

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

Technical Assistance, Analytic Analyses and
Report on the Nature and Extent
of Educational Service Agency
Involvement in Staff Development Services
to Local School Systems

Submitted to:

The U.S. Department of Education
OERI

Project Officer: Carol Mitchell

Submitted by:

The American Association of School Administrators
1801 N. Moore Street
Arlington, VA 22209

Contact: Dr. Walter G. Turner
703/875-0734

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PART A. OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT	1
PART B. INTRODUCTION OF THE REPORT	3
Objectives of the Exploratory Study	3
Development of Primary Data Collection Instrument	4
Data Collection Procedures	4
State Systems Participating In Study	5
Data Analysis Procedures	6
Organization of the Report	6
PART C. RESULTS	9
ESA Involvement in Staff Development	9
Summary of Major Findings on Selected Organizational Features of Participating ESAs	10
Summary of Major Findings on Selected Features of Direct Staff Development Activities of ESAs	11
Major Issues in the Provision of Direct Staff Development Activities	13
PART D. OBSERVATIONS	16
PART E. APPENDICES	19
Appendix A: Questionnaires used for data gathering	20
Appendix B: Statistical Appendices	31
Index to Statistical Appendix	
Section 1: Selected Organizational Features of ESAs	
Table 1 Type of Region Served by ESAs	
Table 2 Number of Public Schools Served, by Size of Enrollment	
Table 3 Number of Nonpublic Schools Served, by Size of Enrollment	
Table 4 Total Distance in Miles from ESA Center Office to Central Office of Farthest LEA	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PART A. OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT	1
PART B. INTRODUCTION OF THE REPORT	3
Objectives of the Exploratory Study	3
Development of Primary Data Collection Instrument	4
Data Collection Procedures	4
State Systems Participating In Study	5
Data Analysis Procedures	6
Organization of the Report	6
PART C. RESULTS	9
ESA Involvement in Staff Development	9
Summary of Major Findings on Selected Organizational Features of Participating ESAs	10
Summary of Major Findings on Selected Features of Direct Staff Development Activities of ESAs	11
Major Issues in the Provision of Direct Staff Development Activities	13
PART D OBSERVATIONS	16
PART E APPENDICES	19
Appendix A: Questionnaires used for data gathering	20
Appendix B: Statistical Appendices	31
Index to Statistical Appendix	
Section 1: Selected Organizational Features of ESAs	
Table 1 Type of Region Served by ESAs	
Table 2 Number of Public Schools Served, by Size of Enrollment	
Table 3 Number of Nonpublic Schools Served, by Size of Enrollment	
Table 4 Total Distance in Miles from ESA Center Office to Central Office of Farthest LEA	

Served

- Table 5 Total Enrollment K-12, Public School Systems Served
- Table 6 Total Enrollment Nonpublic Schools
- Table 7 Total Number of Staff Employed by ESAs
- Table 8 Total Revenue, by Source
- Section 2: Direct Staff Development Activities of ESAs.
- Table 9 Total Expenditures for Both Direct Staff Development by Source of Funding
- Table 10 Estimated Total Expenditures for Direct Staff Development by Source of Funding
- Table 11 Total Number of ESA Staff (in FTEs) Devoted to Direct Staff Development
- Table 12 Number of Teachers/Specialists Receiving Direct Staff Development Activities
- Table 13 Number of Administrators Receiving Direct Staff Development Activities
- Table 14 Number of Board Members Receiving Direct Staff Development Activities
- Table 15 Number of Other Individuals Receiving Direct Staff Development Activities
- Table 16 Frequency of Direct Staff Development Activities to Individual LEAS
- Table 17 Number of Direct Staff Development Services that Enhanced the Instructional Competence and Skills of Teachers and Aids
- Table 18 Number of Direct Staff Development Services that Enhanced Curriculum Development
- Table 19 Number of Direct Staff Development Services that Enhanced the Competence and Skills of Leadership Personnel
- Table 20 Number of Direct Staff Development Services that Enhanced the Competence and Skills of Classified Staff
- Table 21 Number of Direct Staff Development Services that Enhanced the Ability of Schools to Serve Poor and Minority Services
- Table 22 Number of Direct Staff Development Services that Enhanced the Ability of Schools to Serve Other Special Need Student Populations
- Table 23 Number of Direct Staff Development Services that Enhanced the Adoption of Instruction Technology
- Table 24 Number of Direct Staff Development Services that Enhanced the Ability of Schools to Improve School Climate and Personal Welfare of Staff
- Table 25 Common Practices for Allocating Costs for Direct Staff Development Services
- Table 26 Planning Activities Ordinarily Used in Resigning ESA Sponsored Direct Staff Development Services

Table 27 Number of ESAs Making Use of Direct Staff Development Services

Table 28 Number of ESAs Making Use of Direct Staff Development Services

Table 29 Number of ESAs Making Use of Direct Staff Development Services

Section 3: Major Issues Faced in Delivery of Staff Development Services

Table 30 Composite Views of ESA Officials Concerning Problems Faced in Provision of Direct Staff Development Services

Table 31 Composite Views of ESA Officials Concerning Problems Faced in Provision of Direct Staff Development Services

Table 32 Mean Scores of ESA Officials, Views Concerning Problems Faced in The Provision of Direct Staff Development Services, by State

Appendix C: Mini-profiles of participating states

A. OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

During the spring and summer of 1987, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) held discussions with the director of the American Association of Educational Service Agencies (AAESA), Dr. Walter G. Turner, and education researcher, Dr. E. Robert Stephens. The purpose was to determine how best to identify contributions made in educational staff development by education service agencies.

Education Service agencies are intermediate, county, regional, or cooperative education organizations that serve local districts by providing a range of services and products that are best paid for by groups of school districts, rather than individual systems.

The question of the contributions of educational service agencies, or ESAs as they are known, is particularly relevant in light of the educational reform movements occurring in states. It was the opinion of AAESA, which represents ESAs, and Robert Stephens, who has devoted much of his career to studying them, that their role is significant and has increased with the recent emphasis on reform.

