

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Mansfield, Jack Allen

THE ACTUAL AND DESIRED ACTIVITIES OF THE SECONDARY
SPECIALIZED OCCUPATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN MICHIGAN

Michigan State University

PH.D. 1982

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE ACTUAL AND DESIRED ACTIVITIES OF THE
SECONDARY SPECIALIZED OCCUPATIONAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN MICHIGAN

By

Jack Allen Mansfield

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Curriculum

1982

ABSTRACT

THE ACTUAL AND DESIRED ACTIVITIES OF THE SECONDARY SPECIALIZED OCCUPATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN MICHIGAN

By

Jack Allen Mansfield

This descriptive study was an investigation to determine the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as viewed by selected secondary-level vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. The objectives of the study were to:

1. Determine the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.
2. Identify any significant relationships in the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as viewed by secondary-level vocational teachers and vocational administrators.
3. Provide a composite list of the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan with respect to selected activities.

The data for the study were collected through the use of a questionnaire that was mailed to 507 participants. The population included 10 percent of all secondary-level vocational teachers, all

area center principals, and all local vocational directors in Michigan. The questionnaire contained 40 advisory-committee activities that could be performed by the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee under eight general-functions headings. An overall response rate of 73 percent was achieved.

Responses to each activity on the questionnaire were analyzed for all groups individually and collectively, with the frequency and percentage being shown for each activity. The highest ten and lowest ten actual and desired activities in each respondent group were selected to be presented in both narrative and table form. Selection was based on the highest and lowest percentage of the total population who strongly agreed with the advisory-committee activity.

Included in the study was a composite list of the actual and desired activities, with rankings of the 40 activities for the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this study was dependent on the assistance and cooperation of many people. The writer is deeply indebted to his wife, Lorene, for her assistance, encouragement, understanding, and patience, and to his children, Betsy and Carol, who sacrificed many hours of fatherly companionship.

The writer wishes to extend his sincere thanks to Professor George Ferns, who, as Committee Chairman, provided the necessary encouragement and guidance to enable the author to complete the study. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Melvin Bushman, Dr. Cas Heilman, and Dr. Robert Poland, who, as members of the Guidance Committee, provided encouragement and professional advice.

Also, the writer wishes to thank Dr. Leslie H. Cochran, who provided resource materials and encouraged the writer to undertake the study.

Finally, the writer wishes to extend his thanks to the many secondary-level vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors who took the time to complete the questionnaire that provided the data base for this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
I. BACKGROUND AND GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Study	2
Statement of the Problem	3
Need for the Study	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Objectives and Questions	6
Objectives	6
Questions	6
Methodology	7
Assumptions	8
Delimitations of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	9
Summary and Overview	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
Introduction	13
History of Vocational Advisory Committees	13
Pertinent Related Literature	16
Summary	20
III. METHODOLOGY	22
Introduction	22
The Population	23
Preparation of the Questionnaire	24
Data Collection	27
Methods of Analyses	28
Summary	29
IV. ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA	32
Introduction	32
Descriptive Characteristics of Respondents	32

	Page
Professional Work Experience	32
Levels of Formal Education	33
Experience With Advisory Committees	35
Formal Advisory Committee Training	35
Research Questions	36
Research Question 1	37
Research Question 2	44
Research Question 3	50
Research Question 4	58
Summary of Chapter IV	65
Comparison Rankings for Secondary-Level Vocational Teachers and Administrators	65
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	69
Introduction	69
Summary	69
Research Objectives and Questions	70
Findings	72
Research Question 1	72
Research Question 2	74
Research Question 3	75
Research Question 4	77
Conclusions	79
Recommendations and Implications	81
APPENDICES	83
A. SELECTED EXPERTS IN VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION . . .	84
B. LETTER TO SELECTED EXPERTS	86
C. QUESTIONNAIRE	88
D. LETTER TO RESPONDENTS	93
E. FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO NONRESPONDENTS	95
F. ACTUAL SECONDARY SPECIALIZED OCCUPATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES	97
G. DESIRED SECONDARY SPECIALIZED OCCUPATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES	112
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	127

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1. Local Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, and Local Vocational Directors Forming the Population for the Study	28
4.1. Professional Work Experience of Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, and Local Vocational Directors .	33
4.2. Level of Formal Education Attained by Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, and Local Vocational Directors	34
4.3. Years of Experience in Working With Advisory Committees for Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, and Local Vocational Directors	35
4.4. Formal Training Preparing Respondents to Work With Vocational Advisory Committees	36
4.5. The Highest Ten Actual Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee as Viewed by Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, and Local Vocational Directors	38
4.6. The Lowest Ten Actual Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee as Viewed by Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, and Local Vocational Directors	41
4.7. The Highest Ten Desired Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee as Viewed by Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, and Local Vocational Directors	45
4.8. The Lowest Ten Desired Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee as Viewed by Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, and Local Vocational Directors	48
4.9. The Highest Ten Actual Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee as Viewed by Vocational Administrators With Comparison Responses From Vocational Teachers	51

	Page
4.10. The Lowest Ten Actual Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee as Viewed by Vocational Administrators With Comparison Responses From Vocational Teachers	55
4.11. The Highest Ten Desired Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee as Viewed by Vocational Administrators With Comparison Responses From Vocational Teachers	59
4.12. The Lowest Ten Desired Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee as Viewed by Vocational Administrators With Comparison Responses From Vocational Teachers	63
4.13. Rankings of the Actual and Desired Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee in Michigan as Viewed by Vocational Administrators With Comparison Rankings of Vocational Teachers	66
F.1. The Actual Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee in Michigan as Perceived by Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, Local Vocational Directors, and Vocational Administrators	98
F.2. The Desired Activities of the Secondary Specialized Occupational Advisory Committee in Michigan as Perceived by Vocational Teachers, Area Center Principals, Local Vocational Directors, and Vocational Administrators	113

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Since the early years of vocational education, the need and importance for occupational advisory committees has been cited as an integral aspect of an effective vocational program. Even though some programs have experienced varying degrees of success without their use, programs have typically experienced broader support and effectiveness with the initiation and use of an advisory committee.

The impetus for quality vocational-technical education and for the use of occupational advisory committees can be located in the Federal Rules and Regulations governing the use of funds allocated to states under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482 (U.S. Congress, Public Law 94-482). Moving toward the achievement of quality vocational-technical education programs in Michigan, the Michigan Department of Education's Vocational-Technical Education Service developed Program Standards of Quality, which are intended to be accomplished during a normal school year beginning in September and concluding in June. There are five distinct standards in the Program Standards of Quality, including advisory councils, competency-based education, annual and long-range planning, vocational-technical placement and follow-up activities, and administrative regulations

(Michigan Vocational-Technical Education Service, 1978). This study examined the first standard only--advisory councils.

Background of the Study

The Education Amendments of 1976 mandated that a local education agency or postsecondary institution that receives federal funds "shall establish a local advisory council on vocational education." The local advisory council shall be composed of representatives of business, industry, and labor. The local advisory council must also have "an appropriate representation of both sexes and an appropriate representation of the racial and ethnic minorities found in the program areas, schools, community, or region which the local advisory council serves."

For the first time, local advisory committees were required by federal law for those districts receiving assistance under these amendments. The specific language in respect to local advisory committees in the Act was as follows:

1. Each eligible recipient receiving assistance under this Act to operate vocational education programs shall establish a local advisory council to provide such agency with advice on current job needs and on the relevance of courses being offered by such agency in meeting such needs. Such local advisory councils shall be composed of members of the general public, especially of representatives of business, industry, and labor, and such local advisory councils may be established for program areas, schools, communities, or regions, whichever the recipient determines best to meet the needs of that recipient.
2. Each State Board shall notify eligible recipients within the State of the responsibilities of such recipients under the provisions of paragraph (1.), and each State advisory council shall make available to such recipients and the local advisory councils of such recipients such technical assistance as such recipients may request to establish and operate such councils.

According to Cochran, Phelps, and Cochran (1980),

Experience reveals that advisory committees are often dysfunctional and do not accomplish the purposes for which they were established due to the following reasons: (1) many administrators do not recognize the value of an active functioning advisory committee, (2) most educators do not have time nor the expertise to communicate with advisory committees, (3) a large number of educators do not possess the ability adequately to fulfill leadership roles regarding the development and utilization of advisory committees, (4) members of advisory committees do not understand their function in the development of educational programs, and (5) both teachers and administrators are unfamiliar with their role and responsibility on an advisory committee.

Statement of the Problem

Although at least one comprehensive needs assessment on the use of vocational advisory committees in Michigan has been carried out (Cochran, Phelps, Skupin, & Yabu, 1974), research suggested that, to date, there has been no examination of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, particularly at the local level.

Recent legislation (U.S. Congress, Public Law 94-482, 1976) requires the use of local advisory committees for every recipient of federal funding for vocational education programs. Practical experience, research, and the demonstrated success of the effective use of vocational advisory committees have emphasized the important role of advisory committees in the vocational education program. This study examined the activities vocational educators believe the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee "are" and "should be" performing in the vocational education delivery process.

The problem was to conduct an investigation to determine the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as viewed by selected

secondary-level vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. This study measured the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, which could, in turn, be used by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors in determining the role the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee could play in the overall delivery system for vocational-technical education.

Need for the Study

At present, there has been no specific research completed concerning the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by vocational education teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. As a result, as mentioned earlier in this study, advisory committees are often dysfunctional and do not accomplish the purposes for which they were formed. The Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service, does provide examples of duties for local advisory councils in the Administrative Guide for Vocational Education in Michigan Handbook, but local school districts and area centers are free to interpret those examples in whatever manner they wish (MV-TES, 1978). This writer gathered, analyzed, and synthesized data concerning the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.

Purpose of the Study

Investigation by the researcher, including an ERIC search, concluded that there are no current data available concerning the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as viewed by selected vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. Through examination of these actual and desired activities, it will then be feasible for a local education agency, area skill center, or the Michigan Department of Education to assess to what extent these desired functions are, in fact, being effectively used.

The writer identified relationships between the actual and desired activities as they were viewed by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. This information revealed the relative intensity and priority with which these vocational activities were held by selected individuals.

This study should be of value to the Vocational-Technical Education Services of the Michigan Department of Education by providing a composite list of the activities associated with the major vocational functions of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee with respect to what selected vocational educators felt their actual role is and what it should be. The Vocational-Technical Education Service has recognized the importance of the secondary specialized

occupational advisory committees and specifically stated that local advisory councils be established and used (MV-TES, 1978).

It was anticipated that the findings of this study would assist local education agencies, area skill centers, and the Michigan Department of Education in fully understanding the role of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in relationship to vocational education in Michigan.

Research Objectives and Questions

Objectives

This study was structured to:

1. Determine the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.
2. Identify any significant relationships in the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as viewed by secondary-level vocational teachers and vocational administrators.
3. Provide composite lists of both the actual and desired activities of the specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.

Questions

The purpose of the study was realized by answering the following questions:

1. What are the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by

secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors?

2. What are the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors?

3. What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

4. What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

Methodology

Descriptive statistics were used to provide answers to questions related to the research questions concerning the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan. Responses to each item on the questionnaire were analyzed individually and collectively. The frequency and percentage were shown for each activity. For the first two research questions, the highest ten and lowest ten actual and desired activities were selected for presentation in both tabular and narrative form. Selection was based on the highest and lowest percentage of respondents who strongly agreed with the activity. For Research Questions

3 and 4, the highest ten and lowest ten responses of the vocational administrators were compared to the vocational teachers in both tabular and narrative form.

Assumptions

Five main assumptions were made in this study:

1. Given a list of selected activities for secondary specialized occupational advisory committees, vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors can identify the actual activities they believe are being performed by the committees.
2. Given a list of selected activities for secondary specialized occupational advisory committees, vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors can identify the desired activities they believe should be performed by the committee.
3. An acceptable degree of similarity exists between the perceived view of vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors regarding the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee to permit the use of the same questionnaire with each group.
4. The eight major functions and enabling 40 activities that should be performed by the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee have been accurately identified by the Michigan Department of Education.
5. Vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors are considered the vocational authorities in a position to identify the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.

Delimitations of the Study

The study and its findings are subject to the following delimitations:

1. The study was limited to vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational teachers in Michigan.
2. The study was limited to the eight major functions and 40 activities that could be performed by advisory committees for vocational programs in Michigan (Cochran, Phelps, & Skupin, 1974).
3. The study was limited to the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.
4. The findings of the study may not be generalized to other advisory groups that do not fit the definition of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as defined in this study.
5. The study was limited to the state of Michigan.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they are used in this study:

Advisory committee activity--The 40 activities identified as being necessary to perform the eight major functions that should be performed by advisory committees for vocational programs in Michigan as described in A Guide for the Effective Utilization of Advisory Committees (Cochran, Phelps, & Skupin, 1974).

Advisory committee function--The eight major functions that should be performed by advisory committees for vocational programs in Michigan as described in A Guide for Effective Utilization of Advisory Committees (Cochran, Phelps, & Skupin, 1974).

Area center principal--The principal administrator in a specialized secondary-level school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market (MV-TES, 1982, p. 3).

General vocational advisory committee--A group of individuals selected from the community or district to provide advice regarding the overall vocational education program (Cochran, 1976, p. 3).

Local vocational director--An individual who is employed by a local education agency and has direct responsibility for administering the vocational education programs.

Secondary specialized occupational advisory committee--A group of individuals selected from the community or district to provide advice regarding instructional programs in specific trades, occupations, or clusters of occupations (Cochran, 1976, p. 5).

Vocational education--Organized educational programs that are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment or for additional preparation for a career requiring other than baccalaureate or advanced degree (MV-TES, 1982, p. 7).

Summary and Overview

In this chapter, the researcher presented information regarding the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee. The Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service, dictates that all state-reimbursed vocational education programs must have advisory committees (MV-TES, 1974). The major

functions of the specialized occupational advisory committee have been provided by the state (Cochran, 1976).

Because vocational education enrollments in Michigan remain at a high level and because of the mandated use of advisory committees in vocational education programs in Michigan, the problem of this study was to determine the actual and desired activities of the specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by vocational directors. Although the advisory-committee functions have been provided by the State Department of Education, there has been no research completed concerning the actual and desired activities of the specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors.

In this study, four research questions were asked, which dealt with the actual and desired activities of secondary specialized occupational advisory committees as viewed by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. Basic assumptions were made regarding the use of the same questionnaire for all groups. Also, delimitations regarding the respondents who participated, the major activities of advisory committees, and the findings were made. Major terms used throughout the study were defined.

In the next chapter, Review of Related Literature, the researcher determines what has already been researched concerning this topic. The review of literature supplies information that more minutely and accurately describes the problem and helps to bring it into better focus.

In Chapter III, Methodology, the investigator presents the objectives and research questions to be studied. Methodology consists of the systematic procedures by which the researcher traveled from the initial identification of the problem to its final conclusions.

In Chapter IV, Analysis and Presentation of Data, descriptive statistics are used to present the data gathered by the investigator. The researcher presents in tabular and narrative form the data related to the descriptive characteristics of the respondents and the four research questions. These data are presented exactly as gathered by the investigator.

In Chapter V, the investigator presents (1) a summary of the problem, procedures, and findings of the study; (2) conclusions that were derived from the data; and (3) recommendations and implications based on the conclusions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In reviewing related literature, it was determined that no studies have been conducted or reported concerning the activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan. There have been, however, numerous studies regarding general vocational advisory committees, which address secondary and postsecondary vocational programs in total. Even though the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee is different from the general vocational advisory committee, enough similarity exists between the two types of committees to permit the review and presentation of related literature that pertains to the general vocational advisory committee.

There has been one comprehensive study on the vocational advisory committee in Michigan, Vocational Education Advisory Committees: Needs Assessments on the use of Vocational Advisory Committees in Michigan (Cochran, Phelps, Skupin, & Yabu, 1974). That study dealt specifically with the general vocational advisory committee and did not examine the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

History of Vocational Advisory Committees

Even though vocational advisory committees are not new, their use has expanded substantially in recent years. It has been estimated

(Burt, 1967) that some 20,000 new vocational advisory committees are organized each year by vocational and technical educators and schools in an effort to involve industry people in helping develop public-school occupational education programs. This growth has been more than a multiplying of numbers, for it has been accompanied by major changes in purpose, function, role, and emphasis.

Even though the need for and the value of vocational advisory committees were a part of the early philosophy of vocational education, in practice they tended to be used infrequently. The first federal legislation authorizing vocational advisory committees was the George-Deen Act (U.S. Congress, Public Law 74-673). The President of the United States, in signing the George-Deen Act in 1937, stated that he did so with some reluctance and indicated that he would appoint an advisory committee on vocational education to make a study of federal legislation related to vocational education and other matters (Roberts, 1971). The report also emphasized the need for funds for general education and suggested that federal appropriations for vocational education should not be increased until a relatively generous provision of federal funds for general education was made. The George-Deen Act also authorized, on a continuing basis, annual appropriation of approximately \$14 million for vocational education in agriculture, home economics, trades and industry, and, for the first time, distributive occupations (Craig, 1976).

Even though there was much legislation passed that funded vocational education, it was not until the social upheaval of the 1960s that the real need for public involvement in the educational

process began to appear in full force. In 1961, need for review and reevaluation of vocational education was made clear as President Kennedy formed the President's Panel of Consultants of Vocational Education. The report issuing from this panel (U.S. Office of Education, 1963) and a subsequent report (Vocational Education, 1968) from the National Advisory Council of Vocational Education provided the framework for the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. These two pieces of legislation broadened the concept of vocational education to include the preparation and training in a variety of diverse occupations and developed special programs to meet the occupational needs of academically, economically, or otherwise disadvantaged persons.

