



DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 217

EA 016 713

AUTHOR Kronkosky, Preston C.; And Others  
 TITLE Title I Seminar for the Central States. Report of Conference Proceedings (Austin, Texas, January 20-22, 1982).  
 INSTITUTION Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.  
 SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.  
 PUB DATE 82  
 CONTRACT 400-81-0034  
 NOTE 49p.  
 PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Classroom Techniques; Compensatory Education; \*Conference Proceedings; Educational Administration; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; \*Inservice Teacher Education; \*Program Implementation; Teacher Improvement; \*Technical Assistance  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; United States (Central)

ABSTRACT

This report covers proceedings of a conference designed to help state Title I staff carry out their responsibilities under Chapter 1 of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act to provide technical assistance to local districts. The general purposes of the seminar were (1) to provide participants with research-based tools that would help them assist local staff to focus on several important aspects of Title I programs and (2) to inform participants of resources that can be used to help district staff improve the basic skills component of their programs. The report's longest section describes the three conference sessions--providing technical assistance and using resource bases, approaches to effective inservice, and classroom management--as well as related small-group presentations and mini-sessions. Participant concerns, issues raised during the sessions, and suggestions for followup activities are outlined, and conference evaluation results are summarized. Appendixes include the seminar agenda, a list of presenters, a directory of participants, and session evaluation data.  
 (MJL)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

REPORT OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

for the

TITLE I SEMINAR FOR THE CENTRAL STATES

January 20 - 22, 1982

Austin, Texas

Hosted by

CEMREL, Inc.  
St. Louis, Missouri

and

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory  
Austin, Texas

This report is made pursuant to contract #400-81-0034. The amount charged to the Department of Education for the work resulting in this report (inclusive of the amount so charged for any prior reports submitted under this contract) is estimated at \$25,366. The names of the persons, employed or retained by the Contractor, with managerial or professional responsibilities for such work, or for the content of the report, are as follows:

Preston C. Kronkosky, Principal Investigator  
Anna Hundley  
Nancy Baker Jones  
Barbara Baylor  
Martha Boethel  
Ginger Pfister

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Sessions	
A. Opening Session	3
B. Session 1: Providing Technical Assistance and Using Resource Bases	3
C. Session 2: Effective Inservice - A Variety of Approaches	6
D. Session 3: Classroom Management	7
E. Minisessions	9
F. Session Wrapup	11
III. Issues, Concerns, and Suggestions for Follow-Up Activities	13
IV. Evaluation	15

### Appendices

- Appendix A: Conference Agenda
- Appendix B: List of Presenters
- Appendix C: List of Participants
- Appendix D: Evaluation Data for Individual Sessions

## INTRODUCTION

The Title I Seminar for Central States was one of three regional conferences whose purpose was to assist state Title I staff in carrying out their responsibilities, under Chapter I of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act, to provide technical assistance to local Title I staffs. The seminar was designed:

- to provide state Title I staff with a number of research-based tools which could help them assist local district staff to focus on several of the important aspects of Title I programs--specifically, the management of classrooms and the design and conduct of inservice programs; and
- to provide state Title I staff with information about and experience with a number of resources which they can access and use to help local district staff improve the basic skills component of their programs.

The seminar, funded by Title I through the National Institute of Education (NIE) and hosted by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's Regional Exchange (SEDL/RX) in collaboration with the CEMREL Regional Exchange, was held in Austin, Texas, January 20-22, 1982. Participants from the 14 states in the SEDL and CEMREL regions included state Title I coordinators and members of their staff, National Diffusion Network (NDN) state facilitators, representatives from selected local Title I programs, and advisory board members from the SEDL and CEMREL Regional Exchanges.

The seminar's structure, format, and general content areas were determined through a conference planning process which involved federal officials from NIE, Title I, and the NDN, as well as representatives from the host institutions for the seminars to be held in the eastern and western states. As part of the planning process, SEDL and CEMREL also surveyed state Title I staffs in the fourteen states to obtain their input regarding the conference agenda.

In preparing the agenda and selecting presenters, SEDL and CEMREL sought not only to include those persons who could most effectively address the technical assistance needs of Title I coordinators, but also to reflect the diversity among available resource persons, in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, geography, and institutional affiliation. Conference staff felt--and the resulting agenda demonstrated--that the two goals of excellence and diversity among presenters were in no way incompatible.

Format of the two-day seminar called for three major sessions designed to provide an overview of research on each major topic-- providing technical assistance, conducting effective inservice, and organizing and managing classroom instruction. In addition, a number of related small group sessions and minisessions offered opportunities to use materials, discuss issues, and share experiences.

The following sections of this report provide a description of each conference session, a summary of participant concerns and issues raised during the sessions, suggestions for follow-up activities, and a summary of conference evaluation results.

## CONFERENCE SESSIONS

### SEMINAR OPENING AND KEYNOTE

The conference got underway with greetings from the host staff and opening speeches by three representatives of the federal Department of Education. William Lobosco, Director of the Division of Program Development of the Title I Office in Washington, D.C., and Scott Tuxhorn, the Secretary of Education's Regional Representative from Region VI, both emphasized that Title I programs have demonstrated their effectiveness through national, state, and local evaluation data, and that current federal policies are aimed at providing more flexibility for improving local practice. The seminar's keynote speaker, Brent Marriott, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education in the Department of Education, reinforced these statements, noting that Title I is "probably the single most successful program administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education." Marriott explained that the goal of the federal office now is to create a partnership with the states, who must in turn create a partnership with local school staffs. He outlined the tasks of state education staffs in contributing to local improvement as: (1) facilitating good management; (2) expanding resources; and (3) motivating teachers.

### SESSION I: PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND USING RESOURCE BASES

Session Overview. Sheila Rosenblum, of Abt Associates, Inc., presented the overview, offering evidence from research and public policy analysis as to why technical assistance is important, describing its basic premises, and raising some of the issues which state education agencies (SEAs) need to address in order to design and manage a technical assistance system. Rosenblum defined technical assistance as "a process of providing the best available information, guidance, and help, in an appropriate time and manner in order to increase the effectiveness of local educational practice." She cited implementation studies which concluded that, while local commitment to change is the most essential factor in successful implementation, without external assistance schools may not be able to make effective decisions about what and how to implement.

Rosenblum focused primarily on the linkage perspective of technical assistance, and noted that it is not necessary to be an expert in any given subject to be an effective technical assister. Cautioning against overinvolvement and "self-ownership" of local activities, she emphasized that "building local capacity may be

the most valuable impact of a school improvement effort." In conclusion, she outlined issues to be considered in establishing a technical assistance function: how to structure the technical assistance role (intensity and scope of involvement); what type(s) of assistance to offer (e.g., resource finding vs. problem-solving); how to select individuals as technical assisters; where to locate the role (centralized vs. decentralized); how to manage field agents; and how to address the need for training and support.

Small Group 1: What is Technical Assistance? Pascal Trohanis, director of Technical Assistance Development Systems (TADS) at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, presented the TADS approach to technical assistance (TA) and, in doing so, pointed out the key parameters in designing and operating a technical assistance system. The TADS approach is based on a five-step sequence of activities: (1) program planning; (2) needs assessment (which can be conducted on site or via written forms); (3) development of a TA agreement which specifies objectives of the TA, who will do what, how the TA will be evaluated, and the expected impact; (4) TA delivery; and (5) evaluation of the TA, which usually consists of a written follow-up survey.

Trohanis emphasized that the technical assistance coordinator, the person who plans and negotiates the TA activity, is the person who makes the system work; he or she functions as a linker, resource specialist, project advocate, and administrative assistant, and must possess effective communication skills. Trohanis also noted that it is necessary to "market" technical assistance services: to make people aware of the services, gain entry to local systems, and demonstrate competence.