Limited funds required the scope of the study to be modified during the project period. The vehicle for data gathering was the network of state department of education staff in nine states who serve as coordinators of ESA activities. In addition to reviewing distributing and collecting data gathering instruments these officials were also to solicit descriptions of exemplary ESA staff development models. As these tasks proved to be time consuming and demanding for them, few description exemplary models were collected -- in fact too few to include in this report. In addition one state, Connecticut, could not participate due to logistical problems.

Nevertheless, of a possible 150 individual ESA units included in the study, 105 responded to the questionnaires. In some states, 100% of the units responded. Information gathered provides a picture of agencies making a significant response to education reform challenges in their states. The findings

reported here should be of interest to all those seeking to understand how regional and local education agencies provide training to teachers and administrators.

B. INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT

There is a long history of Education Service Agency (ESA) involvement in staff development. Virtually all early national profiles of the agencies established the prominence of staff development in the services they provided to schools. Later national and state descriptive studies confirm the continuing centrality of staff development.

Why then did OERI undertake a new probe? The emphasis given professional renewal reform movements in the school excellence and school reform movements required that at the evolving role of the ESA be examined. There has been some evidence that staff development activities of ESAs have accelerated in recent years due to the total or partial assumption of curriculum development and instructional improvement formerly administered by both large and small LEAs (Local Education Agencies) and by the state education agency.

Objectives of the Exploratory Study

There are three objectives to this inquiry: To describe selected organizational features of ESAs; to describe direct staff development activities offered by ESAs; and to identify major issues confronting ESAs in the provision of staff development.

Of nine states were originally included in this study: Georgia, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, and Texas completed the study. Connecticut later discovered that logistical problems precluded their participation.

The selection criteria used to determine the state involvement is as follows:

- The use of state networks of all three major forms of ESAs;

- The use of state networks where the perceived "receptivity" for participation in the study was judged to be high;
- The use of states where other important contextual features are present, particularly--a history of extensive ESA involvement in staff development;
- Comprehensive state mandated reforms were underway, including state mandated staff development;
- Extensive rurality in the state;
- OMB guidelines that limited the effort to nine states;

Development of Primary Data Collection Instrument

As an initial step, during the summer of 1987, representatives of the state education agencies (SEAs) of the nine states to be included in the study met with OERI personnel. They jointly established objectives for the study and to approved the management plan, including the data collection instrument. SEA representatives agreed to coordinate the collection of primary information requested of individual ESAs.

Data Collection Procedures

The SEA representatives sent necessary forms and instructions to the ESAs in their states in November 1987. Follow-up requests were made in December, January, and February. SEA representatives also were asked to validate information provided by individual ESAs.

The table entitled "State Systems of ESAs Participating in Study" details the pattern of responses. 105 or 64 percent of a potential 150 ESAs provided descriptions of their direct staff development activities. All data was for the 1986-87 school year.

STATE SYSTEMS OF ESAs PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

STATE	TITLE OF UNIT	YEAR ESTABLISHED:	NUMBER OF UNITS IN SYSTEM AND TYPE OF ESA 1986-87		NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN STUDY	
			SPECIAL INTEREST	REGIONALIZED SEA ERATIVE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Connecticut	Regional Educational Service Centers	1972		6	0	00.0
Georgia	Cooperative Education Service Agencies	1966	17		10	58.2
Iowa	Area Education Agencies	1975	15		7	46.7
Minnesota	Education Cooperative Service Centers	1973	9		9	100.0
Nebraska	Educational Service Centers	1965	19		24	73.7
New York	Boards of Cooperative Educational Services	1948	41		41	100.0
North Carolina	Regional Education Centers	1971		8	5	62.5
Oregon	Education Service Districts	1963	29		4	13.8
Texas	Regional Educational Service Centers	1967	20		15	75.0
	TOTAL		150	8	105	64.0

Data Analysis Procedures

Information on ESA staff development practices was limited to frequency counts, means and ranges, (minimum and maximum) for each of the eight participating state networks of ESAs. We caution against the reader using data to draw comparisons among the eight states, and point out the rate of participation of ESAs per state varied.

Organization of Report

The remainder of the report is composed of a results section, a observations, statistical appendix, and descriptive information about the ESA involvement in education reform and staff development in participating states.

Summary statements are provided on the following features of ESA staff development activities:

- Selected organizational features of the ESAs (e.g., type of region served; number and size of enrollment of public and nonpublic schools in region served; number of certified and classified staff employed; revenues sources of the agencies).
- Selected features of ESA direct staff development activities (e.g., total expenditures for direct staff development activities; ESA staff devoted to direct staff development; number of teachers/specialists, administrators, and others receiving ESA staff development services; the nature of ESA staff development services; planning activities used in deciding on what activities to offer; the extent of use of technology in the provision of staff development; the way in which the ESAs evaluate their staff development; efforts).

- The perceptions of ESA administrators concerning major issues faced by them in the provision of direct staff development.
- A number of observations concerning the nature of ESA direct staff development efforts.

Appendix B includes base line data. The mini-profiles in Appendix C provide selected contextual information on each of the participatory states. These state profiles were prepared by the SEA representatives who were asked to follow a standard format. (See Appendix A) Information requested of each SEA representative gave prominence to:

- The nature and origin of state mandated school improvement initiatives underway in the state in the past five years.
- Whether or not mandated staff development is one of the state school improvement initiatives undertaken and if so, to provide a description of the provisions of their effort.
- What role, if any, the ESAs are expected to play in any recent state mandated staff development.
- A description of how ESA staff development activities support state mandated school improvement initiatives.
- A listing of other key providers of staff development and a description of the nature of their activity.

- The nature of the fiscal resources devoted to staff development in the state system and whether or not this has changed in recent years.
- The judgment of the SEA representative, as to whether or not there is currently in place a comprehensive, integrated and cohesive state plan for staff development.
- A description of important governance features of ESAs that will help in understanding how ESA polities are determined.

