



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Vocational Teacher Education Funding
Patterns Used By State Departments of
Education

presented by

Linda S. Letwin

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

PhD degree in Vocational-Technical
Education

Major professor

Date March 2, 1978

~~64103182~~ 098

VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION FUNDING PATTERNS
USED BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

By

Linda S. Letwin

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1978

ABSTRACT

VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION FUNDING PATTERNS USED BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

By

Linda S. Letwin

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to review the vocational teacher education funding patterns used by state departments of education.

More specifically, the study focused on three major objectives:

- (1) to determine the variety and scope of the vocational teacher education funding patterns used by state departments of education;
- (2) to provide an analysis showing commonalities among funding patterns; and (3) to determine the perceived effectiveness (by the vocational education personnel development coordinators) of the funding patterns used.

Methodology for the Study

To attain the stated objectives for the study, it was necessary to develop a survey instrument. This instrument was administered to the vocational education personnel development coordinator employed by each state department of education. The survey instrument contained three major parts: background information about the state; specific questions pertaining to four basic funding patterns;

Q112680

and perceptions of vocational education personnel development coordinators toward the effectiveness of the funding pattern used.

Descriptive statistics including mean, mode, median, and distribution frequency were used to report the findings.

Conclusions of the Study

The findings of the study supported the following conclusions:

1. The four major funding patterns used by state departments of education for directing vocational funds to vocational teacher education institutions are the block grant, the competitive grant, cost sharing and salary reimbursement. Within these patterns there are numerous variations as each state had made adaptations based upon its own unique characteristics, needs, personnel, and resources.

2. Most states use a combination of two or more of the four major funding patterns.

3. Within each of the four major funding patterns, commonalities exist in the criteria and conditions applied by the states.

4. The competitive grant funding pattern is the most common procedure used by state departments of education to allocate funds to vocational teacher education institutions.

5. State and/or federal legislation and State Board of Education policies are the most important factors influencing the priorities established for funding vocational education professional development activities. Ideas proposed by vocational teacher educators is the least important factor influencing the establishment of funding priorities.

6. Perceptions of the vocational education personnel development coordinators are that:

- a. The combination competitive grant and cost sharing funding pattern is more effective than the other funding patterns for most of the designated factors
- b. The competitive grant funding pattern is less effective than the other funding patterns for most of the factors rated in the study
- c. Competitive grants are least effective in maintaining updated preservice programs
- d. The combination competitive grant, cost sharing, and salary reimbursement funding pattern is least effective in meeting the objectives of the State Plan
- e. Each pattern had its unique strengths and weaknesses as evidenced by its high rating for some factors and low rating for others
- f. Vocational teacher educators were dissatisfied with the funding patterns used and with the amount of funds flowing to their institutions
- g. The present funding pattern is in need of change

7. The majority of funds provided to vocational teacher education institutions by state departments of education are used for inservice activities.

8. Even though other agencies have begun to assume responsibility for vocational education personnel development, vocational teacher education institutions are still the prime recipient of the funds allocated for such activities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Completion of the dissertation study could not have been achieved without the assistance, guidance, and support of several individuals. Those individuals who provided support and advice on a professional basis are acknowledged here.

A sincere appreciation is extended to the members of the doctoral committee, Dr. Norma Bobbitt, Dr. Cas Heilman, Dr. Richard Gardner, Dr. Louis Romano, and especially to the graduate advisor, Dr. Frank Bobbitt. His efforts to provide almost immediate feedback regarding the various drafts of the dissertation were particularly appreciated.

Dr. Billie Rader was most helpful in designing a computer program to be used in analyzing the data. His willingness to give up his own time to provide assistance will be long remembered.

The continued support and encouragement provided by Dr. Lawrence Borosage will not be forgotten. His concern made the entire process much easier.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	ix
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Significance of the Study	6
Delimitations of the Study	8
Assumptions of the Study	9
Terminology of the Study	10
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Related Research and References	14
Vocational Teacher Education Funding Patterns in Michigan	21
Major Types of Funding Patterns	24
Block Grants	25
Competitive Grants	26
Cost Sharing	28
Salary Reimbursement	29
III. METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION	31
Type of Study	31
Objectives of the Study	33
Research Questions	33
Design of Study	34
Literature Review	34
Population Selection	35
Instrument Development	36
Data Collection	40
Data Analysis	42

Chapter	Page
IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	45
Administration of Professional Development Funds, Priorities Establishment and Involvement with Teacher Education	46
Administration of Vocational Education Personnel Development	46
Number of Vocational Teacher Education Institutions	48
Number of Vocational Teacher Educators	50
Funds for Professional Development Activities	50
Establishment of Priorities	59
The Variety and Scope of Funding Patterns Used	60
Conditions and Criteria	61
Block Grants	64
Competitive Grants	66
Salary Reimbursement	69
Cost Sharing	73
Other Funding Patterns	76
Perceived Effectiveness of Funding Patterns	79
Block Grants	80
Competitive Grants	80
Cost Sharing	82
Salary Reimbursement	83
Other Funding Patterns	83
Combined Funding Patterns	83
Comparison of Perceptions	89
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND REFLECTIONS	95
Summary of the Findings	96
What Vocational Teacher Education Funding Pattern is Used by Each State Department of Education?	97
What Conditions and Criteria are Applied to Each Funding Pattern Used?	98
What are the Funding Characteristics of Voca- tional Education Personnel Development in Each State?	102
How are Priorities Established for Vocational Education Personnel Development Activities to be Funded by State Departments of Education?	103
What is the Primary Purpose of Funds Allocated to Vocational Teacher Education Institutions (preservice or inservice)?	103

Chapter	Page
What are the Perceptions of Vocational Education Personnel Development Coordinators Toward the Effectiveness of the Vocational Teacher Educa- tion Funding Patterns Used in Their State? . .	104
Are Funding Patterns Used Relatively Stable? . .	105
Conclusions	
Recommendations	108
Implications for Further Research	111
Reflections	112
APPENDICES	116
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	143

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percent of Time Spent Administering Professional Development Activities by State Vocational Education Personnel Development Coordinators	47
2. Number of Individuals Employed by State Departments of Education to Administer Vocational Education Professional Development Activities	47
3. Number of Public Institutions in Each State Approved to Prepare Vocational Education Teachers	48
4. Number of Nonpublic Institutions in Each State Approved to Prepare Vocational Education Teachers	49
5. Number of Vocational Teacher Educators Reported by States	51
6. Number of Full Time Equivalent Vocational Teacher Educators Reported by States	52
7. Funds Used by State Departments of Education for Vocational Education Professional Development	52
8. Percent of Funds Used by Forty-Three State Departments of Education for Vocational Education Personnel Development Derived from Federal, State, and Other Sources	54
9. Percent of Professional Development Funds Awarded to Vocational Teacher Education Institutions by State Departments of Education	55
10. Percent of Funds Awarded by State Departments of Education that Were Used for Preservice and Inservice Activities by Vocational Teacher Education Institutions	58
11. Factors Influencing the Establishment of Priorities for Vocational Teacher Education Professional Development Activities	60

Table	Page
12. Number of States Using Each Funding Pattern . . .	61
13. Funding Patterns Used by Forty-Three State Departments of Education in Allocating Funds to Vocational Teacher Education Institutions	62
14. Combination Funding Patterns Used by State Departments of Education to Allocate Funds to Vocational Teacher Education Institutions	63
15. Factors Forming a Basis for Awarding Block Grants to Vocational Teacher Education Institutions . . .	65
16. Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds Used by the Seventeen States in the Form of Block Grants	66
17. Agencies Competing with Vocational Teacher Education Institutions for Competitive Grant Funds	67
18. Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds Used by the Thirty-One States in the Form of Competitive Grants	69
19. Percent of Vocational Teacher Educator's Salary Reimbursed to the Vocational Teacher Education Institution by Twelve State Departments of Education	70
20. Responsibilities of Salary Reimbursed Vocational Teacher Educators to the Twelve State Departments of Education	71
21. Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds Used by the Twelve States in the Form of Salary Reimbursement	73
22. Factors Upon Which Added Costs were Determined for the Cost Sharing Funding Pattern as Reported by Sixteen States	75
23. Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds Used by the Sixteen States in the Form of Cost Sharing	76
24. Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds Used by Nine States in the Form of "Other" Funding Patterns	79

Table	Page
25. Effectiveness of the Competitive Grant Funding Pattern of Eleven Factors as Perceived by Five State VEPD Coordinators	81
26. Effectiveness of "Other" Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by Five State VEPD Coordinators	84
27. Effectiveness of the Combined Block and Competitive Grant Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by Ten State VEPD Coordinators	86
28. Perceived Reasons for Teacher Education Dissatisfaction With the Combination Block and Competitive Grant Funding Pattern Used in Ten States	87
29. Effectiveness of the Combined Competitive Grant and Cost Sharing Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by Three State VEPD Coordinators	88
30. Effectiveness of the Combined Competitive Grant, Cost Sharing, and Salary Reimbursement Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by Five State VEPD Coordinators	90
31. A Comparative Summary of the Effectiveness of the Means of Five Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by State VEPD Coordinators	91
E-1. A Summary by States of Funding Patterns, Number of Vocational Teacher Education Institutions, Number of Individuals Administering Professional Development and Amount of Funds Spent for Professional Development	141

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. The Survey Instrument	117
B. The Cover Letter	132
C. States Participating in the Study	134
D. Written Comments Provided by State Vocational Education Personnel Development Coordinators Regarding the Need for Change in Funding Patterns .	136
E. Summary of Selected Background Data by States . . .	139

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Since the implementation in 1917 of the Smith-Hughes Act, state departments of education have utilized a variety of financial patterns for funding vocational teacher education at institutions of higher education. In some states the funding pattern has changed often; more frequently than has the federal legislation for vocational education. Over the last several years, state departments of education and institutions of higher education have been searching for a compatible, accountable, and cost-efficient system for funding vocational teacher education.

Background of the Study

The Smith-Hughes Act recognized the major function of vocational teacher education as being that of preparing competent teachers to provide career preparation programs in the public schools. Approximately 14 percent of the funds made available in the annual appropriations of this Act were earmarked for the preparation of vocational teachers. The State Board of Education in each state was responsible for the distribution and supervision of these funds. The amount and type of supervision provided by the State Board of Education varied from state to state. With the passage of this

initial legislation, the basis for a variety of patterns for directing these vocational education funds to vocational teacher education institutions was established.

The passage of the George-Barden Act in 1946 shifted this emphasis and eliminated separate authorizations for teacher training. Instead, it provided an authorization for each vocational service area or field.¹ This change in legislation and funding caused corresponding changes in patterns of distributing funds to vocational teacher education institutions in some states. The George-Barden Act authorized each state to make its own determination regarding the portion of federal vocational education funds to be allocated to vocational teacher education.

The next major federal vocational education legislation was passed in 1963 and required the states to spend at least 3 percent of the funds it received for ancillary services.² There were many types of services identified as ancillary and 3 percent was a small amount to be utilized for such services. Again, however, it was the prerogative of each state to determine the amount to be allocated for vocational teacher preparation. As a result, some states made

¹Vocational service areas included home economics, agriculture, trade and industrial, and distributive occupations. Today, health and office occupations are also considered vocational service areas.

²The Vocational Education Act of 1963 defined ancillary services as preservice and inservice teacher preparation and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials and state administration and leadership.

adjustments in the method used for dispersing funds to vocational teacher education institutions.

Prior to the passage of the Vocational Education Act in 1963, the primary interest of state departments of education in vocational teacher education was monitoring the teacher certification requirements in the State Plan for Vocational Education. The skills and knowledge with which teachers were prepared was left to the discretion of the vocational teacher education institutions. Following the passage of this Act, there was a rapid growth in the number of vocational programs and a corresponding increase in the number of new vocational teachers needed. Consequently, state departments of education began to focus more attention on vocational teacher education. Later as the emphasis turned from quantity of programs and teachers to quality, state departments of education began taking a closer look at how state and federal vocational education funds for personnel development were being used. Research, as illustrated in studies by Hunter,³ Stallings and Kaskowitz,⁴ McDonald,⁵ and Stallings,⁶

³Madaline Hunter, "Teacher Competency: Problem, Theory, and Practice," Theory Into Practice 15 (April 1976): 162-171.

⁴Jane Stallings and David Kaskowitz, Follow Through Classroom Observation Evaluation 1972-73 (Menlow Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1974).

⁵Frederick McDonald, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, Phase II (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1976).

⁶Jane Stallings, "What Teachers Do Does Make a Difference: Implications of Correlational Findings for Inservice Teacher Training Programs," paper presented to National Commission on Performance-Based Education, Washington D.C., September 8, 1976.

fostered this trend and contributed substantially to the identification of a direct relationship between student learning and performance and the skills and competence of the instructional staff. These findings have significantly increased the importance educators are now placing on professional development of school staffs. As a result, the use of all professional development funds, including those provided to vocational teacher education institutions, is under close scrutiny.

Statements made by Harold R. Binkley at the congressional "oversight hearing" on the 1976 federal legislation for vocational education also point out the discrepancies and state of flux in which funding for vocational education is now perceived. Binkley testified that many states are financially cutting support to vocational teacher education institutions and a few have recently eliminated all support. Reasons given by state directors of vocational education for this action is that "higher education is responsible for the production of all other teachers--why not vocational teachers?"⁷

This argument has been countered by vocational teacher educators as they claimed that the trend of reducing support for the basic teacher preparation program (both preservice and inservice) and converting more money to less fundamental and short-term needs and

⁷Harold Binkley, "Statements Made at Congressional Oversight Hearing on Federal Legislation Effecting Vocational Education," American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture 15 (March 1976): 2.

special projects dealing with innovative, exemplary programs diverted and diluted the vocational teacher education efforts.⁸ This reasoning caused vocational teacher educators to lobby for categorical vocational funding in the Education Amendments of 1976.

A variety of arguments exist both for and against providing funding to institutions of higher education for the preparation of vocational education teachers. Some individuals feel that the preparation of teachers is the function of a teacher education institution and therefore additional vocational dollars supplied by the state department of education is double funding. They further advocate that if dollars are supplied by the state department that they should be used only for those activities and programs which are over and above those needed for the basic preparation of the vocational education teacher. On the other side, vocational teacher educators argue that special funding should be made available for the basic preparation of vocational education teachers as such programs are more costly.⁹ State department of education officials argue that the day and age of excess vocational education funds is past and that every dollar must be spent in the most accountable manner possible. There is no longer the luxury of spending dollars without specific objectives and concrete, measurable outcomes. Objectives must be more carefully prioritized and the roles and responsibilities of the various educational groups must be openly established.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 4.

Statement of the Problem

This controversy has caused many educators to question, assess, and consider alternative patterns by which state departments of education provide vocational education funds to institutions of higher education. As new or different approaches to funding vocational teacher education are sought, questions such as the following are often asked. What are the funding patterns used by various state departments of education? What objectives and criteria are applied to the use of the funds? Is the major emphasis on preservice or inservice? How are teacher education funding priorities established?

In this respect, the purpose of the study was to review the funding patterns used by each state, the criteria applied to each funding pattern, and to determine the degree to which the funding pattern was felt to be effective. More specifically, the study focused on three major objectives:

1. To determine the variety and scope of the vocational teacher education funding patterns used by state departments of education
2. To provide an analysis showing commonalities among funding patterns
3. To determine the perceived effectiveness (by the vocational education personnel development coordinators) of the funding patterns used

Significance of the Study

Professional development has rapidly become one of the keystones for educational response to mounting societal pressures

calling for greater accountability and questioning the basic educational frameworks. Correspondingly, the educational system has placed more and more emphasis on the preparation of teachers and all other professional personnel. The need for alternative approaches and new personnel development models is apparent. While the models include personnel at all levels, state departments of education have a primary responsibility for developing and/or implementing a comprehensive model that provides a continuum for the professional development of all educational personnel.

As one component in a comprehensive model for personnel development, the role of teacher education has changed from one of primarily preservice education to one with increased responsibilities for both preservice and inservice education. This is only one shift in emphasis but is characteristic of the type of changes that are being felt by the various segments involved in professional development. As a result, new lines of communication, enhanced cooperative efforts and strengthened linkages between state departments of education, teacher education institutions and local educational agencies must be highly developed so that personnel needs can be easily identified and efficiently and effectively met. The type of funding made available to local districts and to teacher education institutions can help build linkages and promote the efficiency and effectiveness of the personnel development services provided. However, the prevailing question remains: What is the most suitable funding pattern for vocational teacher education institutions? Personnel in

state departments of education are grappling with this question in an effort to build a responsive professional development model.

While state departments of education and teacher education institutions are searching for an answer to the question of whether or not to fund vocational teacher preparation, (and if so, to what extent and under what conditions), a series of other questions must be considered. Many of these may directly or indirectly influence or shape the various alternatives that are finally developed. Findings from this study, for example, provide basic information regarding the current status of funding patterns used by state departments of education throughout this nation. Information regarding the application of criteria applied by the various states for each type of funding pattern is also provided.

Delimitations of the Study

The major objective of the study was to identify the variety and scope of funding patterns used by state departments of education with vocational teacher education institutions. Another objective of the study was to determine the perceived effectiveness of the funding pattern used. Effectiveness was only measured by the perceptions of the vocational education personnel development coordinator employed by each state department of education. In this respect effectiveness is delimiting and would indicate a need for further research regarding the evaluation and effectiveness of funding patterns.

The funding patterns studied were only those for vocational education monies directed to vocational teacher education institutions for personnel development activities. This study does not include those funds appropriated to institutions of higher education by the state legislature. The source of funds used in the study therefore limits the usefulness of the findings to vocational teacher preparation as opposed to the preparation of teachers for other disciplines.