Small Group 2: Bring About School Change. The Educational Renewal Model for Arkansas (ERMA), a method for improving school district practices through their own goals, priorities, and needs, was presented by Mary Gunter, Arkansas NDN State Facilitator. The ERMA process provides school districts with linkers who help the district identify problems, then locate the information, resources, programs, and consultants that are needed to solve the problems. The linkers also help districts get into the educational renewal process, by holding workshops about processes for systematic decisionmaking, and guiding local staff through project activities. Project strategies are grounded in educational research, and the process has been field-tested successfully in three school districts over a three-year period.

Small Group 3: Identifying Regional Resources for Technical Assistance. Nancy Baker Jones of the SEDL Regional Exchange and Greg Goodman from the CEMREL Regional Exchange provided session



participants with information about agencies and publications which can offer support to providers of educational technical assistance. The session included handouts with extensive resource listings, and a handout describing the process of question negotiation, the avenue through which providers of technical assistance determine the precise need of their clients. Presenters answered participant questions about specific resources available within the SEDL and CEMREL regions.

Small Group 4: Identifying Essential Program Elements. Gene Hall and Shirley Hord from the Research on Improvement of Practice Division of The University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education introduced two major concepts which have emerged from their research on program implementation. Levels of Use provides a mechanism for assessing the degree to which innovations are being implemented, and thus a basis for determining further training/technical assistance needs. Innovation Configuration provides a method of identifying the major components of an innovation and the variations possible in implementing each component; from this information, component checklists are developed which can be used to diagnose, monitor, and evaluate implementation efforts.

These concepts are a part of the Research and Development Center's Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), an implementation model which assumes that change is a process, not an event, which entails developmental growth in the feelings and skills of the individuals implementing the change.

Small Group 5: Basic Skills and Compensatory Education. Sandra Nichols, Program Specialist with the Texas Education Agency's Compensatory Education Program, presented an overview of the Texas Basic Skills Improvement Plan. The plan focuses on a unified and unduplicated effort of coordination of all resources, including general education (including bilingual), ESEA Title I, State Compensatory Education, Special Education, and others, to improve student performance in reading, mathematics, and writing. In developing the plan, Agency staff identified characteristics common to educational programs that have proven successful in producing essential levels of student achievement for all pupil populations. Classroom models which incorporate these characteristics then were developed for teachers to use in managing instruction, along with campus and district models to support classroom activities. In addition, the common characteristics were used to identify teacher and administrator competencies for staff development activities, and leadership activities for education service centers and Texas Education Agency support were defined.

## SESSION II: EFFECTIVE INSERVICE--A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

Session Overview. The overview of inservice was presented by Lovely Billups, Assistant Director of the Educational Research and Dissemination Project of the American Federation of Teachers. She stated that research indicates no one best way to approach effective inservice; the task is to share multiple solutions. However, she noted, inservice activities should try to emulate the methods found most effective with adult learners, rather than operate on the old--and false--assumption that adults and children learn in the same way. Citing the research into adult learning, she emphasized the importance of: the learner's experience as a basis for teaching; exchange between teacher and learner, through mutual inquiry and group discussion; motivation--through life-oriented teaching; and allowance for variations in cognitive learning styles.

Billups also stressed the importance of effectively evaluating inservice efforts, but providing flexibility in evaluation designs to account for all possible effects, including social and psychological effects, of the activities.

Small Group 1: Linking Teachers to Research. Lovely Billups also conducted a small-group session, in which she provided participants with opportunities to explore ways in which research findings have been successfully translated for teacher use in the classroom. She stressed that meaningful change occurs as a process, not as an event; trainers must be aware of the appropriate entry level for those who are being trained and must pursue a course which utilizes direct personal intervention. She noted further that descriptive, instructional, and support materials must be accessible to teachers during the process, and administrative support of the process is crucial to its success.

Small Group 2: Useful Research for Staff Development. Gary Griffin, Director of the Research in Teacher Education Program of The University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, discussed four research-derived strategies for engaging Title I personnel in staff development activities. He presented information regarding schools as social systems; peer group strategies; interactive research and development on schooling; and an approach to staff development based on curriculum planning knowledge and skills. He advocated an "eclectic" approach to staff development, drawing on the inservice strategies and program characteristics which are most applicable to the unique needs and concerns of each local school.

Small Group 3: An Inservice Model for Modifying Teacher Behavior. Jane Stallings, Director of the Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in the Secondary Schools Project at the

Teaching and Learning Institute, Mountain View, California, introduced a mastery teaching model for training teachers to use time effectively. Key features of the program's delivery system are to: (1) state the staff development objectives; (2) select or develop instruments to measure relevant teacher behavior; (3) pretest teachers; (4) provide the staff development; (5) observe teachers; and (6) measure the behavior change. Program content focuses on the effective use of time by teachers, with emphasis on interactive instruction and maximizing student time-on-task.

Small Group 4: Models and Guidelines for Staff Development and Inservice. Al King, Senior Researcher with SEDL's Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools Project, led a discussion of trends and developments, research results, and various models and types of inservice education. He emphasized inservice education as a process; discussion focused on all elements of the process: planning, preparation, implementation/delivery, application/adoption, and evaluation. King provided participants with forms and checklists for inservice education planning; he also focused on the importance of leadership, advantages of a collaborative approach, and the necessity of follow-up. In addition to discussing inservice education in general, he explored guidelines for inservice related to multicultural education and integrating the desegregated school.

Small Group 5: An Inservice Model for Improving Student Attitudes Toward School. The Positive Attitudes Toward Learning Project was introduced by John Zirges, Inservice Specialist with the Bethalto, Illinois project. His presentation focused on the key elements for implementing and sustaining educational improvements in inservice training programs, on the relationship of Title I teachers' skills to their students' attitudes toward learning, and on the relevance of the Positive Attitude Toward Learning's inservice component to Title I teachers and coordinators. Activities included a discussion of the criteria identified through the Rand Corporation's study of implementation as essential to effective implementation; a small group activity in which participants identified specific teaching skills which enable Title I and other teachers to improve students' attitudes toward self, school, and learning; and a simulation of techniques which enable Title I teachers to become "significant" to more of their students.

### SESSION III: CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Session Overview: The overview on classroom management was presented by David Boldzkom, Director of CEMREL's Research and

Development Interpretation Service. Holdzkorn reviewed the results of research studies which have focused on how effective teachers manage their classrooms, which materials and learning activities are used, and how time is spent in classrooms. However, he cautioned that much of this research demonstrates only correlations, not cause and effect, and is based on standardized test scores, which pose special problems for many students and are unable to measure affective change.

Grouping research results into the four strands of opportunity for learning, motivators, structure, and instructional events, Holdzkorn noted the following characteristics of effectively managed classrooms: (1) physical arrangements reinforce the teaching/learning style and objectives; (2) time is spent on teaching/learning, rather than on management, grading papers, etc.; (3) rules and procedures are uniform and consistently enforced, and have been taught to pupils; (4) teachers, parents, and administrators share clearly articulated goals, which are communicated to all students; (5) curriculum and tests are consonant; (6) opportunities and occasions for off-task behavior are minimized; (7) the school environment provides strong leadership, high expectations for students, positive reinforcement, and an orderly, pleasant, happy atmosphere; and (8) reading is strongly emphasized.

Small Group 1: Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching. Ed Emmer, Acting Director of The University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education's Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project, summarized research on classroom management with special emphasis on the elementary and junior high/middle school grades. He reviewed the research base for knowledge about management and its relationship to student achievement in basic skills, placing special emphasis on the beginning of the year as a critical period in classroom life. Behaviors and activities used by teachers who are effective classroom managers were described and illustrated, using written case study materials and videotape segments. Emmer emphasized four keys to maintaining good classroom management: active monitoring; stopping inappropriate behavior quickly; consistent use of consequences; and maintaining task orientation and high levels of student accountability for work.

