

This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 66-14,203

DAYRIES, Jr., John Laurans, 1936-
AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED FUNCTIONS OF
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN
THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDU-
CATION.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1966
Education, physical

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED FUNCTIONS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS
OF EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND
PHYSICAL EDUCATION

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

JOHN LAURANS DAYRIES, JR.

Norman, Oklahoma

1966

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED FUNCTIONS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS
OF EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND
PHYSICAL EDUCATION

APPROVED BY

Glenn R. Snider

William F. Beck

Robert E. Ohm

Fred A. Sloan, Jr.

W. R. Fulton

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Glen R. Snider, chairman of the doctoral committee and director of this investigation, for his patience, encouragement, guidance, and many constructive criticisms during the preparation of this dissertation.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. William F. Eick, Dr. Robert E. Ohm, Dr. William R. Fulton, and Dr. Fred A. Sloan, who as members of the committee gave valuable suggestions, criticisms, and encouragement throughout the study.

The writer wishes to express a personal note of appreciation to his wife, Marilyn, for her sympathetic understanding, patience, sacrifice, and encouragement, without which this study could not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Need for the Study.	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Assumptions.	5
Delimitations of the Study	6
Purposes of the Study.	7
Definition of Terms.	7
Procedure Used in the Study.	9
Overview of Following Chapters	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH.	11
Evolution of State Departments of Education.	12
Functions of State Departments of Education.	14
Leadership as a Major Function	16
The Service Concept.	21
Statewide Leadership in Health and Physical Education. . .	23
Summary.	26
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA RELATIVE TO SELECTED FUNCTIONS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION	27
Development of Evaluative Criteria	28
Analysis of Jury Responses to Opinionaire.	31
Summary of Jury Responses to Opinionaire	37
Development of the Questionnaire	37
Analysis of Responses to Questionnaire	39
General Information Pertaining to Staff.	39
The Planning Function.	48
The Research Function.	58
The Public Relations Function.	75
The Advisory and Consultative Function	78
The Coordination Function.	85
The In-Service Education Function.	88
Summary.	102
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY	122
APPENDIX	126

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Jury Responses to Planning Function Criteria.	32
2. Jury Responses to Research Function Criteria.	33
3. Jury Responses to Public Relations Function Criteria.	34
4. Jury Responses to Advisory and Consultative Function Criteria	35
5. Jury Responses to Coordination Function Criteria.	36
6. Jury Responses to In-Service Education Function Criteria.	36
7. Area of Preparation and Degrees Held by Official Representatives of State Departments in the Area of Health and Physical Education	43
8. Area of Preparation and Degrees Held by Other Professional Staff Employed by State Departments in the Area of Health and Physical Education.	45
9. State Departments of Education Requirements for Professional Staff in the Area of Health and Physical Education.	47
10. State Departments of Education Having Formulated and Published Comprehensive Statewide Plans in the Area of Health and Physical Education	50
11. Groups Regularly Included in Developing Comprehensive Statewide Plans in the Area of Health and Physical Education.	55
12. Orientation Practices of State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education	57
13. Adequacy of Research Staffs of State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education	62

Table	Page
14. Manner in Which Research is Handled by State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education	63
15. Significant Research Published by State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education Since 1960.	65
16. Significant Research Presently Being Conducted by State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education.	66
17. Studies Conducted by State Departments of Education Relative to the Supply and Demand of Health and Physical Education Teachers	69
18. Other Research Activities of State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education	72
19. Information Pertaining to Personnel and Finance of Public Relations Program of State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education	77
20. The Use of Resources and Public Relations Media by State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education.	79
21. State Departments Providing Consultative Services in Health and Physical Education and Number of Persons Engaged in Such Services.	81
22. Areas in Which Consultative Services are Most Needed in the Area of Health and Physical Education	83
23. Information Relative to the Coordination Function of State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education.	87
24. Curriculum Guides Published by State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education.	90
25. Manner in Which the Cost was Handled for Preparation and Distribution of Curricular Materials in Health and Physical Education	92

Table	Page
26. Information Relative to the In-Service Education Function of State Departments in the Area of Health and Physical Education	94
27. State Curriculum Commissions in Health and Physical Education.	98
28. Areas From Which Participants are Represented on Statewide Curriculum Committee in Health and Physical Education.	100

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED FUNCTIONS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS
OF EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND
PHYSICAL EDUCATION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Need for the Study

In the United States the responsibility for providing an educational program that meets the needs of the populace is vested in the several states. This responsibility is an implied power under the Tenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution, which reads as follows:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

Therefore, the power for establishing and maintaining the public schools is, by implication, reserved to the several states.

Each of the fifty state constitutions provide for a system of state-supported schools. As each state was granted admission to the union, a section in its state constitution was inserted which provided for a system of public schools. Also, under each constitutional provision on education the legislature is made responsible for the operation and maintenance of this intrastate system of public education. For example, section 1 of article XIII of the constitution of the State of

Oklahoma provides for a statewide system of schools using the following language:

Section 1. Establishment and maintenance of public schools.
The Legislature shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools wherein all the children of the State may be educated.

In effect, then, instead of a single, centrally-controlled "system" of schools in America, there are actually fifty separate and distinct school systems, controlled by the people in each of the respective states. This control is exercised through the state legislature which is acknowledged to have plenary control over educational matters within the state. It remains for the legislature to decide in what way and to what extent it shall exercise its power.

In order to discharge its responsibility for education each state legislative body has seen fit to establish a state educational agency, usually called the state department of education, as an intermediary administrative entity for the maintenance of public schools. It is this agency by reason of its strategic position in the structure of American education that is responsible for the long range planning and professional leadership of a state's educational enterprise. No other official state agency is in the position to wield such influence for the advancement of education.

In addition to being responsible for providing leadership for the state's educational enterprise, state departments of education are also responsible for certain regulatory and operational functions. The regulatory function is specific recognition of the fact that education is a function of the state and that local school districts have no

authority to act except as state laws are provided to permit them. Regulatory responsibilities of state departments of education vary from state to state but for the most part, involve the power of the state education agency to establish and enforce minimum standards of education. These standards are actually a guarantee to the people within the state that certain safeguards have been established and are being maintained by those school authorities who are responsible for the management and operation of educational programs.

Thurston and Roe have skillfully stated that the regulatory functions of state departments of education fall into seven categories. These are: (1) program, (2), personnel, (3) school plant, (4) child accounting, (5) finance, (6) structure, and (7) administration. They further indicate that the regulatory functions of state departments of education are the basic foundation from which local programs of education may grow and flourish.¹

Operational functions of state departments of education takes that agency into a realm of activities similar to those conducted by local school districts. It involves the operation and maintenance of certain programs related to education for purposes of uniformity and emphasis because the state is the most logical unit for operation of these types of programs. Some examples of a state's operational functions are: (1) operation and maintenance of teachers colleges, trade schools, correspondence schools, and schools and services for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped; (2) conducting citizenship

¹Lee M. Thurston and William H. Roe, State School Administration, (Harper & Brothers, Publishers: New York, 1957), pp. 79-80.

and adult education classes; (3) operation and maintenance of state libraries, museums, archives, film libraries, and other activities of a cultural nature; and (4) providing vocational rehabilitation programs legal services to local school districts, teacher-placement services, and teacher-retirement services.

