc committees, forming advisory groups, providing faculty development opportunities
(e) conducting feasibility studies

Steps selected by developers of teacher preparation curricula in order of most frequent inclusion were:
(a) using information sources
(b) stating goals and objectives, forming standing and/or ad hoc committees, forming advisory groups, recognizing political and administrative influences
(c) designating leaders, conducting feasibility studies, providing faculty development opportunities

Selected curriculum decision making steps, gleaned from curriculum literature, primarily stressing systems approaches, presupposed that each step was equally important to the outcome of the processes. However, the above data indicated that developers of both training specialist and teacher preparation curricula designated
some steps more important than others. Thus, consensus and divergence between the two processes could be deduced.

3. More categories of participants or categories of information sources were cited as necessary to completion of various curriculum decision making steps when developing training specialist curricula than when developing teacher preparation curricula. For example, each suggested category of possible committee participants was cited by at least one respondent developing training specialist curricula. Several respondents indicated that all categories of committee participants were considered important for completion of the step. However, many committee participant categories were not cited by respondents developing teacher preparation curricula. This extensive inclusion of participants and information sources for completion of each step, also reinforced the concept that developers of training specialist curricula felt it necessary to go beyond their own knowledge and expertise to create programs. Developers of teacher preparation programs did not feel this insecurity and relied more heavily on their own resources.

4. There was also divergence between training specialist and teacher preparation curricula in the types of persons, information sources, and other relevant resource categories considered important to completion of each curriculum development step. In general, developers of teacher
preparation curricula selected other teacher education faculty and administrators, personnel from state departments of education, and teacher certification personnel. Members of federal, state, and local education professional organizations were also included. Literature about curriculum development, teacher preparation, and evaluation was cited.

In contrast, respondents developing training specialist curricula stated that business and industry personnel, especially trainers and personnel managers were often consulted. Members of the national, state, and local levels of the American Society for Training and Development; and to a lesser extent, members of the National Society for Performance and Instruction were also key resources. Training and development literature, especially Training and Development Journal and National Society for Performance and Instruction Journal were represented. Training specialist and adult education authorities were also cited. Specifically, Leonard Nadler, Malcolm Knowles, Allen Tough, and James Robbins Kidd were mentioned.

Evidently, faculties and administrators who were developing training specialist curricula realized that it was necessary to seek different resources from the ones usually associated with developing teacher preparation curricula. This might explain why they sought out
various occupationally-oriented resources that would assure fulfillment of prospective students', faculties', and prospective employers' expectations about training specialist programs.

Several respondents verified this conclusion when they stated that the strategies employed for developing their training specialist curricula differed from strategies normally involved when developing teacher preparation curricula. One respondent stated that his curriculum development committee devised an externally-oriented, "real-world" approach when developing the training specialist program, as opposed to an internally-oriented, "academic" approach usually employed when developing a teacher preparation program.

5. Analyzing the number and variety of persons, information sources, and other relevant resources considered necessary for completion of each step of training specialist curriculum development, it could be seen that colleges of education included the greatest number and variety of resources. The number and variety of resources was somewhat less for schools of education. The only department of education represented in this study indicated the least reliance on outside personnel, information sources, and other relevant data for completion of each selected curriculum decision making step.
This decreasing reliance on resources may indicate less money available to spend; less knowledge about where to acquire data; fewer previous contacts with outside resources, and therefore, less understanding or willingness to initiate such contacts; less knowledgeable faculties; less understanding that such resources might be necessary when developing training specialist curricula. The decreasing reliance on resources might also be attributed to the fact that training specialist programs located in colleges and schools of education were predominantly placed in vocational or technical areas where faculties already had some familiarity with the involvement of outside resources.

6. Students participated more frequently in developing teacher preparation curricula than training specialist curricula. In addition, students involved with teacher preparation curricula were chosen from other education programs already in place or from curriculum committees devised for that purpose. However, those few students who did participate in developing training specialist curricula came from peripheral, although closely related majors to training specialist curricula such as vocational education, business, and administration.

7. Respondents developing teacher preparation curricula indicated that they included representatives from local boards and state departments of education on their various
committees. These people were involved for their professional expertise but also to assure compliance with teacher certification requirements. Developers of training specialist curricula did not include the same numbers or types of representatives from local boards and state departments of education because there were no certification requirements for training specialist programs.