C. RESULTS

ESA Involvement in Direct Staff Development

Introduction

The principal objective of this exploratory study was to describe selected aspects of ESA direct staff development activities. It is recognized that many ESAs across the country offer a wide and diverse set of activities for LEAs that could be classified as staff development. This study deals only with direct staff development activities of ESAs. The operational definition used for this purpose is as follows:

Direct staff development is defined as those activities where the staff of the ESA, either unilaterally or in collaboration, is engaged in providing a service where the prime objective is to improve the competencies and skills of an individual or group of a public or nonpublic school in a content area of pedagogy. (e.g., workshops, seminars, extended thematic series, consultant services to an individual/group)

Summaries on the following are presented here (reader refer to Statistical Appendix for bar line data that support summary statement):

- Section 1 Selected Organizational Features of
 Participating ESAs

- Section 2 Selected Features of Direct Staff Development
 Activities

- Section 3 Major Issues in the Provision of Direct Staff
 Development Activities

This portion of the report concludes with the statement of a number of observations concerning the direct staff development activities of the 105 participating ESAs in eight states.

Summary of Major Findings on the Selected Organizational Features of Participating ESAs

The major findings relevant to organizational features are as follows:

- The majority (53.3 percent) of ESAs characterized the region they served as largely rural, although another approximate one-fourth (23.8) characterized units as serving regions that were a mix of urban, suburban, and rural (Table 1).
- The 105 responding ESAs served largely small enrollment size public LEAs - those enrolling less than 2,500 students in grades K-12 (Table 2).
- The vast majority of nonprofit schools served also had very small enrollments in 1986-87 (Table 3).
- The mean distance in miles from the central office of the majority of ESAs to the farthest LEA served approximated a one to one-and-one-half hour driving time (Table 4). Maximum travel time is in those states that cover large geographic areas (e.g., Minnesota, Texas and Nebraska).
- The 105 responding ESAs were relatively large educational organizations as measured by the mean number of certified and classified staff employed in 1986-87. The mean number of certified staff exceeded 299 in the seven Iowa ESAs participating in the study and in the 41 New York BOCES who provided data (Table 7).

- The relative large size of the operations of the responding ESAs is also reflected in the size of their revenues in 1986-87 (Table 8).

Summary of Major Findings on Selected Features of Direct Staff Development Activities of ESAs

- The mean expenditures for both direct and technical assistance staff development by ESAs is worthy of mention especially for those responding in Iowa, Texas, New York, and Minnesota (Table 9).
- The bulk of these mean expenditures were reportedly devoted to direct staff development in the majority of cases (Table 10).
- The mean size of certified staff of ESAs is also notable -- representing a meaningful concentration of professional personnel in the majority of cases (Table 11).
- A number of teachers/specialists (Table 12), administrators (Table 13), board members (Table 14) and both public and nonpublic schools received one or more staff development services offered by ESAs in the eight states in 86-87. We do not know where else LEA staff and officials received staff development, but these figures are impressive.
- It is clear that direct ESA staff development services to LEAs in 86-87 are not only important when viewed from the perspective of number of individuals served, but equally important, from the perspective of assisting LEA and nonpublic schools in dealing with the themes of the current school excellent and school reform movement.

As established in Tables 17-24, an impressive number of staff development services were offered in each of the themes of the excellence/reform movement listed as follows:

1. Enhancing the instructional competencies and skills of teachers
2. Enhancing curriculum development
3. Enhancing competence and skills of leadership personnel
4. Enhancing competence and skills of classified staff
5. Enhancing ability of schools to serve poor and minority/students
6. Enhancing ability of schools to serve other special need population
7. Enhancing ability of schools to adopt new technology
8. Enhancing the school climate and personal welfare of staff

It should be noted that ESA services summarized above could be counted only once, even though a particular service might be relevant to several themes (Table 25).

- ESAs make use of a number of approaches for allocating costs for direct staff development when charges for these sources must be assessed. The most common practices are the equal distribution of costs among all LEAs and basing charges on LEA participation (Table 25).

- ESAs ordinarily make extensive use of LEA advisory groups in planning their staff development activities (some are mandated to do so) and also have available local and regional needs assessment data upon which to design their activities (Table 26).
- ESAs tend to make extensive use of first generation technology in the provision of direct staff development activities -- all responding units reportedly use video texts and teletext and a strong majority use video tapes (Table 27).
- A majority of ESAs make use of post user satisfaction measures as part of their assessment of direct staff development activities (usually conducted by ESA staff rather than by an external/third party evaluator). Few ESAs engage the home school district in these types of assessments (Table 28).
- A majority also make regular use of post-user effectiveness measures in assessing the effectiveness of direct staff development activities. ESA staff tend to assume responsibility for assessments of this type (Table 29).
- As somewhat of a surprise, less than a majority of ESA reportedly make use of service utilization measures as part of their evaluation practices (Table 30).

Major Issues as the Provision of Direct Staff Development Activities

ESA administrators were requested to establish major issues they are confronted with in the provision of direct staff development services. Highlights of their response are reported below:

- Key
1. Very serious problem
 2. Rather serious problem
 3. Moderately serious problem
 4. No problems

The most constraining issues reported by ESA administrators related to providing direct staff development by all responding ESAs were:

Unavailability of LEA substitutes	2.6 mean
Difficulty planning follow up	2.6
Lack of allocated ESA funds	2.7
Pressure for short term fixes	2.7
Unavailability of good effectiveness measures	3.0
Unavailability of good cost effective measures	3.0

The least constraining issues reported by all responding ESAs were:

LEAs unwilling to share resources	3.6 mean
Lack of participation - small school districts	3.5
Unavailability of training models	3.4
Lack of teacher interest	3.4
Distance	3.4
Inability to compete for staff	3.4
Unavailability of quality consultants	3.4

Additional constraints reported for some states were:

Lack of good needs data	2.5 mean (Nebraska)
Role ambiguity ESA-LEA	2.7 (Minnesota)
Lack of funds for consultants	2.4 (Minnesota)
Legislative constraints	2.1 (Texas)
Inadequate facilities	2.3 (Oregon)
Regulatory constraints	2.5 (Texas)
Lack of local administrative support	2.8 (Minnesota)

The composite views of ESA officials concerning problems faced in the provisions of direct staff development services are provided in the accompanying table (Table 30).