Assumptions of the Study

It was necessary to make certain assumptions in order to accomplish the objectives of this study. There were four assumptions inherent to the commencement of this study.

The first assumed that there is a need for the information provided by this study. It is a fact that the need for this information exists in Michigan, but it was also assumed that teacher educators and state department officials in other states also had a need, desire and use for the information. This assumption was based on the many queries, comments, suggestions, and discussions with educators representing various regions of the country.

A second, but also primary assumption was that all state departments of education allocate vocational education funds to vocational teacher education institutions. Originally, federal vocational education legislation required that a percentage of the funds received by each state be directed to its teacher education programs. It was presumed that this direct funding by state departments of

education to vocational teacher education institutions has continued, although the parameters and conditions of the funding were expected to have changed.

The vocational education personnel development coordinators employed by state departments of education were considered to be the most knowledgeable and able to provide the data needed for this study. This assumption was based on the fact that vocational education personnel development coordinators deal more closely with teacher education institutions and funding of professional development activities and programs than any other identifiable group.

The existence of four major patterns for state department of education funding of vocational teacher education comprised the fourth assumption. The assumption was based on information found in the literature and on information gained from interviews and conferences with teacher educators and state department of education officials knowledgeable of specific patterns used.

Terminology of the Study

The following operational definitions are included to provide common understanding and clarity of purpose.

Block Grants. A set sum of money awarded annually to a vocational teacher education institution for the purpose of conducting professional development activities which are considered additional to those expected as a part of the undergraduate or graduate vocational teacher education program.

Competitive Grants. Funds set aside for special projects or programs intended to accomplish specific objectives for which institutions are expected to submit proposals on a competitive basis.

Cost Sharing. Funds provided by the state department of education to support vocational teacher education institutions with the added cost of conducting activities for vocational personnel in local educational agencies. Added costs are usually defined as those direct costs incurred which are not covered by tuition generated from participants.

Funding Pattern. A method or system used to provide funds to vocational teacher education institutions for personnel development activities. Specifically funds granted over and above those appropriated by the state legislature for higher education.

Inservice. Instruction and supervision for employed instructional personnel, for the purpose of improving their professional abilities.¹⁰

Perceived Effectiveness. The degree to which vocational education personnel development coordinators felt the funding pattern was useful and produced the desired results.

Preservice. The academic and professional work in a college, or university that a person has done before employment as a teacher.¹¹

¹⁰Definition of Terms Used in Vocational and Practical Arts Education (Washington, D.C.: American Vocational Association, 1974), p. 20.

¹¹Carter V. Good, ed., Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959).

Professional Development. A planned and organized effort to provide teachers and other educational workers with the knowledge and skills necessary to facilitate improved student learning and performance.¹² Used synonymously in this study with the term personnel development.

Salary Reimbursement. Funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions (by the state department of education) for the expressed purpose of reimbursing all or a part of the salary of specified vocational teacher educators.

Vocational Education. Organized educational programs, services, and activities which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid and unpaid employment, or for additional preparation for a career requiring other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree.¹³

Vocational Teacher Educator. A qualified and professional person responsible for the preparation and inservice training of teachers. He/she helps teachers or perspective teachers to secure the professional knowledge, abilities, understandings and appreciations, which will enable them to qualify for professional employment or advancement in teaching positions.¹⁴

¹²State Plan for Professional Development of School Staffs (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1977), p. 5.

¹³Defining Critical Terms in Vocational Education, a Task Force Report of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education (Charleston, W. Va.: West Virginia Department of Education, 1976).

¹⁴Definition of Terms Used in Vocational and Practical Arts Education (Washington, D.C.: American Vocational Association, 1964), p. 20.

Vocational Teacher Education Institution. An educational agency responsible for the proper preparation of teachers. Each state board for vocational education designates the agencies within the state which train vocational teachers.¹⁵

VEPD Coordinator. Vocational education personnel development coordinator. A recently developed national term referring to those individuals at each state department of education (or designated by each state department of education) responsible for administration of Part 553 of the Education Professions Development Act.

¹⁵Ibid.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

While the literature is limited regarding vocational teacher education funding patterns used by state departments of education, the importance of the issue is evident. The controversy surrounding this issue is prevalent across the nation as represented by dialogue and discussion at regional and national conferences. This chapter relates information contained in the literature regarding state departments of education funding patterns as well as a summary of the evolution of vocational teacher education funding in Michigan. Also, a detailed description is provided of the major funding patterns that are currently used by state departments of education in supporting vocational teacher education programs.

Related Research and References

From the outset of this study, it was apparent that there had been a limited number of studies completed regarding state department of education funding patterns. While cost-effectiveness is one of the key reasons state departments of education are carefully evaluating vocational teacher education funding patterns, those limited studies which were completed on financially related topics dealt primarily with cost-effectiveness factors at the secondary

level. Studies by Carroll and Ihnen;¹ Dueker and Altman;² Kaufman, Hu, Lee and Stromsdorfer;³ and Kraft⁴ all focused on such areas. Likewise, Dupree⁵ and Mangum⁶ conducted studies which focused on cost factors beyond the high school level.

Literature directly related to this topic was also limited. Brandon⁷ discussed the preparation of professional vocational education personnel and described a design for professional teacher education. In a historical accounting of education in the United States

¹Adger G. Carroll and Loren A. Ihnen, Costs and Returns for Investments in Technical Schooling by a Group of North Carolina High School Graduates, Economics Research Report No. 5 (Raleigh, N. C.: Department of Economics, North Carolina State University, December 1967).

²Richard L. Dueker and James W. Altman, An Analysis of Cost and Performance Factors in the Operation and Administration of Vocational Programs in Secondary Schools (Pittsburgh, Pa.: American Institutes for Research, October 1967) (VT 005 598).

³Jacob J. Kaufman, Teh-wei Hu, Maw Lin Lee, and Ernst W. Stromsdorfer, A Cost-Effectiveness Study of Vocational Education, Final Report, Project No. OE 512, U. S. Office of Education (University Park, Pa.: Institute for Research on Human Resources, The Pennsylvania State University, October 1968).

⁴Richard H. P. Kraft, Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Vocational-Technical Education Programs (Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida State Department of Education, 1969) (VT 009 690).

⁵Robert L. Dupree, "A Cost-Benefit Study of Post-High School Technical Education in Oklahoma" (M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, May 1968) (ED 026 488).

⁶Garth L. Mangum, Contributions and Costs of Manpower Development and Training (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, December 1967) (VT 000 465).

⁷George Brandon, "Preparation of Professional Personnel for Vocational Education," American Vocational Journal (April 1969): 33-49

since 1900, Fuller and Pearson⁸ reported the functional relationships between state departments of education and institutions of higher education. A recent article by Jacobson⁹ pointed out the dissatisfaction with vocational education funding felt by institutions of higher education. He stated that specific dissatisfaction stemmed from the fact that even though the 1976 federal vocational education legislation required that at least 15 percent of the grant to states be set aside for post-high school programs, less than 3 percent (in some states) had been allocated to higher education.

In describing a state-wide inservice education model, Miller¹⁰ discussed the role of both the state department of education and vocational teacher education institutions. He pointed out that a long-range plan for inservice education must be established. State departments of education should project inservice training needs over a three to five year period. Since teacher educators are the primary resource for conducting such training programs, long range planning would, therefore, influence the funding for vocational teacher education.

⁸Edgar Fuller and Jim Pearson, Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1969).

⁹Robert Jacobson, "Colleges Say Their Short-Changed on Vocational Education Funds," The Chronicle of Higher Education (October 3, 1977): 11.

¹⁰Melvin Miller, "A State Model for Vocational Inservice Education," Theory Into Practice 14 (February 1975): 52-58.

In one of the few directly related studies, Struck, as State Director of Vocational Education, issued A Position Paper and Proposal on Vocational Teacher Education in Pennsylvania.¹¹ In describing the state of the art regarding the funding of vocational teacher education in Pennsylvania, Struck created much controversy which eventually led to massive reorganization of the funding pattern used in Pennsylvania. Swatt summarized the director's paper in the following manner:

The paper referred to the massive dissatisfaction with present vocational education programs. It pointed to inefficiencies and inadequacies in programs that prepare vocational teachers and leaders, and it emphasized the reticence of vocational teacher education to invite representatives of local educational agencies and the Pennsylvania State Department of Education to plan cooperatively vocational education personnel professional development programs. In addition, the paper charged that vocational teacher preparing institutions change far too slowly.

To respond more rapidly and positively to the challenge of change within society and the economy, the paper advocated increased cooperation among representatives of colleges, local educational agencies and the Pennsylvania Department of Education and a change in the PDE strategy for administering federal/state funds allocated for the development of vocational education professional personnel.¹²

As a result of the position paper, a Vocational Teacher Education Advisory Committee was formed. That advisory committee

¹¹John Struck, A Position Paper and Proposal on Vocational Teacher Education in Pennsylvania (Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Education, October 1972).

¹²Kenneth Swatt, State of the Art Regarding Funding of Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development Programs in Pennsylvania (Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Education, March 1976), p. 2.

prepared and issued a document entitled Five-Year Goals and Objectives for Pennsylvania Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development Programs.¹³ One of the goals contained in this document dealt with funding for vocational teacher education. That goal appeared as follows:

An adequate and appropriate vocational education personnel development funding plan to achieve the stability of support and the implementation of innovative programs and projects. The objectives required to implement this goal are to:

- a. develop a funding procedure that will provide for sufficient stability of support, with adequate provision for periodic review and accountability to sustain long-range programs in an efficient manner.
- b. develop mechanisms to provide fiscal support for innovative and exemplary projects designed to meet state-wide priorities in vocational teacher education.
- c. create procedures designed to stimulate funding of vocational teacher education by state and federal government agencies.
- d. devise procedures by which colleges and universities provide larger proportions of the funding of the basic vocational education professional personnel development budget.¹⁴

In a letter to the state college presidents and the university deans, the Pennsylvania Secretary of Education proposed a change in the method of distributing federal/state vocational teacher

¹³Five-Year Goals and Objectives for Pennsylvania Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development Programs (Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Vocational Teacher Education Advisory Committee, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1974).

¹⁴Ibid., p. 3.

education funds. The letter, which was dated October 17, 1973, made three observations before describing the funding change: (1) that current federal legislation required that federal funds supplement rather than supplant state funds in support of vocational teacher education and that Pennsylvania had been supplanting; (2) that the Department was in a position of showing preference to a few institutions in light of the fact that federal and state funds were received by only seven of the twenty-seven institutions with approved vocational teacher education programs; and (3) at some institutions federal and state vocational education funds were used to provide financial assistance to students and that such financial assistance should be the responsibility of the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency.¹⁵

Secretary Pittenger then advocated an annual reduction in the amount of federal/state funds for support of the basic vocational teacher education programs until such time as these programs became self-supporting. The amount "saved" via the reduction process would be made available in the form of grants to institutions desiring to undertake priority activities.¹⁶ Pittenger stressed that in no way did the proposed funding pattern imply a de-emphasis of vocational teacher education or a reduction in the need for vocational teachers and administrators. He said the proposed funding pattern "is

¹⁵Kenneth Swatt, State of the Art Regarding Funding of Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development Programs in Pennsylvania (Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Education, March 1976), p. 2.

¹⁶Ibid.

intended as an educationally and fiscally sound step toward maximizing the wise use of scarce resources and comply with federal directives concerning the accountability of public funds."¹⁷

Pennsylvania is not the only state that has agonized over a compatible, accountable funding pattern for allocating state and federal vocational education funds to vocational teacher education. In another article, Moss¹⁸ provided an account of the struggle in Minnesota to create and operationalize a suitable funding pattern. Here, the Minnesota State Department of Education decided to stop reimbursing the University of Minnesota for its on-campus vocational teacher education activities. The funds that were released were then used to support off-campus teacher education activities. As in Pennsylvania, the withdrawal of reimbursement for regular programs was done over a period of years so that the University would have an opportunity to secure replacement funds.

In designing a suitable funding pattern there were several factors that had to be addressed in order to be mutually agreeable to both the Department of Education and the University of Minnesota's Department of Vocational and Technical Education. From the state department perspective, the funding pattern had to:

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Jerry Moss, Jr., "Financing and Managing In-service Teacher Education at the University of Minnesota," Journal of Industrial Teacher Education 14 (Fall 1976): 5-10.

- a. provide for non-instructional as well as instructional off-campus courses,
- b. secure services at the least possible cost to the state,
- c. build the capacity for vocational education at the University,
- d. insure coordinated planning and management of services across all vocational fields, and
- e. make teacher educators accountable for the outcomes of the services they provide.¹⁹

Teacher educators on staff at the University of Minnesota wanted to see the funding pattern include:

- a. additional, stable funding so that permanent faculty could be added to the staff,
- b. recognition for the student credit hours provided,
- c. flexibility in the services that can be delivered and autonomy in their management, and
- d. the ability to maintain close relationships between off-campus activities and on-campus and research activities.²⁰

As a result, a cost sharing pattern was designed for funding Minnesota vocational teacher education inservice activities and programs provided at the local level.

Vocational Teacher Education Funding Patterns in Michigan

It is evident that there was and still is considerable controversy over the funding patterns used to support vocational

¹⁹Ibid., p. 7.

²⁰Ibid.

teacher education. While the current controversy is focused on a conflict between state departments of education and teacher education institutions, there has been significant shifts during the last sixty years on the method used to fund vocational teacher education. To illustrate this point, a brief summary is provided of the three major funding patterns used in Michigan since 1917.

The Smith-Hughes Act provided specific funding for the training of teachers. As a result, three Michigan institutions of higher education approved to prepare vocational teachers received federal vocational education funds. These funds were provided to each institution in the form of salary reimbursement. At that time, it was the policy of the state board to reimburse 100 percent of the salary and travel expenses of vocational teacher educators.²¹ Initially only trade and industrial, home economics, and agricultural teacher educators were involved in the salary reimbursement funding pattern. Funding remained at 100 percent salary reimbursement until 1954.

With the growth of vocational education programs and a corresponding increase in vocational teacher educators, there was a gradual reduction in the reimbursement rate. The extension of the salary reimbursement concept to include distributive and office occupations along with an increase in the number of approved

²¹Vocational Education in Michigan, The Final Report of the Michigan Vocational Evaluation Project (Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Department of Education, 1963), p. 98.

vocational teacher education institutions (seven by 1960), resulted in a salary reimbursement rate of 47.2% in 1960.²²

With the passage of new federal vocational education legislation in 1963, salary reimbursement for teacher educators was completely discontinued and a block grant concept was introduced. The amount of the block grant varied from institution to institution depending upon the vocational areas for which each was approved to prepare teachers and the number of vocational teacher educators employed by the institution.²³ The block grants were noncompetitive and nonprescriptive. Each institution prepared a proposal describing how the funds would be used and submitted the proposal to the state department of education. Block grants were continued in this manner in Michigan until 1973.

From 1973 to 1975 the dollar amount for the block grants was equalized across the State. All institutions received the same dollar amount regardless of size, number of training programs offered, or number of teacher educators employed. In addition to this change, guidelines were applied to the use of these funds. In order to receive the block grant, for example, an institution had to prepare and submit a proposal which responded to specific objectives established by the vocational education staff of the state department of education. These block grants were still provided on a noncompetitive basis. Each of the eight institutions participating in

²²Ibid.

²³Based on an interview with Lawrence Borosage, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, January 5, 1978.

this program was guaranteed \$22,000 if the designated objectives were addressed in the proposal.

In 1976 block grants were substantially reduced (from \$22,000 to \$5,000 per institution). As a result, nearly all funds for personnel development, curriculum development and research were awarded through a competitive process. While the small block grant is still provided to each institution, utilization of the funds is quite restrictive. For example, the need for any inservice activities that are provided to local school districts must be documented. Other inservice activities that are conducted must be related to priority areas specifically identified in the Michigan State Plan for Vocational Education. To receive state and federal vocational education funding beyond this basic level, the institution must submit a proposal on a competitive basis to the state department of education.

It is clear from this brief summary that vocational teacher education funding in Michigan evolved from a salary reimbursement pattern to block grants to a funding pattern which is almost totally competitive. These changes were influenced by program growth and the extension and broadening of areas of funding in Michigan, as well as shifts that occurred resulting from federal legislation.

Major Types of Funding Patterns

Through information provided by the literature and personal contacts, four major funding patterns were recognized as being currently used by state departments of education in support of

vocational teacher education. These various approaches are subject to adaptation when operationalized in each state. The adaptations are directly related to the unique needs and characteristics of the state and its institutions.

Block Grants

For the purpose of this study, a block grant has been defined as a set sum of money awarded annually to a vocational teacher education institution for the purpose of conducting professional development activities which are considered additional to those expected as a part of the undergraduate or graduate vocational teacher education program. Generally, the block grants are awarded for broad purposes and recipients have great flexibility in use of such funds as long as the basic purposes are fulfilled. A closer look at block grants, how they have been awarded and administered by state departments of education is helpful in understanding this funding pattern.

Following the passage of the Vocational Education Act (in 1963), many state departments of education developed the practice of awarding vocational teacher education institutions sums of money often referred to as a "block" or "basic" grant. Traditionally, state departments of education have made block grants available only to state-supported institutions of higher education approved to prepare vocational education teachers. In most instances state/federal vocational education funds provided through block grants were meant to supplement those funds appropriated by the state legislature

for the normal day to day functioning of the institution. In other words, the function of a teacher education institution is to prepare teachers, while the purpose of the block grant is to financially support those activities and programs designed to supplement the basic teacher preparation program. For example, a basic teacher preparation program might be supplemented with special internships, field experience, site visitations, field trips and demonstrations of special curriculum and materials developed especially for a particular content area. Gradually those supplemental funds began to supplant the institutional funds and soon became the sustenance of the basic vocational teacher education program. In other words, block grant funds were used for supporting basic courses such as methods of teaching and curriculum development.