The 1968 Amendments established two major benchmarks (Cochran, Phelps, & Cochran, 1980) in the evolution of advisory committees. First, it provided for a permanent National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, which has subsequently had an effect on legislation, and had numerous cogent reports recommending improvements for vocational education. Second, it mandated the creation of state advisory councils as a condition for receiving funds. As a result, many states reemphasized the use of advisory committees at the local level. The Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service, stated (MV-TES, 1977) that each eligible recipient (that is, each local educational agency or educational institution that receives state or federal assistance for vocational-technical education programs) shall establish local advisory councils on vocational education.

The specific language in respect to local advisory committees in the Education Amendments of 1976 (U.S. Congress, Public Law 94-482) states the following:

Sec. 105 (g) (1) Each eligible recipient receiving assistance under this Act to operate vocational education programs shall establish a local advisory council to provide such agency with advice on current job needs and on the relevancy of courses being offered by such agency in meeting such needs. Such local advisory councils shall be composed of members of the general public, especially of representatives of business, industry, and labor, and such local advisory councils may be established for program areas, schools, communities, or regions, whichever the recipient determines best to meet the needs of that recipient.

(2) Each State board shall notify eligible recipients within the State of the responsibilities of such recipients under the provisions of paragraph (1), and each State advisory council shall make available to such recipients and the local advisory councils of such recipients such technical assistance as such recipients may request to establish and operate such councils.

Pertinent Related Literature

Even though vocational advisory committees were not required by law until 1968, most experts in vocational education have agreed that these committees have been beneficial to vocational education. Mason and Haines (1965) stated that all programs using the work environment to provide vocational experiences need vocational advisory committees to help provide direction and make best use of resources. They felt that the organized and intelligent use of advisory groups was a vital factor in stimulating community participation, which resulted in better understanding of the vocational education programs and their contributions and in better service to the community. Dunham, Simmons, Whitten, Harris, and Gentry (1978) further stated that vocational advisory groups are essential to vocational education,

among other reasons because of the dynamic changes taking place in the nation's occupational structure.

Since the schools exist for the purpose of meeting the needs of the community, including its industries, employers, and employees, it is logical that communication among these elements of the community be continuous and direct. Such a relationship provides a justification for the educational program in the community. Furthermore, leaders in all parts of government, business, and industry call upon experts to assist them in formulating policies and procedures. It is only reasonable that vocational educators avail themselves of advisory personnel from that segment of society that employs the work force (Dunham et al., 1978).

Burt (1967) viewed the effectiveness of the involvement and participation of industrial representatives as the determinant of the effectiveness of the occupational program for developing manpower resources. In meeting the manpower needs of the community, effective use of an advisory committee is essential. No number of educational administrators can accomplish the advantages gained by the use of an advisory committee. Bull (1973) pointed out that laymen "will talk and they will evaluate, whether they are informed or not" (pp. 28-29); therefore, local vocational education advisory committee members should be involved since the educational process benefits from both the public support and involvement and input lay people offer.

Two major types of advisory committees are commonly associated with vocational education programs at the local level. These are the general vocational education advisory committee, which is used for the

total vocational program, and the specialized occupational advisory committee, which is used to guide each individual occupational program. The Michigan Department of Education, in the Key Concepts in Vocational Education (Cochran, 1976), defined the general vocational advisory committee as:

a group of individuals selected from the community or district to provide advice regarding the overall vocational education program. The committee is concerned with problems of the development and evaluation of overall vocational curriculum. The committee meets periodically to review the vocational education programs being offered and to advise on directions and priorities. Usually, this committee is concerned with programs pertaining to the development and evaluation of the overall vocational program. (p. 3)

The specialized occupational advisory committee, on the other hand, was defined as:

a group of individuals selected from the community or district to provide advice regarding instructional programs in specific trades, occupations, or clusters of occupations. While sometimes called lay advisory committees, craft advisory committees, or joint apprenticeship committees, the occupational advisory committee should be formed for each vocational program. For example, there should be specialized committees for vocational agriculture, data processing, horticulture, distributive education, marketing mid-management, health related occupations, and others. (p. 5)

Even though there is little disagreement regarding the importance of vocational advisory committees, there is concern for what vocational advisory committees are and should be doing in their present capacity. The Michigan Department of Education published A Guide for the Effective Utilization of Advisory Committees (Cochran, 1974), which described the eight major functions that should be performed by vocational advisory committees in Michigan as:

1. Occupational/Community Surveys. Surveys which measure employment opportunities, cooperative work stations, student interest, parent interest, and labor supply can provide solid justification for offering a program. Occupational analysis can identify what should be included in the program. Advisory committees can play a major role in the planning and analysis of surveys which attempt to define program needs and content.
2. Course Content Advisement. A primary concern of the advisory committee is the establishment of practices which will keep the instructional program practical and functional. The committee can engage in planning or research activities which focus on improving course content.
3. Student Placement. This is an important function which frequently is used as a measure of success of the vocational program. The advisory committee can become involved in activities in this area ranging from reviewing follow-up studies to actually employing co-op students and graduates.
4. Community Public Relations. This is a critical function which serves to develop community awareness as well as being the stimulus which interests other individuals in vocational education. This activity should provide continuous communication between the program and the community and helps citizens appreciate the effectiveness of their vocational program.
5. Equipment and Facilities. Obsolescence of equipment and facilities is a continuing problem for all vocational programs. The committee can be of significant assistance in helping to secure equipment, making recommendations, and finding solutions to alleviate problems related to facilities.
6. Program Staffing. This function provides an opportunity for committee involvement in reviewing teacher selection criteria, suggesting recruitment policy, and screening potential candidates. Administrative care must be demonstrated in this area to ensure that committee responsibilities are clearly defined.
7. Program Review. This is one of the most common areas of advisory committee action. Its input, however, is only one of many sources that can be utilized as a part of program evaluation. The entire range of activities encompassed by the program may come under review by the advisory committee. These may range from comparing student accomplishments with program objectives to individual review of various parts of the program.
8. Community Resources. Identifying community resources is another common advisory committee function. Typical activities in this area include providing advice for field trips, assisting in

obtaining instructional materials, identifying personnel and serving personally as a community resource.

In 1974, a needs assessment was conducted (Cochran, Phelps, Skupin, & Yabu, 1974) pertaining to the preceding eight major functions to determine how a wide sample of secondary and postsecondary vocational directors, community college occupational deans, school superintendents, and community college presidents perceived the use of the general vocational education advisory committee in Michigan. After a careful analysis of that needs assessment, a comprehensive ERIC search, and a review of related literature, it was found that there was no study or research available that specifically addressed the role of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as it relates to the eight functions identified by the Michigan Department of Education as perceived by local vocational directors, area center principals, and selected secondary vocational teachers in Michigan. This study fills that void and should provide these three groups and the Michigan Department of Education with the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.

Summary

In reviewing the related literature, it was found that the need for the vocational advisory committee is far too great for them to be dismissed as existing only because they are required by federal law. Vocational programs are in a unique position because their success is openly dependent on the degree to which the needs and requirements of the community, as well as the needs and interests of

the students, are met. Programs must be attuned to what the community, the employers, and the general public want. The community, in turn, has a shared responsibility to ensure that these goals are accomplished. The advisory committee thus serves as a vehicle for educators to gain public support and understanding while at the same time providing a framework for sharing in the educational partnership essential for the viability and effectiveness of the program.

It was also found in the related literature review that there have been numerous studies regarding the general vocational advisory committee at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. It was discovered, however, that no studies have been conducted or reported concerning the activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan. There has been one comprehensive study on the vocational advisory committee in Michigan (Cochran, Phelps, Skupin, & Yabu, 1974), but that study dealt specifically with the general vocational advisory committee and did not examine the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

This study was intended to assist secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, local vocational directors, and the Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service, by providing them with the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter the investigator presents the objectives and research questions that were studied. Methodology consists of the systematic procedures by which the researcher traveled from the initial identification of the problem to its final conclusion.

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Determine the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.

2. Identify significant relationships in the actual and desired activities of the specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as viewed by secondary-level vocational teachers and vocational administrators.

3. Provide a composite list of the actual and desired activities of the specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.

The purpose of the study was realized by answering the following research questions:

1. What are the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors?

2. What are the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors?

3. What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

4. What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

The Population

The population selected for this study included secondary-level vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. These individuals were selected because of their direct relationship and mandated use of advisory committees at the secondary level. The vocational teacher is the program representative at the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee meeting. The area center principal and local vocational director are the authorized individuals who must validate for the Michigan Department of Education their compliance regarding the use of advisory committee meetings and program review on the state Report Form 4483-D. The vocational teachers selected for the study were a 10 percent (353) random sample of all vocational teachers (3,530) in the state. The

area center principals were all persons (43) listed as "Area Center Administrators" in the Michigan Department of Education's Directory of Vocational Administrators (1979-80). The directors selected for the study were all persons (111) listed as "Vocational Directors" in the Michigan Department of Education's Directory of Vocational Administrators (1979-80).

These three groups were identified as having direct involvement with the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee and were included in the study as follows:

1. Three hundred fifty-three selected secondary vocational teachers (10 percent random sample).
2. Forty-three area center principals.
3. One hundred eleven local vocational directors.

Thus, a total of 507 respondents was identified for this research study. The 507 respondents included a 10 percent random sample of all vocational teachers in Michigan, all area center principals in Michigan, and all local state-reimbursed vocational directors in Michigan for the 1980-81 school year.

Preparation of the Questionnaire

In studying role expectations and actual and desired activities, one of the more effective means for gathering data to be used is the questionnaire (Sarbin, 1954, p. 186). This particular form of inquiry was used since it is among the more efficient methods of obtaining information from the target population group.

The researcher used four basic steps to develop the questionnaire. First, eight major functions of advisory committees with 40 activities listed under the major functions that have been identified by the Michigan Department of Education (Cochran, Phelps, & Skupin, 1974) as being important for the effective use of advisory committees were selected for study. The next step was to develop a proposed questionnaire.

The third step involved submitting the proposed questionnaire to a group of persons from the three population groups (Appendix A) familiar with the variables under study and in a position to make value judgments about the instrument. These individuals were asked to fill out and return the questionnaire to help the researcher to identify misunderstandings, ambiguities, useless items, mechanical difficulties, and difficulties with the directions for completing the questionnaire (Wiersma, 1975, p. 141).

The fourth step was to rewrite the questionnaire with the necessary revisions based on the results of the pilot run. Based on the recommendations of the pilot group, the eight major functions with 40 activities were left as presented, the directions to respondents were completely rewritten in a more concise and clear manner, the format was revised, and additional demographic information on the respondents was collected.

The questionnaire was divided into two major sections. Section I contained the 40 activities to be performed by the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee under the headings of the following eight major functions:

1. Occupational Surveys
2. Course Content Advisement
3. Student Placement
4. Community Public Relations
5. Equipment and Facilities
6. Program Staffing
7. Program Review
8. Obtaining Community Resources

A Likert-type scale was used in Section I to help the respondents rate the appropriateness of each activity for both actual and desired activities. The scale allowed the respondents to select one of the following five responses:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Undecided
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

Section II asked the respondents the following:

1. Years of experience in present position?
2. Years of teaching experience in secondary education?
3. Years of administrative experience in secondary education?
4. Highest level of formal education?
5. Years working with advisory committees?
6. Formal training preparing them to work with advisory committees?

After all revisions, corrections, and changes had been made, the questionnaire was professionally printed and mailed out on May 5, 1981. The questionnaire (Appendix C) was printed in booklet form and sent with a cover letter (Appendix D) explaining the study's purpose, with a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. The cover letters and return envelopes were on Flushing Community School letterhead stationery.

Data Collection

The questionnaires with cover letters of explanation were mailed to 507 participants. All of the questionnaire instruments were coded so that each returned questionnaire could be identified with a study respondent for response checking only. In the cover letter of explanation, a quick response rate was requested, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed to encourage the return of the questionnaire by participating respondents.

After three weeks, a reminder letter (Appendix E) was mailed to each nonrespondent, requesting them to return the completed questionnaire. If that request failed, the investigator attempted to contact each nonrespondent personally by telephone to determine if the individual would participate. In some instances, new questionnaires were mailed to nonrespondents who agreed to participate but had misplaced their original questionnaire.

The initial mailing produced a return rate of 54 percent. Subsequent follow-up attempts, which secured additional returns, brought the response rate to 73 percent. (See Table 3.1.)

Table 3.1.--Local vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors forming the population for the study.

Group	Number Contacted	Number Responding	Percentage Responding
Local vocational teachers	353	247	69
Area center principals	43	35	81
Local vocational directors	111	90	81
Total	507	372	73

The questionnaires were returned to the researcher from the respondents over a six-week period. Upon the receipt of all the returned questionnaires, they were coded and key punched by Michigan State University Computer Services.

Methods of Analyses

Descriptive statistics were used to provide answers to the research questions related to the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. Descriptive statistics were selected because in two of the populations being surveyed, area center principals and local vocational directors, a 100 percent sample was surveyed, whereas with the third sample, vocational teachers, only a 10 percent random sample was surveyed. The research study dealt strictly with the data that were collected by the questionnaire. Also, the study dealt with a specific population at a specific time.

In answering the first two research questions, only the highest ten actual, lowest ten actual, highest ten desired, and lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee were selected to be presented in both narrative and tabular form. Presenting the highest ten and lowest ten activities had been determined to be an effective method of presenting data in tabular and narrative form when numerous activities (roles) are being examined (Hawkins, 1981). Selection of the activities was based on the highest and lowest percentage of the combined population (local secondary-level vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors) who strongly agreed with the activities. All 40 activities under the eight major functions are included for each population group in Appendices F and G.

Only the highest ten actual, lowest ten actual, highest ten desired, and lowest ten desired activities in Research Questions 3 and 4 were presented for comparison in both narrative and tabular form. Selection was based on the highest and lowest percentages of vocational administrators who strongly agreed with the functions. A comparison was then made between the vocational administrators (combined population of area center principals and local vocational directors) and vocational teachers for the same activities. The group of vocational administrators was added to the composite of 40 activities in Appendices F and G.

Summary

In this chapter, the investigator presented the objectives and research questions of the study. Those objectives dealt with

determining the actual and desired activities, identifying significant relationships between vocational teachers and administrators, and providing a composite list of the actual and desired activities under each function of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan. To accomplish the objectives, a population made up of 353 vocational teachers, 43 area center principals, and 111 local vocational directors was selected because of the nature of this study and their relationship to and use of secondary specialized occupational advisory committees.

A questionnaire with 40 advisory committee activities was developed by the researcher and submitted to a jury of experts. They were asked to evaluate the content and mechanics of the questionnaire for validity and suitability for the selected population groups. After the suggested changes for improvement and corrections were made, the questionnaire, along with an explanatory cover letter and self-addressed return envelope, was mailed to 507 possible respondents. A total of 372 (73 percent) respondents returned usable questionnaires, which were then coded and prepared for key punching.

Descriptive statistics were used to provide answers to questions related to the research questions concerning the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan. Responses to each item on the questionnaire were analyzed individually and collectively. The frequency and percentage were shown for each activity. For the first two research questions, the highest ten and lowest ten actual and desired activities were selected for presentation in both tabular and narrative

form. Selection was based on the highest and lowest percentages of respondents who strongly agreed with the activity. For Research Questions 3 and 4, the highest ten and lowest ten responses of the vocational administrators were compared to the vocational teachers in both tabular and narrative form.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present in descriptive form the data relative to the responses from vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors regarding the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committees that were examined in this study.

Descriptive Characteristics of Respondents

In this section, information is presented regarding the respondents' professional work experience, which includes the number of years in their present position as well as their teaching and administrative experience in secondary education. Also included in this section is information concerning their level of formal education attained, years of experience in working with advisory committees, and data concerning formal training preparing the respondents to work with vocational advisory committees.

Professional Work Experience

Table 4.1 shows the average years of professional work experience by selected categories for each respondent group. The teachers averaged 9.87 years of experience in their present position, whereas the principals and directors both had averaged less, with 6.26 and

8.00 years, respectively. Principals exceeded both teachers and directors in the number of years of teaching experience in secondary education. The principals averaged 12.56 years of experience, whereas the teachers averaged 11.73 and the directors' average years was 11.14.

Table 4.1.--Professional work experience of vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors.

Work Experience Category	Teachers \bar{X} (N=247)	Principals \bar{X} (N=35)	Directors \bar{X} (N=90)
Years in present position	9.87	6.26	8.00
Years teaching experience in secondary education	11.73	12.56	11.14
Years of administrative experience in secondary education	.88	11.66	9.66

\bar{X} = mean.

In the area of years of administrative experience in secondary education, the principals were highest with 11.6 years, directors had a mean of 9.66 years' experience, and the teachers were lowest with an average of .88 years of administrative experience.

Levels of Formal Education

Table 4.2 contains data showing the number of respondents by levels of formal education. The most common level for teachers was the master's degree, with 33.6 percent responding at that level. The most common level for both principals and directors was more than a

master's but less than a doctoral degree, with 65.8 percent and 75.5 percent responding, respectively, to these categories. Only 1.2 percent of the teachers had doctoral degrees, whereas 17.1 percent of the principals and 7.8 percent of the directors had doctoral degrees. None of the principals or directors had any degrees less than a master's. Teachers had .8 percent with no college education, 5.3 percent with less than a bachelor's degree, 1.2 percent with a bachelor's degree, and 25.9 percent with more than a bachelor's but less than a master's degree.