8. It should also be noted that when respondents developing training specialist curricula went outside of their own faculties and institutions for resource people, few chose representatives from vocational education and no respondents indicated that professional adult educators were included. However, some vocational education and adult education literature was mentioned as important to the development processes.

Perhaps contacts with other vocational and adult educators and representative of their professional societies took place on informal bases, since many of the participants in this study were, themselves vocational, technical, or adult educators.

However, several respondents indicated that they did not include adult educators or the Adult Education Association (now the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education) in their training specialist development processes because they did not think that
adult education was relevant to their needs. One respondent indicated that at the time he was developing the training specialist program, he considered adult education as continuing education or adult basic education and therefore, not pertinent to his program. It should be noted that several respondents indicated that they now are beginning to include more adult education information in their training specialist programs as they seek to expand and enhance experiences for their students.

9. Feasibility studies were not frequently indicated as a step included in the development processes of either training specialist or teacher preparation curricula. Several respondents stated that programs often grew from a few experimental courses to full-fledged, degree-granting programs. It was during the time that the experimental courses were in place that informal research was sometimes undertaken to determine student interest, potential employment opportunities, faculty acceptance of the program, and availability of monetary resources.

10. Although most respondents developing training specialist and teacher preparation curricula indicated that goals and objectives were included as part of their development processes, few could supply specific goals and objectives under the suggested categories. Several respondents indicated that specific goals and objectives statements had been lost over the years. One respondent
stated that generalized goals and objectives developed for each curriculum were made specific for each student, depending upon his academic needs and professional interests.

However, one might conclude that perhaps many of these institutions really did not develop specific goals and objectives for each program. Therefore, goals and objectives could not be employed as valuable measures of how well programs were meeting the needs of students, employers, faculties, higher education, and society.

11. Faculty development opportunities were more readily available to personnel involved with developing training specialist curricula than teacher preparation curricula. Again, just as with resources selection, when faculty development opportunities were made available to teacher preparation faculties, the opportunities tended to remain in teacher preparation areas. Whereas training specialist development opportunities tended to center on occupational knowledge, supporting training specialist curriculum development.

This necessity to seek out additional occupational knowledge may have been considered important by training specialist developers because of the uniqueness of the new occupational programs. It may also have been considered necessary because faculties lacked specific business and industry experiences in occupational areas in which
their training specialist graduates would find employ-
ment. In general, it also reflected the new strategy
adopted by several developers of training specialist
programs: to employ "real world" approaches when develop-
ing these new occupational programs.

12. In general, educators developing teacher preparation
curricula tended to be less concerned with the political
and administrative influences of their work. However,
faculties and administrators developing training special-
ist curricula were more sensitive to these considerations.
These respondents rated almost all categories of political
and administrative influences higher than did respon-
dents developing teacher preparation curricula.

Respondents developing training specialist curricula
indicated that securing administrative support, achieving
faculty philosophical agreement over program, recognizing
interdisciplinary rivalry over program placement, and
reconciling traditional and nontraditional students' needs were all considered important to the overall success
of their development projects. For developers of teacher
preparation curricula who indicated that political and
administrative influences were considered at all, there
was only agreement with training specialist curriculum
developers on the point that securing administrative
support was important. They also highly rated achievement
of monetary support, and securing enrollment quotas.
Other categories were rated as less important.

It may be concluded that faculties and administrators developing training specialist curricula were less secure about their programs' reception within the institutions and with potential students. Perhaps concern over ownership of the programs indicated searches by other academic specialties for new constituencies. Members of other academic specialties also felt that training specialist programs were appropriate to their academic provinces.

For respondents developing teacher preparation curricula, it might be concluded that these sensitive issues were no longer problems. Reconciling traditional and nontraditional students' needs was also not yet an issue, as the majority of teacher preparation students still fell within the traditional 18 to 22 year old range.