Today as state and federal funds become more scarce due to legislative mandates that require them to be spent in specific programs and for specific clientele; and as the "age of educational accountability" has emerged, states have had to reconsider the use of block grants. Some have chosen to eliminate them altogether while others have designed more restrictive guidelines for use of such funds, often reducing the amount of the block grant at the same time.

Competitive Grants

Funds set aside for special projects or programs intended to accomplish specific objectives for which institutions are requested

to submit proposals on a competitive basis are referred to as competitive grants. Usually state departments of education issue a request for proposal (RFP), which identifies the specific objectives to be achieved. A state agency might issue an RFP which has as the overall goal the development of competency-based curriculum materials for vocational education programs. The RFP might require the development of materials for specific vocational programs, a specific format, and pilot tested at a specific number of sites. The RFP is issued to institutions and agencies that might be interested in conducting such a project, program, or research.

Traditionally teacher education institutions have been the prime recipient of such competitive grants. More recently, however, other educational agencies at both the local and regional or intermediate level have prepared and submitted grant award winning proposals. Since intermediate and regional educational organizations provide support personnel to their constituent school districts, the ability of these units to respond to RFPs and carry out project objectives has increased over the past few years. In addition, several states have developed and support teacher centers or professional development centers. These agencies employ staff with the expertise and skills that afford the center the capability of responding to RFPs and to successfully conduct such special projects. As a result, teacher centers or professional development centers are growing as a viable agency competing with teacher education institutions for special project funds.

Usually, the RFP process involves receipt (by the state department of education) of several proposals for which only one grant will be made. A panel of individuals is then asked to read and rate each proposal. Under this system one teacher education institution could submit several proposals and receive funding for more than one special project, while another institution may choose not to compete and submit no proposals or may prepare and submit proposals for several different projects but receive no funding.

Cost Sharing

Another pattern of funding used by state departments of education is cost sharing. This pattern is newer and less common than the other described funding patterns. State departments of education provide vocational teacher education institutions with funds to support the added cost of conducting activities for vocational personnel in local education agencies. Added costs are usually defined as those direct costs incurred which are not covered by tuition generated from participants. Direct costs usually involve the instructors salary and travel expenses, course materials, printing and duplicating costs.

This funding pattern is more useful in states where the major personnel development emphasis is at the inservice level. The cost sharing funding pattern provides greater opportunity for vocational teacher educators to meet the professional development needs of local staffs. Institutional constraints often make the offering of professional development services at the local level prohibitive for

vocational teacher educators. Sometimes state departments of education guarantee teacher education institutions specific dollar amounts so that teacher educators will be encouraged to provide professional development services at the local level even if local staff are not interested in receiving credit and paying tuition. When state departments of education can defray some of the additional expenses incurred by the institution of higher education for professional development programs offered off-campus, the potential for meeting the real staff development needs at the local level is greatly increased.

Salary Reimbursement

Salary reimbursement has been defined as funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions (by state departments of education) for the expressed purpose of reimbursing all or a part of the salary of specified vocational teacher educators. Some state departments of education have chosen to fund vocational teacher education by supporting the salaries of designated vocational teacher educators. In some instances, the teacher educator's total salary is reimbursed to the institution of higher education where he/she is employed. In other instances, a percentage of the teacher educator's salary is reimbursed. A specific example of this can be found in the history of teacher education funding in Michigan. Originally teacher educators received 100 percent salary reimbursement. Later that was reduced to 47 percent and still later the pattern of reimbursing salaries was discontinued.

Various criteria are applied by the different states in determining the eligibility of the vocational teacher educators for salary reimbursement. The discipline areas of vocational education are often given consideration in determining salary reimbursement. Again this is exemplified in Michigan history, where teacher educators from each discipline area received reimbursement. Originally this only included trade and industry, agriculture, home economics, and later involved distributive education and office education as vocational education grew in Michigan.

It appears that salary reimbursement has only been made available to those teacher educators employed by state-supported institutions of higher education. Private and parochial colleges and universities have rarely been the recipient of state or federal vocational education funds even though they have received state approval to prepare vocational teachers.

For the purpose of this study, salary reimbursement does not include those individuals receiving a grant to conduct a special project in which his/her salary is a part of the project budget. Clarification of this is provided by the following example. A teacher educator in Illinois wrote a proposal in response to an RFP and received a grant to develop and conduct a training program for teaching the disadvantaged and handicapped in vocational education programs. As the project director, the teacher educator's salary is paid by the grant. Reimbursement of salary in this manner is not considered part of the salary reimbursement funding pattern but rather a part of the competitive grant funding pattern.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION

The purpose of this study was to review the vocational teacher education funding patterns used by state departments of education across the nation. This chapter introduces the methodology and data collection procedures used to fulfill the purpose by identifying the type of study conducted, restating the objectives of the study and specifying the research questions. It also provides an account of the steps followed in gathering the information, developing a valid instrument, collecting reliable data, and analyzing the data.

Type of Study

Most research studies can be categorized into one of three major types--descriptive, evaluative, or historical. There are many variations and sub-levels of research within this framework. It is also possible that a research study may utilize components of more than one major type, but for purposes of grouping, the study would be identified according to its major thrust.

In determining the nature of this study, a review was made of the major types of research. Van Dalen¹ defined the purpose of

¹Deobold Van Dalen, Understanding Educational Research (New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 203.

descriptive research as being to provide information and data that will assist decision makers in solving a particular problem. Specifically, investigators seeking data to assist in problem solving should ask: What exists--what is the present status of phenomena? Determining the nature of prevailing conditions, practices, and attitudes--seeking accurate descriptions of activities, objects, processes or persons--is their objective.

Based upon this definition, it was determined that this study was descriptive in nature. As Michigan and many other states search for a compatible, effective approach to funding vocational teacher education, an accurate assessment of the current phenomena can assist in decision making that will lead to a solution. This, then, is the approach taken in an effort to provide useful information and data to personnel in state departments of education and teacher education institutions as they seek an appropriate pattern (or solution) for funding vocational teacher education.

It is not appropriate to assume or hypothesize that one funding pattern is better than the others. The unique characteristics of each state, its organizational structure, educational philosophy, geographic size, vocational student enrollment, as well as numerous other factors, all influence the degree to which the pattern used by one state would be suitable for another. The information provided in this descriptive study can be adopted or adapted by states to enhance their existing approach to funding vocational teacher education or to reconstruct the total funding pattern used.

Objectives of the Study

The intent of this study was to review the current vocational teacher education funding patterns used by state departments of education in order to provide useful data for redesigning such patterns, particularly the funding used in Michigan. As a result of the intent, three specific objectives were identified. They are:

1. To determine the variety and scope of the vocational teacher education funding patterns used by state departments of education
2. To provide an analysis showing commonalities among funding pattern(s)
3. To determine the vocational education personnel development coordinators' perception of the effectiveness of the funding pattern used

Research Questions

It was necessary to analyze each objective of the study to determine the type of information that would most effectively assist in achieving the objective. Basic research questions that would elicit the required data were identified as follows:

1. What vocational teacher education funding patterns is used by each state department of education?
2. What conditions or criteria are applied to each funding pattern used?
3. What are the funding characteristics of vocational education personnel development in each state?
4. How are priorities established for vocational teacher education activities to be funded by state departments of education?
5. What is the primary purpose of funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions (preservice or inservice)?

6. What are the perceptions of vocational education personnel development coordinators toward the effectiveness of the vocational teacher education funding pattern used in their state?
7. Are funding patterns currently being used relatively stable?

Design of Study

There were several procedures used in order to prepare a survey instrument that would procure the type of data needed. The following section describes that procedure as well as the method of data analysis.

Literature Review

A review of literature was made by conducting a search of the Education Research Information Center (ERIC) to obtain information about state departments of education funding for vocational teacher education. A variety of descriptors and descriptor combinations were used including teacher education and professional continuing education, teacher education and vocational education, state departments of education and financing, state boards of education and financing, teacher education and financing. The ERIC search revealed only a small amount of usable information as presented in Chapter II of this study.

Additional information was obtained by reviewing library bulletins, educational periodicals and other literature. Articles found in such periodicals as the American Vocational Journal, Theory Into Practice, and Journal of Industrial Teacher Education were

considered. Bulletins and newsletters including the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture Newsletter, The Communicator,² and the National Council of States on Inservice Education Newsletter were found to be useful. Personnel at The Center for Vocational Education in Columbus, Ohio, also conducted a manual search for papers and literature that might be useful, but had not been entered into any retrieval system. The search revealed no material directly related to the topic of this study.

Population Selection

Since the purpose of this study was to review the various funding patterns used by state departments of education with vocational teacher education institutions, it was necessary to identify the population that would be the most knowledgeable of the details of such funding patterns. It was determined that the vocational education personnel development coordinator employed by each state department of education would possess or have access to the needed information. Every state and the District of Columbia has identified an individual to coordinate personnel development activities sponsored by the state. This makes a total population of fifty-one vocational education personnel development coordinators. The functions of a VEPD coordinator include helping establish personnel development priorities, coordinating personnel development activities and monitoring personnel development funds. Most of the activities of a

²A newsletter on vocational education personnel development. Printed and disseminated with Education Professions Development Act, Part 553, funds especially for state vocational education personnel development coordinators.

vocational education personnel development coordinator are either directly or indirectly tied to vocational teacher education institutions.

Instrument Development

In general, the literature revealed only a small amount of specific information regarding the funding patterns for vocational teacher education used by state departments of education. Considerable reliance was placed upon personal experience and contacts with individuals associated with vocational teacher education and state department funding patterns to obtain additional information. The majority of these individuals have been directly responsible for the administration of personnel development funds for his/her respective state. Substantial information regarding funding patterns has been obtained on an informal basis by attending numerous national conferences and workshops with these individuals.

Several nationally known individuals³ were personally contacted for information and suggestions regarding information that might be available in informal and/or unpublished documents. Personnel in the U. S. Office of Education with responsibilities for vocational education personnel development were also contacted to

³Individuals contacted were Calvin Cotrell, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Duane Nielson, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.; Robert Norton, The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Darrell Parks, Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio; Billy N. Pope, Educational Personnel Development Consortium D, Richardson, Texas.

obtain further information regarding funding patterns. Four major types of funding patterns were identified through this process. These patterns are identified in the survey instrument (see Appendix A) and were described in Chapter II. The four funding patterns represent the four major variables of the study. Within each of the funding patterns additional variables are present.

Based upon the information gathered through the literature review and personal interviews, a draft instrument was developed. This instrument was presented to the writer's doctoral committee with the presentation of the proposal for doctoral dissertation study.⁴ Several suggestions were given by the committee members for the improvement of the instrument and appropriate revisions were made.

As an initial step in assuring face validity, a draft copy of the instrument was taken to a staff member of the U. S. Office of Education for review.⁵ Based upon the several years of experience working with state departments of education and vocational teacher education institutions, this individual was able to make several recommendations regarding additional questions that would help achieve the objectives of the study and enhance the usefulness of the findings.

⁴Dissertation proposal was approved at a meeting of committee members on March 31, 1977.

⁵Draft copy of the instrument was reviewed by Muriel Shay Tapman, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U. S. Office of Education in Washington, D.C., April 5, 1977.

A consultant in the Office of Research Consultation, College of Education, Michigan State University,⁶ reviewed the instrument in the next phase of the developmental process. Advice regarding clarity of questions, consistency, terminology, grouping of items, and format for easy tabulation was provided by the consultant. Based upon this input the instrument was once again revised.

To assist in further attainment of face validity, the tentative instrument was then presented to members of the doctoral committee and a committee of judges.⁷ Through a series of individual conferences with the judges and doctoral committee members, additional revisions were made to improve the clarity of questions and to obtain more meaningful data.

As a final step in the developmental process, the reliability of the instrument was tested with individuals familiar with state departments of education and with detailed information about the funding pattern used by their state for vocational teacher education. These five individuals⁸ were asked to respond to the instrument as if

⁶The instrument was reviewed with Diane Wresinski of the Office of Research Consultation, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, November 2, 1977.

⁷Committee of judges included Leslie H. Cochran, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan; Addison S. Hobbs, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan; William King, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan.

⁸The instrument was pilot tested by Zed DeVaughan, Oklahoma Department of Education, Stillwater, Oklahoma; Joseph Kinzer, Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma; Jerry Moss, Jr., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota; John Van Ast, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa; Robert Weishan, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan.

they were the VEPD coordinator employed by their state department of education. Minor revisions were made in the instrument based on the results of the pilot test.

The resulting survey instrument consisted of three major parts (see Appendix A). Part I was designed to collect background information to provide a basis for reviewing the funding patterns used by state departments of education. This part of the survey contained thirty-one variables organized under the major headings of vocational teacher education, funding for vocational education personnel development, and establishment of priorities for vocational education professional development.

Part II of the survey instrument presented the four major techniques used by state departments of education to allocate funds to vocational teacher education institutions. It included a definition of each funding pattern as well as specific conditions and criteria that might be applied to each. There were thirteen variables associated with block grants; fifteen variables dealt with salary reimbursement; eleven variables focused on competitive grants; and sixteen variables associated with cost sharing. Another component of this part of the survey instrument provided respondents with an opportunity to identify funding patterns they used which differed from the four basic patterns. There were two variables in this section of the study. In all, fifty-seven variables were included in Part II of the survey instrument.

Part III of the instrument dealt with the perceived effectiveness of the funding pattern used. The major portion of this part of the survey consisted of eleven items on a Likert-type scale in which the respondent indicated his/her perceived degree of effectiveness. Other items in Part III requested the vocational education personnel development coordinator's perception of the teacher educators satisfaction with the funding pattern used. There were twenty-four variables in this section of the instrument.

The total survey instrument consisted of six pages printed on both sides, sixty-five different questions, and 112 variables. All vocational education personnel development coordinators did not respond to every question as the survey was designed to allow the respondent to skip over questions which were not applicable to the funding pattern used in the particular state.

Data Collection

After making final revisions based upon the pilot test results, the instrument was printed with an appropriate cover letter (see Appendix B). At the outset of this study it was determined that the target population for responding to the instrument would be the vocational education personnel development coordinator employed by each state department of education in the nation. Each of the departments of education of the fifty states, and Washington, D.C. employ a vocational education personnel development coordinator. These individuals annually attend a national conference designed and

conducted for the purpose of assisting them in carrying out their role and responsibilities regarding the professional development of vocational educators. In November of 1977 such a conference was held.⁹ Forty-six states and Washington, D.C. were represented at the conference. Agenda time was provided for the purpose of distributing the instrument and providing an overview of the study and its objectives as well as a review of the instrument itself. Individuals in attendance were then asked to complete the instrument and return it at the conference, if possible.

Those individuals not attending the conference were mailed an instrument the week following the conference. Fourteen instruments were completed and returned at the conference. Twenty-five additional instruments were completed and returned the first week of December 1977. A written follow-up communication was sent to those individuals who had not returned the instrument by the first week of December. By January 3, 1978, nine instruments had not been received. A personal telephone call was made to the appropriate individuals requesting that the instrument be completed and returned. Two of the nine outstanding instruments were received making the total number received forty-four (a return rate of 86 percent). This number included Alaska which was eliminated from the data analysis because it has no vocational teacher education institution.

⁹National Conference for Vocational Education Personnel Development Coordinators was held November 14-16, 1977, in Irving, Texas.

Therefore, the final number of instruments used in the data analysis was forty-three.¹⁰

As the data were reviewed in the process of organizing for keypunching, it was discovered that some of the surveys were incomplete. A telephone call was made to each vocational education personnel development coordinator submitting an incomplete survey. This procedure resulted in the attainment of the missing data and, equally as important, served to verify the respondent's understanding of the funding patterns defined in the study.

Data Analysis

The data collected and reported in Chapter IV were analyzed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. This system provides a unified statistical package which incorporates capabilities of different types of data analysis and a comprehensive set of procedures for data transformation and file manipulation.¹¹

Through the use of analysis of means and variances and a frequency distribution analysis, each of the 112 variables in the study was analyzed. This provided a composite tabulation of the data and formed the basis for answering the following four research

¹⁰Vocational education personnel development coordinators not completing the instrument were from the states of Alabama, Kansas, Maine, New York, North Carolina, Vermont, and West Virginia

¹¹Norman H. Nie, et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975).

questions regarding vocational teacher education funding by state departments of education. What are the funding characteristics of vocational education personnel development in each state? How are priorities established for vocational teacher education activities to be funded by state departments of education? What is the primary purpose of funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions--preservice or inservice? Are funding patterns currently being used relatively stable?

A fifth research question was--What vocational teacher education funding pattern is used by each state department of education? To answer this question a crosstabulation process was utilized to provide frequency distribution of cases according to two or more variable groupings. This approach, which is referred to as a sub-program CROSSTABS procedure within the SPSS system, provided an identification of the specific funding pattern or combination of patterns used in each state.

A further analysis was conducted of the conditions and criteria (fifty-seven variables) for each funding pattern. This was carried out by using the *SELECT IF program of SPSS which is a procedure for selecting cases (states) which indicated use of a particular funding pattern or combination of funding patterns. A frequency distribution, analysis of variance and means were computed for each variable associated with each funding pattern in order to answer the question--What conditions or criteria are applied to each funding pattern? Only funding patterns or combinations of funding patterns

utilized by three or more states were subjected to this statistical analysis with the SPSS program.

The final statistical analysis performed, again, used a frequency distribution, and analysis of means and variance to answer the question--What are the perceptions of vocational education personnel development coordinators toward the effectiveness of the vocational teacher education funding pattern used in their state? For example, the perceptions of the VEPD coordinators in the states using a funding pattern which combined block grants and competitive grants were analyzed to determine the degree of perceived effectiveness.