Small Group 2: The Role of the Principal in Improving Basic Skills Instruction. Jane Stallings presented information, based on research conducted in classrooms and schools during the past ten years, about the role of the principal in achieving success in basic skills instruction. She focused on ways to conduct and analyze effective school policies and leadership style, effective use of classroom time, and simple classroom observation systems. Among the outcomes she reported were the following: in schools



where students, teachers, and administrators collaborated in reviewing and developing school policies, teacher morale was higher and teachers were more committed to teaching; in schools where policies were clear and consistent and were communicated to students, students evidenced less misbehavior and were absent less often; effective teachers had principals who were supportive of their efforts, sharing ideas, encouraging teacher growth, and providing opportunities for collaborative staff development.

Small Group 3: Management Techniques for Multiethnic Learning Teams. John Hollifield of the Student Team Learning Project at the Center for Social Organization of Schools in Baltimore, presented information about ways in which the Student Team Learning instructional process can be used by teachers to effectively manage heterogeneous classrooms and improve students' basic skills learning and interpersonal relations. The session included participation by attendees in a Student Team Learning process, discussion of technical assistance availability such as inservice training and use of certified trainers, and discussion of the use of team learning models for conducting various inservice training workshops. Hollifield explained and demonstrated the basic idea behind the Student Team Learning techniques: that when students learn in small, carefully structured learning teams and are rewarded for working toward a common goal, they help one another, gain in self-esteem and feelings of individual responsibility for their learning, and increase in respect and liking for their classmates, including their classmates of other races.

Small Group 4: An Early Childhood Management Program. Geraldine H. Jenkins, Director of the East St. Louis Direct Instruction Follow Through Program, focused her presentation on management techniques which motivate and stimulate students' interest in learning, and on the interrelatedness of parents and students in the implementation of successful instructional programs and the scheduling of language and reading activities for home and school. She shared techniques for changing negative environments into positive learning centers, and focused on specific classroom management techniques such as time management, grouping, rules for the classroom, and positive reinforcement. Jenkins provided participants with sample exercises, including checklists of supervisory skills and a classroom management assessment form; she also provided work sheets which teachers can use in daily planning.

## MINISESSIONS

Minisession 1: Summary of Evaluation and Quality Control in Title I Programs. Karen Rowlett, Assistant Project Director of



the Region 6 Title I Technical Assistance Center, addressed current and projected requirements for evaluating Title I programs. She identified essential components of the SEA role in reviewing, monitoring, and improving local program evaluation procedures, and established basic steps SEA personnel can take to assure quality evaluation data. She also related the quality control role of SEA personnel to state-level decisions necessary for continuation of Title I evaluation under the new Chapter I guidelines. She concluded her presentation with an exercise to develop a state plan for improving quality of local evaluation data, which involved: (1) identifying ways of correcting common errors in reporting of evaluation data; (2) developing a timeline of activities for improving quality of data; and (3) planning methods by which the state could provide guidance to LEAs with respect to quality control.

Minisession 2: Process Evaluation. Betty Henslee, of the Louisiana State Department of Education's Title I Office, discussed a program for process evaluation which was implemented in Louisiana in 1979. Defining process evaluation as "a systematic approach to describing, examining and making changes to various characteristics of a Title I program, both during the program and at the end of the program," Henslee explained that the process evaluation program had been initiated because the Title I staff felt that test scores did not provide sufficient information about the effectiveness of local programs. She listed the major steps involved in conducting a process evaluation: (1) describe the program as planned; (2) describe the program as implemented; (3) identify program discrepancies; and (4) make programmatic changes. She explained that process evaluation can reveal such information as: what planned activities were implemented; what circumstances changed the implementation of activities; what effect a change of plans had on the activities; which activities were most critical to the program; and what alternative activities can be implemented.

Minisession 3: Title I/NDN Collaboration: A Case Study. Nancy Moore, Illinois NDN State Facilitator, and Jolene Schultz, Missouri NDN State Facilitator, presented a session familiarizing participants with the National Diffusion Network. They discussed examples of Title I/NDN collaboration, with an emphasis on possible continuation and potential for additional Title I/NDN linkages. They also discussed ways in which regional and local educators can gain access to the validated processes and products available through the National Diffusion Network.

Minisession 4: Motivating Secondary School Delinquents and Dropouts. Donald May, Project Administrator of the FOCUS Dissemination Project, Hastings, Minnesota, presented an overview of FOCUS, a successful high school program for dealing with

disaffected youth. The FOCUS Model uses a mini-school approach that operates in cooperation with and as an extension of existing programs and services provided by the district. Classes in FOCUS include English, social studies, American history, math, Family Group, and work experiences for senior high school students. The FOCUS program differs from other mini-school concepts dealing with alienated students in its Family Group atmosphere, which emphasizes care, nurturance, and structure in its approach to students. Students are confronted with their unacceptable behavior and positively reinforced for acting in socially acceptable ways. Staff are selected from volunteers from the existing teaching staff to cover the offered subject areas; each staff member also is involved in at least one Family Group. Staff members are selected who are willing to experiment with different techniques and approaches in dealing with students. The FOCUS team offers an interdisciplinary approach which combines individualized instruction and group work based on the student's ability and needs.

Minisession 5: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) 1981: Michigan's Approach. Phil Hawkins, Director of Planning for the Michigan State Department of Education, focused his presentation on the implications of the ECIA for ESEA Title I and the programs consolidated under Chapter 2 of the Act. His emphasis was on the potential relationship between Chapter 2, the "Block Grant," and Chapter 1 in the future. Hawkins presented a filmstrip outlining major provisions of the ECIA, reviewed the provisions and status of ECIA, reviewed the possibilities for establishing allocation formulas for funding, and outlined potential SEA activities, which include: needs assessment assistance; curriculum assistance, evaluation assistance; interagency cooperation; and audit. Using Michigan as an example, he described the funding impact of the block grants and Chapter I, and described Michigan's activities in planning and allocating resources under the new provisions.

#### SEMINAR WRAPUP

Wilbert A. Cheatham, Director of Compensatory Education Programs of the Department of Education's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, made the final presentation to conference participants. He focused on the Administration's concern for improving the quality of local programs as the burdens of regulation and paperwork are diminished, and emphasized the importance of the shift in roles for state Title I staffs from monitoring compliance to providing technical assistance. He explained that the new regulations for Title I programs (which implement Chapter



I of the ECIA), while de-emphasizing federal requirements, address some issues beyond funding, including: maintenance of effort, student selection, comparability, and evaluation. Finally, he urged participants to plan with federal officials to take the next steps in implementing the new Chapter I, and to take an active role in disseminating information about the effectiveness of Title I programs.

ISSUES, CONCERNS, AND SUGGESTIONS  
FOR FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Major areas of concern expressed by participants throughout the conference sessions included the following:

- How to maintain and improve services to clients in the face of more and more severe budget cuts;
- How to make the shift from a monitoring role to a technical assistance role;
- Whether it is possible to be both compliance monitor and technical assister, or whether the two roles are incompatible;
- How to provide technical assistance when many or most potential clients are not actively seeking help; and
- Whether, as programs are deregulated at the federal level, state-level regulation will increase.

The concerns of conference presenters often reflected those expressed by participants, particularly in regard to potential conflicts between monitoring and technical assistance roles, and to funding cuts. In addition, conference presentations repeatedly focused on the following:

- The importance of time-on-task as a factor in improving student achievement;
- The necessity for personal intervention as a catalyst for change/program improvement;
- The need for a systematic process for conducting all activities (including program implementation, staff development, and provision of technical assistance) which includes the following steps: preplanning, needs assessment, and measurement of outcomes; and
- The need for collaboration and participatory decision-making, between teachers and administrators, between local and state officials, between local officials and technical assisters, and between state and federal officials.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

The high level of personal concern expressed by many state-level participants in this seminar relates to what some regard as lack of clear direction in their roles. Will technical assistance be emphasized? Is monitoring ended? Are the two roles to be combined? Can they be combined successfully? These questions surfaced during the seminar. All but the last can only be answered at the federal level. The answer to the last question is probably no, at least not by one person. The success of technical assistance efforts by state Title I staff in the future will depend on experience they have in conducting it and the support they can expect to get if they wish to sharpen the skills needed to provide such assistance. Follow-up, therefore, should consist, first, of a clear statement of state Title I staff roles and, second, of the provision of training support for those roles.