The preceding list is not intended to be all-inclusive but only to illustrate types of programs that many state departments of education maintain under its operational function.

At this point it is interesting to note that many authorities argue that the operational function of state departments of education is not a proper function of that department because if it were exercised in all areas of service the result would be a centrally-controlled and operated state public school system, which is contrary to the basic philosophy underlying the pattern of decentralized control upon which our state educational systems are established.

Since state departments of education are charged with the responsibility of providing effective leadership for the public school system within the state, it is important that they be studied to determine whether they are fulfilling their duties and responsibilities in this area. This study intended to investigate one aspect of a state's responsibility in education, namely, the specific provisions that the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia were making toward discharging their leadership function in the area of health and physical education.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this investigation was that of determining, analyzing, and interpreting the provisions made by the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia in carrying out selected leadership functions of that agency in the area of health and physical education. More specifically, it was intended to analyze in the area of health and physical education, the provisions made by the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia in discharging those leadership functions identified by the National Council of Chief State School Officers in 1952 as being the key leadership functions of the state education agency in all areas of service. These functions are: (1) planning, (2) research, (3) public relations, (4) advising, (5) coordination, and (6) in-service education.²

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made before undertaking the study:

1. Those leadership functions of state departments of education identified by the National Council of Chief State School Officers in 1952 were satisfactory for the purposes of this study.
2. Appropriate evaluative criteria related to the statewide program of health and physical education could be developed and validated for each selected leadership function.

²The National Council of Chief State School Officers, The State Department of Education: A Statement of Some Guiding Principles for Its Functions, and the Organization of Its Service Areas, (Washington, D. C., 1952), p. 7.

3. An appropriate instrument could be developed from the evaluative criteria which would elicit from an official representative of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education, in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia, the information pertinent to the purposes of this investigation.

4. An analysis of the data obtained from this investigation would be of value in determining the degree to which state departments of education were assuming their responsibilities for making adequate provisions for leadership in the area of health and physical education.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was limited to those provisions that the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia were making toward discharging their leadership function in the area of health and physical education. It was further limited to those provisions that the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia were making toward discharging their leadership function in the areas of planning, public relations, research, advising, coordination, and in-service education in the area of health and physical education.

No attempt was made to appraise total responsibilities of state departments of education in the area of health and physical education. Furthermore, this study avoided efforts to appraise the effectiveness and quality of leadership provided by state education agencies in this area. The basis for determining the degree to which leadership was provided was the discovery of specific provisions made by state departments of education in each of the selected functions in the area of health and

physical education. Any attempt to determine effectiveness and quality of leadership provided would necessitate that the services provided by this agency be judged by the recipients of the services rendered.

Purposes of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the extent and kinds of provisions that the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia were making toward discharging their leadership responsibility in health and physical education in the areas of planning, research, public relations, advising, coordination, and in-service education. Additional purposes of the investigation were those of discovering common practices and patterns of leadership provisions among the fifty state departments of education in the area of health and physical education as well as the identification of strengths, weaknesses, and needs of the individual states in making adequate provisions for leadership in this area.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of clarification and understanding the following terms and their definitions were used in this study:

State Department of Education: That agency of government headed by the chief state school officer and his staff which have the principal duties and responsibilities of the state government in the administration of education. The terms state department of public instruction and state education agency were used synonymously with this term throughout the study.

Chief State School Officer: That person who officially heads the state department of education. This term was used synonymously with superintendent of public instruction throughout the study.

State Director of Health and Physical Education: That person who officially represents the state department of education in the area of health and physical education.

Planning Function: Refers to the formulation of a comprehensive statewide plan of health and physical education for the public schools within the state which includes long and short-term policies, procedures, and objectives.

Research Function: Refers to the systematic gathering, analyzing, and interpretation of data which are basic to educational improvement in health and physical education for the purpose of discovering better ways of doing things and learning how to best achieve newer objectives which seem to be desirable.

Public Relations Function: Refers to the maintenance of a two-way channel for a continuous flow of information between the state department of education and the public on the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education within the state.

Advisory and Consultative Function: Refers to the consultative and advisory assistance rendered on invitation or routinely to teachers and/or supervisors of health and physical education, school administrators, and school boards by a professional staff member of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education for the purpose of problem solving, planning, or evaluation of programs.

Coordination Function: Refers to the establishment of effective lines of communication among the professional staff members of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education, other divisions of the state education agency, and other state agencies concerned with health and physical education for the purposes of preventing duplication and fostering mutual understanding.

- In-Service Education Function: Refers to the activities conducted by the state department of education designed to increase the effectiveness of public school personnel in the area of health and physical education.

Procedure Used in the Study

The normative-survey method of research was used in this study. Travers states that "surveys" are used to determine the nature of existing conditions.³ Best indicated that surveys are concerned with conditions or relationships that exist and practices that prevail. He further states that the normative-survey method of research goes beyond the mere gathering and tabulation of data. It involves an element of interpretation of the meaning and significance of what is described.⁴ This method of investigation was considered appropriate for the purposes of this study.

Because of the nature of this problem the following procedure was utilized in implementing the study:

1. A comprehensive review of the available literature and research related to the problem was made. Every effort was made to

³Robert M. W. Travers, An Introduction to Educational Research, (2nd ed.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), p. 278.

⁴John W. Best, Research in Education, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 107.

investigate the various aspects of state departments of education particularly those concerning the leadership responsibilities of that agency in the area of health and physical education.

2. The leadership functions of state departments of education were identified and related to the statewide program of health and physical education.

3. Evaluative criteria were developed and validated by a jury of experts in each of the selected functions of the state departments of education in the area of health and physical education.

4. A questionnaire was developed from the evaluative criteria and sent to the official representatives of the state departments of education in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia in the area of health and physical education in order to secure the data pertinent to this study.

5. Data secured from the respondents were tabulated and organized into tables to facilitate an analysis and interpretation.

6. Conclusions and recommendations based upon the analysis of the data were made.

Overview of Following Chapters

A study of available research and literature related to the problem is presented in Chapter II. Chapter III contains an analysis and interpretation of the responses to the questionnaire.

A summary of the study as well as conclusions and recommendations based upon an analysis and interpretation of the data is presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Each of the fifty states by constitutional provision or statutory enactment provide for a chief state school officer known most commonly as the superintendent of public instruction or commissioner of education. This officer with his staff comprises the state department of education and together they have the principal duties and responsibilities of the state government in the administration of its educational enterprise.