Table 4.2.--Level of formal education attained by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors.

Educational Level	Teachers		Principals		Directors	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
None	2	.8	0	0	0	0
Less than a bachelor's degree	13	5.3	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's degree	3	1.2	0	0	0	0
More than a bachelor's but less than a master's degree	64	25.9	0	0	0	0
Master's degree	83	33.6	6	17.1	15	16.7
More than a master's but less than a doctoral degree	79	32.0	23	65.8	68	75.5
Doctoral degree	3	1.2	6	17.1	7	7.8
Total	247	100.0	35	100.0	90	100.0

f = Frequency of response.

% = Percentage of response.

Experience With Advisory Committees

Table 4.3 contains data concerning the years of experience for each respondent group in working with advisory committees. The principals had the most experience in working with advisory committees, with a mean of 10.4 years and a median and mode of 10.0 years. The directors were second highest with a mean of 9.9 years' experience in working with advisory committees and a median and mode of 9.7 and 10.0 years, respectively. The teachers had the fewest years of experience in working with advisory committees, with a mean of 6.2 years, a median of 5.6 years, and a mode of 5.0 years.

Table 4.3.--Years of experience in working with advisory committees for vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors.

	Teachers (N=247)	Principals (N=35)	Directors (N=90)
Mean	6.2	10.4	9.9
Median	5.6	10.0	9.7
Mode	5.0	10.0	10.0

N = number of responses.

Formal Advisory Committee Training

Table 4.4 contains data concerning the number of respondents from each respondent group who had formal training preparing them to work with vocational advisory committees. Local vocational directors were the group of respondents who had received the most formal training, with 58.9 percent receiving formal training; 40.0 percent had no

formal training and 1.1 percent did not respond to the question. The principals were exactly split with 48.8 percent indicating they had and the same percentage indicating they had not had formal training preparing them to work with advisory committees. The teachers indicated that 41.3 percent had formal training, whereas 57.1 percent had not received formal training preparing them to work with advisory committees.

Table 4.4.--Formal training preparing respondents to work with vocational advisory committees.

Training	Teachers		Principals		Directors	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Have had formal training	102	41.3	17	48.6	53	58.9
Have not had formal training	141	57.1	17	48.6	36	40.0
No response	4	1.6	1	2.8	1	1.1
Total	247	100.0	35	100.0	90	100.0

f = Frequency of response.
% = Percentage of response.

Research Questions

Only the highest ten and the lowest ten actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee were selected to be presented. The other activities were not selected to be presented because there was no important difference in the opinions held by responding groups. All the actual and desired

activities of the secondary specialized occupational committee are presented for each group in Appendix F.

Research Question 1

What are the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals and local vocational directors?

The highest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.--The highest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (Table 4.5) were selected to be presented in both narrative and tabular form. Selection of these actual activities was based on the highest percentage of the total population who strongly agreed with the activities. The range of responses for the highest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee from the combined population who strongly agreed varied from a high of 34.9 percent to a low of 18.0 percent.

The actual activity receiving the highest percentage (34.9 percent) of responses from the combined population who strongly agreed concerned the need for the vocational advisory committee to Review Equipment and Facilities.

Suggesting Ways of Program Improvement was second with a combined response rate of 33.1 percent of the total population strongly agreeing. The third highest actual activity was Suggesting Equipment Replacement with 28.8 percent strongly agreeing. The next activity, Identifying Occupational Competencies, had a combined population percentage of 27.2 percent. The fifth highest activity, Reviewing

Table 4.5.--The highest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as viewed by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level is in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities							
Combined	f	130	156	29	23	7	27
	%	34.9	41.9	7.8	6.2	1.9	7.3
Activity 33: Suggesting Ways of Program Improvement							
Combined		123	152	35	30	6	26
		33.1	40.9	9.4	8.1	1.6	7.0
Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement							
Combined		107	165	35	33	5	27
		28.8	44.4	9.4	8.9	1.3	7.3
Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies							
Combined		101	142	36	55	8	30
		27.2	38.2	9.7	14.8	2.2	8.1
Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives							
Combined		97	152	41	48	5	29
		26.1	40.9	11.0	12.9	1.3	7.8
Activity 13: Employing Graduates							
Combined		72	162	53	36	16	33
		19.4	43.5	14.2	9.7	4.3	8.9

Table 4.5.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations							
Combined	f	71	174	44	34	19	30
	%	19.1	46.8	11.8	9.1	5.1	8.1
Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)							
Combined	f	71	134	55	59	24	29
	%	19.1	36.0	14.8	15.9	6.5	7.8
Activity 7: Developing Program Goal Statements							
Combined	f	70	118	52	87	15	30
	%	18.8	31.7	14.0	23.4	4.0	8.1
Activity 22: Surveying Industry for Equipment Uses							
Combined	f	67	143	62	58	13	29
	%	18.0	38.4	16.7	15.6	3.5	7.8

NOTE: In this and all subsequent tables, the following symbols are used:

f = frequency	SA = strongly agree
% = percent	A = agree
	U = undecided
	D = disagree
	SD = strongly disagree
	NR = no response

Performance Objectives, had a combined population response rate of 26.1 percent who strongly agreed.

Employing Graduates had a response rate of 19.4 percent of the total population who strongly agreed that this was an actual activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee. The seventh and eighth activities, Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations and

Notifying Teachers of Job Openings for Students, both had a combined population response rate of 19.1 percent. Developing Program Goal Statements received the ninth highest response rate with 18.8 percent; Surveying Industry for Equipment Uses was tenth with 18.0 percent.

Of the highest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, three of the activities (Activities 6, 7, and 9) were under the general-function heading of Course Content Advisement. Three of the highest ten actual activities (Activities 21, 22, and 23) were under the general-function heading of Equipment and Facilities. Two of the highest ten actual activities (Activities 11 and 13) came under the general-function heading of Student Placement. One each of the other highest ten actual activities came under the general-function headings of Program Review (Activity 33) and Obtaining Community Resources (Activity 37). None of the highest ten actual activities came under the general-function headings of Occupational Surveys, Community Public Relations, or Program Staffing.

The lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.--The lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (Table 4.6) were selected to be presented in both tabular and narrative form. Selection of the lowest ten actual activities was based on the lowest percentage of the total population who strongly agreed with the activities. The range of responses for the lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee varied from a low of 1.6 percent to a high of 5.9 percent.

Table 4.6.--The lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as viewed by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level is in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies							
Combined	f	6	63	86	112	59	36
	%	1.6	16.9	23.1	32.8	15.9	9.7
Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.							
Combined		9	38	122	113	42	38
		2.4	10.2	32.8	30.4	14.0	10.2
Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates							
Combined		11	71	79	107	67	37
		3.0	19.1	21.2	28.8	18.0	9.9
Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook							
Combined		13	56	139	99	26	39
		3.5	15.1	37.4	26.6	7.0	10.5
Activity 20: Developing Promotional Materials							
Combined		15	67	82	125	24	59
		4.0	18.0	22.0	33.6	6.5	15.9
Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants							
Combined		15	18	75	120	105	39
		4.0	4.8	20.2	32.3	28.2	10.5

Table 4.6.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances							
Combined	f	16	31	112	127	52	34
	%	4.3	8.3	30.1	34.1	14.0	9.1
Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria							
Combined		17	43	85	120	71	36
		4.6	11.6	22.8	32.3	19.1	9.7
Activity 16: Speaking to Civic Groups							
Combined		18	76	112	102	27	37
		4.8	20.4	30.1	27.4	7.3	9.9
Activity 3: Using the Occupational Outlook Handbook							
Combined		22	107	96	84	26	37
		5.9	28.8	25.8	22.6	7.0	9.9

In this section of Research Question 1, the lowest actual activity identified by the combined population was Suggesting Recruitment Policies. Only 1.6 percent of the combined population strongly agreed that advisory committees actually suggest recruitment policies. The second lowest actual activity identified was Serving as a Liaison With the Michigan Employment Security Commission (M.E.S.C.) with 2.4 percent strongly agreeing. The third lowest actual activity, Recommending Potential Candidates, had 3.0 percent of the combined population who strongly agreed. The fourth lowest actual activity was Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook, with 3.5 percent

strongly agreeing. Developing Promotional Materials and Reviewing Teaching Applicants tied for the fifth and sixth lowest activities, with only 4.0 percent of the combined population feeling that the secondary specialized occupational advisory committees actually perform these activities. Only 4.3 percent felt that advisory committees actually Calculate Depreciation Allowances. The eighth lowest actual activity, with 4.6 percent, was Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria. The ninth lowest actual activity identified was Speaking to Civic Groups, with 4.8 percent, and the tenth lowest actual activity identified was Using the Occupational Outlook Handbook. Only 5.9 percent of the combined population felt that the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee performed this activity.

Of the lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, all of the activities (Activities 26, 27, 28, and 29) under the general-function heading of Program Staffing were identified. Two of the lowest ten actual activities came under the general-function heading of Occupational Surveys (Activities 1 and 3) and Community Public Relations (Activities 16 and 20). One of the lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee came under the general-function headings of Student Placement (Activity 15) and Equipment and Facilities (Activity 24). None of the lowest ten actual activities came under the general-function headings of Course Content Advisement, Program Review, or Obtaining Community Resources.

Research Question 2

What are the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors?

The highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.--The highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (Table 4.7) were selected to be presented in both tabular and narrative form. Selection of these desired activities was based on the highest percentage of the total population who strongly agreed with the activities. The range of responses for the highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee from the combined population who strongly agreed varied from a high of 55.4 percent to a low of 37.9 percent.

The most desired activity, with 55.4 percent strongly agreeing, was Reviewing Equipment and Facilities. The second most desired activity identified by the combined population, with 51.1 percent strongly agreeing, was Suggesting Equipment Replacement. Identifying Occupational Competencies was the third most desired activity, with 50.3 strongly agreeing. Notifying Teachers of Job Openings for Students was the fourth most desired activity, at 48.1 percent strongly agreeing. The fifth most desired activity identified was Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement, with 47.6 percent strongly agreeing. Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations was sixth, with 42.7 percent. Seventh was Reviewing Performance Objectives with 40.9 percent, whereas Employing Graduates was eighth with 40.3 percent. The ninth

Table 4.7.--The highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as viewed by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level should be in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities							
Combined	f	206	133	10	0	0	23
	%	55.4	35.8	2.7	0	0	6.2
Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement							
Combined		190	141	13	6	0	22
		51.1	37.9	3.5	1.6	0	5.9
Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies							
Combined		187	132	15	14	4	20
		50.3	35.5	4.0	3.8	1.1	5.4
Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)							
Combined		179	135	18	14	6	20
		48.1	36.3	4.8	3.8	1.6	5.4
Activity 33: Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement							
Combined		177	155	13	4	0	23
		47.6	41.7	3.5	1.1	0	6.2
Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations							
Combined		159	175	8	4	6	20
		42.7	47.0	2.2	1.1	1.6	5.4

Table 4.7.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives							
Combined	f	152	157	20	16	5	22
	%	40.9	42.2	5.4	4.3	1.3	5.9
Activity 13: Employing Graduates							
Combined		150	151	31	10	9	21
		40.3	40.6	8.3	3.7	2.4	5.6
Activity 38: Identifying Community Resources							
Combined		142	188	17	1	2	22
		38.2	50.5	4.6	.3	.5	5.9
Activity 22: Surveying Industry for Equipment Uses							
Combined		141	151	39	16	5	20
		37.9	40.6	10.5	4.3	1.3	5.4

most desired activity was Identifying Community Resources, with 38.2 percent, and 37.9 percent of the combined population rated Surveying Industry for Equipment Uses as the tenth most desired activity to be performed by the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

Of the highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, three of the activities (Activities 21, 22, and 23) were under the general-function heading of Equipment and Facilities. Two of the highest ten desired activities were under the general-function headings of Course Content Advisement (Activities 6 and 9), Student Placement (Activities 11 and 13), and

Obtaining Community Resources (Activities 37 and 38). One of the highest ten desired activities (Activity 13) came under the general-function heading of Program Review. None of the highest ten desired activities came under the general-function headings of Occupational Surveys, Community Public Relations, or Program Staffing.

The lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.--The lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (Table 4.8) were selected to be presented in both tabular and narrative form. Selection of these desired activities was based on the lowest percentage of the total population who strongly agreed with the activities. The range of responses for the lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee varied from a low of 8.1 percent to a high of 15.1 percent. In this particular table, Suggesting Recruitment Policies was the least desired advisory committee activity, with 8.1 percent of the combined population strongly agreeing. The second least desired activity was Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook, with 8.6 percent strongly agreeing. The third and fourth least desired activities, both with 8.9 percent strongly agreeing, were Recommending Potential Candidates and Reviewing Teaching Applicants. The fifth and sixth least desired activities, Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria and Evaluating Teacher Performance, both had 11.8 percent of the combined population strongly agreeing. The seventh least desired activity, at 12.6 percent, was Calculating Depreciation Allowances. Serving as a Liaison with the M.E.S.C. was the eighth least desirable activity, with 13.2 percent strongly agreeing. The

Table 4.8.--The lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as viewed by vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level should be in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies							
Combined	f	30	142	80	71	34	15
	%	8.1	38.2	21.5	19.1	9.1	4.0
Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook							
Combined		32	157	122	33	12	16
		8.6	42.2	32.8	8.9	3.2	4.3
Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates							
Combined		33	159	73	56	35	16
		8.9	42.7	19.6	15.1	9.4	4.3
Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants							
Combined		33	76	77	78	91	17
		8.9	20.4	20.7	21.0	24.5	4.6
Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria							
Combined		44	121	75	69	49	14
		11.8	32.5	20.2	18.5	13.2	3.8
Activity 31: Evaluating Teacher Performance							
Combined		44	76	66	86	82	18
		11.8	20.4	17.7	23.1	22.0	4.8

Table 4.8.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances							
Combined	f	47	76	106	96	29	18
	%	12.6	20.4	28.5	25.8	7.8	4.8
Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.							
Combined		49	97	120	62	23	21
		13.2	26.1	32.3	16.7	6.2	5.6
Activity 32: Using the Annual State Department Review Questionnaire							
Combined		51	117	125	37	17	25
		13.7	31.5	33.6	9.9	4.6	6.7
Activity 20: Developing Promotional Materials							
Combined		56	165	67	39	10	35
		15.1	44.4	18.0	10.5	2.7	9.4

ninth lowest desired activity of the advisory committee, with a combined percentage of 13.7, was Using the Annual State Department Review Questionnaire. Developing Promotional Materials was the tenth lowest desired activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, with a 15.1 combined population percentage strongly agreeing.

Of the lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, all of the activities (Activities 26, 27, 28, and 29) under the general-function heading of Program Staffing were identified. Two of the lowest ten desired activities

(Activities 31 and 32) came under the general-function heading of Program Review. One each of the lowest ten desired activities came under the general-function headings of Occupational Surveys (Activity 1), Student Placement (Activity 15), Community Public Relations (Activity 20), and Equipment and Facilities (Activity 24). None of the lowest ten desired activities came under the general-function headings of Course Content Advisement or Obtaining Community Resources.

Research Question 3

What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

The highest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.--The highest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (Table 4.9) were selected to be presented in both tabular and narrative form. Selection of these actual activities was based on the highest percentage of vocational administrators (combined area center principals and local vocational directors) who strongly agreed with the activity. The highest ten actual activities that the vocational administrators strongly agreed with were selected to show the relationship between vocational administrators and vocational teachers. The range of responses for the highest ten actual activities from the vocational administrators who strongly agreed varied from a high of 46.4 percent to a low of 17.6 percent.