However, there may be another conclusion that can be drawn from the differences in emphasis placed on administrative and political issues by developers of training specialist and teacher preparation curricula. Educators as a whole did not view political and administrative influences as relevant to the operation of their organizations. It was only when faced with radically new types of programs, serving new constituencies, that they were forced to recognize these influences as important.
Recommendations

Study Development

Soliciting information about teacher preparation curriculum development processes from faculties and administrators primarily involved with developing training specialist curricula is not advised. The same faculty members did not seem to possess enough expertise or information about both sets of curricula. In this study, respondents were chosen for their knowledge of training specialist curriculum development processes. Therefore, information about teacher preparation suffered. As indicated, although seven respondents contributed information on teacher preparation curriculum development, for purposes of comparison, many offered generalized approaches employed when developing most teacher preparation curricula within their respective institutions instead of offering development strategies specific to one comparison curriculum.

Potential Research Areas Deriving From This Study

1. Once trainer competencies are finally decided upon by membership and the Professional Development section of the American Society for Training and Development, and other interested people, a whole series of studies should be undertaken concerning the content analysis and course development steps of the training specialist curriculum.
development process. Steps that might be considered in these studies would include: (a) reconciliation of program content with other curricula, (b) selection and development of course content, (c) methods of content delivery, (d) implementation of curriculum, (e) revision of curriculum.

2. In addition to conducting studies on the content steps of curriculum development, studies might also be conducted on the summative evaluation step as applied to training specialist curriculum development and revision. When these programs have been in place for a sufficient amount of time, studies might be designed that evaluate both content and process steps of these curriculum development projects.

3. Since the study infers that many training specialist students are nontraditional, are colleges, schools, and departments of education sponsoring such programs meeting the needs of these students in the following areas: (a) advising, (b) career planning, (c) course scheduling, and (d) placement?

4. Why are so many women entering the training specialist occupation? What does this mean for the total enrollment and demographic makeup of teacher preparation programs? Are academic institutions sponsoring these training specialist programs anticipating any problems that women trainers might encounter in business and industry such as
prejudice against educators in business, and prejudice against women in high technology areas, where much of future industrial training will occur?

5. Respondents developing teacher preparation curricula stated that they included representatives of local boards and state departments of education on their various committees, in part because they had to assure compliance with teacher certification requirements. No such certification requirements exist for training specialist curricula. As more definitive competencies are developed for this occupation, will certification of institutions granting degrees in the training specialist field be required? Is work now underway to develop such a certification program within the American Society for Training and Development in conjunction with other interested parties?

6. The American Society for Training and Development was considered such an important source of personnel and information for respondents developing training specialist curricula. It is not clear how respondents rate the quality and usefulness of the resources the professional organization provides for determining the academic preparation of training specialists, including: (a) workshops, (b) conferences, (c) books, (d) periodicals, (e) special reports, and (f) occupational experts. What other resources might the organization provide to assist
faculties and administrators in these endeavors?

7. Why were no adult education and few vocational education academicians, besides those already on staff, and their professional organizational representatives cited as important to developing training specialist curricula? Are professional journals, workshops, and conferences sponsored by vocational and adult education not addressing the new occupational interests of adult and vocational students and faculties? Or were informal contacts made with vocational and adult educators that did not appear in answers to questions posed in this study?

Since several respondents stated that they did not perceive adult education as a relevant source for training specialist curriculum development information, are the professional adult education societies meeting the needs of these occupationally-oriented groups or are they not publicizing the relevance of their information to the appropriate people? Might it also be true that many faculty members responsible for developing training specialist curricula did not perceive this occupation as an adult education role and therefore, neglected a rich area of research and literature?

8. Could the selected curriculum decision making steps, gleaned from curriculum development literature, and primarily stressing systems approaches, be applied to analysis of other occupational curricula? Respondents
developing training specialist and teacher preparation curricula were able to interpret some of their activities according to the selected steps. However, it is going to take more research to pinpoint the steps consistently mentioned as important, and to identify additional curriculum decision making steps that might be missing from the processes as now described. Respondents were not given the opportunity to indicate additional steps they included in development processes when answering the questionnaire.

9. Will the selected curriculum decision making steps and the categories of participants and information sources cited as necessary for completion of the steps remain important as more colleges, schools, and departments of education develop training specialist curricula? If the selected steps and categories retain the same degree of importance for future training specialist curriculum developers, when verified by further investigation, then could this study's results expedite the process of training specialist curriculum development? Could the selected steps serve as the beginning of a process model for faculties developing training specialist curricula and thereby save time and money, while helping to assure that the aspirations of all concerned parties are satisfied?
10. Why are so few textbooks written that delineate the procedures necessary for developing postsecondary curricula? Most of the material cited in this study and from which the curriculum decision making steps were chosen, were from primary and secondary curriculum development sources. Does this lack of reference material again indicate that faculties take a less structured approach to postsecondary curriculum development? Perhaps these curriculum developers rely more heavily on texts that describe specific curriculum development procedures for various occupational and vocational areas with which they might be concerned, where such texts exist.