A detailed examination of the literature pertaining to state departments of education revealed a dearth of specific research in the area. It was not until 1949, when the Council of State Governments concluded a voluminous study embracing the organization, administration, and financing of the public school systems in the forty-eight states that adequate investigation of the many problems in this area were made.¹ Since that time several governmental agencies and professional organizations as well as doctoral candidates in colleges and universities have investigated various aspects of state departments of education in the respective states. Among the more significant studies pertaining to state departments of education sponsored by governmental agencies

¹The Council of State Governments, The Forty-Eight State School Systems, (Chicago: The Council, 1949).

have been those conducted under the auspices of the United States Office of Education, the Federal Security Agency, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Also, additional significant studies concerning state departments of education have been conducted by professional organizations such as the National Council of Chief State School Officers, the American Association of School Administrators, the Southwestern Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, the Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago, and various associations affiliated with the National Education Association.

Evolution of State Departments of Education

The character, organization, and procedures of modern state departments of education reach far back into the early 1800's when well-known leaders such as Thomas Jefferson, James G. Carter, Horace Mann, John D. Pierce, and Henry Barnard spoke of the need for an educated citizenry and the further need for planned educational development. Although these dynamic educational statemen prepared the way for state systems of education, the establishment of state departments of education was a slow process evolving from alterations in the public's ideas of education as a function of government.

The initial step in the movement to develop state departments of education was taken when states began to give financial aid to local schools. This acceptance of state aid inevitably meant state control particularly when it became apparent that many schools were wasting funds. To control school funds it became evident that states needed an officer

who represented the state to supervise the handling of funds. To meet this need, states began to elect and appoint a chief state school officer to exercise supervision over its schools. In essence, this step was the beginning of state departments of education in the United States.

Using the logic that the initial step in the creation of a state department of education is the election or appointment of a chief state school officer, New York became the first state to provide for such an agency when in 1812 it appointed a "Superintendent of Common Schools."² After nine years, however, New York abolished the office and no such office existed there until 1854 when the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction was created. In 1904 the title was changed to Commissioner of Education and this is today the official designation of the chief state school officer in New York.³ Maryland became the next state to create a state department of education when in 1826 the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction was established.⁴ That office was later to be discontinued in 1828, but re-created in 1864.

The first state to maintain continuously a state department of education was the state of Michigan when it created the office of Superintendent of Common Schools in 1829.⁵ In 1836 the title was changed to Superintendent of Public Instruction and as such has remained to the present time.

²Ellwood P. Cubberly, Public Education in the United States, (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934), p. 214.

³Ibid., p. 215.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

By 1850, sixteen of the thirty-one states had created a state department of education by electing or appointing a chief state school officer. A decade later twenty-eight of the thirty-four states had established state departments of education.⁶ By 1875, however, state departments of education had become generally accepted and today that agency is permanently established in each of the fifty states.

Functions of State Departments of Education

An examination of the professional literature regarding functions of state departments of education disclosed that definite changes have taken place in the states' conception of the work and functions of that agency. These transitions were perpetuated by vast economic, political, social, and technological changes which have taken place in our society. Further study revealed that not all state departments of education have advanced at the same rate in the development of its functions.

In its early stages the functions of state departments of education were primarily of a clerical and statistical nature. Early superintendents of public instruction, with perhaps the assistance of a secretary, were expected to distribute state funds to local school districts which met the requirements for state aid; gather, compile, and make annual and biennial statistical reports on school attendance; and publish and enforce school laws. These and other similar duties were of common concern to all early state departments of education.

⁶Ibid., p. 216.

Beach and Gibbs in a study of personnel of state departments of education indicated that most state education agencies were functioning primarily as statistical agencies from the time of their establishment until about 1900. They further alleged that as the population in the United States expanded from 1900 until about 1930, state departments of education were used as instruments for the enforcement of rules and regulations imposed by state legislatures over the operation of local educational programs.⁷ These rules and regulations were primarily designed for the purpose of establishing minimum standards for education within the state. Inspectors were employed by state departments of education to see that local school authorities complied with state laws. Such matters as compulsory school attendance, safe and healthful school facilities, efficient management of accounting systems, and the requirements for teaching certain subjects within the curriculum came within the jurisdiction of the inspector.

During this time, which is best described as being inspectoral in nature, state departments of education did not provide consultation and advisory services to local school systems nor did they in any manner assist local school authorities in improving their educational programs. Local school officials were forced to depend upon their own ingenuity in the development of programs and in the solution of problems.

⁷Fred F. Beach and Andrew H. Gibbs, The Personnel of State Departments of Education, Federal Security Agency, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 3.

Leadership as a Major Function

While inspectoral services were important in bringing state educational programs up to a minimal level it did not take some state departments of education long to discover that the value of inspectoral and regulatory services ceased at this point. Minimal standards by their very nature represented only the lowest common denominator. The quality of educational programs could not be improved if states did not proceed beyond minimal standards. Therefore, as indicated by Hawk, the inspectoral phase of state departments of education as a primary function was of short duration.⁸

The answer to how the quality of education could be enhanced was found in a new type of relationship between state departments of education and local school officials. This relationship which has been identified as a partner relationship meant that state departments of education and local school units would share the responsibilities of the state in providing for education. Each contributes toward the betterment of education within the state. Each unit is mutually interdependent. The impotence of either can be damaging to the well-being of the other and to education generally. If education is to be best served both agencies need to be strong in order to fulfill their special functions.

In an effort to carry out this partner relationship with local school authorities and by doing so raise the level of educational programs above minimum requirements, a few state departments of education

⁸James Donald Hawk, An Examination and Evaluation of Consultative Services of the Georgia State Department of Education, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1958.

began in the 1930's to move in the direction of replacing the inspector with qualified professional staff members. The addition of this new type of staff member marked a major shift in the emphasis of the functions of state departments of education. It placed major emphasis on improving educational programs through leadership and guidance rather than by power and authority. Not only did the addition of this new type staff place an emphasis on leadership within state departments of education, but as indicated by Thurston and Roe, it had another significant effect in that it contributed to the professionalization of state departments of education.⁹ State departments of education were now in a position to offer services that could be shared by all local school units within the state. Expanding educational programs on the local level could now look to the state education agency for assistance in developing and improving local programs.

This transformation in the functions of state departments of education did not occur at the same time in all states, nor did it occur at the same pace. Some states made prompt changes while others lagged considerably behind. Although there are wide variations in the amount and kind of leadership provided by modern day state departments of education in the respective states, most state educational agencies today recognize the fact that their most important function lies in the area of leadership.

That the most important function of state departments of education since 1930 lies in their provision for leadership can easily be validated

⁹Lee M. Thurston and William H. Roe, State School Administration (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1957), p. 106.

by reviewing the literature pertaining to state departments of education since that time. In 1938 the President's Advisory Committee recognized that leadership was of prime importance when it listed six functions of state departments of education. These functions were: (1) to provide leadership for the entire educational system of the state; (2) to assist those in the local units in the solution of educational problems; (3) to coordinate educational activities throughout the state; (4) to aid in determining the effectiveness of the state's program of education; (5) to direct research activities necessary to the solution of educational problems as they arise; and (6) to advise the governor and the legislature with respect to educational legislation.¹⁰ From the order in which these functions were listed it might be inferred that this committee recognized leadership as the most important function of the state education agency.