In total, four different computer programs were used to analyze the data. The last two procedures described were used several times, each time substituting a different funding pattern variable. With these procedures it was possible to answer all of the research questions designed for this study.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The funding patterns reported in this study were only those created by state departments of education through a process of allocating vocational education funds to vocational teacher education institutions. The use of funds described in this chapter were exclusive of those a vocational teacher education institution might receive from sources such as the state legislature, board of regents, higher education agency, gifts or nonstate department of education related grants and contracts.

This chapter presents the findings of the study resulting from the various types of analyses performed on the data collected from forty-three states¹ as identified in Appendix C. Percentage, frequency distribution, mean, mode, and median were the most common statistical forms used in reporting the findings. In some instances, additional detail was provided by reporting the adjusted and cumulative percentages. In the descriptive portions of this chapter, percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

It should be pointed out that many of the questions on the survey instrument asked the respondent to approximate. Since data

¹In this study, Washington D.C. was referred to as a state for purposes of reporting and analyzing the data.

of this nature change frequently, it was not realistic to expect VEPD coordinators to provide exact figures.

Administration of Professional Development Funds,
Priorities Establishment and Involvement
with Teacher Education

The first section of the survey instrument was designed to obtain background information about each state. The intent was to use this background information as a basis for reviewing the approaches used by state departments of education to allocate funds to vocational teacher education institutions.

Administration of Vocational Education Personnel Development

Factors relating to the state level administration of vocational education personnel development were addressed within the first part of the survey instrument. The amount of time spent by each vocational education personnel development coordinator for administration of professional development activities varied from state to state. An analysis of the data presented in Table 1 revealed that the amount of time spent by these individuals ranged from 10 to 100 percent. The average amount of time spent was 67 percent, although eighteen of the VEPD Coordinators indicated that they administered professional development activities 100 percent of the time.

Table 2 combined the frequency and the number of individuals employed by the state departments of education to administer vocational education professional development activities. Thirty-five

TABLE 1.--Percent of Time Spent Administering Professional Development Activities by State Vocational Education Personnel Development Coordinators

Percent of Time	Frequency	Adjusted Percent	Cumulative Percent
10	2	5	5
15	3	7	12
20	3	7	19
25	2	5	23
33	1	2	26
35	1	2	28
40	2	5	33
50	5	12	44
75	3	7	51
80	1	2	53
85	2	5	58
100	18	42	100
<hr/>			
N = 43	Mean = 65.8%	Mode = 100%	

TABLE 2.--Number of Individuals Employed by State Departments of Education to Administer Vocational Education Professional Development Activities

Number of Individuals Employed	Frequency	Adjusted Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than one	13	30	30
One	22	51	81
Two	3	7	88
Three	4	9	98
Four	1	2	100
<hr/>			
N = 43	Mean = 1.02	Mode = 1	

state departments of education employed only one individual with the specific responsibility of administering professional development activities. Thirteen of these thirty-five individuals spent less than 75 percent of their time in this role. Of the states involved in this study, 81 percent employ one or fewer individuals to administer professional development activities. One state employed as many as four individuals on a full-time basis.

Number of Vocational Teacher
Education Institutions

It was reported that the number of public institutions in each state approved to prepare vocational education teachers ranged from one to twenty-four with the mean being six. The most frequently reported number (mode) was three, while the median was five. The number of public institutions and the frequency with which each was cited is displayed in Table 3.

TABLE 3.--Number of Public Institutions in Each State Approved to Prepare Vocational Education Teachers

Number of Institutions	Frequency
1	3
2	4
3	7
4	5
5	5
6	4
7	2
8	5
9	4
12	2
24	2
Total	260

N = 43

Mean = 6.1

Mode = 3

Median = 5

In many states nonpublic institutions of higher education were also approved to prepare vocational education teachers. The number of nonpublic institutions in any one state ranged from zero to eighteen. As illustrated in Table 4, eleven states reported that there were no approved nonpublic vocational teacher education institutions. Coordinators from nine states did not respond to the question.

TABLE 4.--Number of Nonpublic Institutions in Each State Approved to Prepare Vocational Education Teachers

Number of Institutions	Frequency
0	11
1	8
2	4
3	5
4	1
5	3
8	1
18	1
Total	76

N = 34 Mean = 2.2 Mode = 0 Median = 1

Only six state departments of education provided state or federal vocational education funds to nonpublic vocational teacher education institutions. Four of the six states used the same procedure for allocating funds to nonpublic institutions as was used for public institutions.

Number of Vocational Teacher Educators

The number of vocational teacher educators serving each state was requested in two forms--head count and full time equivalent. The respondents were asked to indicate the approximate number of individuals for each of these categories. The head count of teacher educators (see Table 5) ranged from 15 to 220 with the mean at sixty six. Coordinators from five states were not able to provide usable data. The number of full time equivalent vocational teacher educators per state ranged from two to 163. There were twenty-one respondents unable to provide data regarding the number of full time equated vocational teacher educators. The number of full time equivalent vocational teacher educators reported by twenty-two coordinators is indicated in Table 6.

Funds for Professional Development Activities

One of the research questions of this study sought the identification of certain characteristics of the funds earmarked by state departments of education for vocational education personnel development. To determine the approximate amount spent annually for vocational education personnel development, each state was asked to indicate the most appropriate dollar range as identified in Table 7. Six coordinators reported spending one million or more dollars annually for professional development activities and programs for vocational education personnel. These six states were Florida,

TABLE 5.--Number of Vocational Teacher Educators Reported by States
(Head Count)

Vocational Teacher Educators	Frequency
15	3
17	1
18	1
19	2
26	2
29	1
30	1
32	2
35	2
40	1
42	1
45	1
50	2
54	1
60	1
61	2
65	1
68	1
70	1
78	1
80	1
82	1
91	1
115	1
146	1
150	1
163	1
173	1
220	1
TOTAL 2327	
N = 38	Mean = 61.2
Mode = 15	Median = 50

TABLE 6.--Number of Full Time Equivalent Vocational Teacher Educators Reported by States

Vocational Teacher Educators		Frequency
	2	1
	7	1
	9	1
	10	1
	14	1
	19	1
	20	1
	26	1
	32	2
	35	1
	36	1
	38	1
	42	1
	50	1
	52	1
	54	1
	60	2
	101	1
	120	1
	163	1
Total	982	

N = 22 Mean = 44.6 Median = 35

TABLE 7.--Funds Used by State Departments of Education for Vocational Education Professional Development

Range	Frequency
\$0 - 100,000	6
\$100,000 - 300,000	7
\$300,000 - 500,000	10
\$500,000 - 700,000	7
\$700,000 - 1,000,000	7
More than one million	6

N = 43

Mean = \$400,000

Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia. The average amount spent by state departments of education for vocational education personnel development activities was approximately \$400,000 annually. Twenty of the states involved in the study reported spending \$500,000 or more each year for vocational education professional development.

The majority of funds used by state departments of education was found to be obtained from federal sources. An inspection of the data in Table 8 revealed fifteen of the states obtained 100 percent of the funds used for vocational education personnel development from federal sources.

The coordinator of one state reported obtaining 100 percent of the funds for vocational education personnel development from state sources. The mean for all states obtaining funds from state sources was approximately 27 percent and the median was 10 percent. The percent of professional development funds derived from state sources were reported in Table 8.

Three state coordinators indicated that funds were used from sources other than state and federal. Less than 1 percent of the funds used by state departments of education for professional development activities were from other than state and federal sources. These other sources were not identified.

Of all the funds set aside by state departments of education for professional development activities and programs for vocational education personnel, 70 percent were directly allocated to

TABLE 8.--Percent of Funds Used by Forty-Three State Departments of Education for Vocational Education Personnel Development Derived from Federal, State, and Other Sources

Federal		State		Other	
Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
0	1	0	16	0	40
1	1	4	1	6	1
10	1	5	1	10	1
14	1	10	4	20	1
20	1	20	1		
30	2	23	1		
31	1	25	3		
40	2	35	1		
48	1	40	4		
54	1	46	1		
60	4	50	1		
65	1	52	1		
75	3	60	2		
77	1	69	1		
80	2	70	1		
90	3	80	2		
96	1	90	1		
100	15	100	1		
Mean	= 72.5%	Mean	= 26.6%	Mean	= .84%
Median	= 80 %	Median	= 10.0%	Median	= 10.0 %
Mode	= 100 %	Mode	= 0.0%	Mode	= 0.0 %

TABLE 9.--Percent of Professional Development Funds Awarded to
Vocational Teacher Education Institutions by State
Departments of Education

Percent	Frequency
20	1
22	1
25	1
26	1
30	2
35	1
40	2
50	3
60	6
67	1
70	1
75	1
80	1
85	3
90	1
92	1
95	2
100	11

N = 40

Mean = 69.9%

Mode = 100%

Median = 75%

vocational teacher education institutions. The data in Table 9 indicated that eleven states awarded 100 percent of the funds for vocational education professional development to vocational teacher education institutions while eighteen states allocated 60 percent or less. The eleven states that reported awarding 100 percent of the funds for professional development to vocational teacher education institutions were Arizona, Colorado, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Utah. Data regarding the percent of vocational education personnel development funds directed to vocational teacher education institutions were not provided by three states.

In response to the survey question of whether or not all vocational teacher education institutions within a state received vocational education funds from the state department of education, twenty-nine coordinators responded "no" and thirteen responded "yes." One state did not provide data for this item. The larger states with many institutions tended to respond no to this question, while the smaller states or less populated states with only a few vocational teacher education institutions responded yes.

One of the research questions of this study was to determine the major emphasis (preservice or inservice) for utilization of funds awarded to vocational teacher education institutions by state departments of education. Analysis revealed that on a national basis approximately 44 percent of the funds were used for preservice activities and programs while 56 percent were used for inservice.

Five states (Arizona, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and Washington D.C.) indicated that 100 percent of the funds awarded to vocational teacher education institutions are for inservice activities. One state (Ohio) reported that 100 percent of the funds were used for preservice activities. In all, it was reported that twenty-four states used 50 percent or more of the funds for inservice programs and activities for vocational education personnel. Three states were unable to determine the percentage breakdown for preservice and inservice activities. The frequency of preservice and inservice percentages were reported in Table 10.

In many states, vocational teacher educators used funds from sources other than the state department of education for conducting professional development activities. The data from thirty-nine states indicated the use of funds from other sources included business and industry (16), local school districts (18), foundations (9), participants (24), and others (19). Some of the other sources of funds used by vocational teacher education institutions were grants from the U. S. Office of Education, continuing education, and the state and federal Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture.

Most states reported that the 1977-78 State Plan for Vocational Education contained a line item indicating a specific dollar amount or a percentage of the funds to be allocated to vocational teacher education. Of the states involved in the study, 81 percent reported this fact.

TABLE 10.--Percent of Funds Awarded by State Departments of Education
that Were Used for Preservice and Inservice Activities by
Vocational Teacher Education Institutions

Preservice		Inservice	
Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
0	5	0	1
10	5	5	1
15	1	10	1
25	2	20	4
30	3	25	1
35	1	30	3
40	3	40	4
44	1	43	1
50	3	50	3
57	1	56	1
60	4	60	3
70	3	65	1
75	1	70	3
80	4	75	2
90	1	85	1
95	1	90	5
100	1	100	5

N = 40

Preservice mean = 43.6%

Inservice mean = 56.4%

There were four basic funding patterns used by state departments of education. An analysis revealed the percent of funds spent by all states for each of the funding patterns. The percentage breakdown was 26 percent for block grants, 28 percent for competitive grants, 16 percent for cost sharing, 17 percent for salary reimbursement and 13 percent for other funding patterns.

Establishment of Priorities

The background information component of the study also obtained data regarding those areas which impact on priority setting for vocational education personnel development activities conducted by vocational teacher education institutions with funds provided by the state department of education. Five items were rated in regard to the degree of importance placed on each in establishing priorities. A Likert-type scale was used to collect these data (5--Great Importance, 3--Some Importance, 1--No Importance). Data in Table 11 illustrated the national mean for each factor.

On a nation-wide basis, state and federal legislation and state board of education policies had the greatest influence on the establishment of priorities for funding professional development activities. Needs resulting from an assessment of local vocational education personnel was ranked the second most important factor influencing professional development priorities, while ideas proposed by teacher educators rated the least important of all the factors. This low rating of teacher educator's ideas may be due to the possibility that teacher educators were not asked for recommendations or

TABLE 11.--Factors Influencing the Establishment of Priorities for Vocational Teacher Education Professional Development Activities

Factors	National Mean*
Ideas proposed by vocational teacher educators	3.5
Ideas proposed by local vocational education administrators	3.7
Needs assessment of local vocational education personnel	3.9
Needs resulting from state/federal legislation or state board of education policy	4.1
Current trends	3.8

*Based on a Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (Great Importance) to 1 (No Importance).

N = 43

input regarding professional development activities to be considered for funding. It should be noted, however, that the variance in the mean for these factors was really very small.

The Variety and Scope of Funding Patterns Used

A crosstabulation was completed to determine the variety and scope of funding patterns used by state departments of education in allocating funds to vocational teacher education institutions. It was found that thirteen states used a single funding pattern, twenty states combined two different funding patterns, eight states combined three different funding patterns, and two states combined four different funding patterns.

The number of states that used each funding pattern were identified in Table 12. Competitive grants were the most popular funding pattern as thirty-one states used it either alone or in combination with another pattern(s).

TABLE 12.--Number of States Using Each Funding Pattern

Funding Pattern	Block Grants	Competitive Grants	Cost Sharing	Salary Reimbursement	Other Combination
Number of States	17	31	16	12	30

N = 43

Another question posed in the study specifically asked what funding pattern(s) was used by each state department of education. The data collected in this respect were summarized in Table 13 according to the funding pattern used by each state.

There were thirty combination funding patterns used. Data in Table 14 identified the combinations and the frequency with which each was used. The two most common combinations were block and competitive grants (10) and competitive grants, cost sharing, salary reimbursement (5).

Conditions and Criteria

As expected, there were a variety of conditions and criteria applied to the funding patterns used. The commonalities and

TABLE 13.--Funding Patterns Used by Forty-Three State Departments of Education in Allocating Funds to Vocational Teacher Education Institutions

	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Wyoming	Washington D.C.	
Block Grants			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Competitive Grants	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Cost-Sharing					X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X				X										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Salary Reimbursement		X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X					X										X	X													
Other							X		X	X	X								X																X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Total	1	2	1	2	4	1	4	2	2	2	3	1	2	3	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	3	3	2	2	1	3	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	3	1	3	1	2	1	1	2	1

TABLE 14.--Combination Funding Patterns Used by State Departments
of Education to Allocate Funds to Vocational Teacher
Education Institutions

Funding Pattern Combinations	Frequency	Percent
Block Grants/Competitive Grants	10	33
Competitive Grants/Cost Sharing	3	10
Salary Reimbursement/Competitive Grants	2	7
Block Grants/Cost Sharing	2	7
Salary Reimbursement/Other	2	7
Competitive Grants/Other	1	3
Competitive Grants/Cost Sharing/ Salary Reimbursement	5	17
Block Grants/Competitive Grants/ Salary Reimbursement	1	3
Block Grants/Competitive Grants/Cost Sharing	2	7
Block Grants/Competitive Grants/Cost Sharing/ Salary Reimbursement	1	3
Competitive Grants/Cost Sharing/Salary Reimbursement/Other	1	3

N = 30 Number of different combinations = 11

differences found for each of the funding patterns analyzed were summarized in this section.

Block Grants

Seventeen states reported using block grants. Only four of the seventeen indicated that every vocational teacher education institution in the state received a block grant. When block grants were used by states with several public supported vocational teacher education institutions, there was a tendency to provide the grants only to the larger or more comprehensive institutions. All seventeen states responded negatively in regard to providing block grants to nonpublic vocational teacher education institutions.

The frequency with which various factors provided the basis for awarding block grants to vocational teacher education institutions was displayed in Table 15. Each respondent was allowed to indicate all factors that were appropriate. The number of vocational teacher educators employed by the institution (8) and the specific objectives to be achieved (9) were the most frequently indicated factors upon which block grant awards were based. It was speculated that one of the reasons the number of vocational teacher educators was a factor frequently considered in making block grants was that a portion of the salary of some of the teacher educators was included as a part of the block grant in some states. The trend toward reducing the flexibility in the use of block grant funds may account for the frequency with which specific objectives to be achieved was

TABLE 15.--Factors Forming a Basis for Awarding Block Grants to Vocational Teacher Education Institutions

Factor	Frequency
Each institution awarded the same dollar amount	2
Number of vocational teacher educators employed	8
Number of students enrolled in the vocational teacher education program	4
Number of vocational teacher preparation programs offered	5
Specific objectives to be achieved	9
Graduate program offered	3
Previous year's performance	2
Other	6

N = 17

indicated as a factor. Six states cited other factors as a basis for awarding block grants. Some of the other factors were tradition, history, politics, and amount of research conducted.

Each respondent was also asked to indicate what percent of all funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by state departments of education was in the form of block grants. The mean was 65 percent for the seventeen states that used the block grant funding pattern. The data in Table 16 revealed the percent of funds used in the form of block grants by the seventeen states. The most frequent amount indicated was 80 percent with six different

TABLE 16.--Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds* Used by the Seventeen States in the Form of Block Grants

Percent	Frequency	Adjusted Percent	Cumulative Percent
10	2	12	12
25	1	6	18
50	1	6	24
57	1	6	29
60	1	6	35
63	1	6	41
75	1	6	47
80	6	35	82
85	1	6	88
90	1	6	94
100	1	6	100

*Allocated by state departments of education

N = 17

Mean = 64.9%

Standard Deviation = 26.9

states providing at least 80 percent of the funds to vocational teacher education institutions in the form of block grants. Through many of the telephone interviews conducted as a follow up effort to gather missing data and clarify existing data, it was found that many states allowed vocational teacher education institutions to use block grant funds for salaries, travel, clerical assistance, and general supplies.