## EVALUATION

Conference participants were asked to evaluate the seminar as a whole and to assess the relevance and effectiveness of each small-group and minisession they attended. In addition, all participants were sent a followup evaluation form approximately one month after the seminar was held. Overall summaries of participant responses are provided below; more detailed evaluation information about specific sessions is included in Appendix D.

Participants were asked to rate their reasons for attending the seminar. In both the summary and followup evaluations, the two reasons rated most strongly were "Information useful back home" (72% of respondents on the summary evaluation gave this item the strongest rating, along with 57% of respondents on the followup evaluation), and "Topics relevant to my job" (60% on summary evaluation; 61% on followup). In assessing the seminar as a whole, respondents expressed the greatest satisfaction with the way staff and presenters managed the conference; the seminar's format, atmosphere, and facilities; the accuracy and helpfulness of preconference materials; and the clarity of conference objectives. A majority of respondents also felt that conference presentations and materials were clear and applicable to their work, and that the seminar provided knowledge and skills which they could use in their work.

In evaluating specific seminar sessions, participants tended to rate the small groups and minisessions higher than the large group, or overview, sessions. Participant comments also indicated that specific, content-focused information was their principal concern; a number of respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the length and character of the opening session, and the number of "political types" included as introductory speakers.

Comments from participants on the summary and followup evaluation surveys also indicated that information and resources from the seminar will be incorporated into local practice, via:

- sharing of seminar materials;
- adaptation and use of seminar techniques/approaches;
- use of resource persons identified at seminar; and
- collaboration with seminar presenters and/or other participants.

APPENDIX A  
CONFERENCE AGENDA

TITLE I SEMINAR AGENDA

Wednesday, January 20, 1982

0:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

REGISTRATION  
(Lunch on your own)

1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.

SEMINAR ORIENTATION

Wilbert A. Cheatham  
Director of Compensatory Education Programs  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
U. S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC

Anna Hundley  
Seminar Coordinator  
Regional Exchange Project  
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory  
Austin, Texas

Preston C. Kronkosky  
Acting Executive Director  
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory  
Austin, Texas

GREETINGS

Scott Tuxhorn  
Secretary's Regional Representative  
U. S. Department of Education  
Dallas, Texas

1:30 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.

SEMINAR KEYNOTE

Brent Marriott  
Special Assistant to Assistant  
Secretary for Elementary and  
Secondary Education  
U. S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC

2:00 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.

BREAK

2:15 p.m. - 5:15 p.m.

SESSION I:  
PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND  
USING RESOURCE BASES

2:15 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

SESSION OVERVIEW

Sheila Rosenblum  
Abt Associates, Inc.  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

3:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

BREAK

3:15 p.m. - 5:15 p.m.

SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

GROUP 1: What is Technical Assistance? How do you Resolve Conflict  
Between Roles of Monitor and Technical Assistor?

Pascal Trohanis  
Director, Technical Assistance Development Systems  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

GROUP 2: Bringing About School Change

Mary Gunter  
Arkansas NDN State Facilitator  
Educational Renewal Model for Arkansas  
Prairie Grove, Arkansas

GROUP 3: Identifying Regional Resources for Technical Assistance

Nancy Baker Jones  
Senior Dissemination Specialist  
Regional Exchange Project  
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory  
Austin, Texas

Greg Goodman  
Needs Assessment and Dissemination Specialist  
Regional Exchange Project  
CEMREL, Inc.  
St. Louis, Missouri

GROUP 4: Identifying Essential Program Elements

Gene Hall  
Division Coordinator  
Research on Improvement of  
Practice  
The University of Texas Research  
and Development Center  
Austin, Texas

Shirley Hord  
Coordinator of Field Services  
The University of Texas  
Research and Development  
Center  
Austin, Texas

GROUP 5: Basic Skills and Compensatory Education--  
Tying It All Together

Sandra Nichols  
Program Specialist  
Compensatory Education Program  
Texas Education Agency  
Austin, Texas

5:15 p.m. FREE TIME/DINNER ON YOUR OWN

Thursday, January 21, 1982

8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m. Coffee & Juice

8:30 a.m. - 12 noon SESSION II:  
EFFECTIVE INSERVICE--A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

8:30 a.m. - 9:15 a.m. SESSION OVERVIEW

Lovely Billups  
Assistant Director, Educational Issues  
Educational Research and Dissemination Project  
American Federation of Teachers  
Washington, DC

9:15 a.m. - 9:30 a.m. BREAK

9:30 a.m. - 12 noon SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

GROUP 1: Linking Teachers to Research

Lovely Billups  
Assistant Director, Educational Issues  
Educational Research and Dissemination Project  
American Federation of Teachers  
Washington, DC

GROUP 2: Useful Research for Staff Development: An Eclectic Approach

Gary Griffin  
Program Director  
Research in Teacher Education  
The University of Texas Research and Development Center  
Austin, Texas

GROUP 3: An Inservice Model for Modifying Teacher Behavior

Jane Stallings  
Director  
The Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in  
Secondary Schools Project  
Teaching and Learning Institute  
Mountain View, California



GROUP 4: Models and Guidelines for Staff Development and Inservice

Al King  
Senior Researcher  
Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools Project  
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory  
Austin, Texas

GROUP 5: An Inservice Model for Improving Student Attitude Toward School

John Zirges  
Inservice Specialist  
Positive Attitudes Toward Learning Project  
Bethalto, Illinois

12 noon - 1:30 p.m. FREE TIME/LUNCH ON YOUR OWN

1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. MINI SESSIONS

SESSION 1: Summary of Evaluation and Quality Control in Title I Programs

Karen Rowlett  
Assistant Project Director  
Title I Technical Assistance Center, Region 6  
Austin, Texas

SESSION 2: Process Evaluation

Betty Henslee  
Title I Office  
State Department of Education  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

SESSION 3: Title I/NDN Collaboration: A Case Study

Nancy Moore  
Assistant Director  
Illinois NDN State  
Facilitator  
Metropolis, Illinois

Jolene Schultz  
Missouri NDN State Facilitator  
Columbia, Missouri

SESSION 4: Motivating Secondary School Delinquents and Dropouts

Donald G. May  
Project Administrator  
Focus Dissemination Project  
Hastings, Minnesota

SESSION 5: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA)  
1981: Michigan's Approach

Phil Hawkins  
Director of Planning  
Michigan State Department of Education  
Lansing, Michigan

SESSION 6: Techniques for Teaching Oral Language to the  
Spanish Dominant Child

Yolanda Gonzales  
Project Consultant  
Corpus Christi Follow  
Through  
Corpus Christi, Texas

Leticia Castaneda  
Resource Center Specialist  
Corpus Christi Follow  
Through  
Corpus Christi, Texas

3:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. BREAK

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. MINI SESSIONS

ALL SESSIONS LISTED ABOVE WILL BE REPEATED AT THIS TIME

5:00 p.m. FREE TIME/DINNER ON YOUR OWN

Friday, January 22, 1982

8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m. Coffee & Juice

8:30 a.m. - 12 noon SESSION III:  
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT  
EFFECTIVE CLASSROOMS? WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS  
FOR TITLE I?

8:30 a.m. - 9:15 a.m. SESSION OVERVIEW

David Holdzkom  
Director  
Research and Development Interpretation Service  
CEMREL, Inc.  
St. Louis, Missouri

9:15 a.m. - 9:30 a.m. BREAK

9:30 a.m. - 12 noon SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

GROUP 1: Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching

Ed Emmer  
Acting Director  
Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project  
The University of Texas Research and Development Center  
Austin, Texas

GROUP 2: The Role of the Principal in Improving Basic Skills Instruction

Jane Stallings  
Director  
The Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in  
Secondary Schools Project  
Teaching and Learning Institute  
Mountain View, California

GROUP 3: Management Techniques for Multiethnic Learning Teams

John Hollifield  
Student Team Learning Project  
Center for Social Organization of Schools  
Baltimore, Maryland

GROUP 4: An Early Childhood Management Program

Geraldine H. Jenkins  
Director  
East St. Louis Director Instruction Follow Through  
East St. Louis, Illinois

12 noon - 12:30 p.m.