In 1942 the Southern States Work-Conference on School Administration further indicated that leadership was of paramount importance to state departments of education and that this function was widely accepted when it made the following statement:

the responsibility of state departments of education for rendering certain routine administrative services for furnishing competent consultative services, and for exercising stimulating leadership is now accepted practically without question throughout the United States.¹¹

¹⁰Walter D. Cocking and Charles H. Gilmore, Organization and Administration of Education, Advisory Committee on Education, (Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1938), pp. 84-85.

¹¹"State Responsibility for the Organization and Administration of Education," Improving Education in the Southern States, Southern States Work-Conference on School Administrative Problems, 1942, p. 9.

Beach, in 1950, conducted a study of the functions of state departments of education and concluded that the key to the effectiveness of the state education agency lies in its provisions made for creative leadership. He further stated that there are five broad and highly important leadership functions of state departments of education and they are present in all areas of service. These five leadership functions are: (1) planning, (2) research, (3) advising and consulting, (4) coordinating, and (5) public relations. Furthermore, as indicated by Beach, these five functions are reflected in direct services to local school officials, educational institutions, the legislature, the governor, other state departments and agencies, voluntary education associations, and to the public.¹²

In 1953 the National Council of Chief State School Officers, an organization representative of the fifty state school systems that conducts, reviews, and interprets educational research pertinent to the work of state departments of education, reiterated the fact that leadership is the primary function of the state education agency. In "A Statement of Some Guiding Principles" for the legal status, functions, and organization of service areas of state departments of education, the Council declared that leadership functions constitute the major responsibility of state departments of education. Also, within the contents of this publication the Council listed six of the important leadership functions of state departments of education as:

¹²Fred F. Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, Federal Security Agency, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950), pp. 4-9.

- (1) Planning. The development of plans for each of the major areas of service and a comprehensive plan for the total state program of education is a continuous and highly significant activity;
- (2) Research. Studies for the formulation of policy and the evaluation of programs are basic to long-range educational planning and the continuing improvement of education;
- (3) Advisory. In all areas of the state's education program, consultative service and advice are essential to continuing improvement;
- (4) Coordination. As a means of promoting unity and encouraging proper balance in education, coordination of all educational efforts within the state's jurisdiction is essential;
- (5) Public Relations. This includes providing the public with information on educational needs and progress, and encouraging public participation in the formulation of educational policy;
- (6) In-Service Education. This includes providing opportunities, facilities, and personnel for the continuing growth of all persons in the state who are engaged in educational work.¹³

From the preceding review of literature it can safely be asserted that state departments of education have reached a point in their development where they can make their greatest contribution by placing major emphasis on leadership. Perhaps Thurston and Roe best described the contribution that leadership can make to state departments of education in the following statement:

Here lies the breath and life of the state education's office. With the philosophy of creative leadership instilled in all members, the state office can fan into life within the state a growing, dynamic, and inspired educational force. Without it the deadening pall of bureaucracy, legislation, red tape and restrictions can stifle creativity. Leadership can mobilize, unify, and coordinate all the positive forces concerned with education for the dedicated purpose of its improvement. It can give common direction to the efforts of all. It can analyze the nature and future direction of

¹³The National Council of Chief State School Officers, The State Department of Education: A Statement of Some Guiding Principles for Its Functions, and the Organization of Its Service Areas, (Washington, D. C., 1952), p. 21.

education and communicate with the public in this regard. It can foster local initiative by discovering and publicizing practices and encourage others to follow suit. It can utilize all possible resources for experimentation and improvement. It can provide opportunities and stimulate all persons engaged in educational work to grow and create professionally.¹⁴

The Service Concept

There is general agreement among contemporary writers concerned with trends and problems in American education that state departments of education are de-emphasizing their regulatory and enforcement functions. More and more they are developing their leadership functions through services rendered by departmental staff members to local school systems. About this matter Fuller stated the following:

Most functions of modern state departments are mandated by state laws administered on a service basis rather than a control basis. The general supervision of school systems required by law now means cooperative consultation and improvement of instructional programs rather than visits for inspection. Special programs such as those for exceptional children or those in the field of vocational education, give opportunities for service in connection with programs specifically required by law.¹⁵

An examination of the thesis abstracts revealed that a major portion of research pertaining to state departments of education dealt with advisory and consultative services provided by these agencies. Hilton, in 1952, conducted a study of the consultative services offered by the state departments of education in Missouri, Nebraska, and Ohio, to school administrators in those states. His study touched upon the nature of consultative visits by state departments of education personnel, the frequency and lengths of visits, and the degree of success of

¹⁴Thurston and Roe, op. cit., p. 82.

¹⁵Edgar Fuller, "You and Your State Department of Education," NEA School Journal, (March, 1956), pp. 165-166.

consultative visits when measured with their designed purpose. He concluded that the majority of consultative visits were by invitation and were for the purpose of discussing a specific problem of the administrator requesting the visitation. Hilton also found that most administrators felt that consultants from the state department of education were adequately prepared and able to be of assistance to them.¹⁶

Savage, in 1955, investigated consultative services of state departments of education in eight midwestern states. The purpose of the study was to examine local public school systems' experience with advisory and consultative service which they received from their state departments of education during 1952. The data obtained in the study were collected through mailed questionnaires and a limited number of interviews. Participating in the study were 923 school systems employing 400 or fewer teachers in Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. This sample represented 24.7 per cent of the total public school administrators in these eight states as defined in the study. From an analysis of the data provided by the administrators which responded to the questionnaire, Savage concluded the following:

1. State departments of education were the major source of consultative service received by local school systems in the eight states included in the study.

¹⁶Lynn M. Hilton, Consultant Services Offered by Three State Departments of Education to School Administrators, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1952.

2. State departments of education included in the study provided consultative service to local school systems in a wider range of school activities than did any other source.

3. State departments of education included in the study attempted to meet most of the felt needs of local school systems for consultative services.¹⁷

Hawk, in 1958, conducted a doctoral study in which he examined the consultative services of the Georgia State Department of Education. He directed the study toward an analysis of the availability of consultants in the state department of education, the needs for services by the state department of education existing throughout the state, and the levels of satisfactions on the part of the recipients to the consultative services provided by the state department of education. He concluded that the prevalent needs of local school systems within the state were being fulfilled in an adequate manner by the Georgia State Department of Education.¹⁸

Statewide Leadership in Health and Physical Education

The state department of education has a clear responsibility to maintain a public school curriculum which will provide instruction in a large number of subject areas. Among these areas are health and physical education. Good programs of health and physical education should be an integral part of every school curriculum if schools are to meet the

¹⁷William W. Savage, An Examination of Consultative Services Provided by Eight State Departments of Education, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1955.