Competitive Grants

The competitive grant was the most common funding pattern used by state departments of education in awarding funds to vocational teacher education institutions. Thirty-one states indicated use of this pattern in one form or another.

It was recorded that in twenty-eight of the thirty-one states, agencies other than vocational teacher education institutions could compete for funds provided via the competitive grant procedure. The frequency with which the various agencies competed were cited in Table 17.

TABLE 17.--Agencies Competing with Vocational Teacher Education Institutions for Competitive Grant Funds

Competing Agencies	Frequency
Local School district	24
Private Schools	14
Private counseling and research agencies	18
Business and industry	10
Professional associations	16
Other	8

N = 31

Local school districts were the most frequently cited competing agency. It was anticipated that this was caused by the recent trend of larger school districts and of intermediate or regional level districts to employ curriculum, professional development, research and evaluation consultants on a full time basis. The increased amount of local level expertise has allowed local districts to become viable competitors for special project funds. Some

of the other designated agencies were professional development centers, community colleges, area service centers, consortiums, and teacher education institutions not approved to prepare vocational education teachers.

Another commonality was identified when twenty-nine states reported that there were instances when only vocational teacher education institutions were allowed to respond to the Request for Proposal (RFP). The practice of assigning or requesting a particular vocational teacher education institution to prepare a proposal in response to a specific RFP was reported as common to twenty-seven states.

In addition to the competitive grant, fourteen states reported using block grants, ten reported using salary reimbursement, twelve reported using cost sharing and two reported using other funding patterns. An average of 38 percent of the funds awarded by these thirty-one state departments of education was in the form of competitive grants. Data in Table 18 indicated the percent of vocational teacher education funds used by the states in the form of competitive grants. It is interesting to note that five state departments of education allocated 100 percent of the funds to vocational teacher education institutions in the form of competitive grants. Another twenty states allocated 50 percent or less of the vocational teacher education funds through this funding pattern. Many respondents indicated, through interviews, that this was a funding pattern that has not been used frequently in the past, but was being

TABLE 18.--Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds*
Used by the Thirty-One States in the Form of
Competitive Grants

Percent	Frequency	Adjusted Percent	Cumulative Percent
5	3	10	10
10	2	6	16
15	3	10	26
20	8	26	52
25	2	6	58
30	1	3	61
33	1	3	65
35	1	3	68
37	1	3	71
43	1	3	74
50	1	3	77
90	2	6	84
100	5	16	100

*Allocated by state departments of education.

N = 31

Mean = 38.4%

Standard Deviation = 33.4

phased in by designating a small percent during the first year and then gradually increasing the amount available in succeeding years while reducing the amount available through some other funding pattern.

Salary Reimbursement

There were twelve states that reported using the salary reimbursement funding pattern. Three of these states indicated that the total salary of the teacher educators involved was reimbursed. These three states were Connecticut, Florida, and Nevada. It was indicated that in Florida a teacher educator's salary was reimbursed for the

first year only. The other nine states reimbursed a percentage of the teacher educator's salary (see Table 19).

TABLE 19.--Percent of Vocational Teacher Educator's Salary Reimbursed to the Vocational Teacher Education Institution by Twelve State Departments of Education

Percent Reimbursed	Frequency
10	1
15	1
50	5
66	1
100	3
Variable	1

N = 12

One state (Missouri) reimbursing at 50 percent indicated that a maximum of \$10,000 per vocational teacher educator had been established. Another state (Ohio) reported reimbursement at the 50 percent level, but qualified the reimbursement rate by stating that the 50 percent was pro-rated based on the amount of time spent on vocational teacher education. For example, if a teacher educator devoted 50 percent of the time to vocational teacher education, then one-fourth of the salary would be reimbursed.

In order to be eligible for salary reimbursement, teacher educators in eight of the states were required to possess a vocational teaching certificate. Six states listed other criteria used to determine eligibility of teacher educators for salary reimbursement.

Some of the other criteria were a minimum of three years' experience teaching in a secondary vocational education program, performance in carrying out the role and responsibilities of a vocational teacher educator, and the number of courses taught.

Nine respondents indicated that teacher educators receiving salary reimbursement had specific responsibilities to the state department of education. The frequency of reported responsibilities were tabulated in Table 20.

TABLE 20.--Responsibilities of Salary Reimbursed Vocational Teacher Educators to the Twelve State Departments of Education

Responsibilities	Frequency
Consultation with local districts	3
Consultation with state department of education	8
Curriculum development	6
Research	5
Coordination of teacher education efforts at institution	7
Liaison between state department of education and institution	7
Inservice training	8
Other	3

N = 12

Two items, consultation with the state department of education and providing inservice training, were the most frequently cited responsibilities of the vocational teacher educators receiving salary reimbursement from the state department of education. Coordination of the teacher education efforts at the institution and liaison between the state department of education and the teacher education institution were also commonly cited responsibilities. In one state (Ohio), teacher educators under the salary reimbursement funding pattern were required to attend and participate in state department of education sponsored inservice and leadership activities. Another state (Missouri) required salary reimbursed vocational teacher educators to prepare an annual program plan (by service area) and an annual report. A third state (Virginia) cited student organizations at both the secondary and collegiate level as a responsibility of the salary reimbursed vocational teacher educators.

The number of teacher education positions reimbursed by the state department of education ranged from five in one state to one hundred in another. The average number of positions reimbursed was thirty-three. A total of 364 positions were reported to be reimbursed to some degree by all states combined. Salary reimbursement represented an average of 62 percent of the total funds provided to the teacher education institutions by the twelve state departments of education. The range was from 5 percent to 100 percent as shown in Table 21.

TABLE 21.--Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds*
Used by the Twelve States in the Form of Salary
Reimbursement

Percent	Frequency	Adjusted Percent	Cumulative Percent
5	1	8	8
15	1	8	17
25	1	8	25
50	1	8	33
60	1	8	42
70	1	8	50
80	3	25	75
90	2	17	92
100	1	8	100

*Allocated by state departments of education.

N = 12

Mean = 62%

Standard Deviation = 31.5

Cost Sharing

Coordinators from sixteen states reported the use of cost sharing as a technique for distributing vocational education funds to vocational teacher education institutions. Fifteen of these states indicated that costs were shared for off-campus activities. On-campus activities were also reported by fifteen states as activities for which costs were shared. Several items were listed by respondents as other activities for which costs were shared. They were research, curriculum development, cooperative work experience for teachers, intern and extern programs, itinerant teacher education services, consultation with local districts, follow up of first year teachers and short-term critical need projects.

It was a common procedure among all sixteen states that used this funding pattern to offer credit to local educators involved in the particular professional development activity. Twelve states also indicated that priorities were established for cost sharing activities. The individuals, groups, and agencies identified as having the responsibility for establishing priorities for cost sharing activities were the state department of education, the state planning process which included a task force of local, state, and university personnel, the personnel development advisory committee, and the state director of vocational education.

Only seven of the sixteen states using the cost sharing funding pattern indicated that specific criteria were applied to the activities that were eligible for cost sharing. One state reported that criteria varies among service areas and that this had created a problem. Other criteria cited were cost-effectiveness, inservice activities only, the use of a cost factor formula, State Plan priorities, course work for vocational teacher certification for those individuals directly from business and industry, and attention to alleviating discrimination and stereotyping. The variety of criteria reported indicated many variations of the cost sharing funding pattern.

The factors forming the basis on which added costs were determined were identified in Table 22. Travel expenses was the most frequently cited factor relating to the determination of added costs for the cost sharing funding pattern. This may be due to the trend

TABLE 22.--Factors Upon Which Added Costs were Determined for the Cost Sharing Funding Pattern as Reported by Sixteen States

Factor	Frequency
Direct costs	9
Direct and indirect costs	9
Costs not covered by the tuition of participants	6
Travel expenses	13
Salaries	10
Supplies	9
Other	2

N = 16

to use cost sharing to encourage teacher educators to conduct professional development activities and programs at the local level. One of the constraints on teacher educators was the limited funds for travel. This funding pattern can alleviate that constraint by providing funds for travel to local school districts. Also, institutional policies which tie the salary of teacher educators to class load has limited the amount of local level assistance provided by vocational teacher educators. This may account for the high frequency with which salaries were cited as a factor in determining added costs. Two states (Connecticut and Nevada) indicated that at times the cost of equipment was shared by the state department of education and the teacher education institution.

When questioned whether or not the state department of education guaranteed the vocational teacher education institutions a specific dollar amount under the cost sharing funding pattern, thirteen states responded negatively. Cost sharing represented an average of 42 percent of the total funds allocated by the state departments of education of these sixteen states. The data in Table 23 indicated the percent of the total vocational teacher education funds used by each of the sixteen states in the form of cost sharing.

TABLE 23.--Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds* Used by the Sixteen States in the Form of Cost Sharing

Percent	Frequency	Adjusted Percent	Cumulative Percent
5	2	13	13
15	3	19	31
20	3	19	50
45	1	6	56
50	2	13	69
66	1	6	75
75	1	6	81
80	1	6	88
90	1	6	94
100	1	6	100

*Allocated by state departments of education.

N = 16 Mean = 41.8% Standard Deviation = 31.8

Other Funding Patterns

The data collected from nine states indicated the use of a funding pattern other than the four major types. Five of the nine states used the other identified funding pattern exclusively. Each

of the nine states described the funding pattern used a little differently as can be observed by the following summaries.

Wisconsin.--The state department of education provided funds to vocational teacher education institutions for special projects only. The staff of the state department of education determined the need and then asked a specific institution to prepare a proposal.

Washington.--Funds were provided to vocational teacher education institutions for specific personnel development activities that were considered to be the responsibility of the state department of education, but for which there was insufficient person power and facilities to carry out.

Hawaii.--This state reported that vocational teacher educators were paid for travel and supplies as needed for special workshops or training deemed necessary by the state department of education staff.

Minnesota.--For the purpose of providing training for teachers directly from business and industry, 20 percent of the vocational teacher education funds were set aside. Vocational teacher educators provided this training at no cost to the participating teachers.

Illinois.--This state provided special funds to support a University Liaison Council to the Division of Adult and Vocational-Technical Education. Members of the council represented the vocational education departments of eight universities. Each member

was responsible for the coordination of all activities at the represented institution. This particular funding procedure only accounted for 10 percent of the funds allocated to vocational teacher education by the Illinois Office of Education.

Utah and Tennessee.--Both of these states indicated that the state department of education specialists determined professional development priorities and decided which institutions should provide each of the corresponding activities or programs. The vocational teacher education institution then prepared a proposal and it was negotiated with the appropriate state department of education staff.

Montana.--The VEPD Coordinator in Montana reported that the state department of education provided funds for the costs related to those "planned activities" which were necessary for the operation of a vocational teacher education program. Funding was approved only for professional courses or activities that were required of vocational teacher trainees, but did not include basic skill courses. Of the funds awarded to vocational teacher education institutions in Montana, 100 percent were provided in this manner.

The percent of total vocational teacher education funds used by the nine state departments of education in the form of "other" funding patterns were summarized in Table 24. The average percent allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by state departments of education using this funding pattern was sixty-three. Five states indicated providing 100 percent

TABLE 24.--Percent of Total Vocational Teacher Education Funds*
Used by Nine States in the Form of "Other" Funding
Patterns

Percent	Frequency	Adjusted Percent	Cumulative Percent
10	2	22	22
20	1	11	33
35	1	11	44
100	5	56	100

*Allocated by state departments of education.

N = 9 Mean = 63.3% Standard Deviation = 42.9

of the funds to vocational teacher education institutions with this approach. These five states were Montana, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Perceived Effectiveness of Funding Patterns

The determination of the perception of the vocational education personnel development coordinator toward the effectiveness of the funding pattern(s) used was one of the objectives of this study. An analysis of these perceptions, as described according to the funding patterns used, form the basis for this section. Perceptions were not analyzed unless three or more states used a particular funding pattern or combination of funding patterns. Less than three states using a particular funding pattern was considered to be an insufficient number from which to develop a valid analysis of the perceived effectiveness.

A Likert-type scale was used to rate the effectiveness of eleven different factors (5--Very Effective, 3--Acceptable, 1--Not Effective). The vocational education personnel development coordinator was asked whether or not the vocational teacher educators were satisfied with the funding pattern used. Those who indicated they felt vocational teacher educators were dissatisfied were asked why. The respondents were also asked to indicate if the funding pattern had changed recently and if they felt the current pattern needed to be changed.

Block Grants

Only one state (South Dakota) indicated use of the block grant as the only funding pattern. Therefore, an analysis of the effectiveness was not prepared. The coordinator did indicate he felt the funding pattern should be changed and his comments were recorded with those of other coordinators in Appendix D.

Competitive Grants

Five coordinators reported that the competitive grants procedure was the only one used to allocate funds to vocational teacher education institutions. These five represented Arizona, California, Massachusetts, Delaware, and Washington, D.C. The effectiveness of the competitive grant funding pattern was rated for eleven different factors by the five VEPD coordinators. The mean of the rating for each factor was displayed in Table 25.

TABLE 25.--Effectiveness of the Competitive Grant Funding Pattern
of Eleven Factors as Perceived by Five State VEPD
Coordinators

Factor	Mean*
Ease of administration	3.6
Meeting local staff needs	2.4
Meeting state department of education priorities	3.2
Keeping vocational teacher educators involved with the total vocational education program	2.4
Maintaining updated preservice programs	1.6
Providing consultative expertise to state department of education	2.6
Creating and maintaining a cooperative relationship among vocational teacher education institutions	2.4
Providing leadership to state department and local vocational educators	3.0
Promoting cooperation among vocational service areas within each institution	2.6
Providing effective vocational teachers for schools	2.8
Meeting the objectives of the State Plan	3.6

*Based on a Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (Very Effective)
to 1 (Not Effective).

N = 5

It was obvious from the table that this type of funding pattern was considered least effective in maintaining updated preservice programs. This was an expected finding as most competitive grants were for special projects that were related to a state-wide need which did not make provisions for implementation at the preservice level. This funding pattern was found to be most effective in ease of administration and in carrying out the objectives of the State Plan for Vocational Education. It follows that competitive grants would be relatively easy to administer because they generally have limited flexibility, objectives and tasks are clear-cut, and the timeliness are stated for each grant. Objectives within the State Plan identify tasks that need to be accomplished and competitive grants provide special project funds to achieve specific State Plan objectives.

Four VEPD coordinators felt the vocational teacher educators were not satisfied with this funding pattern. This seems likely as the funding pattern provided no guarantee of receiving funds. Lack of sufficient funds and lack of participation by teacher educators in setting priorities were the two most frequently cited reasons for dissatisfaction.

Cost Sharing

This funding pattern was not analyzed for perceived effectiveness by the VEPD coordinator because only one state (Iowa) reported using it exclusively for distributing funds to vocational teacher education institutions.

Salary Reimbursement

Again, with this pattern only one state (North Dakota) reported using it exclusively for the allocation of funds to vocational teacher education institutions. Therefore, salary reimbursement was not analyzed for perceived effectiveness.

Other Funding Patterns

Five states reported using patterns for providing funds to vocational teacher education institutions other than the four major patterns. The data listed in Table 26 identified the perceived effectiveness of the other funding patterns used in regard to eleven identified factors. These patterns were ranked low in meeting local staff needs for professional development. The patterns were considered to be most effective in maintaining updated preservice programs, promoting cooperation among service areas within vocational teacher education institutions, and carrying out the objectives of the State Plan for Vocational Education.

Four of the VEPD coordinators reported that teacher educators are not satisfied with the funding pattern used. The primary reason for this dissatisfaction was, again, lack of sufficient funds.

Combined Funding Patterns

There were three combinations of funding patterns which three or more states reported using. An analysis of the perceived effectiveness was completed for each combination.

TABLE 26.--Effectiveness of "Other" Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by Five State VEPD Coordinators

Factor	Mean*
Ease of administration	3.4
Meeting local staff needs	2.8
Meeting state department of education priorities	3.6
Keeping vocational teacher educators involved with the total vocational education program	3.4
Maintaining updated preservice programs	3.0
Providing consultative expertise to state staff	3.6
Creating and maintaining a cooperative relationship among vocational teacher education institutions	3.6
Providing leadership to state department and local vocational educators	3.2
Promoting cooperation among vocational service areas within each institution	3.0
Providing effective vocational teachers for schools	3.6
Meeting the objectives of the State Plan	3.0

*Based on a Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (Very Effective) to 1 (Not Effective).

N = 5

Block Grants and Competitive Grants.--There were ten states that reported that all funds were distributed to vocational teacher education institutions through a combination of block and competitive grants. On the average, these ten states distributed 70 percent of the funds in the form of block grants and the other 30 percent in the form of competitive grants. Table 27 provided data regarding the effectiveness of this combination as seen by the VEPD coordinators. The mean showed this combination funding pattern to be less than acceptable in maintaining updated preservice programs. The most effective factor of this funding pattern combination was perceived to be that of keeping vocational teacher education involved in the total vocational education program at both the state and local level.

Seven of the ten states indicated that teacher educators were dissatisfied with this funding pattern. As shown in Table 28, the most frequently cited reason for dissatisfaction is once again lack of sufficient funds and the second most frequently cited reason was lack of participation by vocational teacher educators in priority setting. Seven states involved in this combination of funding patterns indicated there had not been a recent change in the funding pattern used while seven also indicated a felt need to change the current funding pattern.