Table 4.9.--The highest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as viewed by vocational administrators with comparison responses from vocational teachers.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level is in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 33: Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement							
Vocational administrators	f	58	50	4	7	0	6
	%	46.4	40.0	3.2	5.6	0	4.8
Vocational teachers		65	102	31	23	6	20
		26.3	41.3	12.6	9.3	2.4	8.1
Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities							
Vocational administrators		55	51	6	4	3	6
		44.0	40.8	4.8	3.2	2.4	4.8
Vocational teachers		75	105	23	19	4	21
		30.4	42.5	9.3	7.7	1.6	8.5
Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement							
Vocational administrators		44	64	4	5	2	6
		35.2	51.2	3.2	4.0	1.6	4.8
Vocational teachers		63	101	31	28	3	21
		25.5	40.9	12.6	11.3	1.2	8.5
Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies							
Vocational administrators		38	54	7	14	4	8
		30.4	43.2	5.6	11.2	3.2	6.4
Vocational teachers		63	88	29	41	4	22
		25.5	35.6	11.7	16.6	1.6	8.9
Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives							
Vocational administrators		37	59	9	9	3	8
		29.6	47.2	7.2	7.2	2.4	6.4
Vocational teachers		60	93	32	39	2	21
		24.3	37.7	13.0	15.8	.8	8.5

Table 4.9.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)							
Vocational administrators	f	26	59	12	14	6	8
	%	20.8	47.2	9.6	11.2	4.8	6.4
Vocational teachers		45	75	43	45	18	21
		18.2	30.4	17.4	18.2	7.3	8.5
Activity 13: Employing Graduates							
Vocational administrators		26	71	8	7	2	11
		20.8	56.8	6.4	5.6	1.6	8.8
Vocational teachers		46	91	45	29	14	22
		18.6	36.8	18.2	11.7	5.7	8.9
Activity 14: Reviewing Follow-up Studies							
Vocational administrators		26	48	17	21	5	8
		20.8	38.4	13.6	16.8	4.0	6.4
Vocational teachers		30	77	66	40	13	21
		12.1	31.2	26.7	16.2	5.3	8.5
Activity 8: Reviewing Topical Outlines							
Vocational administrators		24	55	16	19	2	9
		19.2	44.0	12.8	15.2	1.6	7.2
Vocational teachers		37	78	59	48	3	22
		15.0	31.6	32.9	19.4	1.2	8.9
Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations							
Vocational administrators		22	78	8	10	0	7
		17.6	62.4	6.4	8.0	0	5.6
Vocational teachers		49	96	36	24	19	23
		19.8	38.9	14.6	9.7	7.7	9.3

The highest actual activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee according to vocational administrators was Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement, with a percentage of 46.4 for vocational administrators and 26.3 for vocational teachers strongly agreeing with the activity. Reviewing Equipment and Facilities was the second highest actual activity for administrators, with 44.0 percent, whereas teachers rated this function 30.4 in the strongly agree response category. The third highest actual activity for vocational administrators was Suggesting Equipment Replacement, with 35.2 percent strongly agreeing and 25.5 percent of the vocational teachers strongly agreeing. Identifying Occupational Competencies was the fourth highest actual activity, with 30.4 percent of the vocational administrators and 25.5 percent of the vocational teachers strongly agreeing that this activity should be performed by the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee. The fifth highest actual activity was Reviewing Performance Objectives, with administrators and teachers strongly agreeing at percentage rates of 29.6 and 24.3, respectively. Notifying teachers of job openings for students was the sixth highest actual activity identified, with vocational administrators strongly agreeing at a rate of 20.8 and vocational teachers at a rate of 18.2 percent. The seventh highest actual activity identified was Employing Graduates, with administrators strongly agreeing at a rate of 20.8 percent and teachers at 18.6 percent. Reviewing Follow-up Studies was the eighth highest actual activity for administrators, with 20.8 percent strongly agreeing as compared to 12.1 percent of the teachers. Reviewing Topical Outlines was rated the ninth highest activity by vocational

administrators, with 19.2 percent strongly agreeing compared to 15.0 percent of the vocational teachers. The tenth highest actual activity identified by the vocational administrators was Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations.

The lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.--The lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (Table 4.10) were selected to be presented in both tabular and narrative form. Selection of these actual activities was based on the lowest percentage of vocational administrators (combined area center principals and local vocational directors) who strongly agreed with the activity. The lowest ten actual activities that the vocational administrators strongly agreed with were selected to show the relationship between vocational administrators and vocational teachers. The range of responses for the lowest ten actual activities for the vocational administrators who strongly agreed varied from a low of .8 percent to a high of 4.8 percent.

The lowest actual activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee identified by vocational administrators, with .8 percent strongly agreeing, was Calculating Depreciation Allowances. Vocational teachers responded "strongly agree" that advisory committees were performing this activity at a rate of 6.1 percent. The second lowest actual activity identified was Suggesting Recruitment Policies, with both administrators and teachers strongly agreeing with this activity at a rate of 1.6 percent. Evaluating Teacher Performance was the third lowest activity identified, with vocational

Table 4.10.--The lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as viewed by vocational administrators with comparison responses from vocational teachers.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level is in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances							
Vocational administrators	f	1	16	29	54	18	8
	%	.8	12.0	23.2	43.2	14.4	6.4
Vocational teachers		15	16	83	73	34	26
		6.1	6.5	33.6	29.6	13.8	10.5
Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies							
Vocational administrators		2	21	21	47	25	9
		1.6	16.8	16.8	37.6	20.0	7.2
Vocational teachers		4	42	65	75	34	27
		1.6	17.0	26.3	30.4	13.8	10.9
Activity 31: Evaluating Teacher Performance							
Vocational administrators		3	10	16	52	36	8
		2.4	8.0	12.8	41.6	28.8	6.4
Vocational teachers		19	37	58	57	53	23
		7.7	15.0	23.5	23.1	21.5	9.3
Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants							
Vocational administrators		3	5	15	47	44	11
		2.4	4.0	12.0	37.6	35.2	8.8
Vocational teachers		12	13	60	73	61	28
		4.9	5.3	24.3	29.6	24.7	11.3
Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates							
Vocational administrators		3	36	18	36	25	7
		2.4	28.8	14.4	28.8	20.0	5.6
Vocational teachers		8	35	61	71	42	30
		3.2	14.2	24.7	28.7	17.0	12.1

Table 4.10.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.							
Vocational administrators	f	3	14	25	56	15	12
	%	2.4	11.2	20.0	44.8	12.0	9.6
Vocational teachers		6	24	97	57	37	26
		2.4	9.7	39.3	23.1	15.0	10.5
Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria							
Vocational administrators		5	12	25	46	29	9
		4.0	9.6	20.0	36.0	23.2	7.2
Vocational teachers		12	31	60	75	42	27
		4.9	12.6	24.3	30.4	17.0	10.9
Activity 16: Speaking to Civic Groups							
Vocational administrators		5	38	25	40	7	10
		4.0	30.4	20.0	32.0	5.6	8.0
Vocational teachers		13	38	87	62	20	27
		5.3	15.4	35.2	25.1	8.1	10.9
Activity 20: Developing Promotional Materials							
Vocational administrators		6	31	19	40	10	19
		4.8	24.8	15.2	32.0	8.0	15.2
Vocational teachers		9	36	63	35	14	40
		3.6	14.6	25.5	34.4	5.7	16.2
Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook							
Vocational administrators		6	26	22	49	12	10
		4.8	20.8	17.6	39.2	9.6	8.0
Vocational teachers		7	30	117	50	14	29
		2.8	12.1	47.4	20.2	5.7	11.7

administrators and vocational teachers agreeing at a rate of 2.4 percent and 7.7 percent, respectively. The fourth lowest actual activity identified was Reviewing Teaching Applicants, with vocational administrators strongly agreeing at a rate of 2.4 percent compared to 4.9 percent for teachers. Recommending potential candidates was the fifth lowest actual activity, with 2.4 percent of the administrators and 3.2 percent of the teachers strongly agreeing that this is an actual activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee. Both vocational administrators and vocational teachers strongly agreed at a rate of 2.4 percent that the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee actually Serves as a Liaison With M.E.S.C. The seventh lowest actual activity identified by vocational administrators was Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria, with 4.0 percent strongly agreeing compared to 4.9 percent of the teachers. Speaking to Civic Groups was the eighth lowest actual activity identified, with 4.0 percent of the administrators and 5.3 percent of the vocational teachers strongly agreeing that the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee was actually performing this activity. Vocational administrators and vocational teachers strongly agreed at a rate of 4.8 percent and 3.6 percent, respectively, that secondary specialized occupational committees actually Develop Promotional Materials. The tenth lowest actual activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee identified by vocational administrators with 4.8 percent strongly agreeing, as compared to 3.6 percent of the vocational teachers who strongly agreed, was Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook.

Research Question 4

What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

The highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.--The highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (Table 4.11) were selected to be presented in both tabular and narrative form. Selection of these desired activities was based on the highest percentage of vocational administrators (combined area center principals and local vocational directors) who strongly agreed with the activities. The highest ten desired activities that the vocational administrators strongly agreed with were selected to show the relationship between vocational administrators and vocational teachers. The range of responses for the highest ten desired activities from the vocational administrators who strongly agreed varied from a high of 64.0 percent to a low of 32.8 percent.

Administrators identified Reviewing Equipment and Facilities as the most desired activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee at a rate of 64.0 percent, with 51.0 percent of the vocational teachers strongly agreeing with this activity. Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement was the second most desired activity identified by the administrators at 58.4 percent, with 42.1 percent of the teachers strongly agreeing. The third most desired activity was Identifying Occupational Competencies, with administrators and teachers strongly agreeing at a rate of 54.4 and 48.2 percent, respectively.

Table 4.11.--The highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as viewed by vocational administrators with comparison responses from vocational teachers.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level should be in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities							
Vocational administrators	f	80	37	1	0	0	7
	%	64.0	29.6	.8	0	0	5.6
Vocational teachers		126	96	9	0	0	16
		51.0	38.9	3.6	0	0	6.5
Activity 33: Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement							
Vocational administrators		73	42	2	1	0	7
		58.4	33.6	1.6	.8	0	5.6
Vocational teachers		104	113	11	3	0	16
		42.1	45.7	4.5	1.2	0	6.5
Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies							
Vocational administrators		68	42	2	6	0	7
		54.5	33.6	1.6	4.8	0	5.6
Vocational teachers		119	90	13	8	4	13
		48.2	36.4	5.3	3.2	1.6	5.3
Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement							
Vocational administrators		63	49	1	4	0	8
		50.4	39.2	.8	3.2	0	6.4
Vocational teachers		127	92	12	2	0	14
		51.4	37.2	4.9	.8	0	5.7
Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives							
Vocational administrators		59	51	6	1	1	7
		47.2	40.8	4.8	.8	.8	5.6
Vocational teachers		93	106	14	15	4	15
		37.7	42.9	5.7	6.1	1.6	6.1

Table 4.11.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)							
Vocational administrators	f	55	50	5	5	2	8
	%	44.0	40.0	4.0	4.0	1.6	6.4
Vocational teachers		124	85	13	9	4	12
		50.2	34.4	5.3	3.6	1.6	4.9
Activity 13: Employing Graduates							
Vocational administrators		54	52	8	3	0	8
		43.2	41.6	6.4	2.4	0	6.4
Vocational teachers		96	99	23	7	9	13
		38.9	40.1	9.3	2.8	3.6	5.3
Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations							
Vocational administrators		46	69	2	2	0	6
		36.8	55.2	1.6	1.6	0	4.8
Vocational teachers		113	106	6	2	6	14
		45.7	42.9	2.4	.8	2.4	5.7
Activity 38: Identifying Community Resources							
Vocational administrators		44	69	3	1	0	8
		35.2	55.2	2.4	.8	0	6.4
Vocational teachers		98	119	14	0	2	14
		39.7	48.2	5.7	0	.8	5.7
Activity 7: Developing Program Goal Statements							
Vocational administrators		41	44	9	20	4	7
		32.8	35.2	7.2	16.0	3.2	5.6
Vocational teachers		76	103	22	26	8	12
		30.8	41.7	8.9	10.5	3.2	4.9

The fourth most desired activity identified by the administrators was Suggesting Equipment Replacement, with 50.4 percent of the administrators strongly agreeing compared to 51.4 percent of the vocational teachers. Reviewing Performance Objectives was the fifth most desired activity, with administrators strongly agreeing at a rate of 47.2 percent and teachers at 37.7 percent. Identified as the sixth most desired activity by the administrators was Notifying Teachers of Job Openings for Students, with a percentage rate of 44.0 percent and 50.2 percent for vocational administrators and teachers strongly agreeing, respectively. The seventh most desired activity, Employing Graduates, had a strongly agree response rate of 43.2 percent for administrators and 38.9 percent for teachers. Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations was identified as the eighth most desired activity, with administrators and teachers strongly agreeing at a rate of 36.8 and 45.7 percent, respectively. Identifying community resources was the ninth most desired activity identified, with 35.2 percent of the administrators strongly agreeing compared to 39.7 percent of the teachers. The tenth most desired activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, as identified by 32.8 percent of the vocational administrators who strongly agreed, was Developing Program Goal Statements. Teachers strongly agreed with the same activity at a rate of 30.8 percent.

The lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.--The lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (Table 4.12) were selected to be presented in both tabular and narrative form.

Selection of these desired activities was based on the lowest percentage of vocational administrators (combined area center principals and local vocational directors) who strongly agreed with the activity.

The lowest ten desired activities that the vocational administrators strongly agreed with were selected to show the relationship between vocational administrators and vocational teachers. The range of responses for the lowest ten desired activities from the vocational administrators who strongly agreed varied from a low of .8 percent to a high of 12.8 percent.

The lowest desired activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee identified by vocational administrators was Suggesting Recruitment Policies. Strongly agreeing that this was a desired activity were .8 percent of the administrators compared to 11.7 percent of the vocational teachers. The second lowest desired activity for vocational administrators was Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria, with 4.0 percent of the administrators and 15.8 percent of the teachers strongly agreeing that this was a desired activity. Reviewing Teaching Applicants was the third least desired activity for vocational administrators, at a rate of 4.8 percent strongly agreeing, compared to 10.9 percent of the teachers. The fourth least desired activity for administrators, with 4.8 percent strongly agreeing, was Recommending Potential Candidates compared to 10.9 percent of the vocational teachers who strongly agreed. Evaluating Teacher Performance was the fifth lowest desired activity of the advisory committee as identified by 6.4 percent of the administrators and 14.6 percent of the vocational teachers who strongly agreed. The vocational

Table 4.12.--The lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as viewed by vocational administrators with comparison responses from vocational teachers.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level should be in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies							
Vocational administrators	f	1	39	26	40	15	4
	%	.8	21.2	20.8	32.0	12.0	3.2
Vocational teachers		29	103	54	31	19	11
		11.7	41.7	21.9	12.6	7.7	4.5
Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria							
Vocational administrators		5	40	22	34	20	4
		4.0	32.0	17.6	27.2	16.0	3.2
Vocational teachers		39	81	53	35	29	10
		15.8	32.8	21.5	14.2	11.7	4.0
Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants							
Vocational administrators		6	14	19	42	39	5
		4.8	11.2	15.2	33.6	31.2	4.0
Vocational teachers		27	62	58	36	52	12
		10.9	25.1	23.5	14.6	21.1	4.9
Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates							
Vocational administrators		6	60	19	20	14	6
		4.8	48.0	15.2	16.0	11.2	4.8
Vocational teachers		27	99	54	36	21	10
		10.9	40.1	21.9	14.6	8.5	4.0
Activity 31: Evaluating Teacher Performance							
Vocational administrators		8	19	17	41	35	5
		6.4	15.2	13.6	32.8	28.0	4.0
Vocational teachers		36	57	49	45	47	13
		14.6	23.1	19.8	18.2	19.0	5.3

Table 4.12.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances							
Vocational administrators	f	8	31	23	45	13	5
	%	6.4	24.8	18.4	36.0	10.4	4.0
Vocational teachers		39	45	83	51	16	13
		15.8	18.2	33.6	20.6	6.5	5.3
Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook							
Vocational administrators		9	70	23	15	2	6
		7.2	56.0	18.4	12.0	1.6	4.8
Vocational teachers		23	87	99	18	10	10
		9.3	35.2	40.1	7.3	4.0	4.0
Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.							
Vocational administrators		10	27	35	37	9	7
		8.0	21.6	28.0	29.6	7.2	5.6
Vocational teachers		39	70	85	25	14	14
		15.8	28.3	34.4	10.1	5.7	5.7
Activity 30: Evaluating Student Performance							
Vocational administrators		16	37	14	32	21	5
		12.8	29.6	11.2	25.6	16.8	4.0
Vocational teachers		43	72	43	46	29	14
		17.4	29.1	17.4	18.6	11.7	5.7
Activity 20: Developing Promotional Materials							
Vocational administrators		16	54	16	22	4	13
		12.8	43.2	12.8	7.6	3.2	10.4
Vocational teachers		40	111	51	17	6	22
		16.2	44.9	20.6	6.9	2.4	8.9

administrators rated Calculating Depreciation Allowances as the sixth lowest desired activity, with 6.4 percent strongly agreeing compared to 15.8 percent of the vocational teachers. Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook was the seventh lowest desired activity identified by administrators, with 7.2 percent strongly agreeing compared to 9.3 percent of the vocational teachers. Identified by the vocational administrators as the eighth lowest desired activity of advisory committees, with 8.0 percent strongly agreeing, was Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C. Vocational teachers strongly agreed with this activity at a rate of 15.8 percent. Evaluating Student Performance was the ninth lowest desired activity, with vocational administrators and vocational teachers strongly agreeing with this activity at a rate of 12.8 and 17.4 percent, respectively. The tenth lowest desired activity of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, with 12.8 percent of the vocational administrators and 16.2 percent of the vocational teachers strongly agreeing with the activity, was Developing Promotional Materials.

Summary of Chapter IV

Comparison Rankings for Secondary-Level Vocational Teachers and Administrators

The comparison rankings for vocational administrators and teachers regarding their perceived views of the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committees in Michigan are presented for all 40 activities in Table 4.13. That table is provided to summarize the basic data from the four

Table 4.13.--Rankings of the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as viewed by vocational administrators with comparison rankings of vocational teachers.

Activity	Administrator		Teacher	
	Actual	Desired	Actual	Desired
Suggesting ways for program improvement	1	2	2	3
Reviewing equipment and facilities	2	1	1	1
Suggesting equipment replacement	3	3	3	2
Reviewing performance objectives	4	5	4	9
Employing graduates	5	6	7	10
Recommending potential co-op work stations	6	7	6	4
Identifying occupational competencies	7	4	5	7
Identifying community resources	8	8	9	6
Notifying teachers of job openings (for students)	9	9	14	5
Surveying industry for equipment uses	10	14	8	8
Reviewing topical outlines	11	16	11	23
Comparing accomplishments with stated objectives	12	12	12	17
Reviewing follow-up studies	13	10	16	14
Obtaining personnel for classroom presentations	14	15	18	12
Using community survey data	15	11	13	15
Using Annual State Department Review	16	22	25	35
Obtaining consultants for teachers	17	18	21	18
Developing program goal statements	18	21	10	19
Soliciting equipment donations	19	19	29	21
Providing input for program funding activities	20	20	17	16
Providing input at public hearings	21	13	23	20
Making periodic reports to administration	22	25	19	29

Table 4.13.--Continued.