The mean scores of ESA officials views concerning problems faced in the provision of direct staff development services by state are provided in the accompanying table (Table 31).

The mean aggregate scores of ESA officials' views concerning problems faced in the provision of direct staff development services by individual states are provided in the accompanying table (Table 32).

D. OBSERVATIONS

The completion of this exploratory study of direct staff development activities of ESA in eight states makes possible the offering of a number of major observations. These are:

- ESAs, especially in Iowa, Minnesota, New York, and Texas, would appear to be important actors on their respective state systems of elementary-secondary education -- when measured by: Their total expenditures; and the size of their staffs.
- Direct staff development activities with a major focus of the programs and services of a substantial majority of the ESAs--when measured by: the percent of ESAs offering staff development (virtually all do); and the percent of the total expenditures of the units devoted to staff development.
- ESAs appear to be a major provider of staff development activities in their respective states--when measured by: the number of school systems (both public and nonpublic) serviced; the frequency of activities provided a single system; and, the number of LEA teachers/specialists, administrators, board members, and other employees served.
- ESAs appear to be critical partners in the implementation of school reform initiatives in their respective states, especially in the promotion of the following themes of their reform movement: the enhancement of the instructional competence and skills of teacher and instructional aids; the enhancement of curriculum development; the enhancement of the ability of schools to serve special need student populations; and, the adoption of instructional technology.

- A majority of ESAs make extensive use of widely acknowledged planning processes to facilitate user involvement in the design of their staff development activities. These processes appear to be "institutionalized" in the agencies.
- The use of "first generation" only technology for the delivery of staff development activities appears to be the norm.
- While a majority of ESAs engage in an evaluation of their staff development activities, they tend to limit these to user satisfaction measures and service utilization measures and do not make extensive use of other, more meaningful, but difficult to develop, post user effectiveness measures.
- Most of the dominant issues faced by ESAs in the provision of effective direct staff development services, while complex in their origin and in their resolution, are nonetheless amiable to cooperative problem-solving, a process that would seem to be enhanced if all parties express an organizational commitment to excellence in staffing.

Four additional, but more guarded comments on the staff development activities of ESAs are offered:

1. The heavy involvement of ESAs in staff development would appear to have accelerated the implementation of the objectives of many of the school reform initiatives underway in their respective states
2. Rural small school districts (those enrolling fewer than 2,500 student) appear to be heavily dependent upon the services of ESAs for much of their school improvement efforts.

3. Similarly, it would appear that ESAs are a major provider of direct staff development services for nonpublic schools in their service region.

4. The commitment of the state education agency (continues to be) critical in the formulation of a meaningful ESA role in staff development as it is for the development of a needed comprehensive, integrated, and cohesive "master plan" for staff development in the state system.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

QUESTIONNAIRES USED FOR
DATA GATHERING

MINI STATE PROFILE

The SEA consultant for ESAs is asked to provide a brief profile of pertinent background information on the state system of elementary-secondary education that will help set the context for the more detailed, yet still brief, description of ESA staff development activities that is being pursued in Form B.

The mini state profile should not exceed 5-6 double-spaced typewritten pages.

FORMAT FOR MINI STATE PROFILE

- I. Name of state agency.
- II. Address.
- III. Contact person and telephone number.
- IV. The nature and origin (legislative action and/or state education agency regulations) of state-mandated school improvement initiatives underway in the state in the past five years.
- V. If mandated state development is one of the state school improvement initiatives undertaken, please provide a more detailed description of the provision of this effort.
- VI. Describe what role, if any, ESAs are expected to play in any recent state-mandated staff development.
- VII. Describe how ESA state development activities support state-mandated school improvement initiatives.
- VIII. List the other key providers of staff development services (LEAs, the SEA, postsecondary institutions, regional laboratories), and describe the nature of their activity.
- IX. What is the nature of the fiscal resources devoted to staff development in the state system? Has this changed in recent years?
- X. In your judgment, is there currently in place a comprehensive, integrated, and cohesive state plan for staff development? If so, briefly describe.
- XI. Please describe important governance features of ESAs that will help in understanding how ESA policies are determined.

SELECTED FEATURES OF INDIVIDUAL
EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AGENCY (ESA)

Name of This Agency: _____

Address: _____

_____ Zip Code: _____

Phone: (_____) _____

Name of Chief Executive Officer: _____

Name of Individual Completing Form (if other than CEO): _____

PART A: SELECTED ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES

	1981-82*1	1986-87						
1. Total enrollment in grades K-12 of school systems served by this ESA								
public school districts	_____	_____						
nonpublic schools	_____	_____						
2. Total revenue of this ESA and source								
local sources	_____	_____						
state sources	_____	_____						
federal sources (including state flow through)	_____	_____						
other (specify major) _____	_____	_____						
3. Total staff of this ESA								
certified	_____	_____						
classified	_____	_____						
4. What is the total distance in miles from the central office of this ESA to the central office of the farthest LEA served in 1986-87?		_____						
5. How would you best characterize the area served by this ESA in 1986-87? (check only one)								
_____ largely urban	_____ a mix of urban and suburban							
_____ largely suburban	_____ a mix of suburban and rural							
_____ largely rural	_____ other (specify) _____							
_____ a mix of urban, suburban, and rural								
6. Number of school districts, by size of enrollment, served by this ESA in 1986-87:								
	1 to 599	600 to 999	1,000 to 2,499	2,500 to 4,999	5,000 to 9,999	10,000 to 24,999	25,000 or more	Total
public	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
nonpublic	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

*1 if available for 1981-82.

- activities that enhanced the ability of schools to serve poor and minority students
 - total number of different activities _____
 - total number of participants _____
 - total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced the ability of schools to serve other special need student populations
 - total number of different activities _____
 - total number of participants _____
 - total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced the adoption of instructional technology
 - total number of different activities _____
 - total number of participants _____
 - total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced school climate and personal welfare of staff
 - total number of different activities _____
 - total number of participants _____
 - total number of contact hours _____

- other (specify primary focus): _____

total number of different activities _____

total number of participants _____

total number of contact hours _____

7. Which of the following arrangements for allocating the costs for ESA direct staff development services were ordinarily used in 1986-87 (rank in order of most common use)?