¹⁸Hawk, op. cit.

educational demands of society. To meet this challenge leadership is needed on the state level.

Superintendents of Public Instruction having recognized the need for statewide leadership in health and physical education have established separate departments within the state department of education for the purpose of providing over-all supervision and coordination of health and physical education within the state. Although all states do not have a State Director of Health and Physical education as such, there is someone in every state department of education who has the responsibility for state programs in this area. However, with the increased recognition of the fundamental need for regular health and physical education programs for all public school pupils and with the urging of the President's Council on Youth Fitness, there are indications that several states are now establishing, or making preliminary studies prior to establishing, separate departments of health and physical education in the state agency for public education.

The State Director of Health and Physical Education in the state department of education has tremendous opportunities and challenges with respect to providing leadership through essential services needed for the improvement of health and physical education programs on the local level. Since his work reaches into every school in the state, it is essential that he exercise the highest level of dynamic and intelligent leadership at all times.

Since the basic purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent and kinds of provisions that the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia were making toward discharging

their leadership responsibility in health and physical education in the areas of planning, research, public relations, advising, coordination, and in-service education, a thorough review of the literature was made in an attempt to find studies that might be related to the problem. Such an examination revealed that no study of the nature or scope of the one described herein had been undertaken. However, Riddle, in 1964, conducted a doctoral study in which he analyzed and interpreted the activities of state departments of education in the fifty states to determine their leadership role in curriculum and instructional improvement in the areas of planning, research, advising, coordination, public relations, and in-service education. The data obtained in the study were collected through mailed questionnaires sent to each of the chief state school officers in the fifty states. Forty-three of the chief state school officers or their designates responded to the questionnaire. From an analysis of the returned questionnaires, Riddle concluded the following:

1. The responsibility for planning long term educational programs for the public schools of the United States was inadequately discharged by many state departments of education.

2. The task of curricular or instructional improvement was not discharged satisfactory by many state departments of education.

3. The number of professional consultants reported in many of the state departments of education was inadequate for providing consultative and other services to meet the needs of the public schools in the various states.

4. State departments of education need to expand their research activities and re-examine their responsibilities in the area of research activity.

5. Many state departments of education were not adequately meeting the challenge of providing quality leadership in improving education in the states.¹⁹

Summary

The preceding review of related literature disclosed that there was a dearth of specific research dealing with state departments of education. Among the more significant studies pertaining to state education agencies have been those conducted by governmental agencies and professional organizations. The examination further revealed that although there was widespread agreement on the role that state education agencies should assume in the operation of their total educational enterprise, analytical study of that role had been limited. Also, the examination of significant research relating to state departments of education indicated that no study of the nature or scope of the one described herein had been undertaken and that there was indeed, a need for such a study.

¹⁹Bruce E. Riddle, An Analysis of State Departments of Education With Respect to Their Emerging Leadership Functions in Educational Improvement, Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, College of Education, The University of Oklahoma, 1964.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA RELATIVE TO SELECTED FUNCTIONS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The problem with which this study dealt was that of determining, analyzing, and interpreting the provisions made by the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia in carrying out selected leadership functions of that agency in the area of health and physical education. Those leadership functions identified by the National Council of Chief State School Officers in 1952 were used as the basis for the investigation. Attempts were made to determine the extent and kinds of provisions made by the various state departments of education in the area of health and physical education as well as the identification of strengths, weaknesses, and needs of the several states in each leadership function area.

The purposes of this chapter are: (1) to describe the development of the evaluative criteria used in the study and the manner in which those criteria were validated; (2) to describe the development of the questionnaire used in the study; and (3) to present an analysis of the data secured from respondents to the questionnaire.

Development of Evaluative Criteria

The initial step in the development of the evaluative criteria used in this investigation involved a comprehensive review of available research and literature related to the problem. Every effort was made to investigate the various aspects of state departments of education particularly those concerning the leadership responsibilities of that agency in the area of health and physical education. Based upon the information gleaned from this review it was found that the leadership functions of state departments of education in all areas of service fall into six broad categories. These are: (1) planning, (2) research, (3) public relations, (4) advising, (5) coordination, and (6) in-service education.¹

The next step involved the matter of defining each function in terms of the manner in which it related to the state department of education and the statewide program of health and physical education. The definitions as used in this study appear in Chapter I under the rubric Definition of Terms.

The third step in the construction of the evaluative criteria involved the development of essential elements of each selected leadership function as it related to the state department of education and the statewide program of health and physical education. The essential elements were delineated in fifty-two criteria each of which were categorized according to their relationship to a specific function of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education. These criteria were discussed and evaluated by colleagues and

¹The National Council of Chief State School Officers, op. cit.

members of the investigator's doctoral committee. Those criteria found to be repetitious or having little significance to the study were deleted. As a result of this process, thirty criteria considered to be appropriate for the purposes of the study remained to be further validated.

As a fourth step an opinionnaire was constructed using the criteria as the basis for the instrument and forwarded to a jury of twenty highly qualified persons able to meet one of the following standards:

1. The juror must possess professional knowledge and understanding of the organization and administration of health and physical education as evidenced by contribution to professional literature or authorship of recognized texts in the area of organization and administration of health and physical education. (10 jurors were selected using this criterion)

2. The juror must be a nationally recognized supervisor of health and physical education in a public school system as evidenced by being a member of a committee of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. (5 jurors were selected using this criterion)

3. The juror must be a designated leader and teacher of health and physical education in the public schools as evidenced by occupying the position of president of the state association for health and physical education in the state in which he resides. (5 jurors were selected using this criterion)

Throughout the opinionnaire consideration was given to stating each criterion in such a manner that it would lend itself to different degrees of agreement or disagreement. Consequently, the following five point scale for degrees of agreement and disagreement was used by jury members for recording responses to each criterion.

SA - Strongly Agree

A - Agree

U - Uncertain

D - Disagree

SD - Strongly Disagree

The opinionnaire (Appendix A) accompanied by a cover letter explaining the study (Appendix B) and a request for cooperation was mailed to each jury member. A stamped self-addressed envelope was also enclosed to facilitate a prompt response. Of the twenty jury members originally selected, two requested that they be withdrawn because of a lack of time to comply. As a result of this circumstance two other persons able to meet the standards for jurors were selected as replacements. These two persons agreed to participate in the study.

Four weeks after the initial opinionnaires were sent, 19 of the 20 jurors had responded by returning the instrument. A follow-up letter was sent to the remaining juror but he again failed to respond. No further attempt was made to secure his cooperation. (An alphabetical list of cooperating jurors appears as Appendix C)

Prior to sending out the opinionnaire to the jury, it was decided by this investigator, utilizing his best professional judgment, that any criterion receiving a combined total of 80 per cent or more of

strongly agree and agree responses from the jury would be justification for validation and for further use in the study. Consequently, the fifth step involved a tabulation of the responses by the jury to determine the validity status of each criterion. This was done in the following manner:

1. Totals for each degree of agreement on each criterion were made.

2. The total number of strongly agree and agree responses for each criterion were combined and converted to a percentage and compared to the cumulative percentage of uncertain, disagree, and strongly disagree responses.