Cost Sharing and Competitive Grants.--For those states (3) using a combination of the cost sharing and competitive grants funding patterns, an average of 31 percent of the funds were allocated

TABLE 27.--Effectiveness of the Combined Block and Competitive Grant Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by Ten State VEPD Coordinators

Factor	Mean*
Ease of administration	2.9
Meeting local staff needs	2.9
Meeting state department of education priorities	3.3
Keeping vocational educators involved with the total vocational education program	3.9
Maintaining updated preservice programs	2.8
Providing consultative expertise to state staff	3.0
Creating and maintaining a cooperative relationship among vocational teacher education institutions	3.3
Providing leadership to state department and local vocational educators	3.4
Promoting cooperation among vocational service areas within each institution	3.2
Providing effective vocational teachers	3.3
Meeting the objectives of the State Plan	3.6

*Based on a Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (Very Effective) to 1 (Not Effective).

N = 10

TABLE 28.--Perceived Reasons for Teacher Education Dissatisfaction
With the Combination Block and Competitive Grant Fund-
ing Pattern Used in Ten States

Reasons	Frequency
Too much programmatic state control	3
Too much fiscal state control	3
Not enough state control	0
Insufficient funds	6
Inflexibility of procedures	0
Unfair allocation of funds	2
Lack of participation by vocational teacher educators in priority setting	4
Lack of long-range planning on the part of teacher education	3

N = 10

through the competitive grant process and 69 percent through the cost sharing pattern. Table 29 summarized the perceptions of VEPD coordinators regarding the effectiveness of this funding pattern combination. This combination funding pattern was perceived as more effective than the other funding patterns. Providing effective vocational teachers was rated as the factor most effectively achieved by this funding pattern. Five other factors also received a high rating. They were ease of administration, meeting state department of education priorities, maintaining updated preservice programs, creating and maintaining cooperative relationships among vocational

TABLE 29.--Effectiveness of the Combined Competitive Grant and Cost Sharing Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by Three State VEPD Coordinators

Factors	Means*
Ease of administration	4.0
Meeting local staff needs	3.6
Meeting state department of education priorities	4.0
Keeping vocational teacher educators involved with the total vocational program	3.6
Maintaining updated preservice programs	4.0
Providing consultative expertise to state staff	3.0
Creating and maintaining a cooperative relationship among vocational teacher education institutions	4.0
Providing leadership to state and local vocational educators	2.6
Promotion cooperation among service areas within each institution	2.6
Providing effective vocational teachers	4.6
Meeting the objectives of the State Plan	4.0

*Based on a Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (Very Effective) to 1 (Not Effective)

N = 3

teacher education institutions and meeting the objectives of the State Plan. Two VEPD coordinators indicated they felt the teacher educators were satisfied with the funding pattern. In one state the funding pattern had changed since 1975.

Competitive Grants, Cost Sharing, and Salary Reimbursement.--

There were five respondents that indicated the use of this funding pattern combination. The average percent of funds spent for each pattern was: competitive grants, 19 percent; cost sharing, 20 percent; salary reimbursement, 61 percent. The data in Table 30 indicated the VEPD coordinators' perception of the effectiveness of this combination of funding patterns. All factors were rated as acceptable (3.0) or better with the factor, providing effective vocational teachers rated as the highest. Three coordinators indicated that the teacher educators were not satisfied with this funding pattern. The data from two states indicated the funding pattern had been changed recently and the VEPD coordinators from three states indicated the need for a change.

Comparison of Perceptions

The data in Table 31 provided a comparative summary of the perceived effectiveness of the means of five funding patterns used exclusively by three or more states. The combination pattern involving cost sharing and competitive grants was perceived as the most effective for seven of the eleven factors.

TABLE 30.--Effectiveness of the Combined Competitive Grant, Cost Sharing, and Salary Reimbursement Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by Five State VEPD Coordinators

Factors	Means*
Ease of administration	3.6
Meeting local staff needs	3.2
Meeting state department of education priorities	3.8
Keeping vocational teacher educators involved with the total vocational program	3.4
Maintaining updated preservice programs	3.4
Providing consultative expertise to state staff	3.2
Creating and maintaining a cooperative relationship among vocational teacher education institutions	3.6
Providing leadership to state and local vocational educators	3.0
Promoting cooperation among service areas within each institution	3.6
Providing effective vocational teachers	4.0
Meeting the objectives of the State Plan	1.6

*Based on a Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (Very Effective) to 1 (Not Effective).

N = 5

TABLE 31.--A Comparative Summary of the Effectiveness of the Means of Five Funding Patterns on Eleven Factors as Perceived by State VEPD Coordinators

Factors	National Mean by Funding Pattern				
	Competitive Grants	"Other" Grants	Block & Competitive Grants	Cost Sharing & Competitive Grants	Competitive Grants Cost Sharing Salary Reimbursement
Ease of administration	3.6	3.4	2.9	4.0	3.6
Meeting local staff needs	2.4	2.8	2.9	3.6	3.2
Meeting state department of education priorities	3.2	3.6	3.3	4.0	3.8
Keeping vocational teacher educators involved	2.4	3.4	3.9	3.6	3.4
Maintaining updated preservice programs	1.6	3.0	2.8	4.0	3.4
Providing consultative expertise to state staff	2.6	3.6	3.0	3.0	3.2
Creating and maintaining a cooperative relationship among vocational teacher education institutions	2.4	3.6	3.3	4.0	3.6
Providing leadership to state and local vocational educators	3.0	3.2	3.4	2.6	3.0
Promoting cooperation among the service areas within each institution	2.6	3.0	3.2	2.6	3.6
Providing effective vocational teachers	2.8	3.6	3.3	4.6	4.0
Meeting the objectives of the State Plan	3.6	3.0	3.6	4.0	1.6
Number of States equals	5	5	10	3	5

Based on a Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (Very Effective) to 1 (Not Effective).

Total number of states = 32.

The competitive grant funding pattern was rated as least effective for seven of the eleven factors. This funding pattern was rated particularly ineffective in maintaining updated preservice programs. It was also rated the lowest of all patterns in providing effective vocational teachers. Seven of the eleven factors received a less than acceptable (3.0) rating.

The "other" funding patterns were rated less than acceptable for meeting local staff needs. They were also rated as the most effective of all patterns for providing consultative expertise to state department of education staff.

The combination block and competitive grants funding pattern was rated as acceptable or better for all but three factors. Those three factors were ease of administration, meeting local staff needs, and maintaining updated preservice programs. It was rated as more effective than any of the other funding patterns in keeping vocational teacher educators involved with the total vocational education program.

The cost sharing and competitive grant funding pattern was rated as less effective than the other funding patterns in providing leadership to state and local vocational educators. It was also rated low in promoting cooperation among service areas within each institution.

The combination competitive grant, cost sharing, and salary reimbursement funding pattern received the lowest rating of all funding patterns in meeting the objectives of the State Plan. It received

a higher rating than the other funding patterns in promoting cooperation among service areas within each institution.

The effectiveness rating provided by each state VEPD coordinator was compared on a state by state basis. Those states where funding patterns were rated as 4.0 or better for seven or more factors were identified. There may have been particular conditions and criteria applied to the funding patterns that were not reported due to the limitations of the survey instrument. This and other unidentified information about the funding patterns used may have contributed to the high rate of effectiveness perceived by the VEPD coordinators for the states of Connecticut, Georgia, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming.

A final group of questions was asked of all vocational education personnel development coordinators regarding the stability of the funding patterns used. The coordinators from ten states indicated that the funding pattern had changed since 1975. In addition, twenty-five state VEPD coordinators indicated that they felt the funding pattern should be changed. These data clearly suggested instability in the vocational teacher education funding patterns used by state departments of education. The following were some of the reasons cited for changing the current funding pattern: (see Appendix D for a complete listing of all responses).

Specific funding criteria is needed.

State institutions should justify and secure funds from the state legislature for vocational teacher education.

Present pattern is inefficient.

There is an inequality in support among discipline areas.

Inability to meet the needs of vocational teachers.

Present funding is too political.

Accountability is lacking.

Need for greater articulation and participation by vocational teacher educators with local education agency staff.

Need to be more cost effective.

Need to extend period of funding beyond one year at a time.

More funds needed for inservice.

More administrative control needed.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH, AND REFLECTIONS

There have been several research studies that have focused on various aspects related to funding vocational education. Most of these have either centered on cost-effectiveness factors at the secondary school level or on a limited basis at the post-secondary school level. While there has been growing controversy between vocational teacher education institutions and state departments of education concerning the amount of support and type of funding patterns, only limited study has been undertaken in this respect.

In Chapter I it was pointed out that this study was directed at a review and analysis of the various funding patterns used by state departments of education in supporting vocational programs in teacher education institutions. Three major objectives were established to guide this task:

1. To determine the variety and scope of the vocational teacher education funding patterns used by state departments of education
2. To provide an analysis showing commonalities among funding patterns, and
3. To determine the perceived effectiveness (by the vocational education personnel development coordinators) of the funding patterns used

Each of the preceding chapters provided supporting data and findings related to the objectives. These findings were

summarized in this chapter according to seven major questions to provide a basis for the conclusions, observations, recommendations, and implications for further research that follow. The statements listed in the section under conclusions were drawn from the findings and relate directly to the specified objectives and supporting questions. The section on observations revealed findings which lacked sufficient data to be classified with the conclusions of the study, but were felt by the author to be pertinent to the study. The recommendations suggest further uses for the findings, while implications for further research were provided in the final section.

Summary of the Findings

The descriptive study was aimed at answering seven major questions to fulfill the stated objectives:

1. What vocational teacher education funding pattern is used by each state department of education?
2. What conditions and criteria are applied to each funding pattern used?
3. What are the funding characteristics of vocational education personnel development in each state?
4. How are priorities established for vocational education personnel development activities to be funded by state departments of education?
5. What is the primary purpose of funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions (pre-service or inservice)?
6. What are the perceptions of vocational education personnel development coordinators toward the effectiveness of the vocational teacher education funding pattern used in their states?
7. Are the funding patterns used relatively stable?

The data which formed the basis to answer these questions were obtained from a survey instrument sent to vocational education personnel development coordinators in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia. An overall response rate of 86 percent was obtained. Data from forty-two states and the District of Columbia were used in the study.

The data collected were analyzed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences computer program. With the use of analysis of means and variances and a frequency distribution analysis, the 112 variables in the study were analyzed and grouped around each of the seven major questions.

What Vocational Teacher Education
Funding Pattern is Used by Each
State Department of Education?

There were a variety of funding patterns used by state departments of education. All but five of the states used some form of the four basic patterns identified at the commencement of this study. Seventeen states used the block grant funding pattern. All but one of the seventeen combined block grants with another funding pattern. Thirty-one states used competitive grants, while only five used it as the only method for allocating funds to vocational teacher education institutions. The cost sharing funding pattern was used by sixteen states. Fifteen of these states used cost sharing in combination with another pattern. There were eleven different combination funding patterns used. The combination block grants and

competitive grants was the most common, being used in ten states. The second most common combination involved three funding patterns-- competitive grants, cost sharing, and salary reimbursement.

It was reported that block grants comprised approximately 26 percent of all funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions, while competitive grants were at 28 percent, cost sharing at 16 percent, salary reimbursement at 17 percent, and other funding patterns at 13 percent.

What Conditions and Criteria are
Applied to Each Funding Pattern
Used?

The conditions and criteria for each type of funding pattern were different. Each state department of education's particular implementation procedure for each of the funding patterns also varied. However, there were some commonalities among conditions and criteria applied.

Block Grants.--The two most common factors cited as the basis for awarding the block grants were the number of vocational teacher educators employed by the institution and the specific objectives to be achieved. Nine of the seventeen states awarded 80 percent or more of the funds to vocational teacher education institutions through the use of block grants.

Competitive Grants.--This was the most frequently used funding pattern. Twenty-eight of the thirty-one states that indicated

use of the funding pattern reported that agencies other than vocational teacher education institutions could compete for grant funds. Local school districts were cited as the most common competing agency. Private consulting and research agencies and professional associations were also indicated as frequent competitors for grant funds.

Another commonality was found in that twenty-nine states reported that there were instances when only vocational teacher education institutions were allowed to compete for the funds. Twenty-seven states indicated that at times a specific institution is asked to respond to an RFP for funds that would normally only be available on a competitive basis.

The use of competitive grants was most often combined with block grants. Five states indicated the sole use of competitive grants as the approach for directing funds to vocational teacher education institutions. Competitive grants represent 28 percent of all funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by state departments of education.

Cost Sharing.--Cost sharing was used by sixteen states as a technique for distributing funds to vocational teacher education institutions. One state used this as the only pattern for allocating funds to the vocational teacher education institutions. Costs were shared for both on-campus and off-campus activities by most states. The differences in the criteria used by states for this funding

pattern indicated that there were many variations to implementation.

The most frequent factor cited for determining added cost funds to be shared through this funding pattern was travel expenses. Salary was the next most frequent factor used to determine added costs. State departments of education in thirteen of the sixteen cases did not guarantee a specific dollar amount to the vocational teacher education institutions. Cost sharing represented approximately 16 percent of all funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by the forty-three states involved in the study.

Salary Reimbursement.--Twelve states indicated the use of salary reimbursement; three at full salary and nine at a percent of the teacher educator's salary. Eight states required salary reimbursed vocational teacher educators to possess a vocational teaching certificate. Six states identified other criteria for salary reimbursement eligibility.

Vocational teacher educators receiving salary reimbursement had specific responsibilities to the state department of education in nine states. The responsibilities most frequently cited were consultation with state department of education and inservice training. Consultation with local districts was cited as the most infrequent responsibility of salary reimbursed vocational teacher educators.

The average number of positions reimbursed by any one state was 33; however, one state indicated reimbursing as many as 100

positions. A total of 364 positions were reported to be reimbursed to some degree by all states combined.

Salary reimbursement represented a total of 17 percent of all funds distributed to vocational teacher education institutions by the states involved in this study.

Other Funding Patterns.--Nine states identified the use of other funding patterns. Five of these states used this other funding pattern as the only procedure for distributing funds to vocational teacher education institutions. The other funding patterns represented approximately 13 percent of all funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by states in this study.

Wisconsin, Utah, Tennessee, and Washington all reported a similar procedure in that state staff determined the needs and then asked specific institutions to prepare a proposal in response to the identified needs. Hawaii provided funds to vocational teacher educators for travel and supplies as deemed appropriate by the state staff. Of the funds to be allocated to the Minnesota vocational teacher education institutions, 20 percent were reserved for conducting training for teachers directly from business and industry. Illinois supported a council of university representatives to promote cooperation and coordination between the state department of education and the vocational teacher educators. A procedure was used in Montana for supporting vocational teacher preparation requirements over and above the basic skill courses required of all teachers.

What are the Funding Characteristics
of Vocational Education Personnel
Development in Each State?

The data from each state regarding these funding characteristics were compiled to provide a composite picture of vocational education personnel development in state departments of education. Six states reported spending one million or more annually for vocational education personnel development. Twenty states spend \$500,000 or more every year. The average amount spent was \$400,000.

The majority (73 percent) of funds used by state departments of education for vocational education personnel development were derived from federal sources. Of the funds set aside for professional development activities by the state departments of education analyzed in the study, 70 percent were allocated to vocational teacher education institutions.

Twenty-nine of the forty-three states reported that all vocational teacher education institutions within the state did not receive funds from the state department of education. Only six states in the study reported that funds were provided to nonpublic vocational teacher education institutions by the state department of education.

How are Priorities Established for
Vocational Education Personnel
Development Activities to be
Funded by State Departments
of Education?

Factors which influenced the establishment of priorities for vocational education personnel development activities were ranked in the following order of importance:

1. Needs resulting from state/federal legislation or state board of education policies
2. Needs assessment of local vocational education personnel
3. Current trends
4. Ideas proposed by local vocational education administrators
5. Ideas proposed by vocational teacher educators

What is the Primary Purpose of Funds
Allocated to Vocational Teacher Edu-
cation Institutions (preservice or
inservice)?

The primary purpose for vocational education funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions was inservice activities. Of the funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by state departments of education in this study, 56 percent was used for inservice purposes, while 44 percent was for preservice. Five states used all of the funds for inservice activities and one state used all of the funds for preservice activities.

What are the Perceptions of Vocational Education Personnel Development Coordinators Toward the Effectiveness of the Vocational Teacher Education Funding Patterns Used in Their States?

The combination competitive grant and cost sharing funding pattern was rated as the most effective for the majority of the eleven factors identified. This combination funding pattern was rated the highest in providing effective vocational teachers. It was also rated highly effective for the following five factors:

1. Ease of administration
2. Meeting state department of education priorities
3. Maintaining updated preservice programs
4. Creating and maintaining a cooperative relationship among vocational teacher education institutions
5. Meeting the objectives of the State Plan

Of all the funding patterns and combination funding patterns, this particular pattern was found most effective in maintaining updated preservice programs. The competitive grant funding pattern was rated as the least effective in maintaining updated preservice programs. Generally, the competitive grant funding pattern was rated less effective than any of the other funding patterns for nearly all of the factors.

The vocational education personnel development coordinators in thirty states reported that they perceived the vocational teacher educators to be dissatisfied with the funding patterns used. The

most frequent reason given was lack of sufficient funds regardless of the funding pattern used. The second most frequent reason given was lack of participation by vocational teacher educators in setting priorities.

Are Funding Patterns Used Relatively Stable?

The data showed that funding patterns were quite unstable. Ten states reported a change in the funding pattern used since 1975 and 25 states indicated the need for a change in the funding pattern used to allocate funds to vocational teacher education institutions. In total, over 75 percent of the states had changed the funding pattern in the last three years or felt that a change was needed.

Conclusions

The data collected in the study provided the basis for numerous comparisons and methods of analyzing the funding patterns used by state departments of education in supporting vocational teacher education programs at institutions of higher education. The findings related to the specified objectives revealed nine major conclusions.