SEMINAR WRAP-UP

Wilbert A. Cheatham  
Director of Compensatory Education Programs  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
U. S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC

Preston C. Kronkosky  
Acting Executive Director, SEDL

Anna Hundley  
Regional Exchange, SEDL



APPENDIX B  
LIST OF PRESENTERS

Presenters for Central States  
Title I Seminar  
January 20-22, 1982  
Austin, Texas

SEMINAR KEYNOTE/ORIENTATION

Wilbert A. Cheatham  
Director of Compensatory  
Education Programs  
Office of Elementary and  
Secondary Education  
U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC  
202/245-3081

Scott Tuxhorn  
Secretary's Regional Representative  
Regional Office of Educational  
Programs  
1200 Main Tower Building  
Dallas, TX 75202  
214/767-3711

Brent Marriott  
Special Assistant to Assistant  
Secretary for Elementary and  
Secondary Education  
U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC  
202/245-8720

Session I--PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND USING RESOURCE BASES

Sheila Rosenblum  
ABT Associates  
226 W. Rittenhouse Square-Apt. 505  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215/732-6560

Nancy Baker Jones  
Senior Dissemination Specialist  
Regional Exchange Project  
Southwest Educational Development  
Laboratory  
211 East 7th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/476-6861

Pascal Trohanis  
Director and Principal Investigator  
of the Technical Assistance  
Development System  
University of North Carolina  
330-A Damascus Church Road  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514  
919/962-2001

Greg Goodman  
Needs Assessment and Dissemination  
Specialist  
Regional Exchange Project  
CEMREL, Inc.  
3120 59th Street  
St. Louis, MO 63139  
314/781-2900

Session I--PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND USING RESOURCE BASES (continued)

Mary Gunter  
Arkansas State Facilitator Project  
Region I  
Boston Mount Cooperation  
P. O. Drawer 248  
Prairie Grove, AR 72753  
501/846-2206

Gene Hall  
Coordinator  
Research on Improvement of Practice  
Research & Development Center for  
Teacher Education  
The University of Texas at Austin  
Education Annex  
Austin, TX 78712  
512/471-3844

Shirley Hord  
Coordinator of Field Services  
Research and Development Center  
for Teacher Education  
The University of Texas at Austin  
Education Annex  
Austin TX 78712  
512/471-3844

Sandra Nichols  
Fiscal Program Specialist  
Compensatory Education Programs  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-3327

Session II--EFFECTIVE INSERVICE--A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

Lovely Billups  
Assistant Director  
Educational Research & Dissemination  
Project  
American Federation of Teachers  
11 Dupont Circle  
Washington, DC 20036  
202/797-4400

Gary Griffin  
Coordinator, Research in Teacher Education  
Research and Development Center for  
Teacher Education  
The University of Texas at Austin  
Education Annex  
Austin, TX 78712  
512/471-7522

Jane Stallings  
Stallings Teaching and Learning  
Institute  
1111 Fife Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94302  
415/948-9564

John Zirges  
Inservice Specialist  
Bethalto Unit #8 Schools  
322 E. Central  
Bethalto, IL 62010  
618/377-7213

Al King  
Coordinator, Ways to Improve  
Education in Desegregated School  
Southwest Educational Development  
Laboratory  
211 E. 7th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/476-6861

## MINI SESSIONS

Karen Rowlett  
Assistant Project Director  
Technical Assistance Center-  
Region VI  
3724 Jefferson  
Austin, TX 78731  
512/453-7288

Betty Henslee  
Assistant Director ESEA, Title I  
Louisiana State Department of  
Education  
P. O. Box 44064  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
504/342-3341

Nancy Moore  
Assistant Director  
Illinois Statewide Facilitator  
1105 East Fifth Street  
Metropolis, IL 62960  
618/524-2664

Jolene Schultz  
Director  
Missouri State Facilitator Center  
310 North Providence Road  
Columbia, MO 65201  
314/449-8622

Donald G. May  
Project Administrator  
Focus Dissemination Project  
Education Growth Exchange  
121 E. Second Street  
Hastings, MN 55033  
612/437-3976

Phil Hawkins  
Director of Planning  
Michigan State Department  
of Education  
P. O. Box 30008  
Lansing, MI 48909  
517/373-7398

Yolanda Gonzales  
Project Consultant  
Corpus Christi Follow Through  
Zavala Elementary School  
3102 Highland  
Corpus Christi, TX 78405  
512/884-0611

Leticia Castaneda  
Resource Center Specialist  
Zavala Elementary School  
3102 Highland  
Corpus Christi, TX 78405  
512/884-0611

Session III--CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT EFFECTIVE CLASSROOMS?  
WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR TITLE I?

David Holdzkom  
Director  
R&D Interpretation Services  
CEMREL, Inc.  
3120 59th Street  
St. Louis, MO 63139  
314/781-2900

Jane Stallings  
Stallings Teaching and Learning  
Institute  
1111 Fife Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94302  
415/948-9564



Session III (continued)

Ed Emmer  
Acting Director  
Classroom Organization and  
Effective Teaching Project  
The University of Texas at Austin  
Education Annex  
Austin, TX 78712  
512/471-1283

John Hollifield  
Dissemination Coordinator  
Center for Social Organization  
of Schools  
3505 N. Charles Street  
Baltimore, MD 21218  
301/338-8249

Geraldine H. Jenkins  
Director  
Project Follow Through  
East St. Louis Board of Education  
554 N. 27th  
East St. Louis, IL 62205  
618/274-2838

CONFERENCE COORDINATORS

Anna Hundley  
Dissemination Specialist  
SEDL/Regional Exchange Project  
211 E. 7th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/476-6861

Nancy Baker Jones  
Senior Dissemination Specialist  
SEDL/Regional Exchange Project  
211 E. 7th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/476-6861

Barbara L. Baylor  
Senior Secretary  
SEDL/Regional Exchange Project  
211 E. 7th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/476-6861

Carol Thomas  
Director  
CEMREL/Regional Exchange Project  
3120 59th Street  
St. Louis, MO 63139

APPENDIX C  
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

TITLE I SEMINAR FOR CENTRAL STATES  
PARTICIPANTS LIST

ARKANSAS

Emily Barrier  
Consultant, State Facilitator  
Project  
Arkansas Department of Education  
State Capitol Mall  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
501/370-5038

Edwin Benning  
Title I Area Supervisor  
Arkansas Department of Education  
State Capitol Mall  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
501/371-1803

B. J. Confer  
Arkansas NDN State Facilitator  
Arkansas Department of Education  
State Capitol Mall  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
501/370-5038

Jo Cheek  
Title I Area Supervisor  
Arkansas Department of Education  
State Capitol Mall  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
501/371-1801

Garland Doss  
Title I Area Supervisor  
Arkansas Department of Education  
State Capitol Mall  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
501/371-5126

Elizabeth Gaston  
Title I Area Supervisor  
Arkansas Department of Education  
State Capitol Mall  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
501/371-1803

Don Hindman  
Title I Area Supervisor  
Arkansas Department of Education  
State Capitol Mall  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
501/371-1802

Bob Kerr  
Title I Area Supervisor  
Arkansas Department of Education  
State Capitol Mall  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
501/371-5130

ILLINOIS

Robert H. Hardy  
Manager of Compensatory Education  
Illinois State Board of Education  
100 N. 1st Street  
Springfield, IL 62777  
217/782-5534

Richard W. Naccarato  
Professional Associate  
Educational Testing Service  
One American Plaza  
Evanston, IL 60201  
312/869-7700

??INDIANA

As of 1/13/82 there are no pre-  
registered participants.