3. All percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number and compared to the criterion needed for validation.

Analysis of Jury Responses to Opionaire

To facilitate the appropriate analysis the data will be presented in table form showing the combined percentage of strongly agree and agree responses to each criterion as opposed to the combined percentage of uncertain, disagree, and strongly disagree responses. Also, each criterion was paraphrased in order that as little space as possible be used in reporting the analysis. It will be noted that all percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number and will always total 100 per cent. The comments given by the respondents were recorded and those which were significant or which presented a trend of criticism or interpretation were given consideration when presenting the findings.

Table 1 presents the responses of the jury to the criteria pertaining to the planning function of state departments of education in

the area of health and physical education. From this table it can be seen that each criterion related to the planning function received more

TABLE 1
JURY RESPONSES TO PLANNING FUNCTION CRITERIA

CRITERIA	Percentage of SA and A Responses	Percentage of U, D, and SD Responses
1. Comprehensive plan for health and physical education	100	-
2. Plan should be published	100	-
3. Plan should be cooperatively formulated	84	16
4. Plan should be periodically reviewed and revised	100	-
5. Plan should be flexible	95	5
6. Should have orientation program to familiarize staff with plan	95	5

than the 80 per cent strongly agree and agree response needed for validation. Three, or 50 per cent of the criteria received a 100 per cent strongly agree and agree response. The third criterion, in addition to receiving the lowest percentage of strongly agree and agree responses, elicited several comments from jury members. These comments all pertained to the difficulty of facilitating such a criterion in actual practice.

As shown in Table 2, all of the criteria pertaining to the research function were validated since they received a strongly agree

and agree response of 80 per cent or more from jury members. Of the three criteria receiving the lowest percentage of responses, criterion number one, which stated that the state department of education should have an adequately trained research person to work chiefly in the area

TABLE 2
JURY RESPONSES TO RESEARCH FUNCTION CRITERIA

CRITERIA	Percentage of SA and A Responses	Percentage of U, D, and SD Responses
1. Adequately trained research person	84	16
2. Should publish and distribute significant research	84	16
3. Should objectively interpret the findings of research	95	5
4. Should have access to adequate data processing equipment	95	5
5. Should act as clearinghouse	89	11
6. Should coordinate research activities	84	16
7. Should stimulate research	95	5
8. Should locate funds for research	89	11
9. Should allocate part of budget for research activities	100	-
10. Should utilize results of research	100	-

of health and physical education, induced several comments from jurors. These comments were all related to the fact that although there would be

ample work and need for such a person, the budget of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education could not afford such a person.

From the data presented in Table 3, it can be learned that 3, or 75 per cent of the criteria related to the public relations function received a 100 per cent strongly agree and agree response from jury members. Of the jurors who did not concur with criterion number one, it was felt that such a function should be carried out by the superintendent of public instruction; therefore voiding the need for a public relations specialist who directs and coordinates public relations activities in the state department including those in the area of health and physical education.

TABLE 3

JURY RESPONSES TO PUBLIC RELATIONS FUNCTION CRITERIA

CRITERIA	Percentage of SA and A Responses	Percentage of U, D, and SD Responses
1. Director and coordinator of public relations activities	84	16
2. Should use all available resources in public relations program	100	-
3. Public relations program should be continuous and reliable	100	-
4. Should allocate part of budget for public relations activities	100	-

According to the data presented in Table 4, all of the criteria related to the advisory and consultative function of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education were validated. Most jurors were of the opinion that this function was the most important function of the state department in the area of health and physical education.

TABLE 4
JURY RESPONSES TO ADVISORY AND CONSULTATIVE FUNCTION CRITERIA

CRITERIA	Percentage of SA and A Responses	Percentage of U, D, and SD Responses
1. Should provide advisory and consultative services	100	-
2. Services should be based on needs of the recipients	89	11
3. Services should make schools aware of their needs in health and physical education	95	5

Table 5 reveals that both criteria related to the coordination function received a 100 per cent strongly agree and agree response from jury members. They also indicated that the official representative of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education should, in carrying out the coordination function, promote the bringing together of representative administrators, teachers, parents, physicians, dentists, nurses, public health personnel, and others to work on common problems in health and physical education.

TABLE 5

JURY RESPONSES TO COORDINATION FUNCTION CRITERIA

CRITERIA	Percentage of SA and A Responses	Percentage of U, D, and SD Responses
1. Should establish liaison and coordinate its efforts	100	-
2. Should make use of a variety of mechanisms to promote coordination	100	-

TABLE 6

JURY RESPONSES TO IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FUNCTION CRITERIA

CRITERIA	Percentage of SA and A Responses	Percentage of U, D, and SD Responses
1. Should encourage in-service education on the local level	89	11
2. Should collaborate with teacher education institutions in developing preparation programs	100	-
3. Should make use of a wide variety of structures in promoting in-service education programs	95	5
4. Should assume leadership in developing instructional guides	100	-
5. Should evaluate in-service education program	100	-

From Table 6, it can be seen that 3, or 60 per cent of the criteria related to the in-service education function received a 100 per cent strongly agree and agree response. Also, the remaining 2 criteria were validated by reason of their receiving over an 80 per cent strongly agree and agree response.

Summary of Jury Responses to Opinionnaire

In summary, an examination of Tables 1 through 6 revealed that of the 30 criteria contained in the opinionnaire, 14, or 47 per cent received a 100 per cent strongly agree and agree response. Of the remaining 16 criteria, 7 received a 95 per cent strongly agree and agree response; 4 an 89 per cent strongly agree and agree response; and 5 an 84 per cent strongly agree and agree response from jury members. In view of these data, all 30 criteria were validated and were further used in this study.

Development of the Questionnaire

From the thirty criteria validated by the jury members a questionnaire was developed embracing seven sections. These were: I - General Information Pertaining to Staff, II - Planning Function, III - Research Function, IV - Public Relations Function, V - Advisory and Consultative Function, VI - Coordination Function, VII - In-Service Education Function. In constructing the questionnaire an attempt was made to formulate questions which would reflect the criteria validated by the jury and at the same time evaluate present provisions that the various state departments of education were making toward carrying out each selected function in the area of health and physical education.

Prior to the final draft of the questionnaire a number of preliminary copies were developed and evaluated by colleagues and members of the investigator's doctoral committee. Those questions considered to be repetitious and insignificant to the purposes of the study were deleted. Also, those questions which did not reflect the criteria validated by the jury were canceled.