Activity	Administrator		Teacher	
	Actual	Desired	Actual	Desired
Using the Occupational Outlook Handbook	23	26	20	24
Promoting the program via the media	24	17	24	11
Arranging field trips	25	30	27	22
Conducting a community needs assessment	26	24	15	13
Speaking to civic groups	27	23	30	26
Consulting with the Michigan Employment Security Commission	28	28	22	28
Organizing student/employer conferences	29	31	26	27
Developing promotional materials	30	29	33	25
Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook	31	27	28	31
Recommending potential candidates	32	32	39	33
Evaluating student performance	33	33	32	37
Writing letters of recommendation for students	34	35	31	36
Serving as a liaison with M.E.S.C.	35	34	36	30
Suggesting recruitment policies	36	38	35	32
Calculating depreciation allowances	37	37	37	38
Reviewing teacher selection criteria	38	36	38	34
Evaluating teacher performance	39	39	34	39
Reviewing teaching applicants	40	40	40	40

NOTE: Rankings were determined by using the mean scores for each respondent group.

research questions. The rankings were determined by using the mean score for each of the 40 activities for teachers and administrators with a ranking of 1 being the most desired and 40 being the least desired.

In this chapter, descriptive statistics were used to present the data gathered by the investigator. Presented in narrative and tabular form were the data related to the descriptive characteristics of the respondents and the four research questions. These data were presented exactly as gathered by the investigator.

In the next chapter, Chapter V, the investigator presents (1) a summary of the problem, procedures, and findings of the study; (2) conclusions that were derived from the data; and (3) recommendations and implications.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, the investigator presents (1) a summary of the problem, procedures, and findings of the study; (2) conclusions that were derived from the data; and (3) recommendations and implications.

Summary

This study was an investigation to determine the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. The data gathered in the study measured the relative intensity and priority with which these vocational activities were held by the selected individuals.

The data for this research study were collected through the use of a questionnaire that was devised by the investigator. The questionnaire was submitted to a jury of experts for their evaluation as to its validity and suitability for the selected population. The questionnaire was divided into two major sections. Section I contained 40 activities to be performed by the secondary specialized

occupational advisory committee under the headings of eight major functions. These general-function headings were:

1. Occupational Surveys
2. Course Content Advisement
3. Student Placement
4. Community Public Relations
5. Equipment and Facilities
6. Program Staffing
7. Program Review
8. Obtaining Community Resources

The second section asked the respondents to provide information regarding their professional work experience, levels of formal education, experience in working with vocational advisory committees, and the amount of training they had in preparing them to work with vocational advisory committees. After refinement, the questionnaire along with a cover letter and return-addressed, stamped envelope was mailed to 353 selected secondary vocational teachers, 43 area center principals, and 111 local vocational directors. Of the 507 possible respondents, 372 (73 percent) returned usable questionnaires, which were then coded and prepared for key punching.

Research Objectives and Questions

The objectives of this study were structured to:

1. Determine the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.

2. Identify any significant relationships in the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as viewed by secondary-level vocational teachers and vocational administrators.

3. Provide a composite list of the actual and desired activities of the specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan.

The purposes of the study were realized by answering the following research questions:

1. What are the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors?

2. What are the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors?

3. What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

4. What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

Findings

The findings in this research study are presented for each research question separately.

Research Question 1

What are the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors?

In this study, the researcher selected only the highest ten and lowest ten activities perceived as actually being performed by the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee. Although they are found in the appendices, the other activities were not selected to be presented.

A brief summary of the highest ten and lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee follows:

Highest Ten Actual Activities

Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities
Activity 33: Suggesting Ways of Program Improvement
Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement
Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies
Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives
Activity 13: Employing Graduates
Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations
Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)
Activity 7: Developing Program Goal Statements
Activity 22: Surveying Industry for Equipment Uses

Three of the highest ten activities (Activities 7, 6, and 9) fell under the general-function heading of Course Content Advisement, and three activities (Activities 21, 22, and 23) were under the general-function heading of Equipment and Facilities. Two of the highest ten actual activities (Activities 11 and 13) came under the

general-function heading of Student Placement. One each of the highest ten actual activities came under the general-function headings of Program Review (Activity 33) and Obtaining Community Resources. None of the top ten actual activities came under the general-function headings of Occupational Surveys, Community Public Relations, or Program Staffing.

Lowest Ten Actual Activities

Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies
 Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.
 Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates
 Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook
 Activity 20: Developing Promotional Materials
 Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants
 Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances
 Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria
 Activity 16: Speaking to Civic Groups
 Activity 3: Using the Occupational Outlook Handbook

Of the lowest ten actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, all of the activities (Activities 26, 27, 28, and 29) under the general-function heading of Program Staffing were identified. Two of the lowest ten actual activities came under the general-function heading of Occupational Surveys (Activities 1 and 3) and Community Public Relations (Activities 16 and 20). One each of the activities came under the general-function headings of Student Placement (Activity 15) and Equipment and Facilities (Activity 24). None of the lowest ten actual activities came under the general-function headings of Course Content Advisement, Program Review, or Obtaining Community Resources.

Research Question 2

What are the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors?

A brief summary of the highest ten and lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee follows:

Highest Ten Desired Activities

Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities
Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement
Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies
Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)
Activity 33: Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement
Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations
Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives
Activity 13: Employing Graduates
Activity 38: Identifying Community Resources
Activity 22: Surveying Industry for Equipment Uses

Of the highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, three of the activities (Activities 21, 22, and 23) fell under the general-function heading of Equipment and Facilities. Two each of the highest ten desired activities were under the general-function headings of Course Content Advisement (Activities 6 and 9), Student Placement (Activities 11 and 13), and Obtaining Community Resources (Activities 37 and 38). One of the highest ten desired activities (Activity 13) came under the general-function heading of Program Review. None came under the general-function headings of Occupational Surveys, Community Public Relations, or Program Staffing.

Lowest Ten Desired Activities

- Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies
- Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook
- Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates
- Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants
- Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selecting Criteria
- Activity 31: Evaluating Teacher Performance
- Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances
- Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.
- Activity 32: Using the Annual State Department Review Questionnaire
- Activity 20: Developing Promotional Materials

Of the lowest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, all of the activities (Activities 26, 27, 28, and 29) under the general-function heading of Program Staffing were identified. Two of the activities (Activities 31 and 32) came under the general-function heading of Program Review. One each of the lowest ten desired activities came under each of the general-function headings of Occupational Surveys (Activity 1), Student Placement (Activity 15), Community Public Relations (Activity 20), and Equipment and Facilities (Activity 24). None of the lowest ten desired activities came under the general-function headings of Course Content Advisement or Obtaining Community Resources.

Research Question 3

What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

To present the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan, the researcher presented the highest ten and lowest ten

activities selected by vocational administrators who strongly agreed with each activity. Comparison scores were then presented for vocational teachers and vocational administrators. The highest ten actual activities identified by vocational administrators were:

Highest Ten Actual Activities

- Activity 33: Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement
- Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities
- Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement
- Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies
- Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives
- Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)
- Activity 13: Employing Graduates
- Activity 14: Reviewing Follow-up Studies
- Activity 8: Reviewing Topical Outlines
- Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations

Of the highest ten actual activities selected by vocational administrators, seven of the same activities (Activities 33, 21, 23, 6, 9, 13, and 37) were in the highest ten actual activities for vocational teachers. Both vocational teachers and vocational administrators selected the same highest five actual activities, indicating a high degree of relationship between vocational teachers and vocational administrators.

Lowest Ten Actual Activities

- Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances
- Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies
- Activity 31: Evaluating Teacher Performance
- Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants
- Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates
- Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.
- Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria
- Activity 16: Speaking to Civic Groups
- Activity 20: Developing Promotional Materials
- Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook

Of the lowest ten actual activities selected by vocational administrators, eight activities (Activities 27, 29, 28, 15, 26, 16,

20, and 1) were selected by vocational teachers as the lowest ten actual activities. Again, a high relationship was indicated among vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding their perceived views of the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

Research Question 4

What are the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan?

To present the relationships between the perceived views of vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan, the researcher presented the highest ten and lowest ten activities selected by vocational administrators who strongly agreed with each activity. Comparison scores were then presented for vocational teachers and vocational administrators. The highest ten desired activities identified by vocational administrators were:

Highest Ten Desired Activities

Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities
 Activity 33: Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement
 Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies
 Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement
 Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives
 Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)
 Activity 13: Employing Graduates
 Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations
 Activity 38: Identifying Community Resources
 Activity 7: Developing Program Goal Statements

Of the highest ten desired activities selected by vocational administrators, eight activities (Activities 21, 33, 6, 23, 11, 13,

37, and 38) were selected by vocational teachers as the highest ten desired activities. A high degree of relationship was shown between vocational teachers and vocational administrators regarding the highest ten desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

Lowest Ten Desired Activities

Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies
 Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria
 Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants
 Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates
 Activity 31: Evaluating Teacher Performance
 Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances
 Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook
 Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.
 Activity 30: Evaluating Student Performance
 Activity 20: Developing Promotional Materials

Of the lowest ten desired activities selected by vocational administrators, all the activities except one (Activity 30) were also selected by vocational teachers as the lowest ten desired activities.

Of the highest ten actual activities, vocational administrators and teachers selected seven of the same activities. Of the lowest ten actual activities, both administrators and teachers agreed on eight of the activities. The same two groups had 80 percent (eight of ten) agreement on the highest ten desired activities and 90 percent (nine of ten) agreement on the lowest ten desired activities. This consensus between vocational administrators and vocational teachers on the highest ten and lowest ten actual and desired activities revealed the high relationship of agreement for the two populations' perceived views regarding the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

Conclusions

The data collected in this descriptive research study provided the basis for numerous comparisons of the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors. The findings related to the specific research questions revealed nine major conclusions.

1. The study allowed the researcher to identify and rank the actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan. The highest ten actual activities can be located on page 72, and the lowest ten actual activities can be located on page 73. A composite list of all 40 actual activities for all respondent groups is reported individually and collectively in Appendix F.

2. The study allowed the researcher to identify and rank the desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan. The highest ten desired activities can be located on page 77, and the lowest ten desired activities can be located on page 78. A composite list of all 40 desired activities for all respondent groups is reported individually and collectively in Appendix G.

3. There was a high degree of similarity between the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by the composite population

of secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors.

A. In Table 4.13, eight of the same activities were selected by both teachers and administrators in the highest ten actual and desired.

B. In Table 4.13, nine of the activities were selected by both teachers and administrators in the lowest ten actual and desired.

4. There was a high degree of similarity between the perceived views of vocational teachers and administrators regarding the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

A. Of the highest ten actual activities, vocational administrators and teachers selected seven of the same activities (page 76).

B. Of the lowest ten actual activities, vocational administrators and teachers selected eight of the same activities (page 76).

C. Of the highest ten desired activities vocational administrators and teachers selected eight of the same activities (page 77).

D. Of the lowest ten desired activities, vocational administrators and teachers selected nine of the same activities (page 78).

5. Based on the opinions of the combined population, the researcher concluded that the highest ten priority activities to be

performed by the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (highest ten desired activities) included Activities 21, 23, 6, 11, 33, 37, 9, 13, 38, and 22.

6. Based on the opinions of the combined population, the researcher concluded that the lowest ten priority activities to be performed by the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee (lowest ten desired activities) included Activities 27, 1, 28, 29, 26, 31, 24, 15, 32, and 20.

Recommendations and Implications

Based on the results of the study, the researcher made the following recommendations:

1. Universities with responsibilities for vocational-personnel development should provide preservice and inservice instruction in the effective use of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee, with special attention given to the highest activities identified in this study.

2. The Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service, should refer to the conclusions of this study to identify the most important activities to be performed by the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee and encourage inservice opportunities for vocational educators on implementing the activities.

3. Further research should be conducted to determine how secondary specialized occupational advisory committee members view their roles in the vocational-education delivery process.

4. The nonrespondents should be studied to determine why they did not respond and if their responses could have changed the results of the study.

5. Further research should be conducted to determine if preservice and inservice education increase the effectiveness of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

6. A study should be conducted to determine if vocational programs function better with the use of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

7. The researcher hopes that the results of this study will be of value to vocational educators and that the data presented will help provide a basis for the more effective use of secondary specialized occupational advisory committees.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SELECTED EXPERTS IN VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Ms. Gloria Burdoin
Home Economics Specialist
Genesee Intermediate School District

Dr. John Doneth
Professor
Ferris State College

Dr. Richard Hawkins
C.E.P.D. Vocational-Technical Specialist
Gratiot-Isabella Intermediate School District

Mr. Richard Loomis
Principal
Genesee Area Skill Center

Dr. Alva Mallory
C.E.P.D. Vocational-Technical Specialist
Genesee Intermediate School District

Mr. Ken Matousek
Trade & Industry Co-Op Coordinator
Flushing Community Schools

Dr. Marvin Oberlander
Director of Vocational Education
Mt. Pleasant Public Schools

Mr. John Olson
Shared-Time Vocational Director
Carman-Ainsworth & Grand Blanc

Mrs. Francis Roberts
Office Co-Op Coordinator
Flushing Community Schools

Mr. Harlon Rose
Director of Vocational Education
Genesee Intermediate School District

Mr. Harold Scoville
Director of Vocational Education
Clio Public Schools

Mrs. Karen Wells
Steno-Clerical Teacher
Flushing Community Schools

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SELECTED EXPERTS

Flushing Community Schools

M. B. McDonald, Ed. D., Superintendent
522 N. McKinley Road
Flushing, Michigan 48433 - 1399
(313) 659-3181

DONALD WYSZYNSKI, Director of
Personnel & Labor Relations

BARBARA GUEBEL, Director of
Instruction

H. CHARLES ELBERT, Director of
Community Education

JACK A. MANSFIELD, Director of
Vocational & Career Education

April 8, 1981

Dear

Thank you for agreeing to fill out my questionnaire and to help me to validate my instrument. Please feel free to make any suggestions, changes, corrections, or helpful hints you feel would improve the questionnaire.

After the instrument is validated, I will be mailing it to selected secondary vocational teachers, area center principals, and local vocational directors to assess the actual and desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee as they perceive them. The returned questionnaires will provide me with the data that I will use to write my dissertation.

I would appreciate receiving the questionnaire with your suggestions for improvement by April 22, 1981. Your help is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jack A. Mansfield
Vocational Director

JAM:lm

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

THE ACTUAL AND DESIRED FUNCTIONS OF THE SECONDARY SPECIALIZED OCCUPATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Q. NO. _____

Questionnaire

This study of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee is being done to determine the major functions which **are** and **should be** performed by the specialized occupational advisory committee. The responses you make will be held completely confidential.

This questionnaire consists of two sections:

Section I is designed to determine your perception of the actual and desired functions or "role expectations" of the specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level.

Section II is designed to collect information on your educational background and work experience.

Section I

Directions - The secondary specialized occupational advisory committee has been identified as a group of individuals selected from the community or district to provide advice regarding instructional programs in specific trades, occupations, or clusters of occupations. This section of the questionnaire contains descriptions of functions or "role expectations" that might be performed by the specialized occupational advisory committee. You are asked to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that the committee does and should perform each function. Please weigh each function carefully and place two checks (☒) in the boxes at the right of each function which best approximates your opinion.

Preface each function with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level . . ."

Check one "SHOULD BE" and one "IS IN" box for each function.

"The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level . . ."

<p>"The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level . . ."</p>	Should be in the practice of					Is in the practice of				
	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
A. Occupational Surveys										
1. using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook.										
2. consulting with the Michigan Employment Security Commission.										
3. using the Occupational Outlook Handbook.										
4. conducting a community needs assesment.										
5. using community survey data.										
B. Course Content Advisement										
6. Identifying occupational competencies.										
7. developing program goal statements.										
8. reviewing topical outlines.										
9. reviewing performance objectives.										
C. Student Placement										
10. organizing student/employer conferences.										
11. notifying teachers of job openings. (for students)										
12. writing letters of recommendation for students.										
13. employing graduates.										
14. reviewing follow-up studies.										
15. serving as a liasson with M.E.S.C.										
D. Community Public Relations										
16. speaking to civic groups.										
17. providing input for program funding activities.										
18. providing input at public hearings.										
19. promoting the program via the media.										

Check on "SHOULD BE" and one "IS IN" box for each function.

"The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level . . ."

<p>"The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level . . ."</p>	Should be in the practice of					Is in the practice of				
	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
20. developing promotional materials.										
E. Equipment and Facilities										
21. reviewing equipment and facilities.										
22. surveying industry for equipment uses.										
23. suggesting equipment replacement.										
24. calculating depreciation allowances.										
25. soliciting equipment donations.										
F. Program Staffing										
26. reviewing teacher selection criteria.										
27. suggesting recruitment policies.										
28. recommending potential candidates.										
29. reviewing teaching applicants.										
G. Program Review										
30. evaluating student performance.										
31. evaluating teacher performance.										
32. using Annual State Department Review Questionnaire.										
33. suggesting ways for program improvement.										
34. comparing accomplishments with stated objectives.										
35. making periodic reports to administration.										
H. Obtaining Community Resources										
36. arranging field trips.										
37. recommending potential co-op work stations.										
38. Identifying community resources.										
39. obtaining personnel for classroom presentations.										
40. obtaining consultants for teachers.										