Summary

This study sought to determine the curriculum development processes identified in colleges, schools, and departments of education when developing undergraduate training specialist curricula, as compared with processes employed when developing teacher preparation curricula, with which it was presumed they were more familiar. It was hoped that points of consensus and divergence between processes would be highlighted. Selected curriculum decision making steps, gleaned from curriculum development, and primarily stressing systems approaches, were included for purposes of description and comparison.
A two-part questionnaire was designed to elicit information from faculties and administrators in 10 colleges, schools, and departments of education which represented the population of undergraduate training specialist programs at the time. Nine out of 10 respondents returned completed questionnaires, supplying data on training specialist programs. Seven out of the nine also supplied information on teacher preparation programs.

Part I of the questionnaire asked for background information about the colleges, schools, and departments of education; faculties; and students. It also elicited information about training specialist programs, faculties, and students. Part II led respondents through selected curriculum decision making steps. They were asked to indicate which steps were chosen for inclusion when developing training specialist and/or teacher preparation curricula. Where applicable, respondents contributed additional information about completion of the step or rated the importance of the step's components to completion of the step.

This chapter presented conclusions and recommendations resulting from analysis of data obtained from the questionnaires. It also suggested areas for further study that might derive from information presented in this study.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTIONS:
Part I of this questionnaire asks for data about your college, school, department of education; its faculty and students; and the undergraduate training specialist (human resource development, training and development) program. Some questions ask for specific numerical data. Please try to be as accurate as possible when filling in the blanks.

Part I: Background Data

A COLLEGE, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROFILE
1. Name of your college, school, department of education: ____________________________

2. Is your college, school, department differentiated into areas of academic specialization?
   Yes _______ No (If No, go to question A3)
   → 2a. Specify areas: ____________________________
   → 2b. Into which area of specialization has the training specialist program been placed?

3. Number of fulltime equivalent faculty: (school year 1981-82) __________
4. Total student enrollment: (school year 1981-82) __________

B UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING SPECIALIST PROGRAM PROFILE
1. Your program's title: ____________________________

2. How many years has your program been offered? __________
3. How was your program formed?
   ______ as a totally new program
   ______ as a revision of an existing program
4. Undergraduate degree offered: ____________________________

C FACULTY PROFILE
1. Number of fulltime equivalent faculty having responsibility in your training specialist program: (school year 1981-82) __________
2. Number of faculty whose specialization is:
   ______ vocational education
   ______ adult education
   ______ media development
   ______ test construction
   ______ curriculum design
   ______ instructional design
   ______ evaluation
   ______ teacher preparation
   ______ human resource development/training
   ______ others (specify) __________

3. Number of faculty with experiences in:
   ______ business
   ______ industry
   ______ social services
   ______ government
   ______ others (specify) __________

4. Do faculty from academic areas outside of education participate in your program?
   Yes _______ No (If No, go to page 2, Part D)
   → 4a. Specify areas: ____________________________
3. TRAINING SPECIALIST STUDENT PROFILE

1. Number of students enrolled in your program (school year 1981-82)

2. Number of male students: _____; Number of female students: _____

3. Percentage of students employed in training specialist positions while enrolled in your program: _____

PART II: Curriculum Decision Making Process

The curriculum decision making process might be thought of as a series of concurrent and/or successive steps. These steps include: identifying sources of program initiative, selecting committees and participants, assigning leadership responsibility, setting goals and objectives, selecting information sources, determining faculty development opportunities, and recognizing political and administrative influences.

DIRECTIONS:

You will be presented with a series of questions pertaining to each step. The purpose is to have you compare decisions made in developing your training specialist curriculum with those made in developing any teacher preparation curriculum with which you were recently involved.

1. Select and name a teacher preparation curriculum to be used for purposes of comparison:

2. For each process step there are suggested categories of participants or information sources used to accomplish that step. Please indicate:

   (a) whether the category is Applicable [A] or Not Applicable [NA] to the training specialist curriculum and the curriculum you have chosen for purposes of comparison.