1. The four major funding patterns used by state departments of education for directing vocational funds to vocational teacher education institutions are the block grant, the competitive grant, cost sharing and salary reimbursement. Within these patterns there are numerous variations as each state has made adaptations based upon its own unique characteristics, needs, personnel, and resources.

2. Most states use a combination of two or more of the four major funding patterns.

3. Within each of the four major funding patterns, commonalities exist in the criteria and conditions applied by the states.

The major commonality for each pattern is as follows:

a. Most block grants are awarded based on the specific objectives to be achieved and the number of vocational teacher educators employed.

b. Agencies other than teacher education institutions can compete for grant funds. Local districts are the most frequent competitors.

c. College credit is offered to local educators involved in professional development activities supported by the cost sharing funding pattern.

d. Most states require salary reimbursed vocational teacher educators to possess a vocational teaching certificate, to provide consultation to the state department of education, and to conduct inservice training.

4. The competitive grant funding pattern is the most common procedure used by state departments of education to allocate funds to vocational teacher education institutions.

5. State and/or federal legislation and State Board of Education policies are the most important factors influencing the priorities established for funding vocational education professional development activities. Ideas proposed by vocational teacher

educators is the least important factor influencing the establishment of funding priorities.

6. Perceptions of the vocational education personnel development coordinators are that:

a. The combination competitive grant and cost sharing funding pattern is more effective than the other funding patterns for most of the designated factors.

b. The competitive grant funding pattern is less effective than the other funding patterns for most of the factors rated in the study.

c. Competitive grants are least effective in maintaining updated preservice programs.

d. The combination competitive grants, cost sharing, and salary reimbursement funding pattern is least effective in meeting the objectives of the State Plan.

e. Each pattern had its unique strengths and weaknesses as evidenced by its high rating for some factors and low rating for others.

f. Vocational teacher educators were dissatisfied with the funding patterns used and with the amount of funds flowing to their institutions.

g. The present funding pattern is in need of change.

7. The majority of funds provided to vocational teacher education institutions by state departments of education are used for inservice activities.

8. Even though other agencies have begun to assume responsibility for vocational education personnel development, vocational teacher education institutions are still the prime recipient of the funds allocated for such activities.

9. The patterns used by state departments of education to provide funds to vocational teacher education institutions are in a state of flux. Most states have either recently changed the pattern used or it is perceived by the VEPD coordinator that a change is needed.

10. There is no one best funding pattern used by state departments of education in providing funds to vocational teacher education institutions. The unique needs, characteristics, personnel, and resources differ from one state to the next and the funding pattern must be adapted to each state.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings of the study and ensuing conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

1. Michigan, as well as other states searching for a compatible, effective funding procedure, should appoint a task force. The task force should be composed of individuals representing vocational teacher education institutions, local education agencies, and

the state department of education. The responsibilities of the task force should be as follows:

- a. review the findings of this study.
- b. obtain further information from states using the combination cost sharing and competitive grant funding pattern. There has apparently been a balance achieved by states using this combination which has caused a high degree of perceived effectiveness.
- c. obtain more information from states using the cost sharing funding pattern. This pattern seems to have a variety of approaches for implementation, many of which provide teacher educators with assistance in overcoming institutional constraints so that professional development programs and activities can be provided at the local level.
- d. obtain more detailed information from the twelve states in which the funding pattern was rated as particularly effective. There may be criteria, conditions, or other aspects not ascertained by this study which were instrumental in making the patterns effective.
- e. define the role and responsibility of vocational teacher education. This is necessary, as the funding pattern developed should enhance and assist vocational teacher educators in carrying out their role and responsibility.
- f. determine whether or not the state department of education should fund preservice vocational teacher education programs--if so to what degree and under what conditions.
- g. examine the staff development and other related needs identified by state and local vocational educators for type,

variety, quantity and other characteristics. Keep these needs in mind when selecting a funding pattern as one that does not provide a vehicle for meeting such needs is of little value.

h. survey vocational teacher educators to surface their unique needs, concerns, and problems encountered preparing vocational teachers at both the preservice and inservice level.

i. consider the total statewide effort regarding professional development and select a funding pattern that complements that effort.

j. consider the role and responsibility of other agencies within the state currently involved in providing professional development programs. Select a funding pattern which is compatible with the work being done by agencies other than vocational teacher education. Avoid developing turfsmanship and nonconstructive competition between teacher education and other agencies.

k. propose at least three alternative solutions to the problem of funding vocational teacher education and make a recommendation as to which alternative should be selected.

2. Bringing about change in the funding pattern used should be a joint process of state department of education staff, teacher educators and others. Any attempt on the part of a singular agency to impose a funding pattern will be met with great resistance.

3. It is recommended that when searching for funding pattern solutions, the question of lack of sufficient funds be separated from the funding pattern itself as it is another issue.

4. States should solicit, encourage, and provide a mechanism for input and participation by vocational teacher educators in setting priorities for professional development activities.

5. The planning for professional development programs, activities and funding should be done on a long-range basis rather than on an annual basis. This will give more stability to the professional development programs and will allow vocational teacher educators to become more responsive to the professional development needs of vocational educators.

Implications for Further Research

This section of the chapter deals with implications for research. These take the form of brief descriptions of related studies that could be undertaken to extend the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. This study assessed the perceptions of the vocational education personnel development coordinators toward the effectiveness of the funding pattern used. A parallel study could assess the perceptions of the vocational teacher educators toward the effectiveness of the funding pattern used.

2. Analyze and compare states to determine whether factors such as size, number of vocational teacher education institutions, economic base, population should be used in determining the funding pattern to be used.

Reflections

The reflections are not based totally on statistical data resulting from this study, but rather, are the author's interpretations and opinions concerning the issue of funding for vocational teacher education.

1. Competitive grants are becoming a more popular funding pattern used by state departments of education. One of the reasons for this may be due to the degree to which accountability is an important part of the educational system. Cost-effectiveness is a part of the accountability thrust and competitive grants seem to provide accountability as the funds are awarded via a very stringent, competitive procedure. The accomplishments achieved with the use of the funds can easily be pointed out. In addition, state departments of education are faced with fewer funds to provide more services to more people. As a result, priorities must be set and generally critical short-term needs are met first. These needs are usually met by special projects funded through a competitive grant procedure.

2. The number of vocational teacher educators employed by an institution was cited most frequently as the basis for awarding block grants. Many states include salary reimbursement as a part of the block grant funds. The general trend seems to be that states set aside a specific dollar amount for the vocational teacher education institutions in the form of block grants. The vocational teacher education institutions are then expected to submit a proposal to the state department of education describing how the funds will be used. The reimbursement of a portion of the salary of some of the teacher

educators is often included in the proposal. Another frequently cited factor forming the basis for awarding block grants was the specific objectives to be achieved. Again, due to the thrust toward educational accountability and cost-effectiveness, state departments of education have begun to lessen the flexibility that has been allowed in block grants in the past. Many states have begun to require that the block grant funds be used to accomplish specific objectives.

3. The findings show that vocational teacher educators are generally perceived to be dissatisfied with the funding pattern used. The reason most often cited for dissatisfaction was lack of sufficient funds. There is a trend developing in the educational system for agencies other than teacher education institutions to provide professional development programs and activities. This has probably caused a reduction in the amount of funds allocated to teacher education institutions.

4. Many states indicated that there are times when a specific vocational teacher education institution is asked to write a proposal for grant funds that would normally be available on a competitive basis. The reasoning behind this practice is that there is generally only one agency with the capability, facilities, personnel, and other qualifications needed to carry out the objectives of the project or activity.

5. There appears to be a trend to discontinue the salary reimbursement funding procedure. Any state with approved vocational

teacher education institutions from 1917 through 1963 probably used the salary reimbursement funding pattern. Today, only twelve states are using this funding pattern and it comprises only 16 percent of the funds used by all states in this study.

6. The fact that travel expenses was the most frequently cited factor for determining added costs for the cost sharing funding pattern could indicate an effort on the part of state departments of education to assist teacher educators in overcoming some of the institutional constraints they often encounter. Travel funds allow teacher educators to respond to the locally identified personnel development needs by enabling them to provide such training programs at the local level. Salaries were also frequently cited and the reason for this may be similar. Teacher educators are usually required to teach a certain number of classes each year. This class load does not make provisions for many teacher educators to provide training programs and inservice activities at the local level. Some state departments of education have paid the additional cost of the salaries of teacher educators who provide inservice activities at the local level.

7. Vocational teacher educators and state departments of education need to put aside individual differences and really work toward the development of a productive, complementary relationship that has as its main goal the preparation of quality personnel to serve the youth and adults in vocational programs.

8. Vocational teacher educators must be willing to look beyond funding as it is not a panacea. There are alternatives to

overcoming institutional constraints which do not impinge upon funding. There are ways to meet the needs of local educators and to maintain updated preservice programs which do not require funding.

9. Vocational teacher educators need to make a conscious effort to keep updated in the state wide program (and national) for vocational education. They must not allow their vision to become narrowed to their own discipline area, the two or three courses they teach or the special projects they are conducting. This will allow them to make useful input to state leaders of vocational education regarding various decisions that must be made including the most appropriate funding for vocational teacher education.

10. State department of education personnel must provide more opportunity for vocational teacher educators to make input and share in decision making.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

**VOCATIONAL
TEACHER
EDUCATION**

**a survey of funding patterns used
by state departments of education**

SURVEY

VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION FUNDING PATTERNS
USED BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

NAME OF STATE: _____

PHONE #: _____

PERSON COMPLETING FORM: _____
(name) (title)

PERCENT OF TIME SPENT ADMINISTERING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES? _____%

D I R E C T I O N S

This survey contains three parts.

Part I has been designed to obtain background information about professional development and vocational teacher education in your state.

Part II has been designed to obtain information about the funding pattern used and the criteria applied. All questions in this section pertain to those funds provided to vocational teacher education institutions which are allocated and administered by your state department of vocational-technical education.

Part III has been designed to obtain information about your perception of the effectiveness of the system used.

Please complete the attached survey by filling in or checking the most appropriate response.

Any additional information that more clearly describes the funding pattern used by your state will be most welcome. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (517) 373-8626.

After completing this survey, please return it in the self-addressed envelope to:

Linda S. Letwin, Consultant
Personnel Development Unit
Michigan Department of Education
Vocational-Technical Education Service
P.O. Box 30009
Lansing, Michigan 48909

PART I

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Vocational Teacher Education

1. What is the number of institutions of higher education offering vocational teacher education in your state?

Public _____ Non-public _____
2. Are funds allocated by your state department of education, office for vocational and technical education, to non-public institutions of higher education?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, is the process for funding public and non-public institutions offering vocational teacher education programs the same?

YES _____ NO _____
3. Approximately, how many vocational teacher educators (as defined by you) are there in your state?

Head Count _____ Full-Time Equivalent _____

Funding for Vocational Education Professional Development

4. What is your total state budget for vocational education?

5. Approximately, how many dollars are spent annually by your state department of education for all vocational education professional development activities? (check one)

a. <input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$100,000	d. <input type="checkbox"/> \$500,000 - \$700,000
b. <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,000 - \$300,000	e. <input type="checkbox"/> \$700,000 - \$1,000,000
c. <input type="checkbox"/> \$300,000 - \$500,000	f. <input type="checkbox"/> more than one million

6. Approximately what percent of the above (5) is:

- a. obtained from federal sources _____%
- b. obtained from state sources _____%
- c. obtained from other sources _____%
- d. allocated to vocational teacher education institutions _____%

7. Do all vocational teacher education institutions receive funding for professional development activities from the state department of education?

YES _____ NO _____

If NO, how many do? _____

8. What percent of the funds awarded to vocational teacher education institutions are for:

- a. pre-service (undergraduate programs) _____%
- b. in-service (graduate programs, state and local workshops) _____%

9. Do vocational teacher educators in your state conduct professional development activities with funds other than those allocated by the state department of education?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, what is the source of funds?

- a. ___ business & industry
- b. ___ local school districts
- c. ___ foundations
- d. ___ participants
- e. ___ don't know
- f. ___ other (please explain) _____

10. Does your State Plan for Vocational Education line item a designated amount of money (or %) specifically for vocational teacher education?

YES _____ NO _____

Priorities for Vocational Education Professional Development

11. In the past, how much importance has each of the following been given in determining funding priorities for professional development activities conducted by vocational teacher educators?

	<u>Great</u> <u>Impor-</u> <u>tance</u>		<u>Some</u> <u>Impor-</u> <u>tance</u>		<u>No</u> <u>Impor-</u> <u>tance</u>
a. Ideas proposed by teacher educators	5	4	3	2	1
b. Ideas proposed by local vocational education administrators	5	4	3	2	1
c. Needs ascertained by assessment of local vocational education personnel	5	4	3	2	1
d. Needs determined by state staff as a result of state/federal legislation or board of education policy	5	4	3	2	1
e. Current trends in vocational education (i.e. Competency Based Education)	5	4	3	2	1

12. Are the priorities established for professional development activities (to be conducted by vocational teacher education) included in your State Plan for Vocational Education?

YES _____ NO _____

13. How many individuals in your state department of education spend at least 75% of their time administering vocational education professional development projects, programs and activities (i.e. EPDA and others)?

PART II
FUNDING PATTERNS

A. BLOCK GRANTS

Definition - a set sum of money awarded annually to a vocational teacher education institution, for the purpose of conducting professional development activities which are considered additional to those expected as a part of the undergraduate or graduate vocational teacher education program.

1. Does your state department of education provide block grants to vocational teacher education institutions?

YES _____ NO _____

If NO, skip to B.

If YES -

- a. Does every institution of higher education offering vocational teacher training receive a block grant?

YES _____ NO _____

- b. Are block grants provided to non-public vocational teacher education institutions?

YES _____ NO _____

2. On what basis are the block grants awarded? (check all that are appropriate)

- a. ☐ each institution awarded the same dollar amount
- b. ☐ amount of grant varies according to number of vocational teacher educators on staff
- c. ☐ amount of grant varies according to number of vocational students enrolled
- d. ☐ amount of grant varies according to the number of vocational programs offered
- e. ☐ amount varies according to specific objectives to be achieved by each institution with the block funds
- f. ☐ amount varies if a graduate program is offered
- g. ☐ amount of grant varies depending on whether the institution is public or private
- h. ☐ amount of grant varies depending on previous year's performance
- i. ☐ other (please explain) _____

3. Block grants represent what percent of the total funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by your state department of education?

_____ %

B. SALARY REIMBURSEMENT

Definition - funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions (by state departments of education) for the expressed purpose of reimbursing all or a part of the salary of specified vocational teacher educators.

1. Are state institutions of higher education reimbursed to any extent for vocational teacher educators' salary?

YES _____ NO _____

If NO, skip to C.

If YES, on what basis is reimbursement made? (check one)

- a. ___ total salary is reimbursed
 b. ___ a percent of each teacher educator's salary is reimbursed
 (the percent is _____)
 c. ___ a flat rate is applied to all (the flat rate is _____)

2. Does the teacher educator have to possess a vocational teaching certificate to be eligible for salary reimbursement?

YES _____ NO _____

3. Are other criteria applied in determining eligibility for salary reimbursement?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, list criteria.

4. Do reimbursed vocational teacher educators have specified responsibilities to the state department of education?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, which of the following apply?

- a. ☐ consultation with local districts
 - b. ☐ consultation with state department of education
 - c. ☐ curriculum development
 - d. ☐ research
 - e. ☐ coordination of teacher education efforts at his/her institution
 - f. ☐ liaison between state office and his/her institution
 - g. ☐ in-service training
 - h. ☐ other (please explain) _____
- _____
- _____

5. Approximately, how many vocational teacher education positions do you reimburse annually?

6. Salary reimbursement represents what percent of the total funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by your state department of education?

_____ %

C. COMPETITIVE GRANTS

Definition - funds set aside for special projects or programs intended to accomplish specific objectives for which institutions are requested to submit proposals on a competitive basis.

1. Does your state solicit proposals from vocational teacher education institutions via Request for Proposals (RFP) or other means, for special vocational education projects?

YES _____ NO _____

If NO, skip to D.

If YES, can agencies other than vocational teacher education institutions compete for these projects?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, please check competing agencies.

- a. ☐ local school districts
 - b. ☐ private schools
 - c. ☐ private consulting or research agencies
 - d. ☐ business and/or industry
 - e. ☐ professional organizations
 - f. ☐ other (please describe) _____
-

2. Are there instances where proposals would only be solicited from teacher education institutions?

YES _____ NO _____

3. Are there instances when proposals would be assigned to or requested from a specific teacher education institution?

YES _____ NO _____

4. Competitive grants represent what percent of the total funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by your state department of education?

_____ %

D. COST SHARING

Definition - state departments of education provide vocational teacher education institutions with funds to support the added cost of conducting activities for vocational personnel in local education agencies. Added costs are usually defined as those direct costs incurred which are not covered by tuition generated from participants.

1. Does your state department of education provide funds to vocational teacher education institutions to support the added cost of activities conducted for local school vocational education personnel?

YES _____ NO _____

If NO, skip to E.

If YES, for which activities are added cost funds provided?

a. ☐ on-campus activities (courses, workshops, seminars, etc.)

b. ☐ off-campus activities (courses, workshops, seminars, and other services)

c. ☐ other (please explain) _____

2. Do your vocational teacher education institutions offer credit to local educators participating in the workshops/programs/courses offered (off-campus)?

YES _____ NO _____

3. Are priorities established for cost sharing activities?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, who establishes the priorities?

4. Are specific criteria applied to those activities which are eligible for cost sharing?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, what are the criteria?