IOWA

David C. Lidstrom  
Director, Iowa State Facilitator  
Project  
Grimes Office Building  
De Moines, IA 50319  
515/281-3111

Participants List (cont.)

LOUISIANA

James E. Green  
Director, ESEA Title I  
Louisiana State Department of  
Education  
P. O. Box 44064  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
504/342-3336

Kathy Hilbun  
SPUR Project Officer  
Louisiana State Department of  
Education  
Bureau of Elementary Education  
P. O. Box 44064  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
504/342-3483

Betty Kraft  
Assistant Director, Curriculum,  
Inservice, and Staff Development  
Louisiana State Department of  
Education  
Bureau of Elementary Education  
P. O. Box 44064  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
504/342-1131

Glenda Lofton  
Supervisor, SPUR Project  
Louisiana State Department of  
Education  
Bureau of Elementary Education  
P. O. Box 44064  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
504/342-3483

(Canceled) Sue Wilson  
Assistant Director of  
Dissemination  
Bureau of Development  
Louisiana State Department of  
Education  
P. O. Box 44064  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
504/342-4268

MICHIGAN

Lyle DeBoer  
Grand Rapids Public Schools  
143 Bostwick, N.E.  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

Gladys Burks  
Director, State and Federal  
Programs  
Benton Harbor Area Schools  
711 E. Britian Avenue  
Benton Harbor, MI 49022  
616/926-8253

Vern Smith  
Michigan Department of Education  
P. O. Box 30008  
Lansing, MI 48909  
517/373-3302

Clarence Wills  
Supervisor, Compensatory Education  
Programs  
Michigan Department of Education  
P. O. Box 30008  
Lansing, MI 48909  
517/373-3666

Joseph Hirsch  
5057 Woodward Avenue  
Detroit, MI 48202  
313/494-1683

??Niles Community Schools  
(2 representatives)  
111 Spruce Street  
Niles, MI 49120  
616/683-0731

??MINNESOTA

As of 1/13/82 there are no pre-  
registered participants.

MISSISSIPPI

A. C. Bilbo  
Assistant Coordinator  
ESEA Title I Unit  
State Department of Education  
P. O. Box 971  
Jackson, MS 39205  
601/354-5944

Participants List (con't.)

MISSISSIPPI (con't.)

Lance Eiland  
Supervisor, Field Services  
ESEA Title I Unit  
State Department of Education  
P. O. Box 771  
Jackson, MS 39205  
601/345-6944

Clint McInnis  
Supervisor, Field Services  
ESEA Title I Unit  
State Department of Education  
P. O. Box 771  
Jackson, MS 39205  
601/345-6944

Jim Sinclair  
Supervisor, Field Services  
ESEA Title I Unit  
State Department of Education  
P. O. Box 771  
Jackson, MS 39205  
601/345-6944

Dewey Townsend  
Supervisor, Field Services  
ESEA Title I Unit  
State Department of Education  
P. O. Box 771  
Jackson, MS 39205  
601/345-6944

MISSOURI

Don Snyder  
Title I, Project Supervisor  
P. O. Box 480  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
314/751-4420

NEW MEXICO

Rex Hopson  
Title I Coordinator  
New Mexico Boys School  
P. O. Box 521  
Springer, NM 87747  
505/483-2475

Lulu M. Valdez  
Title I Coordinator  
P. O. Box 617  
Alamogordo, NM 88310  
505/437-4010

OHIO

As of 1/13/82 there are no pre-registered participants.

OKLAHOMA

Joe Birdwell  
Deputy Administrator for  
Compensatory Education  
State Department of Education  
2500 North Lincoln  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
405/521-2895

Bob Ranquist  
Area Supervisor  
State Department of Education  
2500 North Lincoln  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
405/721-6237

Ken Smith  
Oklahoma NDN State Facilitator  
1216 S. Rankin  
Edmond, OK 73034  
405/341-2246

Participants List (con't.)

TEXAS

??Dicki Alston  
Region 6, ESC  
3332 Montgomery Road  
Huntsville, TX 77340  
713/295-9161

??Dixie Boyd  
Consultant  
P. O. Box 863  
Houston, TX 77001  
713/462-7708

Patsy Brunson  
Migrant Program Coordinator  
Region 15, ESC  
P. O. Box 5199  
San Angelo, TX 76902  
915/655-6551

Oscar Cantu  
Title I Migrant Administrator  
Austin Independent School  
District  
1106 Clayton Lane, Suite 500 E  
Austin, TX 78723  
512/458-1291

??Frank Contreras  
Division Director, Migrant  
Education  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-0772

Lucy Cox  
Instructional Materials  
Consultant  
Region 5, ESC  
2295 Delaware  
Beaumont, TX 77703

??Rosalinda Eathorne  
Fiscal Program Specialist I  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-6523

George Franklin  
Program Director, General  
Education  
Region 1, ESC  
1900 West Schunior  
Edinburg, TX 78539

Bonnie Garrington  
NDM State Facilitator  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-5656

Saul V. Hinojosa  
Principal  
Box 240  
Freer, TX 78357  
512/394-6800

Mary Francis Hull  
NDN State Facilitator  
Region 11, ESC  
3001 North Freeway  
Fort Worth, TX 76106  
817/625-5311

Jan Johnson Keith  
Curriculum Consultant/NDN  
State Facilitator  
Region 7, ESC  
P. O. Box 1622  
Kilgore, TX 75662  
214/984-3071

Bill Lafferty  
Texas NDN State Facilitator  
1314 Hines Avenue  
San Antonio, TX 78208  
512/828-3551

Nancy Lowe  
NDN State Facilitator  
Region 15, ESC  
P. O. Box 5199  
San Angelo, TX 76902  
915/655-6551

Margaret Looper  
Region 6, ESC  
3332 Montgomery Road  
Huntsville, TX 77340  
713/295-9161

Participants List (con't.)

TEXAS (con't.)

Don Morrow  
Assistant Director  
Region 5, ESC  
2295 Delaware  
Beaumont, TX 77703  
713/835-5212

Bill Powell  
Region 3, ESC  
1905 Leary Lane  
Victoria, TX 77901  
512/573-0731

Ann Ray  
Director, Instructional Services  
P. O. Box 5199  
San Angelo, TX 76902  
915/655-3045

Ora Scott  
Fiscal Program Specialist I  
Division of Compensatory  
Education  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-3371

R. J. Smalley  
Fiscal Program Specialist I  
Division of Compensatory  
Education  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-3327

Pamela Tackett  
Planning Assistant  
Division of Compensatory  
Education  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-3327

Bill Whitfield  
Region 18, ESC  
P. O. Box 6020  
Midland, TX 79701  
915/563-2380

Jim Wilson  
Director, Division of Compensatory  
Education  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-4126

Walter Ranbo  
NDN State Facilitator  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-5656

Newlove Baulah  
Research & Development Center  
for Teacher Education  
The University of Texas  
Education Annex  
Austin, TX 78712

Leslie Huling  
Research & Development Center  
for Teacher Education  
The University of Texas  
Education Annex  
Austin, TX 78712

Karen B. Carsrud  
Austin ISD  
6100 Guadalupe  
Austin, TX 78752

Rosiland Eathorne  
Migrant Education  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701

Participants List (con't.)