Section II

Directions - Please complete the following information about yourself. Be assured that all information you supply will be kept confidential and no individual or district will be identified in the report of this study.

1. How many years of experience do you have in your present position?

2. How many years of teaching experience do you have in secondary education?

3. How many years of administrative experience do you have in secondary education?

4. How many years of college education do you have? (check one)
 _____ A. None
 _____ B. Less than a bachelor's degree.
 _____ C. Bachelor's degree.
 _____ D. More than a bachelor's degree but less than a master's degree.
 _____ E. Master's degree.
 _____ F. More than a master's degree but less than a doctoral degree.
 _____ G. Doctoral degree.
5. How many years have you personally worked with advisory committees?

6. Have you had formal training preparing you to work with advisory committees?

7. Would you like a copy of the results of this research?
 _____ yes _____ no

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Please return completed Questionnaire to:

Jack Mansfield
 Flushing Community Schools
 522 North McKinley Road
 Flushing, Michigan 48433

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO RESPONDENTS

Flushing Community Schools

M. B. McDonald, Ed. D., Superintendent
522 N. McKinley Road
Flushing, Michigan 48433 - 1399
(313) 659-3181

RONALD WYSZYNSKI, Director of
Personnel & Labor Relations

BARBARA GOEHREL, Director of
Instruction

CHARLES ELLIOTT, Director of
Community Education

JACK A. MANSFIELD, Director of
Vocational & Career Education

May 5, 1981

Dear Vocational Educator:

I am a local vocational director for Flushing Community Schools and a doctoral candidate at Michigan State University. I am doing a research project to determine what "front line" vocational educators such as yourself feel regarding the actual and desired functions of vocational advisory committees at the secondary level.

Hopefully, with your input, we can get a handle on what local vocational advisory committees are and should be doing. The information should be helpful to all of us.

Please help me by taking about 15 minutes of your time to complete the attached questionnaire and to return it to me in the envelope provided. I know that it is late in the year and that you are very busy, but I need your help to make the data valid.

Thank you for taking the time to do this. I appreciate your help very much!

Sincerely,

Jack A. Mansfield
Vocational Director

P.S. If you would like a copy of the survey results, please note this when you return your completed instrument.

Enclosure

JAM/jal

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO NONRESPONDENTS

Flushing Community Schools

M. B. McDonald, Ed. D., Superintendent
522 N. McKinley Road
Flushing, Michigan 48433 - 1399
(313) 659-3181

**RONALD WASYNSKI, Director of
Personnel & Labor Relations**

**BARBARA GOKHEL, Director of
Instruction**

**H. CHARLES ELLIOTT, Director of
Community Education**

**JACK A. MANSFIELD, Director of
Vocational & Career Education**

Dear

Approximately three weeks ago I mailed you a questionnaire to determine your perceptions regarding the actual and desired functions of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee.

Thus far, the number of returns of this statewide study is encouraging and I anticipate that the final return rate will be sufficiently high to assume validity of the findings. As of yet, I have not received a questionnaire from you, which is vital to the completion of this research.

For your convenience, I am enclosing a fresh questionnaire with this letter. Please complete the questionnaire and return it in the addressed, stamped envelope prior to June 20, 1981. If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, thank you.

Your time and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jack A. Mansfield
Vocational Director

JAM: 1m

Enclosure

APPENDIX F

ACTUAL SECONDARY SPECIALIZED OCCUPATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Table F.1.--The actual activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by vocational teachers, area center principals, local vocational directors, and vocational administrators.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level is in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
A. OCCUPATIONAL SURVEYS							
Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook							
Vocational teachers	f	7	30	117	50	14	29
	%	2.8	12.1	47.7	20.2	5.7	11.7
Area center principals		2	8	7	15	1	2
		5.7	22.9	20.0	42.9	2.9	5.7
Local vocational directors		4	18	15	34	11	8
		4.4	20.0	16.7	37.8	12.2	8.9
Vocational administrators		6	26	22	49	12	10
		4.8	20.8	17.6	39.2	9.6	8.0
Combined		13	56	139	99	26	39
		3.5	15.1	37.4	26.6	7.0	10.5
Activity 2: Consulting With the Michigan Employment Security Commission							
Vocational teachers		15	55	80	51	18	28
		6.1	22.3	32.4	20.6	7.3	11.3
Area center principals		4	14	4	12	0	1
		11.4	40.0	11.4	34.3	0	2.9
Local vocational directors		5	21	10	37	8	9
		5.6	23.3	11.1	41.1	8.9	10.0
Vocational administrators		9	35	14	49	8	10
		7.2	28.0	11.2	39.2	6.4	8.0
Combined		24	90	94	100	26	38
		6.5	24.2	25.3	26.9	7.0	10.2

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 3: Using the Occupational Outlook Handbook							
Vocational teachers	f	12	65	85	41	17	27
	%	4.9	26.3	34.4	16.6	6.9	10.9
Area center principals		4	19	2	10	0	0
		11.4	54.3	5.7	28.6	0	0
Local vocational directors		6	23	9	33	9	10
		6.7	25.6	10.0	36.7	10.0	11.1
Vocational administrators		10	42	11	43	9	10
		8.0	33.6	8.8	34.4	7.2	8.0
Combined		22	107	96	84	26	37
		5.9	28.8	25.8	22.6	7.0	9.9
Activity 4: Conducting a Community Needs Assessment							
Vocational teachers		46	53	65	47	10	26
		18.6	21.5	26.3	19.0	4.0	10.5
Area center principals		2	16	1	14	0	2
		5.7	45.7	2.9	40.0	0	5.7
Local vocational directors		9	18	16	29	9	9
		10.0	20.0	17.8	32.2	10.0	10.0
Vocational administrators		11	34	17	43	9	11
		8.8	27.2	13.6	34.3	7.2	8.8
Combined		57	87	82	90	19	37
		15.3	23.4	22.0	24.2	5.1	9.9
Activity 5: Using Community Survey Data							
Vocational teachers		41	64	64	41	10	27
		16.6	25.9	25.9	16.6	4.0	10.9
Area center principals		1	25	5	2	0	2
		2.9	71.4	14.3	5.7	0	5.7
Local vocational directors		13	32	12	18	4	11
		14.4	35.6	13.3	20.0	4.4	22.2
Vocational administrators		14	57	17	20	4	13
		11.2	45.6	13.6	16.0	3.2	10.4
Combined		55	121	81	61	14	40
		14.8	32.5	21.8	16.4	3.8	10.8

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
B. COURSE CONTENT ADVISEMENT							
Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies							
Vocational teachers	f	63	88	29	41	4	22
	%	25.5	35.6	11.7	16.6	1.6	8.9
Area center principals		17	14	1	1	2	0
		48.6	40.0	2.9	2.9	5.7	0
Local vocational directors		21	40	6	13	2	8
		23.3	44.4	6.7	14.4	2.2	8.9
Vocational administrators		38	54	7	14	4	8
		30.4	43.2	5.6	11.2	3.2	6.4
Combined		101	142	36	55	8	30
		27.2	38.2	9.7	14.8	2.2	8.1
Activity 7: Developing Program Goal Statements							
Vocational teachers		52	70	40	55	8	22
		21.1	28.3	16.2	22.3	3.2	8.9
Area center principals		9	13	3	9	1	0
		25.7	37.1	8.6	25.7	2.9	0
Local vocational directors		9	35	9	23	6	8
		10.0	38.9	10.0	25.6	6.7	8.9
Vocational administrators		18	48	12	32	7	8
		14.4	38.4	9.6	25.6	5.6	6.4
Combined		70	118	52	87	15	30
		18.8	31.7	14.0	23.4	4.0	8.1
Activity 8: Reviewing Topical Outlines							
Vocational teachers		37	78	59	48	3	22
		15.0	31.6	23.9	19.4	1.2	8.9
Area center principals		12	15	4	3	0	1
		34.3	42.9	11.4	8.6	0	2.9
Local vocational directors		12	40	12	16	2	8
		13.3	44.4	13.3	17.8	2.2	8.9
Vocational administrators		24	55	16	19	2	9
		19.2	44.0	12.8	15.2	1.6	7.2
Combined		61	133	75	67	5	31
		16.4	35.8	20.2	18.0	1.3	8.3

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives							
Vocational teachers	f	60	93	32	39	2	21
	%	24.3	37.7	13.0	15.0	.8	8.5
Area center principals		15	19	1	0	0	0
		42.9	54.3	2.9	0	0	0
Local vocational directors		22	40	8	9	3	8
		24.4	44.4	8.9	10.0	3.3	8.9
Vocational administrators		37	59	9	9	3	8
		29.6	47.2	7.2	7.2	2.4	6.4
Combined		97	152	41	48	5	29
		26.1	40.9	11.0	12.9	1.3	7.8
C. STUDENT PLACEMENT							
Activity 10: Organizing Student/Employer Conferences							
Vocational teachers		25	39	60	76	22	25
		10.1	15.8	24.3	30.8	8.9	10.1
Area center principals		5	9	3	16	2	0
		14.3	25.7	8.6	45.7	5.7	0
Local vocational directors		3	27	12	31	8	9
		3.3	30.0	13.3	34.4	8.9	10.0
Vocational administrators		8	36	15	47	10	9
		6.4	28.8	12.0	37.6	8.0	7.2
Combined		33	75	75	123	32	34
		8.9	20.2	20.2	33.1	8.6	9.1
Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)							
Vocational teachers		45	75	43	45	18	21
		18.2	30.4	17.4	18.2	7.3	8.5
Area center principals		13	16	1	4	1	0
		37.1	45.7	2.9	11.4	2.9	0
Local vocational directors		13	43	11	10	5	8
		14.4	47.8	12.2	11.1	5.6	8.9
Vocational administrators		26	59	12	14	6	8
		20.8	47.2	9.6	11.2	4.8	6.4
Combined		71	134	55	59	24	29
		19.1	36.0	14.8	15.9	6.5	7.8

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 12: Writing Letters of Recommendation for Students							
Vocational teachers	f	33	34	54	68	36	22
	%	13.4	13.8	21.9	27.5	14.6	8.9
Area center principals		4	3	5	18	5	0
		11.4	8.6	14.3	41.4	14.3	0
Local vocational directors		5	7	20	36	12	10
		5.6	7.8	22.2	40.0	13.3	11.1
Vocational administrators		9	10	25	54	17	10
		7.2	8.0	20.0	43.2	13.6	8.0
Combined		42	44	79	122	53	32
		11.3	11.8	21.2	32.8	14.2	8.6
Activity 13: Employing Graduates							
Vocational teachers		46	91	45	29	14	22
		18.6	36.8	18.2	11.7	5.7	8.9
Area center principals		14	19	1	1	0	0
		40.0	54.3	2.9	2.9	0	0
Local vocational directors		12	52	7	6	2	11
		13.3	57.8	7.8	6.7	2.2	12.2
Vocational administrators		26	71	8	7	2	11
		20.8	56.8	6.4	5.6	1.6	8.8
Combined		72	162	53	36	16	33
		19.4	43.5	14.2	9.7	4.3	8.9
Activity 14: Reviewing Follow-up Studies							
Vocational teachers		30	77	66	40	13	21
		12.1	31.8	26.7	16.2	5.3	8.5
Area center principals		13	13	3	3	2	1
		37.1	37.1	8.6	8.6	5.7	2.9
Local vocational directors		13	35	14	18	3	7
		14.4	38.9	15.6	20.0	3.3	7.8
Vocational administrators		26	48	17	21	5	8
		20.8	38.4	13.6	16.8	4.0	6.4
Combined		56	125	83	61	18	29
		15.1	33.6	22.3	16.4	4.8	7.8

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.							
Vocational teachers	f	6	24	97	57	37	26
	%	2.4	9.7	39.3	23.1	15.0	10.5
Area center principals		1	6	5	19	3	1
		2.9	17.1	14.3	54.3	8.6	2.9
Local vocational directors		2	8	20	37	12	11
		2.2	8.9	22.2	41.1	13.3	12.2
Vocational administrators		3	14	25	56	15	12
		2.4	11.2	20.0	44.8	12.0	9.6
Combined		9	38	122	113	52	38
		2.4	10.2	32.8	30.4	14.0	10.2
D. COMMUNITY PUBLIC RELATIONS							
Activity 16: Speaking to Civic Groups							
Vocational teachers		13	38	87	62	20	27
		5.3	15.4	35.2	25.1	8.1	10.9
Area center principals		3	11	7	11	2	1
		8.6	31.4	20.0	31.4	5.7	2.9
Local vocational directors		2	27	18	29	5	9
		2.2	30.0	20.0	32.2	5.6	10.0
Vocational administrators		5	38	25	40	7	10
		4.0	30.4	20.0	32.0	5.6	8.0
Combined		18	76	112	102	27	37
		4.8	20.4	30.1	27.4	7.3	9.9
Activity 17: Providing Input for Program Funding Activities							
Vocational teachers		26	73	59	52	11	26
		10.5	29.6	23.9	21.1	4.5	10.5
Area center principals		4	15	6	7	2	1
		11.4	42.9	17.1	20.0	5.7	2.9
Local vocational directors		5	37	14	20	5	9
		5.6	41.1	15.6	22.2	5.6	10.0
Vocational administrators		9	52	20	27	7	10
		7.2	41.6	16.0	21.6	5.6	8.0
Combined		35	125	79	79	18	36
		9.4	33.6	21.2	21.2	4.8	9.7

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 18: Providing Input at Public Hearings							
Vocational teachers	f	14	47	85	58	16	27
	%	5.7	19.0	34.4	23.5	6.5	10.9
Area center principals		6	18	4	7	0	0
		17.1	51.4	11.4	20.0	0	0
Local vocational directors		8	23	18	27	6	8
		8.9	25.6	20.0	30.0	6.7	8.9
Vocational administrators		14	41	22	34	6	8
		11.2	32.8	17.6	27.2	4.8	6.4
Combined		28	88	107	92	22	35
		7.5	23.7	28.8	24.7	5.9	9.4
Activity 19: Promoting the Program Via the Media							
Vocational teachers		20	46	73	58	23	27
		8.1	18.6	29.6	23.5	9.3	10.9
Area center principals		5	15	2	11	2	0
		14.3	42.9	5.7	31.4	5.7	0
Local vocational directors		3	26	18	29	6	8
		3.3	28.9	20.0	32.2	6.7	8.9
Vocational administrators		8	41	20	40	8	8
		6.4	32.8	16.0	32.0	6.4	6.4
Combined		28	87	93	98	31	35
		7.5	23.4	25.0	26.3	8.3	9.4
Activity 20: Developing Promotional Material							
Vocational teachers		9	36	63	85	14	40
		3.6	14.6	25.5	34.4	5.7	16.2
Area center principals		3	14	2	11	3	2
		8.6	40.0	5.7	31.4	8.6	5.7
Local vocational directors		3	17	17	29	7	17
		3.3	18.9	18.9	32.2	7.8	18.9
Vocational administrators		6	31	19	40	10	19
		4.8	24.8	15.2	32.0	8.0	15.2
Combined		15	67	82	125	24	59
		4.0	18.0	22.0	33.6	6.5	15.9

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
E. EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES							
Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities							
Vocational teachers	f	75	105	23	19	4	21
	%	30.4	42.5	9.3	7.7	1.6	8.5
Area center principals		25	10	0	0	0	0
		71.4	28.6	0	0	0	0
Local vocational directors		30	41	6	4	3	6
		33.3	45.6	6.7	4.4	3.3	6.7
Vocational administrators		55	51	6	4	3	6
		44.0	40.8	4.8	3.2	2.4	4.8
Combined		130	156	29	23	7	27
		34.9	41.9	7.8	6.2	1.9	7.3
Activity 22: Surveying Industry for Equipment Uses							
Vocational teachers		47	80	45	43	10	22
		19.0	32.4	18.2	17.4	4.0	8.9
Area center principals		13	13	5	3	0	1
		37.1	37.0	14.3	8.6	0	2.9
Local vocational directors		7	50	12	12	3	6
		7.8	55.6	13.3	13.3	3.3	6.7
Vocational administrators		20	63	17	15	3	7
		16.0	50.4	13.6	12.0	2.4	5.6
Combined		67	143	62	58	13	29
		18.0	38.4	16.7	15.6	3.5	7.8
Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement							
Vocational teachers		63	101	31	28	3	21
		25.5	40.9	12.6	11.3	1.2	8.5
Area center principals		20	14	1	0	0	0
		57.1	40.0	2.9	0	0	0
Local vocational directors		24	50	3	5	2	6
		26.7	55.6	3.3	5.6	2.2	6.7
Vocational administrators		44	64	4	5	2	6
		35.2	51.2	3.2	4.0	1.6	4.8
Combined		107	165	35	33	5	27
		28.8	44.4	9.4	8.9	1.3	7.3