5. On what basis are added costs determined? (check all that are appropriate)

a. ☐ direct costs
 b. ☐ direct and indirect costs
 c. ☐ costs not covered by tuition of participants
 d. ☐ travel expenses
 e. ☐ salaries
 f. ☐ supplies
 g. ☐ other (please explain) _____

6. Does your state department of education guarantee your vocational teacher education institutions a minimum amount annually for cost sharing?

YES _____ NO _____

7. Cost sharing represents what percent of the total funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by your state department of education?

_____ %

E. OTHER FUNDING PATTERNS

1. Does your state use a funding pattern other than those examined above to direct monies to teacher education institutions for vocational education personnel development activities?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, please describe.

2. This funding pattern represents what percent of the total funds allocated to vocational teacher education institutions by your state department of education?

_____ %

PART III

FUNDING PATTERN EFFECTIVENESS

1. How effective do you feel the funding pattern used by your state is in regard to: (circle appropriate response)

	<u>Very Effective</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Not Effective</u>
a. ease of administration.	5	4	3	2	1
b. meeting local staff needs for professional development.	5	4	3	2	1
c. meeting state department of education identified professional development priorities.	5	4	3	2	1
d. keeping teacher education involved in the total vocational education program at both the state and local levels.	5	4	3	2	1
e. maintaining updated pre-service programs.	5	4	3	2	1
f. providing consultative expertise to state department of education staff.	5	4	3	2	1
g. creating and maintaining a cooperative relationship among vocational teacher education institutions.	5	4	3	2	1
h. providing leadership to state department and local vocational educators.	5	4	3	2	1
i. promoting cooperation among the discipline or service areas within each vocational teacher education institution.	5	4	3	2	1
j. providing effective vocational teachers for schools.	5	4	3	2	1
k. carrying out the objectives of the State Plan for Vocational Education.	5	4	3	2	1

2. Do you feel the vocational teacher educators in your state are satisfied with the funding pattern used?

YES _____ NO _____

If NO, what are some of the reasons for dissatisfaction?
(check all that are appropriate)

- a. ☐ too much programmatic state control
- b. ☐ too much fiscal state control
- c. ☐ not enough state control
- d. ☐ insufficient funds
- e. ☐ inflexibility of procedures
- f. ☐ unfair allocation of funds
- g. ☐ lack of participation by teacher educators in setting priorities
- h. ☐ lack of long-range planning on part of teacher educators
- i. ☐ other (please explain) _____

3. Has the funding pattern you are currently using been changed recently (since 1975)?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, briefly describe previous funding pattern.

What were the reasons for changing?

4. Do you think the funding pattern in your state needs to be changed?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES, why?

5. Do you feel the point of view you have expressed regarding the effectiveness of the funding pattern used by your state is in agreement with those individuals possessing the authority to change the pattern?

YES _____ NO _____

THANKS AGAIN FOR
YOUR TIME. PLEASE
RETURN TO: Ms. LINDA LETWIN
CONSULTANT
PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT UNIT
MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION SERVICE
P.O. Box 30009
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909

APPENDIX B

THE COVER LETTER



JOHN W. PORTER
Superintendent of
Public Instruction

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Vocational-Technical Education Service

Box 30009 Lansing, Michigan 48909

November 14, 1977

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
BARBARA DUMOUCHELLE
DR. PAUL B. HENRY
BARBARA ROBERTS MASON
ANNETTA MILLER
DR. GUMECINDO SALAS
NORMAN OTTO STOCKMEYER, SR.
EDMUND F. VANDETTE
JOHN WATANEN, JR.
GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN
Ex-Officio

Dear VEPD Coordinator:

Greetings from Michigan! I hope the new fiscal year is off to a good start for you. Professional development is growing in Michigan. We have made significant strides in this respect and each day shows new signs of improvement. I hope things are progressing equally well for you.

One of the areas we are currently studying deals with patterns of funding for vocational teacher education. It is in this regard that I would like to request your assistance. It will only take a small amount of your time, but will be of invaluable assistance in at least two respects. First, those of us in Michigan are in the process of re-thinking the existing procedures for funding vocational teacher education. Second, in connection with this task, I am studying vocational teacher education funding patterns used by other state departments of education as a dissertation topic. For this study, I am surveying vocational education personnel development coordinators employed by state departments of education. Thus, the information you can provide by completing the attached survey is critical to the successful completion of the project.

There are a variety of patterns and approaches used by states to provide funds to their vocational teacher education institutions. Hopefully, I will be able to delineate these from your responses. I should emphasize however, that *this survey is only concerned with those funds provided to teacher education institutions that are directly administered by your state office for vocational and technical education.* It is the purpose of this study to review the funding patterns used by each state, the criteria applied to each, and to determine the degree to which the funding pattern is felt to be effective.

Specific directions are on the front page of the survey and an envelope has been prepared for your convenience. At the completion of the study, it is my intent to provide each participant in the study with a brief summary of the findings. I am sure this will be helpful to you in your efforts.

I am looking forward to receiving your early reply.

Sincerely,

Linda Letwin, Consultant
Personnel Development Unit

LL:skv

Enclosures



1

APPENDIX C

STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

Arizona	Nebraska
Arkansas	Nevada
California	New Hampshire
Colorado	New Jersey
Connecticut	New Mexico
Delaware	North Dakota
Florida	Ohio
Georgia	Oklahoma
Hawaii	Oregon
Idaho	Pennsylvania
Illinois	Rhode Island
Indiana	South Carolina
Iowa	South Dakota
Kentucky	Tennessee
Louisiana	Texas
Maryland	Utah
Massachusetts	Virginia
Michigan	Washington
Minnesota	Wisconsin
Mississippi	Wyoming
Missouri	Washington D.C.
Montana	

APPENDIX D

WRITTEN COMMENTS PROVIDED BY STATE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT COORDINATORS REGARDING THE
NEED FOR CHANGE IN FUNDING PATTERN

WRITTEN COMMENTS PROVIDED BY STATE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT COORDINATORS REGARDING THE
NEED FOR CHANGE IN FUNDING PATTERN

There is inequity in the support that occupational areas receive. For instance, agriculture and home economics each receive more funds than trade and industry but trade and industry has more programs and less professional training on the part of their beginning teachers.

A defensible rationale is needed for the block grant portion. A purchase-of-services/accountability approach has been proposed.

Policies and procedures should be reexamined. Programs and support services are not always based upon need. Roles and responsibilities of the Department of Education, districts, and universities should be further clarified and coordinated.

As growth takes place funding "control" must leave the State Director's Office and become less political in nature and become more objective.

We need to move to a system for more accountability within a plan for personnel development.

Current law drastically cuts funds available for professional development activities.

There is a need for a better description of activities to be performed by teacher educators. Also, there needs to be a budget breakdown as to how money will be spent for each activity. This will help cut the "fat" from our Memorandums of Agreements.

Double Funding - Not meeting (the unknown) needs of vocational teachers.

There is a need for greater articulation and participation by teacher educators with LEA staff. Immediate and long-range planning is needed as well as the definite commitment to allocation of funds to meet these objectives. There is no consistency to the present pattern.

Needs to be more cost effective. Need to assist vocational teacher education in meeting the inservice needs at the local level.

Our present funding is on an annual basis. We need at least 3 years to maintain any continuity of contracts. We presently loose a lot of good people.

Needs are not adequately met. Expenditures seem to be poor value in cost effectiveness.

Just improve the process of joint priority/project determining.

To provide needed services to teachers.

More consideration for needs of teachers.

Greater amount needed for inservice.

More administrative control from State Director for Vocational Education - inservice training.

It is inefficient in terms of input/output. Would like to consider putting teacher education on a competitive basis. Developing a detailed set of specifications of services desired and let a contract for 3-5 years, renewable on basis of fulfilling predetermined performance standards. However, there would be a price to pay for such a change. Possible fracturing of unity and commitment of total teacher education staff to state vocational education program.

State institutions should justify and secure funding for vocational teacher education from the General assembly - as a part of the total institutional appropriation. Department of Education vocational dollars would no longer be used to support the basic program. These monies could then be allocated by contract for specific programs, services or activities which are above and beyond the basic program.

Need to go on a Cost Sharing funding pattern basis (state board for vocational education providing vocational teacher education institutions with funds to support the added cost of conducting activities for vocational personnel in local education agencies) by FY 80.

With the new legislation, changes will have to be made to be in line with State Plans. Specific details will have to be addressed.

Ability to allocate dollars on basis of performance is limited.

Percent of salary reimbursement leaves much to be desired (credit courses - 15% and LEA activity - 100% and conditional certification effort). Without EPDA 553 funds for specific objectives, we will need to allocate funds for these types of projects.

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF SELECTED BACKGROUND DATA BY STATES

SUMMARY OF SELECTED BACKGROUND DATA BY STATES

The data in Table E-1 summarized four variables of the study. It identified the funding pattern, the number of public and non-public teacher education institutions, the number of individuals employed by the state department of education to administer professional development and the amount of funds spent for professional development by each state.

Except for Nevada, all states that employed more than one individual to administer professional development programs and activities spent \$500,000 or more annually. Those states with three or fewer public vocational teacher education institutions generally spent less than \$500,000 annually for professional development.

The data in Table E-1 revealed no trend regarding the number of vocational teacher education institutions and the funding pattern(s) used. There also was no evident trend relating the number of individuals employed to administer professional development activities and the funding pattern(s) used.

TABLE E-1.--A Summary by States of Funding Patterns, Number of Vocational Teacher Education Institutions, Number of Individuals Administering Professional Development and Amount of Funds Spent for Professional Development

State	Funding Pattern*					Vocational Teacher Education Institutions		Individuals Administering Professional Development		Dollars Spent for Professional Development	
	BG	CG	CS	SR	O	Public	Nonpublic				
Arizona	X					3	1	1		\$ 500,000 -	\$ 700,000
Arkansas	x			x		5	3	1		\$ 500,000 -	\$ 700,000
California	X					24	--	1		\$ 700,000 -	\$1,000,000
Colorado	X					2	--	1		\$1,000,000 +	
Connecticut	X		X	X		2	3	1		\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
Delaware	X					3	0	1		\$ 0 -	\$ 100,000
Florida	X		X	X		9	--	3		\$1,000,000 +	
Georgia	X		X			6	2	1		\$ 700,000 -	\$1,000,000
Hawaii	X		X	X		1	1	1		\$ 100,000 -	\$ 300,000
Idaho	X					3	1	1		\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
Illinois	X				X	8	0	3		\$1,000,000 +	
Indiana	X		X	X		4	5	1		\$ 500,000 -	\$ 700,000
Iowa			X			3	0	1		\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
Kentucky	X		X			8	0	3		\$ 500,000 -	\$ 700,000
Louisiana	X		X	X		5	0	1		\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
Maryland	X		X			4	3	1		\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
Massachusetts	X		X			5	2	1		\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
Michigan	X		X			9	8	2		\$ 700,000 -	\$1,000,000
Minnesota			X		X	7	--	1		\$ 100,000 -	\$1,000,000
Mississippi	X		X			8	1	1		\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
Missouri	X			X		9	1	2		\$ 700,000 -	\$1,000,000
Montana					X	3	0	1		\$ 0 -	\$ 100,000
Nebraska	X					6	2	1		\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
Nevada	X		X	X		2	0	4		\$ 100,000 -	\$ 300,000

TABLE E-1.--Continued.

State	Funding Pattern*				Vocational Teacher Education Institutions		Individuals Administering Professional Development		Dollars Spent for Professional Development	
	BG	CG	CS	SR	0	Public	Nonpublic			
New Hampshire	X	X	X			3	4	1	\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
New Jersey	X	X				6	3	1	\$ 500,000 -	\$ 700,000
New Mexico		X	X			4	0	1	\$ 100,000 -	\$ 300,000
North Dakota				X		7	--	1	\$ 100,000 -	\$ 300,000
Ohio		X	X	X		12	3	1	\$1,000,000 +	
Oklahoma	X	X	X			5	0	1	\$ 700,000 -	\$1,000,000
Oregon		X	X			4	--	1	\$ 500,000 -	\$ 700,000
Pennsylvania	X	X	X			8	18	1	\$1,000,000 +	
Rhode Island		X	X			2	2	1	\$ 0 -	\$ 100,000
South Carolina	X					5	0	1	\$ 300,000 -	\$ 500,000
South Dakota	X	X	X			3	0	1	\$ 0 -	\$ 100,000
Tennessee					X	8	1	1	\$ 100,000 -	\$ 300,000
Texas		X	X	X		24	5	2	\$1,000,000 +	
Utah				X		4	1	1	\$ 500,000 -	\$ 700,000
Virginia		X		X		9	5	1	\$1,000,000 +	
Washington					X	6	0	3	\$ 500,000 -	\$ 700,000
Wisconsin					X	12	1	1	\$ 100,000 -	\$ 300,000
Wyoming	X	X				1	0	1	\$ 0 -	\$ 100,000
Washington, D.C.		X				1	0	1	\$ 0 -	\$ 100,000

N = 43

*BC = Block Grants; CG = Competitive Grants; CS = Cost Sharing; SR = Salary Reimbursement; 0 = Other

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Good, Carter V., ed. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
- Hawkins, Layton S.; Prosser, Charles A.; and Wright, John C. Development of Vocational Education. Chicago: American Technical Society, 1951.
- Nie, Norman H.; Hull, C. Hadlai; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin; and Bent, Dale H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Van Dalen, Deobold B., and Meyer, William J. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Journal and Newsletter Articles

- Binkley, Harold. "Statements Made at Congressional Oversight Hearings on Federal Legislation Effecting Vocational Education." American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture 15 (March 1976): 2-5.
- Brandon, George. "Preparation of Professional Personnel for Vocational Education." American Vocational Journal 44 (April 1969): 33-49.
- Hunter, Madaline. "Teacher Competency: Problem, Theory, and Practice." Theory Into Practice 15 (April 1976): 162-171.
- Jacobson, Robert. "Colleges Say Their Short-Changed on Vocational Education Funds." The Chronicle of Higher Education (October 3, 1977): 11.
- Miller, Melvin. "A State Model for Vocational Inservice Education." Theory Into Practice 14 (February 1975): 52-58.
- Moss, Jerry, Jr. "Financing and Managing In-service Teacher Education at the University of Minnesota." Journal of Industrial Teacher Education 14 (Fall 1976): 5-10.

"Report to National Council of States on Inservice Education."
Inservice, National Council of States on Inservice Education
 (September 1977): 3.

Van Ryn, Mike, and Santelli, Charles. "Financing Inservice Education
 --A Dialogue." Inservice, National Council of States on
Inservice Education (March 1977): 6-7.

Documents, Reports, and Studies

Carroll, Adger G., and Ihnen, Loren A. Costs and Returns for Invest-
ments in Technical Schooling by a Group of North Carolina
High School Graduates. Economics Research Report No. 5.
 Raleigh, N. C.: Department of Economics, North Carolina
 State University, December 1967.

Defining Critical Terms in Vocational Education. Charleston, W. V.:
 West Virginia Department of Education, Task Force Report of
 the National Association of State Directors of Vocational
 Education, 1976.

Definition of Terms Used in Vocational and Practical Arts Education.
 Washington, D.C.: American Vocation Association, 1964.

Dueker, Richard L., and Altman, James W. An Analysis of Cost and
Performance Factors in the Operation and Administration of
Vocational Programs in Secondary Schools. Pittsburgh, Pa.:
 American Institutes for Research (VT 005 598), October 1967.

Five-Year Goals and Objectives for Pennsylvania Vocational Education
Professional Personnel Development Programs. Harrisburg,
 Pa.: Pennsylvania Vocational Teacher Education Advisory
 Committee, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1974.

Fuller, Edgar, and Pearson, Jim. Education in the States: Nation-
wide Development Since 1900. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office
 of Education, 1969.

Kaufman, Jacob J.; Hu, Teh-wei; Lee, Maw Lin; and Stromsdorfer,
 Ernst W. A Cost-Effectiveness Study of Vocational Education.
Final Report, Project No. OE 512, U. S. Office of Education.
 University Park, Pa.: Institute for Research on Human
 Resources, The Pennsylvania State University, October 1968.

Kraft, Richard H. P. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Vocational-
Technical Education Programs. Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida
 State Department of Education (VT 009 690), 1969.

- Mangum, Garth L. Contributions and Costs of Manpower Development and Training. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan (VT 000 465), December 1967.
- McDonald, Frederick. Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, Phase II. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.
- Stallings, Jane, and Kaskowitz, David. Follow Through Classroom Observation Evaluation 1972-73. Menlow Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1974.
- State Plan for Professional Development of School Staffs. Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Department of Education, 1977.
- Struck, John. A Position Paper and Proposal on Vocational Teacher Education in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Education, October 1972.
- Swatt, Kenneth. State of the Art Regarding Funding of Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development Programs in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Education, March 1976.
- U. S. Congress. Educational Amendments of 1976. Public Law 92-482, 94th Congress, 1st session, 1976.
- U. S. Congress. Vocational Education Act of 1963. Public Law 88-210, 88th Congress, 1st session, 1963.
- U. S. Congress. Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. Public Law 90-576, 90th Congress, 1st session, 1968.
- Vocational Education in Michigan. Lansing, Mich.: The Final Report of the Michigan Vocational Evaluation Project. Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Department of Education, 1963.

Unpublished Materials

- Dupree, Robert L. "A Cost-Benefit Study of Post-High School Technical Education in Oklahoma." M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, May 1968. (ED 026 488)
- Schaefer, Carl, and Moss, Jerry Jr. "The Role of Universities in Vocational Education." Policy Statement Developed by the University Council on Vocational Education. Revised August, 1977.

Stallings, Jane. "What Teachers Do Does Make a Difference: Implications of Correlational Findings for Inservice Teacher Training Programs." Paper presented to National Commission on Performance-Based Education, Washington, D.C., September 8, 1976.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293100657869