Leroy Hendrick  
Region VIII, ESC  
100 N. Riddle  
Mt. Pleasant, TX 75455

Jeannie Caraway  
Region VIII, ESC  
100 N. Riddle  
Mt. Pleasant, TX 75455

Jacquelyn Harrison  
Region XX, ESC  
P. O. Box 1300  
Richardson, TX 75080

Marj Wightman  
Director, Division of  
Dissemination  
Texas Education Agency  
201 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/475-5601

Henrietta Grooms  
Region VII, ESC  
P. O. Box 1622  
Kilgore, TX 75662

Antonio Perez  
Corpus Christi ISD  
P. O. Box 110  
Corpus Christi, TX 78405

Gloria Zipkowski  
Technical Assistance Center  
Region VI  
3724 Jefferson  
Austin, TX 78731

Mike Howard  
Technical Assistance Center  
Region VI  
3724 Jefferson  
Austin, TX 78731

Laura Williams  
Region XIII, ESC  
7703 N. Lamar  
Austin, TX 78752

Earl P. Schubert  
UT/TEA  
Rt. 3 Box 262K  
Spicewood, TX

Barbara Clements  
Research & Development Center  
for Teacher Education  
The University of Texas  
Education Annex  
Austin, TX 78712

Arthur C. Hows  
Technical Assistance Center  
Region VI  
3724 Jefferson Street  
Austin, TX 78731

Jan Anderson  
CITE  
211 E. 7th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/476-6861

Eva Westmoreland  
CITE  
211 E. 7th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/476-6861

Deborah Daniels  
CITE  
211 E. 7th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512/476-6861



Participants List (con't)

WISCONSIN

Alter Burkholder  
Wisconsin State NDN Facilitator  
Department of Public Instruction  
25 South Webster Street  
P. O. Box 7941  
Madison, WI 53707  
608/267-7269

Agency--Lincoln  
Title I Consultant  
State Department of Public  
Instruction  
25 South Webster Street  
Madison, WI 53707  
608/267-9144

OTHERS

KANSAS

Ken Gentry  
Coordinator, State/Federal  
Programs Administrator  
State Department of Education  
120 E. 10th Street  
Topeka, KS 66612  
913/296-3161

Sandra Howdeshell  
Community Education Center  
1847 North Chawtaugua  
Wichita, KS 67214  
316/268-7762

Jo Ellen Ronson  
Rushton Elementary School  
6001 West 52nd  
Shawnee Mission, KS 66202  
913/722-0664

Kendall Stephenson  
Rushton Elementary School  
6001 West 52nd  
Shawnee Mission, KS 66202  
913/722-0664

NEBRASKA

Pat Thompson  
Evaluation Specialist  
Technical Assistance Center  
American Institute for Research  
1641 Summer #3  
Lincoln, NE 68502  
402/476-7051

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sidney Cooper  
Deputy Superintendent of  
Instruction  
State Department of Education  
Rutledge Building  
Columbia, SC 29201  
803/758-3403

(Canceled) Jack Seurynck  
Director of Federal Programs  
State Department of Education  
Rutledge Building  
Columbia, SC 29201  
803/758-3403

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

George Blasingame  
Chief of Education Services  
U. S. Department of Education  
Regional Office of Education  
Programs  
1200 Main Tower Building  
Dallas, TX 75202  
214/767-3711

Edward Kelson  
Education Program Specialist  
U. S. Department of Education  
Regional Office of Education  
Programs  
1200 Main Tower Building  
Dallas, TX 75202  
214/767-3711

Participants List (con't.)

U. S. Dept. of Educ. (con't)

William Lobosco  
Director of Division of Program  
Development

Title I

U. S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20202  
202/245-9897

Helen MacArthur  
Education Program Specialist  
Title I

U. S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20202  
202/245-9897

Taunya Oates  
Education Program Specialist  
Title I

U. S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20202  
202/245-9897

B. F. Peters  
U. S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue  
Washington, DC 20202

SEDL STAFF

Anna Hundley  
Nancy Baker Jones  
Barbara L. Baylor  
Martha Boethel  
Sue Bryarly  
Lynn Dawson  
Renato Espinoza  
Joyce Evans  
Preston C. Kronkosky  
Kim Kunetka  
Cynthia Levinson  
Barbara Ann Lynch  
David Williams  
Donna Bricker



APPENDIX D  
EVALUATION DATA  
FOR INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS

PARTICIPANT SUMMARY EVALUATION

Item 1: Reasons for attending seminar

Reason	Rating			Total
	3	2	1	
Topics of high personal interest	12 52%	11 48%		23
Information useful back home	18 72%	7 28%		25
Topics relevant to my job	15 60%	9 36%	1 4%	25
Strongly encouraged by others	14 58%	6 25%	4 17%	24
Interact with peers	10 44%	9 39%	4 17%	23
Interact with presenters	16 67%	6 25%	2 8%	24

3=very important 2=somewhat important 1=not important

Item 2: Conference assessment

Reason	Rating			Total
	4	3	2-1	
Objectives clearly defined	16 61%	9 35%	1 4%	26
Objectives addressed my needs	13 50%	8 31%	5 9%	26
Presentations clear	14 54%	12 46%		26
Presentations applicable to my work	12 46%	9 35%	5 19%	26
Materials applicable to my work	13 50%	10 38%	3 12%	26
Preconference materials helpful	17 65%	7 27%	2 8%	26
Preconference materials accurately portrayed seminar	18 72%	7 28%		25
Seminar well managed	22 85%	4 15%		26
Format & atmosphere conducive to learning	20 77%	6 23%		26
Facilities adequate	20 77%	6 23%		26
Seminar provided knowledge I can use in my work	9 47%	8 42%	2 11%	21
Seminar taught new skills I can use in my work	7 39%	10 56%	1 5%	18

PRESENTER EVALUATION

Item	Rating		4	3	2	1	Totals
1. I had adequate time to prepare for this seminar	9	90%	1	10%			10
2. I was given adequate advance information regarding seminar objectives.	10	100%					10
3. I was given adequate advance information regarding seminar format.	8	80%	2	20%			10
4. I was given adequate advance information regarding my presentation.	8	80%	2	20%			10
5. Seminar objectives were clearly defined.	9	90%	1	10%			10
6. Seminar objectives were achieved.	3	30%	7	70%			10
7. Seminar objectives were appropriate to participant needs.	5	50%	3	30%	2	20%	10
8. The seminar format and atmosphere were conducive to learning.	7	70%	3	30%			10
9. Adequate time was provided for my presentation.	9	90%	1	10%			10
10. Adequate time was provided for questions and discussion.	10	100%					10
11. Physical facilities were adequate.	9	90%	1	10%			10
12. The seminar was well managed by Regional Exchange staff.	9	90%	1	10%			10
13. Participants indicated they will use the information I presented in their work.	2	29%	4	57%	1	14%	7
14. Participants indicated they will use information from the seminar in their work.	3	43%	4	57%			7

4=absolutely yes 3=somewhat yes 2=somewhat no 1=absolutely no

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SESSION OVERVIEWS

Item 1: Relevance of Content

Session \ Rating	4	3	2	1	total
Providing technical assistance	27 57%	13 28%	7 15%	-	47
Effective inservice	19 38%	21 42%	7 14%	3 6%	50
Classroom management	24 86%	3 11%	1 3%	-	28
<b>totals</b>	<b>70 56%</b>	<b>37 30%</b>	<b>15 12%</b>	<b>3 2%</b>	<b>125</b>

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Session \ Rating	4	3	2	1	total
Providing technical assistance	23 47%	20 41%	6 12%	-	49
Effective inservice	17 35%	15 31%	9 19%	7 15%	48
Classroom management	22 82%	3 11%	2 7%	-	27
<b>totals</b>	<b>62 50%</b>	<b>38 31%</b>	<b>17 14%</b>	<b>7 5%</b>	<b>124</b>

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Session \ Rating	4	3	2	1	total
Providing technical assistance	33 73%	9 20%	2 5%	1 2%	45
Effective inservice	17 61%	5 18%	4 14%	2 7%	28
Classroom management	22 81%	3 11%	2 8%	-	27
<b>totals</b>	<b>72 72%</b>	<b>17 17%</b>	<b>8 8%</b>	<b>3 3%</b>	<b>100</b>

Ratings: 4=very good 3=good 2=fair 1=poor

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SMALL GROUPS  
SESSION I: PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Item 1: Relevance of Content

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. What is technical assistance?		7 70%	3 30%			10
2. Bringing about school change		10 100%				10
3. Regional Resources		4 80%	1 20%			5
4. Identifying essential program elements		7 54%	3 23%	3 23%		13
5. Basic skills and compensatory education		10 59%	6 35%	1 6%		17
	totals	38 69%	13 24%	4 7%		55