   (b) if the category is applicable:

    (1) where indicated, provide specific information relative to that category;

    (2) where indicated, rate the importance of each category on the scale provided.

    The following scale will be used:

    | 1 | 2 | 3 |
    |---|---|---|
    | Very Important | Important | Somewhat Important |
    | Not Very Important | Not Important |

    - PLEASE WRITE OR PRINT LEGIBLY -

4. IDENTIFYING SOURCES OF PROGRAM INITIATIVE

In order for a new curriculum to be considered, the idea for it must be brought to the attention of the faculty. The feasibility of the curriculum must also be considered, to assure that the concept is consistent with the philosophy of the college, school, or department of education and to assure that a need exists for such a program.

A1. Did the idea for the training specialist program originate outside the college, school, department of education?

   Yes _____ No (If No. go to page 3, question A4)

   ➷ A2. Was this the first time a program concept had been introduced from outside the college, school, or department of education?

   Yes _____ No

   ➷ A3. What was the source of initiative for the training specialist curriculum?

   ____________________________
A4. Was a feasibility study conducted before deciding to proceed with development of the training specialist curriculum?

   ____ Yes _____ No

A5. Was a feasibility study conducted when developing your comparison teacher preparation curriculum?

   ____ Yes _____ No

- If you answered Yes to question A4 or A5, proceed with questions A6 and A7, using the appropriate column(s). If you answered No to both questions A4 and A5, go to page 4, Part B.

A6. Following are suggested categories of participants in a feasibility study. Check whether each category is A or NA to the situation, and provide specific examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS IN FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR TRAINING SPECIALIST CURRICULUM</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS IN FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR COMPARISON CURRICULUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Faculty: (areas of specialization)</td>
<td>6a. Faculty: (areas of specialization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Administrators: (titles)</td>
<td>6b. Administrators: (titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Students: (majors)</td>
<td>6c. Students: (majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Community/civic groups: (types)</td>
<td>6d. Community/civic groups: (types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Professional organizations: (types)</td>
<td>6e. Professional organizations: (types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f. Business/industry representatives: (titles)</td>
<td>6f. Business/industry representatives: (titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g. Government agencies: (types)</td>
<td>6g. Government agencies: (types)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A7. Following are suggested categories of issues addressed in a feasibility study. Check whether each category is "A" or "MA" to the situation, then rate in order of importance by circling the appropriate number: 1 - Very Important, 2 - Important, 3 - Somewhat Important, 4 - Not Very Important, 5 - Not Important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES IN FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR TRAINING SPECIALIST CURRICULUM</th>
<th>A / MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Potential student interest:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Congruence with university/college philosophy:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Congruence with college/school/department philosophy:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Material resource capabilities:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Financial resource capabilities:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. Faculty capabilities:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Employment opportunities:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Similar programs in the area:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7i. Others: (specify)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES IN FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR COMPARISON CURRICULUM</th>
<th>A / MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Potential student interest:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Congruence with university/college philosophy:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Congruence with college/school/department philosophy:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Material resource capabilities:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Financial resource capabilities:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. Faculty capabilities:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Employment opportunities:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Similar programs in the area:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7i. Others: (specify)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. SELECTING COMMITTEES AND PARTICIPANTS

Most curriculum decision making is accomplished by group process, sometimes involving college committees, and advisory groups. Designation of leadership is also seen as important, to facilitate group process.

B1. Was someone designated to provide leadership for development of the training specialist curriculum?
- Yes ___ No (If No, go to page 5, question B6)

B2. Designate the person's title: _____
B3. Designate the person's primary areas of expertise: ____________________________

B4. How was the person chosen?

___ Selected  ___ Appointed

B5. By whom was the person chosen?

B6. Was someone designated to provide leadership for development of the comparison curriculum you have chosen?

___ Yes ___ No

B7. Did a standing and/or ad hoc committee(s) help to develop the training specialist curriculum?

___ Yes ___ No

B8. Were committees used to develop the comparison curriculum?