The final draft of the questionnaire (Appendix D) was mailed to the official representatives of the state departments of education in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia in the area of health and physical education. The mailing list was acquired from the October, 1965, issue of the Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. Accompanying the questionnaire was a cover letter from the State Director of Health and Physical Education of Oklahoma recommending the study and the author's cover letter explaining the study and requesting cooperation in the study. Also, a self-addressed stamped envelope was included to facilitate a prompt response. (Cover letters appear as Appendices E and F)

Four weeks after the questionnaires were forwarded a follow-up letter (Appendix G) was sent to each person who had not responded. Accompanying each letter was a self-addressed air mail postal card (Appendix H) requesting a check mark to determine the status of participation. Ten days after the follow-up letter was mailed, a telephone call was made to each of the remaining persons who had not responded to the questionnaire. The purpose of the call was to request cooperation in completing the questionnaire. This was the final effort made by the investigator in soliciting cooperation in the study.

Analysis of Responses to the Questionnaire

For the purposes of this analysis the District of Columbia was treated in the same manner as the other state departments of education. Consequently, the analysis was based upon a total of 51 state departments of education.

Forty-nine, or 96 per cent of the state education agencies in the United States responded to the questionnaire. The data was organized into tables to facilitate as simple an analysis as possible. Numbers and percentages were indicated for most items studied relative to the total number of questionnaires answered and returned to the investigator, and percentages were calculated to the nearest whole per cent unless otherwise indicated.

General Information Pertaining to Staff

The state department of education is in a strategic position of first magnitude to provide leadership in a variety of school subjects. One of these is health and physical education. The growing concern for adequate programs in this area requires that the state department of education provide the highest level of dynamic and intelligent leadership at all times. Many chief state school officers, having recognized this crucial role, have established separate departments within the state education agency for the purpose of providing over-all supervision and coordination of health and physical education programs. Presently, there are 39 states, including the District of Columbia, which provide for a separate Department of Health and Physical Education within the State Department of Public Instruction. Furthermore, each of these

departments are headed by a person, usually called the Director of Health and Physical Education, who in many instances has responsibility for school recreation and interscholastic athletic programs as well. In the remaining 12 states which do not have this type arrangement, the official representative of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education is usually a general coordinator, or supervisor, or his assistant, who has other duties and assignments.²

The State Director of Health and Physical Education is in a key position to promote the essential services needed for the improvement of programs in this area. By the very nature of his position he is able to exert tremendous influence upon individual physical education teachers, as well as upon teacher education personnel and school administrators. Consequently, it is essential that the State Director of Health and Physical Education exercise the highest level of leadership essential for making educational improvements which will meet the needs of society in the area of health and physical education. To this end, the state director must direct his time, energy, and resources in order that local schools may realize the highest potential possible inherent in health and physical education programs.

Bechtel and Holland, in a publication developed under the auspices of the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, stated that in order to do his job effectively the state director should possess certain personal and professional qualifications. Some of the more important of these are:

²Interview with Simon A. McNeely, Director of Federal-State Relations, President's Council on Physical Fitness, April 1, 1966.

1. Personal Qualifications

- a. Leadership skills and the ability to work cooperatively with people on all levels.
- b. Professional integrity demonstrated in positions held previously.
- c. Ability to plan, speak, and write effectively.
- d. A pleasing personality with the ability to inspire others.
- e. Enthusiastic and dedicated to improving the quality of the programs under his jurisdiction.
- f. Good physical and mental health with the ability to cope comfortably with changing conditions.

2. Professional Qualifications

- a. Minimum Training: Master's Degree, major and extensive study in health education and physical education.
- b. Desirable Training: Doctor's Degree with major or minor in health and physical education.
- c. Membership and active participation in recognized professional organizations.
- d. Thorough knowledge of pertinent laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to health and physical education and the ability to interpret these to local authorities and the general public.
- e. A thorough knowledge of administration, teaching methods, materials, problems, and subject matter of the educational areas under his leadership.³

³Paul C. Bechtel and Robert Holland, A Handbook for State Directors of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Safety (Tentative Draft, 1965).

Professional Training of Official State Representatives
of Health and Physical Education

In an effort to determine the professional training of the official representatives of the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia in the area of health and physical education, two questions in Section I were designed to secure this information. Those questions requested that the respondent indicate the highest degree held by the official representative of the state education agency in health and physical education and the area in which he held his highest degree. A review of Table 7 reveals that of the 49 state education agencies responding to the questionnaire, 48, or 98 per cent of the official representatives of that agency in health and physical education possessed at least a Master's degree. A further examination indicated that 6, or 12 per cent held the Doctor's degree; 16, or 32 per cent a diploma or certificate beyond the Master's degree; and 26, or 53 per cent held just the Master's degree with no further preparation. Only one official representative held as his highest degree a Bachelor's degree.

Table 7 also provides data concerning the areas of preparation in which those representatives held their highest degree. A breakdown of these data indicated that 19, or 39 per cent were prepared in both health and physical education; 14, or 30 per cent in just physical education; 12, or 24 per cent in education; and 3, or 7 per cent in health education. In view of these findings, it is apparent that the persons officially representing the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia in the area of health and physical education are adequately meeting the minimum degree requirements of that position

TABLE 7

AREA OF PREPARATION AND DEGREES HELD BY OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE DEPARTMENTS
IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Degree Held*	Area of Preparation**	State	Degree Held	Area of Preparation
Alabama	B	3	Montana	C	4
Alaska	D	1	Nebraska	B	4
Arkansas	C	1	Nevada	C	4
California	B	4	New Hampshire	B	4
Colorado	A	3	New Jersey	A	3
Connecticut	A	4	New Mexico	C	1
Delaware	C	3	New York	A	3
Dist. of Columbia	B	2	North Carolina	B	4
Florida	C	3	North Dakota	C	3
Georgia	C	1	Ohio	C	3
Hawaii	C	3	Oklahoma	B	4
Idaho	C	4	Oregon	B	1
Illinois	B	3	Pennsylvania	B	2
Indiana	A	3	Rhode Island	C	1
Iowa	B	1	South Carolina	B	1
Kansas	C	4	Tennessee	C	3
Kentucky	C	3	Texas	C	1
Louisiana	A	1	Utah	C	1
Maine	C	4	Vermont	B	1
Maryland	C	3	Virginia	C	3
Massachusetts	C	1	Washington	B	3
Michigan	B	3	West Virginia	C	3
Minnesota	C	3	Wisconsin	C	1
Mississippi	B	3	Wyoming	C	4
Missouri	C	3			

* A. Doctorate
 B. Certificate or Diploma beyond
 Master's Degree
 C. Master's Degree
 D. Bachelor's Degree

** 1. Physical Education
 2. Health Education
 3. Combination Health and Physical
 Education
 4. Education

as advocated by the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

Other Professional Staff Employed by State Departments
in Health and Physical Education

If the state department is to provide adequate leadership in the area of health and physical education, then, it must have sufficient professional staff in addition to the state director. Such a statement is easy to defend in light of the fact that health and physical education is required for more students than any other area in the school curriculum with the possible exception of English. Consequently, it is an impossible task for one person to provide the necessary leadership needed for such a vast area of the public school curriculum. From Table 8 it can be learned that, excluding the state director, there are 107 professional staff members employed by the various state departments of education in the area of health and physical education. It further shows that not all of these persons are employed on a full-time basis. Ninety-five, or 89 per cent are full-time employees; 4, or 4 per cent are on a half-time basis; and 8, or 7 per cent are employed less than half-time. This amounts to an average of approximately two professional staff members per state department of education. However, this average was greatly influenced by the two states which had the largest professional staffs. If these two states had comparable staffs the average would be reduced to slightly over one and one-half persons per state department of education.