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. What is technical assistance?		9 90%	1 10%			10
2. Bringing about school change		10 100%				10
3. Regional Resources		5 83%	1 17%			6
4. Identifying essential program elements		10 77%	2 15%	1 8%		13
5. Basic skills and compensatory education		10 55%	7 39%	1 6%		18
	totals	44 77%	11 19%	2 4%		57

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. What is technical assistance?		7 78%		2 22%		9
2. Bringing about school change		9 90%	1 10%			10
3. Regional Resources		6 100%				6
4. Identifying essential program elements		10 77%	2 15%	1 8%		13
5. Basic skills and compensatory education		12 71%	5 29%			17
	totals	44 80%	8 15%	3 5%		55

Item 4: Use of Time

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. What is technical assistance?		6 60%	3 30%	1 10%		10
2. Bringing about school change		7 70%	3 30%			10
3. Regional Resources		5 83%	1 17%			6
4. Identifying essential program elements		7 54%	4 31%	1 8%	1 7%	13
5. Basic skills and compensatory education		11 60%	6 34%	1 6%		18
	totals	36 63%	17 30%	3 5%	1 2%	57

Ratings: 4=very good 3=good 2=fair 1=poor



PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SMALL GROUPS

SESSION II: EFFECTIVE INSERVICE

Item 1: Relevence of Content

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Linking teachers and research		2 100%				2
2. Research for staff development		4 44%	4 44%	1 12%		9
3. Modifying teacher behavior		19 95%	1 5%			20
4. Inservice education models & guidelines		8 73%	3 27%			11
5. Improving student attitudes (Inservice Model)		8 80%	2 20%			10
	totals	41 79%	10 19%	1 2%		52

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Linking teachers and research		2 100%				2
2. Research for staff development		7 78%	2 22%			9
3. Modifying teacher behavior		18 90%	2 10%			20
4. Inservice education models & guidelines		8 73%	3 27%			11
5. Improving student attitudes (Inservice Model)		9 82%	2 18%			11
	totals	44 83%	9 17%			53

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Linking teachers and research		2 100%				2
2. Research for staff development		3 50%	3 50%			6
3. Modifying teacher behavior		19 95%	1 5%			20
4. Inservice education models & guidelines		6 55%	5 45%			11
5. Improving student attitudes (Inservice Model)		7 64%	4 36%			11
	totals	37 74%	13 26%			50

Item 4: Use of Time

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Linking teachers and research		2 100%				2
2. Research for staff developmnet		5 56%	4 44%			9
3. Modifying teacher behavior		18 90%	2 10%			20
4. Inservice education models & guidelines		9 82%	2 18%			11
5. Improving student attitudes (Inservice Model)		7 70%	3 30%			10
	totals	41 79%	11 21%			52

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SMALL GROUPS

SESSION III: CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Item 1: Relevance of Content

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
Classroom Organization & Effective Teaching		6 75%	1 13%	1 12%		8
Role of the Principal		10 91%	1 9%			11
Management Techniques for Multiethnic Teams		5 100%				5
Early Childhood Management Program		2 50%	1 25%	1 25%		4
	<b>totals</b>	23 82%	3 11%	2 7%		28

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
Classroom Organization & Effective Teaching		5 63%	2 25%	1 12%		8
Role of the Principal		10 83%	2 17%			12
Management Techniques for Multiethnic Teams		3 60%	2 40%			5
Early Childhood Management Program		2 50%		2 50%		4
	<b>totals</b>	20 69%	6 21%	3 10%		29

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
Classroom Organization & Effective Teaching		6 75%	2 25%			8
Role of the Principal		12 100%				12
Management Techniques for Multiethnic Teams		5 100%				5
Early Childhood Management Program		2 50%	1 25%	1 25%		4
	<b>totals</b>	25 86%	3 10%	1 4%		29

Item 4: Use of Time

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
Classroom Organization & Effective Teaching		5 63%	2 25%	1 12%		8
Role of the Principal		11 92%	1 8%			12
Management Techniques for Multiethnic Teams		4 80%	1 20%			5
Early Childhood Management Program		2 50%	1 25%	1 25%		4
	<b>totals</b>	22 76%	5 17%	2 7%		29

Ratings: 4=very good 3=good 2=fair 1=poor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SMALL GROUPS  
MINISESSIONS

Item 1: Relevance of Content

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Quality Control in Title I Programs	8 80%	2 20%				10
2. Process Evaluation	7 78%	2 22%				9
3. Title I/NDN Collaboration	8 73%	2 18%	1 9%			11
4. Motivating Delinquents	4 66%	1 17%	1 17%			6
5. Michigan's Approach to ECIA	9 50%	8 44%	1 6%			18
	<b>totals</b>	<b>36 67%</b>	<b>15 28%</b>	<b>3 5%</b>		<b>54</b>

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Quality Control in Title I Programs	7 70%	3 30%				10
2. Process Evaluation	6 60%	4 40%				10
3. Title I/NDN Collaboration	8 73%	1 9%	2 18%			11
4. Motivating Delinquents	1 17%	3 50%	2 33%			6
5. Michigan's Approach to ECIA	11 61%	7 39%				18
	<b>totals</b>	<b>33 60%</b>	<b>18 33%</b>	<b>4 7%</b>		<b>55</b>

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Quality Control in Title I Programs	6 60%	4 40%				10
2. Process Evaluation	6 60%	4 40%				10
3. Title I/NDN Collaboration	6 60%	3 30%	1 10%			10
4. Motivating Delinquents		3 60%	2 40%			5
5. Michigan's Approach to EGIA	9 50%	8 44%	1 6%			18
	<b>totals</b>	<b>27 51%</b>	<b>22 41%</b>	<b>4 8%</b>		<b>53</b>

Item 4: Use of Time

Group	Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Quality Control in Title I Programs	8 80%	2 20%				10
2. Process Evaluation	6 60%	3 30%	1 10%			10
3. Title I/NDN Collaboration	8 73%	2 18%	1 9%			11
4. Motivating Delinquents	2 34%	2 33%	2 33%			6
5. Michigan's Approach to ECIA	7 44%	8 50%	1 6%			16
	<b>totals</b>	<b>31 59%</b>	<b>17 32%</b>	<b>5 9%</b>		<b>53</b>

FOLLOWUP EVALUATION

Item 1: Reasons for attending seminar

Reason	Rating						Total
	3		2		1		
Topics of high personal interest	34	50%	30	44%	4	6%	68
Information useful back home	38	57%	21	31%	8	12%	67
Topics relevant to my job	41	61%	22	33%	4	6%	67
Strongly encouraged by others to attend	19	30%	29	45%	16	25%	64
Interact with peers	35	53%	23	35%	8	12%	66
Interact with presenters	34	53%	28	44%	2	3%	64

3=very important 2=somewhat important 1=not important

Item 2: Conference assessment

Reason	Rating						Total
	4		3		2-1		
Objectives clearly defined	38	53%	31	44%	2	3%	71
Objectives addressed my needs	20	30%	32	48%	15	22%	67
Presentations clear	34	49%	30	43%	6	8%	70
Presentations applicable to my work	24	35%	32	46%	13	19%	69
Materials applicable to my work	33	49%	24	35%	11	16%	68
Preconference materials helpful	31	47%	25	38%	10	15%	66
Preconference materials accurately portrayed seminar	33	50%	28	42%	5	8%	66
Seminar well managed	57	80%	14	20%			71
Format and atmosphere conducive to learning	42	59%	24	34%	5	7%	71
Facilities adequate	51	73%	17	24%	2	3%	70
Seminar provided knowledge I can use in my work	27	44%	25	40%	10	16%	62
Seminar taught new skills I can use in my work	18	29%	24	39%	20	32%	62

4=absolutely yes 3=somewhat yes 2=somewhat no 1=absolutely no