___ Yes ___ No

- If you answered Yes to question B7 or B8, proceed with question B9, using the appropriate column(s). If you answered No to both questions B7 and B8, go to page 5, question B10. -

B9. Following are suggested categories of committee participants. Check whether each category is [A] or [NA] to the situation, and provide specific examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP FOR TRAINING SPECIALIST CURRICULUM</th>
<th>A/NA</th>
<th>COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP FOR COMPARISON CURRICULUM</th>
<th>A/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9a. Faculty: (areas of specialization)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9a. Faculty: (areas of specialization)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b. Administrators: (titles)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9b. Administrators: (titles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c. Students: (majors)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9c. Students: (majors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9d. Community/civic groups: (types)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9d. Community/civic groups: (types)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9e. Professional organizations: (types)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9e. Professional organizations: (types)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B10. Did advisory groups help to develop the training specialist curriculum?

______ Yes _______ No

B11. Were advisory groups used to develop the comparison curriculum?

______ Yes _______ No

If you answered Yes to question B10 or B11, proceed with question B12, using the appropriate column(s). If you answered No to both questions B10 and B11, go to page 7, Part C.

B12. Following are suggested categories of advisory group participants. Check whether each is [A] or [NA] to the situation, and provide specific examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVISORY GROUP PARTICIPANTS FOR TRAINING SPECIALIST CURRICULUM</th>
<th>ADVISORY GROUP PARTICIPANTS FOR COMPARISON CURRICULUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12a. Faculty: (areas of specialization)</td>
<td>12a. Faculty: (areas of specialization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b. Administrators: (titles)</td>
<td>12b. Administrators: (titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c. Students: (majors)</td>
<td>12c. Students: (majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d. Community/civic groups: (types)</td>
<td>12d. Community/civic groups: (types)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12e. Professional organizations: (types) | 12e. Professional organizations: (types)
---|---
12f. Business/industry representatives: (titles) | 12f. Business/industry representatives: (titles)
---|---
12g. Government agencies: (types) | 12g. Government agencies: (types)
---|---
12h. Others: (specify) | 12h. Others: (specify)
---|---

### SETTING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Determination of long and short term goals and objectives is often part of the curriculum development process. Objectives more clearly delineate the steps by which goals will be reached.

C1. Were goals and objectives identified when developing the training specialist curriculum?

- Yes  
- No

C2. Were goals and objectives identified when developing the comparison curriculum?

- Yes  
- No

- If you answered Yes to question C1 or C2, proceed with question C3. If you answered No to both questions C1 and C2, go to page 6, Part D.

C3. Following are suggested categories of goals and objectives. Check whether each category is **A** or **NA** to the situation, and provide specific examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR TRAINING SPECIALIST CURRICULUM</th>
<th>A/NA</th>
<th>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR COMPARISON CURRICULUM</th>
<th>A/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Societal goals and objectives:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3a. Societal goals and objectives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Higher education goals and objectives:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3b. Higher education goals and objectives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SELECTING INFORMATION SOURCES

Many sources of data can be used in developing new curricula, including: potential employers, students, professional organizations, and others.

D1. Were information sources used to develop the training specialist curriculum?

- **Yes**    - **No**

D2. Were information sources used to develop the comparison curriculum?

- **Yes**    - **No**

- If you answered Yes to question D1 or D2, proceed with question D3, using the appropriate column(s). If you answered No to both questions D1 and D2, go to page 9, Part E.

D3. Following are suggested categories of information sources. Check whether each category is [A] or [NA] to the situation, then rate in order of importance by circling the appropriate number: 1 - Very Important, 2 - Important, 3 - Somewhat Important, 4 - Not Very Important, 5 - Not Important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION SOURCES FOR TRAINING SPECIALIST CURRICULUM</th>
<th>A / NA</th>
<th>INFORMATION SOURCES FOR COMPARISON CURRICULUM</th>
<th>A / NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J0. Needs analysis:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>J0. Needs analysis:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1. Occupational information:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>J1. Occupational information:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2. Professional literature:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>J2. Professional literature:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3. Student information:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>J3. Student information:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5. Learning theories/ instructional techniques:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>J5. Learning theories/ instructional techniques:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Determining Faculty Development Opportunities

Some experts contend that faculty development opportunities should be part of the process of developing all curricula, especially new curricula.

**E1.** Were faculty development opportunities made available to support the training specialist curriculum?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**E2.** Were faculty development opportunities made available to support the comparison curriculum?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

- If you answered Yes to question E1 or E2, proceed with question E3, using the appropriate column(s). If you answered No to both questions E1 and E2, go to page 10, Part F.