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances							
Vocational teachers	f	15	16	83	73	34	26
	%	6.1	6.5	33.6	29.6	13.8	10.5
Area center principals	1	3	8	20	3	0	0
	2.9	8.6	22.9	57.1	8.6	0	0
Local vocational directors	0	12	21	34	15	8	8
	0	13.3	23.3	37.8	16.7	8.9	8.9
Vocational administrators	1	15	29	54	18	8	8
	.8	12.0	23.2	43.2	14.4	6.4	6.4
Combined	16	31	112	127	52	34	34
	4.3	8.3	30.1	34.1	14.0	9.1	9.1
Activity 25: Soliciting Equipment Donations							
Vocational teachers	18	46	65	68	25	25	25
	7.3	18.6	26.3	27.5	10.1	10.1	10.1
Area center principals	3	16	5	9	1	1	1
	8.6	15.7	14.3	25.7	2.9	2.9	2.9
Local vocational directors	9	38	13	17	6	7	7
	10.0	42.2	14.4	18.9	6.7	7.8	7.8
Vocational administrators	12	54	18	26	7	8	8
	9.6	43.2	14.4	20.8	5.6	6.4	6.4
Combined	30	100	83	94	32	33	33
	8.1	26.9	22.3	25.3	8.6	8.9	8.9
F. PROGRAM STAFFING							
Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria							
Vocational teachers	12	31	60	75	42	27	27
	4.9	12.6	24.3	30.4	17.0	10.9	10.9
Area center principals	5	6	5	15	3	1	1
	14.3	17.1	14.3	42.9	8.6	2.9	2.9
Local vocational directors	0	6	20	30	26	8	8
	0	6.7	22.2	33.3	28.9	8.9	8.9
Vocational administrators	5	12	25	45	29	9	9
	4.0	9.6	20.0	36.0	23.2	7.2	7.2
Combined	17	43	85	120	71	36	36
	4.6	11.6	22.8	32.3	19.1	9.6	9.6

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies							
Vocational teachers	f %	4 1.6	42 17.0	65 26.3	75 30.4	34 13.8	27 10.9
Area center principals		2 5.7	11 31.4	6 17.1	15 42.9	0 0	1 2.9
Local vocational directors		0 0	10 11.1	15 16.7	32 35.6	25 27.8	8 8.9
Vocational administrators		2 1.6	21 16.8	21 16.8	47 37.6	25 20.0	9 7.2
Combined		6 1.6	63 16.9	86 23.1	122 32.8	59 15.9	36 9.7
Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates							
Vocational teachers		8 3.2	35 14.2	61 24.7	71 28.7	42 17.0	30 12.1
Area center principals		2 5.7	16 45.7	7 20.0	9 25.7	1 2.9	0 0
Local vocational directors		1 1.1	20 22.2	11 12.2	27 30.0	24 26.7	7 7.8
Vocational administrators		3 2.4	36 28.8	18 14.4	36 28.8	25 20.0	7 5.6
Combined		11 3.0	71 19.1	79 21.2	107 28.8	67 18.0	37 9.9
Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants							
Vocational teachers		12 4.9	13 5.3	60 24.3	73 29.6	61 24.7	28 11.3
Area center principals		3 8.6	2 5.7	2 5.7	18 51.4	8 22.9	2 5.7
Local vocational directors		0 0	3 3.3	13 14.4	29 32.2	36 40.0	9 10.0
Vocational administrators		3 2.4	5 4.0	15 12.0	47 37.6	44 35.2	11 8.8
Combined		15 4.0	18 4.8	75 20.2	120 32.3	105 28.2	39 10.5

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
G. PROGRAM REVIEW							
Activity 30: Evaluating Student Performance							
Vocational teachers	f	27	38	54	60	34	23
	%	10.9	15.4	21.9	24.3	18.2	9.3
Area center principals		4	9	3	15	4	0
		11.4	25.7	8.6	42.9	11.4	0
Local vocational directors		3	16	12	31	20	8
		3.3	17.8	13.3	34.4	22.2	8.9
Vocational administrators		7	25	15	46	24	8
		5.6	20.0	12.0	36.8	19.2	6.4
Combined		34	63	69	106	69	31
		9.1	16.9	18.5	28.5	18.5	8.3
Activity 31: Evaluating Teacher Performance							
Vocational teachers		19	37	58	57	53	23
		7.7	15.0	23.5	23.1	21.5	9.3
Area center principals		2	6	4	17	6	0
		5.7	17.1	11.4	48.6	17.1	0
Local vocational directors		1	4	12	35	30	8
		1.1	4.4	13.3	38.9	33.3	8.9
Vocational administrators		3	10	16	52	35	8
		2.4	8.0	12.8	41.6	28.8	6.4
Combined		22	47	74	109	89	31
		5.9	12.6	19.9	29.3	23.9	8.3
Activity 32: Using Annual State Department Review Questionnaire							
Vocational teachers		19	31	97	56	19	25
		7.7	12.6	39.3	22.7	7.7	10.1
Area center principals		7	15	5	4	4	0
		20.0	42.9	14.3	11.4	11.4	0
Local vocational directors		13	33	18	12	6	8
		14.4	36.7	20.0	13.3	6.7	8.9
Vocational administrators		20	48	23	16	10	8
		16.0	38.4	18.4	12.8	8.0	6.4
Combined		39	79	120	72	29	33
		10.5	21.2	32.3	19.4	7.8	8.9

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 33: Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement							
Vocational teachers	f	65	102	31	23	6	20
	%	26.3	41.3	12.6	9.3	2.4	8.1
Area center principals		23	12	0	0	0	0
		65.7	34.3	0	0	0	0
Local vocational directors		35	38	4	7	0	6
		38.9	42.2	4.4	7.8	0	6.7
Vocational administrators		58	50	4	7	0	6
		46.4	40.0	3.2	5.6	0	4.8
Combined		123	152	35	30	6	26
		33.1	40.9	9.4	8.1	1.6	7.0
Activity 34: Comparing Accomplishments With Stated Objectives							
Vocational teachers		34	87	56	31	18	21
		13.8	35.2	22.7	12.6	7.3	8.5
Area center principals		9	18	2	4	1	1
		25.7	51.4	5.7	11.4	2.9	2.9
Local vocational directors		11	42	14	14	3	6
		12.2	46.7	15.6	15.6	3.3	6.7
Vocational administrators		20	60	16	18	4	7
		16.0	48.0	12.8	14.4	3.2	5.6
Combined		54	147	72	49	22	28
		14.5	39.5	19.4	13.2	5.9	7.5
Activity 35: Making Periodic Reports to Administration							
Vocational teachers		23	62	68	46	20	28
		9.3	25.1	27.5	18.6	8.1	11.3
Area center principals		7	12	5	9	0	2
		20.0	34.3	14.3	25.7	0	5.7
Local vocational directors		9	28	15	18	12	8
		10.0	31.1	16.7	20.0	13.3	8.9
Vocational administrators		16	40	20	27	12	10
		12.8	32.0	16.0	21.6	9.6	8.0
Combined		39	102	88	73	32	38
		10.5	27.4	23.7	19.6	8.6	10.2

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
H. OBTAINING COMMUNITY RESOURCES							
Activity 36: Arranging Field Trips							
Vocational teachers	f %	29 11.7	45 18.2	46 18.6	71 28.7	32 13.0	24 9.7
Area center principals		3 8.6	11 31.4	5 14.3	13 37.1	3 8.6	0 0
Local vocational directors		4 4.4	32 35.6	14 15.6	25 27.8	8 8.9	7 7.8
Vocational administrators		7 5.6	43 34.4	19 15.2	38 30.4	11 8.8	7 5.6
Combined		36 9.7	88 23.7	65 17.5	109 29.3	43 11.6	31 8.3
Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations							
Vocational teachers		49 19.8	96 38.9	36 14.6	24 9.7	19 7.7	23 9.3
Area center principals		8 22.9	21 60.0	1 2.9	5 14.3	0 0	0 0
Local vocational directors		14 15.6	57 63.3	7 7.8	5 5.6	0 0	7 7.8
Vocational administrators		22 17.6	78 62.4	8 6.4	10 8.0	0 0	7 5.6
Combined		71 19.1	174 46.8	44 11.8	34 9.1	19 5.1	30 8.1
Activity 38: Identifying Community Resources							
Vocational teachers		40 16.2	91 36.8	42 17.0	39 15.8	12 4.9	23 9.3
Area center principals		10 28.6	18 51.4	3 8.6	3 8.6	0 0	1 2.9
Local vocational directors		10 11.1	56 62.2	10 11.1	5 5.6	3 3.3	6 6.7
Vocational administrators		20 16.0	74 59.2	13 10.4	8 6.4	3 2.4	7 5.6
Combined		60 16.1	165 44.4	55 14.8	47 12.6	15 4.0	30 8.1

Table F.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 39: Obtaining Personnel for Classroom Presentations							
Vocational teachers	f	33	72	47	46	24	25
	%	13.4	29.1	19.0	18.6	9.7	10.1
Area center principals		8	14	7	5	0	1
		22.9	40.0	20.0	14.3	0	2.9
Local vocational directors		10	43	14	11	6	6
		11.1	47.8	15.6	12.2	6.7	6.7
Vocational administrators		18	57	21	16	6	7
		14.4	45.6	16.8	12.8	4.8	5.6
Combined		51	129	68	62	30	32
		13.7	34.7	18.3	16.7	8.1	8.6
Activity 40: Obtaining Consultants for Teachers							
Vocational teachers		21	67	61	51	22	25
		8.5	27.1	24.7	20.6	8.9	10.1
Area center principals		4	20	5	6	0	0
		11.4	57.1	14.3	17.1	0	0
Local vocational directors		6	32	25	16	5	6
		6.7	35.6	27.8	17.8	5.6	6.7
Vocational administrators		10	52	30	22	5	6
		8.0	41.6	24.0	17.6	4.0	4.8
Combined		31	119	91	73	27	31
		8.3	32.0	24.5	19.6	7.3	8.3

APPENDIX G

DESIRED SECONDARY SPECIALIZED OCCUPATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Table G.1.--The desired activities of the secondary specialized occupational advisory committee in Michigan as perceived by vocational teachers, area center principals, local vocational directors, and vocational administrators.

Preface each activity with the phrase, "The specialized occupational advisory committee at the secondary level should be in the practice of. . ."

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
A. OCCUPATIONAL SURVEYS							
Activity 1: Using the Michigan Manpower Development Handbook							
Vocational teachers	f	23	87	99	18	10	10
	%	9.3	35.2	40.1	7.3	4.0	4.0
Area center principals		2	20	6	4	0	3
		5.7	57.1	17.1	11.4	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		7	50	17	11	2	3
		7.8	55.6	18.9	12.2	2.2	3.3
Vocational administrators		9	70	23	15	2	6
		7.2	56.0	18.4	12.0	1.6	4.8
Combined		32	157	122	33	12	16
		8.6	42.2	32.8	8.9	3.2	4.3
Activity 2: Consulting With the Michigan Employment Security Commission							
Vocational teachers		51	105	45	24	12	10
		20.6	42.5	18.2	9.7	4.9	4.0
Area center principals		3	15	8	6	0	3
		8.6	42.9	22.9	17.1	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		13	43	12	17	2	3
		14.4	47.8	13.3	18.9	2.2	3.3
Vocational administrators		16	58	20	23	2	6
		12.8	46.4	16.0	18.4	1.6	4.8
Combined		67	163	65	47	14	16
		18.0	43.8	17.5	12.6	3.8	4.3

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 3: Using the Occupational Outlook Handbook							
Vocational teachers	f	49	109	50	20	6	13
	%	19.8	44.1	20.2	8.1	2.4	5.3
Area center principals		5	17	2	8	0	3
		14.3	48.6	5.7	22.9	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		12	46	13	14	2	3
		13.3	51.1	14.4	15.6	2.2	3.3
Vocational administrators		17	63	15	22	2	6
		13.6	50.4	12.0	17.6	1.6	4.8
Combined		66	172	65	42	8	19
		17.7	46.2	17.5	11.3	2.2	5.1
Activity 4: Conducting a Community Needs Assessment							
Vocational teachers		101	83	22	22	6	14
		40.9	33.2	8.9	8.9	2.4	5.7
Area center principals		8	12	4	9	0	2
		22.9	34.3	11.4	25.7	0	5.7
Local vocational directors		20	41	9	11	5	4
		22.2	45.6	10.0	12.2	5.6	4.4
Vocational administrators		28	53	13	20	5	6
		22.4	42.4	10.4	16.0	4.0	4.8
Combined		129	135	35	42	11	20
		34.7	36.3	9.4	11.3	3.0	5.4
Activity 5: Using Community Survey Data							
Vocational teachers		85	98	29	17	4	14
		34.4	39.7	11.7	6.9	1.6	5.7
Area center principals		9	18	4	2	0	2
		25.7	51.4	11.4	5.7	0	5.7
Local vocational directors		30	45	4	4	1	6
		33.3	50.0	4.4	4.4	1.1	6.7
Vocational administrators		39	63	8	6	1	8
		31.2	50.4	6.4	4.8	.8	6.4
Combined		124	161	37	23	5	22
		33.3	43.3	9.9	6.2	1.3	5.9

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
B. COURSE CONTENT ADVISEMENT							
Activity 6: Identifying Occupational Competencies							
Vocational teachers	f	119	90	13	8	4	13
	%	48.2	36.4	5.3	3.2	1.6	5.3
Area center principals		22	6	2	2	0	3
		62.9	17.1	5.7	5.7	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		46	36	0	4	0	4
		51.1	40.0	0	4.4	0	4.4
Vocational administrators		68	42	2	6	0	7
		54.4	33.6	1.6	4.8	0	5.6
Combined		187	132	15	14	4	20
		50.3	35.3	4.0	3.8	1.1	5.4
Activity 7: Developing Program Goal Statements							
Vocational teachers		76	103	22	26	8	12
		30.8	41.7	8.9	10.4	3.2	4.9
Area center principals		12	10	4	6	0	3
		34.3	28.6	11.4	17.1	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		29	34	5	14	4	4
		32.2	37.8	5.6	15.6	4.4	4.4
Vocational administrators		41	44	9	20	4	7
		32.8	35.2	7.2	16.0	3.2	5.6
Combined		117	147	31	46	12	19
		31.5	39.5	8.3	12.4	3.2	5.1
Activity 8: Reviewing Topical Outlines							
Vocational teachers		63	94	42	28	5	15
		25.5	38.1	17.0	11.3	2.0	6.1
Area center principals		11	15	3	2	0	4
		31.4	42.9	8.6	5.7	0	11.4
Local vocational directors		23	50	6	6	1	4
		25.6	55.6	6.7	6.7	1.1	4.4
Vocational administrators		34	65	9	8	1	8
		27.2	52.0	7.2	6.4	.8	6.4
Combined		97	159	51	36	6	23
		26.1	42.7	13.7	9.7	1.6	6.2

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 9: Reviewing Performance Objectives							
Vocational teachers	f	93	106	14	15	4	15
	%	37.7	42.9	5.7	6.1	1.6	6.1
Area center principals		17	15	0	0	0	3
		48.6	42.9	0	0	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		42	36	6	1	1	4
		46.7	40.0	6.7	1.1	1.1	4.4
Vocational administrators		59	51	6	1	1	7
		47.2	40.8	4.8	.8	.8	5.6
Combined		152	157	20	16	5	22
		40.9	42.2	5.4	4.3	1.3	5.9
C. STUDENT PLACEMENT							
Activity 10: Organizing Student/Employer Conferences							
Vocational teachers		70	88	23	49	7	10
		28.3	35.6	9.3	19.8	2.8	4.0
Area center principals		6	10	5	9	2	3
		17.1	28.6	14.3	25.7	5.7	8.6
Local vocational directors		15	29	19	15	6	6
		16.7	32.2	21.1	16.7	6.7	6.7
Vocational administrators		21	39	24	24	8	9
		6.8	31.2	19.2	19.2	6.4	7.2
Combined		91	127	47	73	15	19
		24.5	34.1	12.6	19.6	4.0	5.1
Activity 11: Notifying Teachers of Job Openings (For Students)							
Vocational teachers		124	85	13	9	4	12
		50.2	34.4	5.3	3.6	1.6	4.9
Area center principals		19	11	0	1	1	3
		54.3	31.4	0	2.9	2.9	8.6
Local vocational directors		36	39	5	4	1	5
		40.0	43.3	5.6	4.4	1.1	5.6
Vocational administrators		55	50	5	5	2	8
		44.0	40.0	4.0	4.0	1.6	6.4
Combined		179	135	18	14	6	20
		48.1	36.3	4.8	3.8	1.6	5.4

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 12: Writing Letters of Recommendation for Students							
Vocational teachers	f	50	56	52	52	23	14
	%	20.2	22.7	21.1	21.1	9.3	5.7
Area center principals		4	7	3	14	4	3
		11.4	20.0	8.6	40.0	11.4	8.6
Local vocational directors		16	12	17	32	9	4
		17.8	13.3	18.9	35.6	10.0	4.4
Vocational administrators		20	19	20	46	13	7
		16.0	15.2	16.0	36.8	10.4	5.6
Combined		70	75	72	98	36	21
		18.8	20.2	19.4	26.3	9.7	5.6
Activity 13: Employing Graduates							
Vocational teachers		96	99	23	7	9	13
		38.9	40.1	9.3	2.8	3.6	5.3
Area center principals		15	17	0	0	0	3
		42.9	48.6	0	0	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		39	35	8	3	0	5
		43.3	38.9	8.9	3.3	0	5.6
Vocational administrators		54	52	8	3	0	8
		43.2	41.6	6.4	2.4	0	6.4
Combined		150	151	31	10	9	21
		40.3	40.6	8.3	2.7	2.4	5.6
Activity 14: Reviewing Follow-up Studies							
Vocational teachers		71	117	33	10	2	14
		28.7	47.4	13.4	4.0	.8	5.7
Area center principals		14	17	0	0	0	4
		40.0	48.6	0	0	0	11.4
Local vocational directors		25	49	5	5	1	5
		27.8	54.4	5.6	5.6	1.1	5.6
Vocational administrators		39	66	5	5	1	9
		31.2	52.8	4.0	4.0	.8	7.2
Combined		110	183	38	15	3	23
		29.6	49.2	10.2	4.0	.8	6.2