- _____ no charge to participants
- _____ charges based on K-12 student population of local systems
- _____ charges based on wealth of local systems
- _____ charges based on total number of teachers/staff of local systems
- _____ charges equally divided by all local systems
- _____ charges based on level of participation
- _____ tuition charge to participants
- _____ other (specify) _____

8. Which of the following planning activities were ordinarily used in 1986-87 in designing ESA-sponsored direct staff development services (check all that apply)?

- _____ use of internal processes only (ESA staff)
- _____ use of internal processes and external advisory groups of local system representatives
- _____ use of locally or regionally developed needs assessments
- _____ use of state-developed needs assessments
- _____ other (specify) _____

*If available for 1981-82.

9. Which of the following types of technology, if any, were used one or more times in delivering ESA direct staff development activities in 1986-87 (check all that apply, and establish illustrations of types used, where appropriate)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	closed circuit television	
<input type="checkbox"/>	telecommunications	_____ Illustrations
<input type="checkbox"/>	computer networking	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	computer conferencing	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	video conferencing	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	audio conferencing	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	videotapes	
<input type="checkbox"/>	interactive video disks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	videotext	
<input type="checkbox"/>	teletext	
<input type="checkbox"/>	other (specify) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/>	other (specify) _____	

10. Which of the following evaluation practices, if any, were ordinarily used to assess the effectiveness of ESA direct staff development activities (check all that apply)?

	<u>Conducted by</u>	
	ESA Staff	External/Third Party
<input type="checkbox"/> post user satisfaction measures		
<input type="checkbox"/> participant	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> home school system	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> post user effectiveness measures		
<input type="checkbox"/> participant	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> home school system	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> service utilization measures	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify) _____	_____	_____

11. Did the ESA sponsor, or jointly sponsor, one or more teacher or administrator assessment center(s)/exercise(s) in 1986-87?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please attach a brief description of the activity.

PART B: SELECTED FEATURES OF DIRECT STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OFFERED BY THIS ESA

It is recognized that many ESAs across the country offer a wide and diverse set of activities for local school systems that could be classified as staff development.

However, for purposes of this project we have chosen to collapse the numerous activities that ESAs are engaged in into two broad categories.

- direct staff development activities, operationally defined to be activities where the staff of the ESA, either unilaterally, or through contracted services, or in collaboration with others, is engaged in providing a service where the prime objective is to improve the competencies and skills of an individual or a group of employees of a public or nonpublic school in a content area or pedagogy (common examples would be: a workshop, a seminar, an extended thematic series, consultant services to an individual/group, the training of trainers)
- technical assistance staff development activities, operationally defined to be activities where the staff of the ESA may also be engaged but the prime objective of the service is to improve the ability of local systems to improve a locally sponsored staff development program (common examples would be: assistance in the conduct of a needs assessment, assistance in planning and program design, assistance in evaluation design)

For the most part, our interest here is to ascertain the nature and extent of involvement of ESAs in the provision of direct staff development activities as established in the admittedly rough working definitions cited above. Both types of services are important.

Nonetheless, for purposes of this exploratory survey our primary interest is on: activities where the primary objective is to improve the competencies and skills of an individual or group...in a content area or pedagogy.

A total of eleven lines of inquiry are included. You will note that the first five request trend-line data so that patterns can be established for two different time periods: 1981-82 (if available) and 1986-87. The remaining six questions are concerned with the most recent school year, 1986-87.

	1981-82*1	1986-87
1. <u>Total expenditures for both direct and technical assistance staff development activities, by source of funding:</u>		
local sources	_____	_____
state sources	_____	_____
federal sources	_____	_____
other (specify major)	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
2. <u>Estimated total expenditures for direct ESA staff development, by source of funding:</u>		
local sources	_____	_____
state sources	_____	_____
federal sources	_____	_____
other (specify major)	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
3. <u>Total number of ESA staff (in FTEs) devoted to direct staff development activities:</u>		
certified	_____	_____
classified	_____	_____

*1 if available for 1981-82.

4. Number and type of clientele served by ESA direct staff development activities:

teachers/specialists		
public	_____	_____
nonpublic	_____	_____
administrators		
public	_____	_____
nonpublic	_____	_____
board members		
public	_____	_____
nonpublic	_____	_____
other individuals	_____	_____

5. Number of school systems receiving direct ESA staff development services in 1986-87 and frequency of service:

number of systems receiving 1-3 services	_____
number of systems receiving 4-6 services	_____
number of systems receiving 7-10 services	_____
number of systems receiving 11 or more services	_____
number of systems receiving no services	_____

6. Below are listed eight categories of potential ESA direct development services (the majority of which reflect a number of the dominant themes of school improvement initiatives underway across the country). You are asked to establish the total number of activities in each of the six categories that were sponsored in 1986-87, or use the space provided to identify the primary focus of activities judged to be outside the themes of the eight categories. All direct staff development services should be accounted for, but an individual activity should be counted only once.

- activities that enhanced the instructional competencies and skills of teachers and instructional aides

total number of different activities _____
total number of participants _____
total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced curriculum development in the schools

total number of different activities _____
total number of participants _____
total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced the competencies and skills of leadership personnel (e.g., curriculum specialists, supervisors, principals, superintendents, board members)

total number of different activities _____
total number of participants _____
total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced the competencies and skills of classified staff (e.g., clerical/secretarial, custodial, school lunch workers, bus drivers)

total number of different activities _____
total number of participants _____
total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced the ability of schools to serve poor and minority students
 - total number of different activities _____
 - total number of participants _____
 - total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced the ability of schools to serve other special need student populations
 - total number of different activities _____
 - total number of participants _____
 - total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced the adoption of instructional technology
 - total number of different activities _____
 - total number of participants _____
 - total number of contact hours _____

- activities that enhanced school climate and personal welfare of staff
 - total number of different activities _____
 - total number of participants _____
 - total number of contact hours _____

- other (specify primary focus): _____

total number of different activities _____

total number of participants _____

total number of contact hours _____

7. Which of the following arrangements for allocating the costs for ESA direct staff development services were ordinarily used in 1986-87 (rank in order of most common use)?