**E3.** Following are suggested faculty development categories. Check whether each category is [A] or [NA] to the situation, and provide specific examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Development Opportunities Supporting Training Specialist Curriculum</th>
<th>Faculty Development Opportunities Supporting Comparison Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ja. Workshops/conferences: (titles)</td>
<td>A / NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb. Academic courses: (titles)</td>
<td>A / NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jc. Personnel exchanges with occupational counterparts: (types)</td>
<td>A / NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
# RECOGNIZING POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE INFLUENCES

The curriculum development process and its outcomes can often be affected by the goals and objectives, aspirations and ambitions of persons directly and indirectly involved with it. Often these influences are not explicitly stated, and yet, if no attempt is made to recognize and consider them as the program is developed, they can adversely affect the outcome.

F1. Were political and administrative influences recognized when developing the training specialist curriculum?

- Yes
- No

F2. Were political and administrative influences recognized when developing the comparison curriculum?

- Yes
- No

- If you answered Yes to question F1 or F2, proceed with question F3, using the appropriate column(s). If you answered No to both questions F1 and F2, this completes the questionnaire.

F3. Following are suggested categories of political and administrative influences. Check whether each category is [A] or [NA] to the situation, then rate in order of importance by circling the appropriate number: 1- Very Important, 2- Important, 3- Somewhat Important, 4- Not Very Important, 5- Not Important.

### POLITICAL/ADMINISTRATIVE INFLUENCES ON TRAINING SPECIALIST CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3a. Securing administrative support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POLITICAL/ADMINISTRATIVE INFLUENCES ON COMPARISON CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3a. Securing administrative support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Job. Securing enrollment quotas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Job. Securing monetary support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Job. Achieving faculty philosophical agreement over program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Job. Overcoming interdisciplinary rivalry over program placement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Job. Reconciling traditional/non-traditional students' needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Job. Overcoming competition from similar programs in the same geographic area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

Please check if you wish a summary of the study's results.

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING

Return Address:  
Miss Roberta Freed  
603 Olde Towne Ave., Apt. D  
Columbus, Ohio 43214
Dear

As per our recent conversation, you agreed to participate in a survey of training specialist programs in higher education. Your institution was chosen because it is one of the few offering undergraduate preparation for the training specialist (trainer, human resource developer) in business and industry. Selection was made from the ASTD Directory of Academic Programs in Training and Development/Human Resource Development, 1981.

The processes by which faculties design curricula in higher education are not thoroughly documented. This is especially true for training specialist programs.

The enclosed questionnaire will allow this researcher to compare processes used by educational faculties in developing teacher preparation and training specialist curricula. By highlighting points of consensus and divergence between the processes, it is hoped that faculties will come to better understand their own experiences and those of their colleagues.

In order that the results of this study will reflect the state of the art, it is important that I have your response. The questionnaire has been sent to you as the person designated as most familiar with the development of the training specialist curriculum. If you are unable to complete it, please pass it along to another appropriate person. Please return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. Code numbers have been used on the questionnaires in place of institution and personal names.

I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Vocational-Technical Education, College of Education; The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. My major area is adult education, with emphasis on human resource development. This survey is a partial fulfillment of my dissertation requirements.
I would be happy to answer any questions. Please write or call (614) 451-9832.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Miss Roberta Freed
Ph.D. Candidate

RF: rf
Enclosure
Dear

Recently a questionnaire was sent to you concerning the curriculum decision making process used to develop your undergraduate training specialist program.

In checking the returns, I did not find that I had received your questionnaire. Perhaps your response has been delayed by the mails.

I am enclosing another questionnaire and solicit your aid in completing it. Because there are so few undergraduate training specialist programs now in existence, it is important that I have information on all of them as soon as possible, in order to make this a meaningful and timely study.

Thank you for cooperating with this request.

Sincerely,

Miss Roberta Freed
Ph.D. Candidate

RF: rf
Enclosure
Dear

Thank you for participating in a survey of undergraduate training specialist programs in higher education. Data you supplied contributed to a better understanding of curriculum decision making processes employed by faculties developing occupational programs.

If you so indicated, a summary of the study's findings accompany this letter.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Miss Roberta Freed
Ph.D. Candidate

RF:rf
Enclosure
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