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 15: Serving as a Liaison With M.E.S.C.							
Vocational teachers	f	39	70	85	25	14	14
	%	15.8	28.3	34.4	10.1	5.7	5.7
Area center principals		3	6	11	13	0	2
		8.6	17.1	31.4	37.1	0	5.7
Local vocational directors		7	21	24	24	9	5
		7.8	23.3	26.7	26.7	10.0	5.6
Vocational administrators		10	27	35	37	9	7
		8.0	21.6	28.0	29.6	7.2	5.6
Combined		49	97	120	62	23	21
		13.2	26.1	32.3	16.7	6.2	5.6
D. COMMUNITY PUBLIC RELATIONS							
Activity 16: Speaking to Civic Groups							
Vocational teachers		50	98	62	19	6	12
		20.2	39.7	25.1	7.7	2.4	4.9
Area center principals		7	13	7	6	0	2
		20.0	37.1	20.0	17.1	0	5.7
Local vocational directors		15	43	20	7	1	4
		16.7	47.8	22.2	7.8	1.1	4.4
Vocational administrators		22	56	27	13	1	6
		17.6	44.8	21.6	10.4	.8	4.8
Combined		72	154	89	32	7	18
		19.4	41.4	23.9	8.6	1.9	4.8
Activity 17: Providing Input for Program Funding Activities							
Vocational teachers		70	108	45	11	2	11
		28.3	43.7	18.2	4.5	.8	4.5
Area center principals		7	17	5	3	1	2
		20.0	48.6	14.3	8.6	2.9	5.7
Local vocational directors		19	50	7	7	3	4
		21.1	55.6	7.8	7.8	3.3	4.4
Vocational administrators		26	67	12	10	4	6
		20.8	53.6	9.6	8.0	3.2	4.8
Combined		96	175	57	21	6	17
		25.8	47.0	15.3	5.6	1.6	4.6

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 18: Providing Input at Public Hearings							
Vocational teachers	f	45	128	52	8	4	10
	%	18.2	51.8	21.1	3.2	1.6	4.0
Area center principals		11	19	1	1	0	3
		31.4	54.3	2.9	2.9	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		23	48	7	4	1	5
		25.6	53.3	10.0	4.4	1.1	5.6
Vocational administrators		34	67	10	5	1	8
		27.2	53.6	8.0	4.0	.8	6.4
Combined		79	195	62	13	5	18
		21.2	52.4	16.7	3.5	1.3	4.8
Activity 19: Promoting the Program via the Media							
Vocational teachers		90	107	25	5	10	10
		36.4	43.3	10.1	2.0	4.0	4.0
Area center principals		10	16	4	2	0	3
		28.6	45.7	11.4	5.7	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		22	49	9	4	1	5
		24.4	54.4	10.0	4.4	1.1	5.6
Vocational administrators		32	65	13	6	1	8
		25.6	52.0	10.4	4.8	.8	6.4
Combined		122	172	38	11	11	18
		32.8	46.2	10.2	3.0	3.0	4.8
Activity 20: Developing Promotional Materials							
Vocational teachers		40	111	51	17	6	22
		16.2	44.9	20.6	6.9	2.4	8.9
Area center principals		55	16	3	7	2	2
		14.3	45.7	8.6	20.0	5.7	5.7
Local vocational directors		11	38	13	15	2	11
		12.2	42.2	14.4	16.7	2.2	12.2
Vocational administrators		16	54	16	22	4	13
		12.8	43.2	12.8	17.6	3.2	10.4
Combined		56	165	67	39	10	35
		15.1	44.4	18.0	10.5	2.7	9.4

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
E. EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES							
Activity 21: Reviewing Equipment and Facilities							
Vocational teachers	f	126	96	9	0	0	16
	%	51.0	38.9	3.6	0	0	6.5
Area center principals		23	9	0	0	0	3
		65.7	25.7	0	0	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		57	28	1	0	0	4
		63.3	31.1	1.1	0	0	4.4
Vocational administrators		80	37	1	0	0	7
		64.0	29.6	.8	0	0	5.6
Combined		206	133	10	0	0	23
		55.4	35.8	2.7	0	0	6.2
Activity 22: Surveying Industry for Equipment Uses							
Vocational teachers		100	95	27	7	4	14
		40.5	38.5	10.9	2.8	1.6	5.7
Area center principals		15	14	2	2	0	2
		42.9	4.0	5.7	5.7	0	5.7
Local vocational directors		26	42	10	7	1	4
		28.9	46.7	11.1	7.8	1.8	4.4
Vocational administrators		41	56	12	9	1	6
		32.8	44.8	9.6	7.2	.8	4.8
Combined		144	151	39	16	5	20
		37.9	40.6	10.5	4.3	1.3	5.4
Activity 23: Suggesting Equipment Replacement							
Vocational teachers		127	92	12	2	0	14
		51.4	37.2	4.9	.8	0	5.7
Area center principals		21	10	0	1	0	3
		60.0	28.6	0	2.9	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		42	39	1	3	0	5
		46.7	43.3	1.1	3.3	0	5.6
Vocational administrators		63	49	1	4	0	8
		50.4	39.2	.8	3.2	0	6.4
Combined		190	141	13	6	0	22
		51.1	37.9	3.5	1.6	0	5.9

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 24: Calculating Depreciation Allowances							
Vocational teachers	f	39	45	83	51	16	13
	%	15.8	18.2	33.6	20.6	6.5	5.3
Area center principals		1	4	11	15	1	3
		2.9	11.4	31.4	42.9	2.9	8.6
Local vocational directors		7	27	12	30	12	2
		7.8	30.0	13.3	33.3	13.3	2.2
Vocational administrators		8	31	23	45	13	5
		6.4	24.8	18.4	36.0	10.4	4.0
Combined		47	76	106	96	29	18
		12.6	20.4	28.5	25.8	7.8	4.8
Activity 25: Soliciting Equipment Donations							
Vocational teachers		79	83	42	15	14	14
		32.0	33.6	17.0	6.1	5.7	5.7
Area center principals		5	17	2	6	1	4
		14.3	48.6	5.7	17.1	2.9	11.4
Local vocational directors		23	46	9	7	1	4
		25.6	51.1	10.0	7.8	1.1	4.4
Vocational administrators		28	63	11	13	2	8
		22.4	50.4	8.8	10.4	1.6	6.4
Combined		107	146	53	28	16	22
		28.8	39.2	14.2	7.5	4.3	5.9
F. PROGRAM STAFFING							
Activity 26: Reviewing Teacher Selection Criteria							
Vocational teachers		39	81	52	35	29	10
		15.8	32.8	21.5	14.2	11.7	4.0
Area center principals		4	10	7	9	3	2
		11.4	28.6	20.0	25.7	8.6	5.7
Local vocational directors		1	30	15	25	17	2
		1.1	33.3	16.7	27.8	18.9	2.2
Vocational administrators		5	40	22	34	20	4
		4.0	32.0	17.6	27.2	16.0	3.2
Combined		44	121	75	69	49	14
		11.8	32.5	20.2	18.5	13.2	3.8

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 27: Suggesting Recruitment Policies							
Vocational teachers	f	29	103	54	31	19	11
	%	11.7	41.7	21.9	12.6	7.7	4.5
Area center principals		1	13	9	10	0	2
		2.9	37.1	25.7	28.6	0	5.7
Local vocational directors		0	26	17	30	15	2
		0	28.9	18.9	33.3	16.7	2.2
Vocational administrators		1	39	26	40	15	4
		.8	31.2	20.8	32.0	12.0	3.2
Combined		30	142	80	71	34	15
		8.1	38.2	21.5	19.1	9.1	4.0
Activity 28: Recommending Potential Candidates							
Vocational teachers		27	99	54	36	21	10
		10.9	40.1	21.9	14.6	8.5	4.0
Area center principals		2	21	4	4	1	3
		5.7	60.0	11.4	11.4	2.9	8.6
Local vocational directors		4	39	15	16	13	3
		4.4	43.3	16.7	17.8	14.4	3.3
Vocational administrators		6	60	19	20	14	6
		4.8	48.0	15.2	16.0	11.2	4.8
Combined		33	159	73	56	35	16
		8.9	42.7	19.6	15.1	9.4	4.3
Activity 29: Reviewing Teaching Applicants							
Vocational teachers		27	62	58	36	52	12
		10.9	25.1	23.5	14.6	21.1	4.9
Area center principals		3	2	5	13	9	3
		8.6	5.7	14.3	37.1	25.7	8.6
Local vocational directors		3	12	14	29	30	2
		3.3	13.3	15.6	32.2	33.3	2.2
Vocational administrators		6	14	19	42	39	5
		4.8	11.2	15.2	33.6	31.2	4.0
Combined		33	76	77	78	91	17
		8.9	20.4	20.7	21.0	24.5	4.6

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
G. PROGRAM REVIEW							
Activity 30: Evaluating Student Performance							
Vocational teachers	f	43	72	43	46	29	14
	%	17.4	29.1	17.4	18.6	11.7	5.7
Area center principals		7	13	1	6	5	3
		20.0	37.1	2.9	17.1	14.3	8.6
Local vocational directors		9	24	13	26	16	2
		10.0	26.7	14.4	28.9	17.8	2.2
Vocational administrators		16	37	14	32	21	5
		12.8	29.6	11.2	25.6	16.8	4.0
Combined		59	109	57	78	50	19
		15.9	29.3	15.3	21.0	13.4	5.1
Activity 31: Evaluating Teacher Performance							
Vocational teachers		36	57	49	45	47	13
		14.6	23.1	19.8	18.2	19.0	5.3
Area center principals		3	7	8	8	6	3
		8.6	20.0	22.9	22.9	17.1	8.6
Local vocational directors		5	12	9	33	29	2
		5.6	13.3	10.0	36.7	32.2	2.2
Vocational administrators		8	19	17	41	35	5
		6.4	15.2	13.6	32.8	28.0	4.0
Combined		44	76	66	86	82	18
		11.8	20.4	17.7	23.1	22.0	4.8
Activity 32: Using Annual State Department Review Questionnaire							
Vocational teachers		26	61	102	28	12	18
		10.5	24.7	41.3	11.3	4.9	7.3
Area center principals		9	12	5	4	2	3
		25.7	34.3	14.3	11.4	5.7	8.6
Local vocational directors		16	44	18	5	3	4
		17.8	48.9	20.0	5.6	3.3	4.4
Vocational administrators		25	56	23	9	5	7
		20.0	44.8	18.4	7.2	4.0	5.6
Combined		51	117	125	37	17	25
		13.7	31.5	33.6	9.9	4.6	6.7

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 33: Suggesting Ways for Program Improvement							
Vocational teachers	f	104	113	11	3	0	16
	%	42.1	45.7	4.5	1.2	0	6.5
Area center principals		23	9	0	0	0	3
		65.7	25.7	0	0	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		50	33	2	1	0	4
		55.6	36.7	2.2	1.1	0	4.4
Vocational administrators		73	42	2	1	0	7
		58.4	33.6	1.6	.8	0	5.6
Combined		177	155	13	4	0	23
		47.6	41.7	3.5	1.1	0	6.2
Activity 34: Comparing Accomplishments With Stated Objectives							
Vocational teachers		57	129	29	8	7	17
		23.1	52.2	11.7	3.2	2.8	6.9
Area center principals		15	16	0	0	0	4
		42.9	45.7	0	0	0	11.4
Local vocational directors		19	53	8	4	2	4
		21.1	58.9	8.9	4.4	2.2	4.4
Vocational administrators		34	69	8	4	2	8
		27.2	55.2	6.4	3.2	1.6	6.4
Combined		91	198	37	12	9	25
		24.5	53.2	9.9	3.2	2.4	6.7
Activity 35: Making Periodic Reports to Administration							
Vocational teachers		44	89	64	19	15	16
		17.8	36.0	25.9	7.7	6.1	6.5
Area center principals		7	16	3	4	0	5
		20.0	45.7	8.6	11.4	0	14.3
Local vocational directors		12	47	12	8	7	4
		13.3	52.2	13.3	8.9	7.8	4.4
Vocational administrators		19	63	15	12	7	9
		15.2	50.4	12.0	9.6	5.6	7.2
Combined		63	152	79	31	22	25
		16.9	40.9	21.2	9.3	5.9	6.7

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
H. OBTAINING COMMUNITY RESOURCES							
Activity 36: Arranging Field Trips							
Vocational teachers	f	68	100	30	23	12	14
	%	27.5	40.5	12.1	9.3	4.9	5.7
Area center principals		3	13	5	9	2	3
		8.6	37.1	14.3	25.7	5.7	8.6
Local vocational directors		14	42	12	12	6	4
		15.6	46.7	13.3	13.3	6.7	4.4
Vocational administrators		17	55	17	21	8	7
		13.6	44.0	13.6	16.8	6.4	5.6
Combined		85	155	47	44	20	21
		22.8	41.7	12.6	11.8	5.4	5.6
Activity 37: Recommending Potential Co-op Work Stations							
Vocational teachers		113	106	6	2	6	14
		45.7	42.9	2.4	.8	2.4	5.7
Area center principals		11	18	1	2	0	3
		31.4	51.4	2.9	5.7	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		35	51	1	0	0	3
		38.9	56.7	1.1	0	0	3.3
Vocational administrators		46	69	2	2	0	6
		36.8	55.2	1.6	1.6	0	4.8
Combined		159	175	8	4	6	20
		42.7	47.0	2.2	1.1	1.6	5.4
Activity 38: Identifying Community Resources							
Vocational teachers		98	119	14	0	2	14
		39.7	48.2	5.7	0	.8	5.7
Area center principals		12	18	0	1	0	4
		34.3	51.4	0	2.9	0	11.4
Local vocational directors		32	51	3	0	0	4
		35.6	56.7	3.3	0	0	4.4
Vocational administrators		44	69	3	1	0	8
		35.2	55.2	2.4	.8	0	6.4
Combined		142	188	17	1	2	22
		38.2	50.5	4.6	.3	.5	5.9

Table G.1.--Continued.

Respondents		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Activity 39: Obtaining Personnel for Classroom Presentations							
Vocational teachers	f	81	118	22	4	10	12
	%	32.8	47.8	8.9	1.6	4.0	4.9
Area center principals		10	18	1	3	0	3
		28.6	51.4	2.9	8.6	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		31	38	8	5	3	5
		34.4	42.2	8.9	5.6	3.3	5.6
Vocational administrators		41	56	9	8	3	8
		32.8	44.8	7.2	6.4	2.4	6.4
Combined		122	174	31	12	13	20
		32.8	46.8	8.3	3.2	3.5	5.4
Activity 40: Obtaining Consultants for Teachers							
Vocational teachers		59	123	41	6	6	12
		23.9	49.8	16.6	2.4	2.4	4.9
Area center principals		8	17	3	4	0	3
		22.9	48.6	8.6	11.4	0	8.6
Local vocational directors		19	51	12	2	2	4
		21.1	57.7	13.3	2.2	2.2	4.4
Vocational administrators		27	68	15	6	2	7
		21.6	54.4	12.0	4.8	1.6	5.6
Combined		86	191	56	12	8	19
		23.1	51.3	15.1	3.2	2.2	5.1

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bull, C. E. "Roles of Lay and Professional Persons." The Bulletin of National Association of Secondary School Principals (1963).
- Burt, Samuel M. Industry and Community Teachers in Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.
- Cochran, Leslie H. Key Concepts in Vocational Education: Advisory Committees. Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1976.
- Cochran, Leslie H.; Phelps, L. Allen; and Cochran, Linda Letwin. Advisory Committees in Action--An Educational/Occupational/Community Partnership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.
- Cochran, Leslie H.; Phelps, L. Allen; and Skupin, Joseph F. A Guide for Effective Utilization of Advisory Committees. Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1974.
- Cochran, Leslie H.; Phelps, L. Allen; Skupin, Joseph F.; and Yabu, Joe K. Vocational Education Advisory Committees: Needs Assessment on the Use of Vocational Advisory Committees in Michigan. Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1974.
- Craig, Robert L. Training and Development Handbook: A Guide to Human Resource Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976.
- Dunham, David B.; Simmons, Barbara L.; Whitten, Benjamin C.; Harris, Paul J.; and Gentry, Don K. "The Human Element of Comprehensive Planning." Comprehensive Planning for Vocational Education. Virginia: The American Vocational Association, Inc., 1978.
- Hawkins, Richard T. "Vocational-Technical Role Expectations of the Vocational-Technical Specialist Position at the Intermediate School District Level in Michigan." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1981.
- Mason, Ralph E., and Haines, Peter G. Cooperative Occupational Education and Work Experience in the Curriculum. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965.
- Michigan Department of Education. Directory of Vocational Administrators. Lansing: MDOE, 1978-80.

Michigan Vocational-Technical Education Service. Administrative Guide for Vocational Education. Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1978.

_____. Program Standards of Quality for Vocational-Technical Educational Programs in Michigan for School Year 1977-78. Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1977.

_____. The Annual and Long-Range State Plan for Vocational Education in Michigan. Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1982.

Roberts, Roy W. Vocational and Practical Arts Education. New York: Harper and Row Publishing Co., 1977.

Sarbin, Theodore R. "Role Theory." Vol. I, Part II of Handbook of Social Psychology. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. 2 vols. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

U.S. Congress. Public Law 74-673, The George Deen Act, 1937.

U.S. Office of Education. Education for a Changing World of Work. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

U.S. Congress. Public Law 94-482, Education Amendments of 1976. 94th Congress, 1976.

Vocational Education: The Bridge Between Man and His Work. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Wiersman, William. Research Methods in Education. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1975.