- _____ no charge to participants
- _____ charges based on K-12 student population of local systems
- _____ charges based on wealth of local systems
- _____ charges based on total number of teachers/staff of local systems
- _____ charges equally divided by all local systems
- _____ charges based on level of participation
- _____ tuition charge to participants
- _____ other (specify) _____

8. Which of the following planning activities were ordinarily used in 1986-87 in designing ESA-sponsored direct staff development services (check all that apply)?

- _____ use of internal processes only (ESA staff)
- _____ use of internal processes and external advisory groups of local system representatives
- _____ use of locally or regionally developed needs assessments
- _____ use of state-developed needs assessments
- _____ other (specify) _____

*If available for 1981-82.

9. Which of the following types of technology, if any, were used one or more times in delivering ESA direct staff development activities in 1986-87 (check all that apply, and establish illustrations of types used, where appropriate)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	closed circuit television	
<input type="checkbox"/>	telecommunications	Illustrations
<input type="checkbox"/>	computer networking	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	computer conferencing	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	video conferencing	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	audio conferencing	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	videotapes	
<input type="checkbox"/>	interactive video disks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	videotext	
<input type="checkbox"/>	teletext	
<input type="checkbox"/>	other (specify)	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	other (specify)	_____

10. Which of the following evaluation practices, if any, were ordinarily used to assess the effectiveness of ESA direct staff development activities (check all that apply)?

	<u>Conducted by</u>	
	ESA Staff	External/Third Party
<input type="checkbox"/> post user satisfaction measures		
<input type="checkbox"/> participant	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> home school system	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> post user effectiveness measures		
<input type="checkbox"/> participant	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> home school system	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> service utilization measures	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify)	_____	_____

11. Did the ESA sponsor, or jointly sponsor, one or more teacher or administrator assessment center(s)/exercise(s) in 1986-87?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please attach a brief description of the activity.

To what extent do you consider each of the following to be a problem faced by this ESA in providing effective direct staff development services to the school systems served by the agency?

Circle the number corresponding to your belief:

- 1. very serious problem
- 2. rather serious problem
- 3. moderately serious problem
- 4. no problem

Area / Planning and Delivery of Direct Staff Development Activities

- 1. legislative constraints 1 2 3 4
- 2. regulatory constraints 1 2 3 4
- 3. lack of involvement of large enrollment size systems 1 2 3 4
- 4. lack of involvement of small enrollment size systems 1 2 3 4
- 5. lack of good needs assessment data 1 2 3 4
- 6. lack of adequate facilities 1 2 3 4
- 7. lack of adequate lead time to plan activities 1 2 3 4
- 8. availability of effective training models 1 2 3 4
- 9. pressure to engage in short term solutions 1 2 3 4
- 10. ambiguity about role of individual school systems and role of
ESA in providing staff development 1 2 3 4
- 11. lack of teacher interest 1 2 3 4
- 12. lack of local administration support 1 2 3 4
- 13. distance to local agencies 1 2 3 4
- 14. other (specify) _____ 1 2 3 4
- 15. other (specify) _____ 1 2 3 4

Area / Financing Direct Staff Development Activities

- 1. inability of LEAs to hire substitutes to release teachers . . . 1 2 3 4
- 2. unwillingness of LEAs to share resources 1 2 3 4
- 3. lack of funds to employ outside consultants 1 2 3 4
- 4. lack of allocated ESA funds 1 2 3 4
- 5. other (specify) _____ 1 2 3 4
- 6. other (specify) _____ 1 2 3 4

Area / Staffing Direct Staff Development Activities

- 1. inability of ESAs to compete for quality staff development
specialists 1 2 3 4
- 2. availability of quality outside consultants to staff programs . 1 2 3 4
- 3. inability to staff programs with needed interdisciplinary
teams, where needed 1 2 3 4
- 4. other (specify) _____ 1 2 3 4
- 5. other (specify) _____ 1 2 3 4

Area / Evaluating Direct Staff Development Activities

- 1. availability of good measures to judge effectiveness of services 1 2 3 4
- 2. availability of good cost effectiveness measures 1 2 3 4
- 3. difficulty in planning on-site follow-up activities 1 2 3 4
- 4. other (specify) _____ 1 2 3 4
- 5. other (specify) _____ 1 2 3 4

Please identify which two of the above issues you regard to be the most critical in hampering your efforts to provide effective direct staff development services:

DIRECT STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY TO RURAL
SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

FORMAT FOR DESCRIPTIONS

In this section, you are asked to select one or more direct staff development activities offered in 1986-87, especially those to rural small school districts, that you regard to be effective and provide a description of the service.

An ad hoc review panel of the American Association of Educational Service Agencies will select a number of these descriptions for use at a national invitational conference to be held in the Fall of 1987. A number of the descriptions will also be included in a forthcoming AAESA publication.

In describing the programs, practices, or services of staff development, please use the following format: head each of your sections as indicated below. The description for each activity should be as complete as possible, yet not exceed 2-3 double-spaced typewritten pages.

- I. Name of the ESA unit and the direct staff development activity
- II. Address of the ESA unit
- III. Contact Person and Telephone Number
- IV. Objective(s) of the Activity (check one or specify other)
activities that enhance the:
____ instructional competencies and skills of teachers/specialists
____ curriculum development
____ competencies and skills of leadership personnel
____ competencies and skills of classified staff
____ adoption of new technology
____ school climate and personal welfare of staff
____ other _____
activities that enhance the ability of schools to serve:
____ poor and minority students
____ special need student population
____ other _____
- V. Description. Elaborate fully on the direct staff development activity.
- VI. Date Implemented
- VII. Number of Individuals and School Systems Served
- VIII. Training Model Used
- IX. Planning Activities used in designing the direct staff development service
- X. Cost of the Activity for the ESA, for the individual and/or school system
- XI. Evaluation. Explain how this direct staff development activity was or is being evaluated and by what method and criteria. Discuss the outcomes. Cite existing data or observational information to support the success of the activity. If evaluation data is not available, on what basis do you judge this activity to be a success?

Please attach any additional information that will help in understanding the program or model.

APPENDIX B:
STATISTICAL APPENDIX

TABLE 1
TYPE OF REGION SERVED BY ESAs
1986-87

STATE		NUMBER RESPONDING	LARGELY URBAN	LARGELY SUB- URBAN	LARGELY RURAL	MIX OF URBAN, SUB- URBAN, RURAL	MIX OF URBAN/ SUB- URBAN	MIX OF SUB- URBAN/ RURAL	OTHER
Georgia	10/17*	10			8			2	
Iowa	7/15	7			3	3			1
Minnesota	9/9	9			7	1		1	
Nebraska	14/19	14	2		11			1	
New York	41/41	41	1	6	17	12	1	4	
North Carolina	5/8	5			3	2			
Oregon	4/29	4			2	1	1		
Texas	15/20	15			5	6		4	
TOTALS	105/158	105	3 2.9%	6 5.7%	56 53.3%	25 23.8%	2 1.9%	12 11.4%	1 1.0%

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 2
 NUMBER OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS SERVED
 BY SIZE OF ENROLLMENT
 1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	LESS THAN 600	600- 999		1,000- 2,499		2,500- 4,999		5,000- 9,999		10,000- 24,999		25,000 OR MORE		TOTAL
			3	8	3	50	34	12	3	0					
Georgia	10/17*	10	8	3	50	34	12	3	0	102					
Iowa	7/15	7	127	53	45	13	6	2	1	237					
Minnesota	9/9	9	189	88	90	48	16	7	3	441					
Nebraska	14/19	14	547	19	14	7	3	1	0	592					
New York	4/1/41	41	154	99	261	151	59	6	0	690					
North Carolina	5/8	5	0	4	20	26	21	12	3	85					
Oregon	4/29	4	29	8	6	10	5	0	1	59					
Texas	15/20	15	366	110	173	81	42	32	18	851					

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 3
 NUMBER OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS SERVED,
 BY SIZE OF ENROLLMENT
 1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPONDING	LESS THAN 600	600-999	1,000-2,499	2,500-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-24,999	25,000 OR MORE	TOTAL
Georgia	10/17*	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Iowa	7/15	94	3	2	2	0	0	0	101
Minnesota	9/9	90	6	11	4	0	0	0	111
Nebraska	14/19	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
New York	41/41	425	133	5	3	2	11	1	580
North Carolina	5/8	134	0	0	1	0	0	0	135
Oregon	4/29	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Texas	15/20	146	10	5	1	0	2	0	164

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 4
 TOTAL DISTANCE IN MILES FROM ESA CENTRAL OFFICE
 TO CENTRAL OFFICE OF FARTHEST LEA SERVED
 1986-87

STATE		NUMBER RESPOND- ING	DISTANCE IN MILES		
			MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Georgia	10/17*	10	58	31	84
Iowa	7/15	6	76	60	97
Minnesota	9/9	9	94	60	202
Nebraska	14/19	14	61	00	121
New York	41/41	41	42	11	110
North Carolina	5/8	5	79	60	97
Oregon	4/29	4	41	29	51
Texas	15/20	15	115	74	166

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 5
 TOTAL ENROLLMENT K-12,
 PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS SERVED
 1986-87

STATE		NUMBER RESPOND- ING	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	TOTAL
Georgia	10/17*	10	32,559	18,062	43,814	325,590
Iowa	7/15	7	44,065	10,522	98,717	308,455
Minnesota	9/9	9	79,900	26,591	356,128	719,100
Nebraska	14/19	14	16,124	42	52,682	225,736
New York	41/41	41	35,967	9,472	177,108	1,474,647
North Carolina	5/8	4	117,010	60,514	190,203	468,040
Oregon	4/29	4	32,096	10,500	77,111	128,384
Texas	15/20	15	159,531	43,411	654,270	2,392,965

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 6
TOTAL ENROLLMENT NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS
1986-87

STATE		NUMBER RESPOND- ING	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	TOTAL
Georgia	10/17*	4	413	0	1,000	1,652
Iowa	7/15	7	4,806	1,453	9,200	33,642
Minnesota	9/9	6	1,993	0	5,000	11,956
Nebraska	14/19	11	2,076	10	12,584	22,836
New York	41/41	31	5,332	350	36,324	165,292
North Carolina	5/8	1	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400
Oregon	4/29	2	275	200	350	550
Texas	15/20	12	6,535	662	33,490	78,420

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 7
TOTAL NUMBER OF STAFF EMPLOYED BY ESAS
1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	CERTIFIED STAFF			CLASSIFIED STAFF					
		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM	TOTAL	MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM	TOTAL	
Georgia	10/17*	10	16.6	6	31	166.0	13.6	5	35	136.0
Iowa	7/15	7	326.3	50	1,224	2,284.0	72.1	23	93	504.7
Minnesota	9/9	8	17.0	6	44	136.0	12.5	3	50	100.0
Nebraska	14/19	14	243.4	8	2,873	3,407.6	161.1	3	2,012	2,255.4
New York	41/41	40	225.6	75	600	9,024.0	276.4	39	2,881	11,056.0
North Carolina	5/8	5	17.8	17	19	89.0	9.4	8	11	47.0
Oregon	4/29	3	90.3	45	173	270.9	100.7	38	201	302.1
Texas	15/20	14	49.0	21	128	686.0	49.5	13	147	693.0

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 8
TOTAL REVENUE, BY SOURCE
1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	LOCAL SOURCES (in 000s)			NUMBER RESPOND- ING			STATE SOURCES (in 000s)		
		MEAN	PER CENT	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM	MEAN	PER CENT	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM	
Georgia	10/17*	221	23.3	40	698	10	566	62.0	**	1,709
Iowa	7/15	4,704	34.8	128	11,644	7	4,994	51.7	1,068	10,394
Minnesota	9/9	1,129	51.6	55	4,740	9	367	22.1	69	1,117
Nebraska	14/19	7,676	77.8	213	90,410	11	3,547	4.0	0	38,911
New York	41/41	16,847	89.5	4,619	75,666	32	720	4.7	10	3,353
North Carolina	5/8	0	0	0	0	2	714	83.5	713	714
Oregon	4/29	11,400	53.6	3,094	28,008	3	779	9.8	432	1,000
Texas	15/20	3,997	48.5	665	2,819	15	1,239	27.1	557	2,998

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

** less than 1,000

TABLE 9 (continued)
 TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR BOTH DIRECT AND TECHNICAL
 ASSISTANCE STAFF DEVELOPMENT,
 BY SOURCE OF FUNDING
 1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	FEDERAL SOURCES (in 000s)		
		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM
Georgia	10/17*	5	37	0 97
Iowa	7/15	0		
Minnesota	9/9	7	68	11 195
Nebraska	14/19	9	9	0 30
New York	41/41	16	79	0 495
North Carolina	5/8	1	128	128 128
Oregon	4/29	1	7	7 7
Texas	15/20	11	558	109 1,366

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 10
ESTIMATED TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR DIRECT STAFF DEVELOPMENT,
BY SOURCE OF FUNDING
1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	LOCAL SOURCES (in 000s)			NUMBER RESPOND- ING	STATE SOURCES (in 000s)		
		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM
Georgia	10/17*	40	3	76	8	148	3	467
Iowa	7/15	751	26	3,800	1	80	80	80
Minnesota	9/9	295	35	1,435	8	119	7	311
Nebraska	14/19	69	3	258	7	3	0	20
New York	4/1/41	164	0	700	25	144	0	415
North Carolina	5/8	1			1	732	732	732
Oregon	4/29	25	15	33	2	15	15	15
Texas	15/20	277	96	504	12	277	32	651

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant. The second column shows the proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 10 (continued)
 ESTIMATED TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR DIRECT STAFF DEVELOPMENT,
 BY SOURCE OF FUNDING
 1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	FEDERAL SOURCES (in 000s)			
		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM	
Georgia	10/17	5*	17	0	75
Iowa	7/15	0			
Minnesota	9/9	5	125	28	273
Nebraska	14/19	8	7	0	30
New York	4/1/41	16	39	0	150
North Carolina	5/8	1	43	43	43
Oregon	4/29	1	7	7	7
Texas	15/20	12	317	63	800

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 11
 TOTAL NUMBER OF ESA STAFF (in FTEs)
 DEVOTED TO DIRECT STAFF DEVELOPMENT
 1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	CERTIFIED STAFF			NUMBER RESPOND- ING	CLASSIFIED STAFF		
		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM
Georgia	10	6.7	1.0	10.0	8	3.4	0.0	7.0
Iowa	7	8.0	0.0	19.0	6	3.5	0.0	9.0
Minnesota	9	9.1	2.0	40.0	8	7.3	0.0	40.0
Nebraska	13	1.0	0.0	3.0	12	1.7	1.0	2.0
New York	36	6.7	0.0	80.0	32	3.7	0.0	45.0
North Carolina	4	16.8	15.0	19.0	2	4.5	0.0	9.0
Oregon	3	3.3	1.0	8.0	3	1.7	1.0	2.0
Texas	14	17.1	2.0	32.0	13	8.2	0.0	36.0

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 12
 NUMBER OF TEACHERS/SPECIALISTS RECEIVING
 DIRECT STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
 1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	PUBLIC LEAS			NUMBER RESPOND- ING	NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS					
		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM	TOTAL		
Georgia	10/17*	9	1,466	360	2,256	13,194	3	56	8	135	168
Iowa	7/15	6	1,995	790	3,271	11,970	5	266	30	724	1,330
Minnesota	9/9	9	3,480	1,341	9,450	31,320	9	114	8	200	1,026
Nebraska	14/19	14	1,340	25	7,101	18,760	12	120	0	400	1,440
New York	4/1/41	35	2,442	99	18,993	85,470	23	172	0	822	3,956
North Carolina	5/8	4	7,356	4,000	10,280	29,424	2	88	60	115	176
Oregon	4/29	4	1,443	430	4,017	5,772	4	144	0	520	576
Texas	15/20	14	7,608	1,027	19,425	106,512	7	107	4	300	749

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 13
 NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS RECEIVING
 DIRECT STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
 1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	PUBLIC LEAS			NUMBER RESPOND- ING	NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS					
		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM		TOTAL	MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM	TOTAL	
Georgia	10/17*	8	168	55	411	1,344	1	4	4	4	4
Iowa	7/15	7	189	45	560	1,323	6	28	2	50	168
Minnesota	9/9	9	414	102	1,080	3,726	9	60	1	210	540
Nebraska	14/19	13	80	19	300	1,040	12	7	0	23	84
New York	41/41	35	172	15	1,960	6,020	23	23	0	161	529
North Carolina	5/8	4	1,672	180	5,356	6,688	1	27	27	27	27
Oregon	4/29	3	43	33	50	129	3	2	0	5	6
Texas	15/20	14	1,514	275	5,886	21,196	7	73	2	394	511

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.

TABLE 14
 NUMBER OF BOARD MEMBERS RECEIVING
 DIRECT STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
 1986-87

STATE	NUMBER RESPOND- ING	PUBLIC LEAS			NUMBER RESPOND- ING	NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS			TOTAL
		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM		MEAN	MINI- MUM	MAXI- MUM	
Georgia	10/17*	40	3	99	3	19	0	50	57
Iowa	7/15	107	0	150	4	19	0	65	76
Minnesota	9/9	135	6	378	7	36	0	140	252
Nebraska	14/19	128	1	423	8	27	0	125	216
New York	4/1/41	77	0	297	9	4	0	35	36
North Carolina	5/8	10	10	10	0				
Oregon	4/29	27	0	60	3	0	0	0	0
Texas	15/20	204	0	686	6	1	0	2	6

* The first column of figures shows the total number of ESAs who returned completed questionnaires to the SEA consultant in proportion to the total number of ESAs in the state.