Data presented in Table 8 also reveals that of the 107 other professional staff members employed by the various state departments of

TABLE 8

AREA OF PREPARATION AND DEGREES HELD BY OTHER PROFESSIONAL STAFF EMPLOYED
BY STATE DEPARTMENTS IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Full-time	Half-time or Less	Doctorate	Certificate or Diploma	Master's Degree	Bachelor's Degree
Alabama	5		1	2	2	
Alaska		1				1
Arkansas	1				1	
California	4	1	2	1	2	
Colorado						
Connecticut	2		2			
Delaware						
Dist. of Columbia	7				7	
Florida	4	2			6	
Georgia	1				1	
Hawaii	1				1	
Idaho						
Illinois	1		1			
Indiana	15	2	2		14	1
Iowa		1		1		
Kansas						
Kentucky						
Louisiana	3				3	
Maine						
Maryland	1	1				2
Massachusetts						
Michigan	1				1	
Minnesota	1				1	
Mississippi	2				2	
Missouri	1				1	
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada	1				1	
New Hampshire		1			1	
New Jersey	2	2	1 M.D.		3	
New Mexico	1				1	
New York	12		3		9	
North Carolina	4			1	3	
North Dakota		1				1
Ohio	4				4	
Oklahoma	1				1	

TABLE 8--Continued

State	Full-time	Half-time or Less	Doctorate	Certificate or Diploma	Master's Degree	Bachelor's Degree
Oregon	1				1	
Pennsylvania	2				2	
Rhode Island						
South Carolina	1				1	
Tennessee	4				4	
Texas	1				1	
Utah						
Vermont	2				2	
Virginia	5				5	
Washington	2			2		
West Virginia	1				1	
Wisconsin	1				1	
Wyoming						
Totals	95	12	12	7	84	4

education in the area of health and physical education, 12, or 11 per cent held the Doctor's degree; 7, or 6 per cent a certificate or diploma beyond the Master's degree; 84, or 79 per cent just a Master's degree; and 4, or 4 per cent a Bachelor's degree.

This study also attempted to discover whether the various state departments of education had any minimal requirements for professional staff members in the area of health and physical education. Table 9 shows that of the 49 state education agencies responding to the questionnaire, 42, or 86 per cent did have minimal requirements while 7, or 14 per cent had no requirements. Of the 42 states which had minimum requirements, 40, or 95 per cent indicated that a Master's degree was required for employment in the area of health and physical education.

TABLE 9
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF
IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Requirements Yes or No	Minimum Requirements	State	Requirements Yes or No	Minimum Requirements
Alabama	Yes	Master's degree 4 yr.exp.	Montana	Yes	Master's degree
Alaska	Yes	Bachelor's degree	Nebraska	No	
Arkansas	Yes	Master's degree	Nevada	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
California	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	New Hampshire	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Colorado	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	New Jersey	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Connecticut	Yes	Doctorate 10 yr.exp.	New Mexico	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Delaware	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	New York	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Dist.of Columbia	No		North Carolina	Yes	Master's degree
Florida	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	North Dakota	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Georgia	No		Ohio	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Hawaii	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	Oklahoma	Yes	Master's degree
Idaho	Yes	Master's degree	Oregon	Yes	Master's degree
Illinois	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	Pennsylvania	Yes	Master's degree
Indiana	No		Rhode Island	Yes	Master's degree
Iowa	No		South Carolina	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Kansas	Yes	Master's degree	Tennessee	No	
Kentucky	Yes	Master's degree adm.exp.	Texas	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Louisiana	No		Utah	Yes	Master's degree 9 yr.exp.
Maine	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	Vermont	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Maryland	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	Virginia	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Massachusetts	Yes	Master's degree	Washington	Yes	Master's degree
Michigan	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	West Virginia	Yes	Master's degree 3 yr.exp.
Minnesota	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	Wisconsin	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Mississippi	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.	Wyoming	Yes	Master's degree 5 yr.exp.
Missouri	Yes	Master's degree 3 yr.exp.			
			Total Yes	42	
			Per Cent	86	
			Total No	7	
			Per Cent	14	

The other two states indicated that a Doctor's degree and a Bachelor's degree were required. Most of the respondents further indicated that teaching experience was required in addition to the specific degree requirements. Although the range of experience varied from none to ten years, a majority of the states required five years of teaching experience in the area of health and physical education as a minimum requirement for employment.

The Planning Function

In this study the planning function of state departments of education referred to the formulation of a comprehensive statewide plan of health and physical education for the public schools within the state which include long and short-term policies, procedures, and objectives.

The ultimate success of any program will be dependent upon the extent to which the program has benefited from careful planning. Profit making enterprises, having recognized this significant fact, devote much time, energy, and money to the effort of planning in order that they may be assured success in the outcome of whatever goods or services they are providing the public. For this reason, it seems logical to assume that a government agency such as the state department of education should carefully plan programs under its jurisdiction in order that the greatest value will accrue. In discussing the planning function of state departments of education Beach stated the following:

Planning ranks at the top among the functions of the state department of education. It is the very essence of the leadership function. It calls for the highest type of far-sighted vision,

initiative, and at certain times bold and courageous action. Only through planning can the program of the state department of education have purpose and direction. No program of the state department can go much beyond the vision of its leaders as expressed in their plans.⁴

Since state departments of education foster the belief that health and physical education are essential subjects in the school curriculum, it does not seem unreasonable to expect that this agency should develop a comprehensive statewide plan of health and physical education. In this connection there are certain factors which may be considered basic to the formulation of a comprehensive statewide plan of health and physical education. The first of these is that a proper plan involves the formulation of long-term policies, procedures, and objectives. The absence of these constituents in a plan produces a program that functions in a haphazard manner. The day-by-day activities and problems cannot be dealt with wisely and in relation to long-term goals if these components are non-existent.

State Departments Having Comprehensive Plans In Health and Physical Education

Analysis of responses from state departments of education with respect to planning activities in health and physical education revealed surprising deficiencies on the part of far too many of the departments. It can be learned from Table 10 that 27, or 55 per cent of the state departments of education had formulated a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education. Twenty-two, or 45 per cent indicated that they had no such plan. It is of particular interest to note that

⁴Beach, op. cit., p. 4.

TABLE 10
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION HAVING FORMULATED AND PUBLISHED COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE
PLANS IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Policies and Objectives Formulated? Yes or No	Year Formulated	Published? Yes or No	State	Policies and Objectives Formulated? Yes or No	Year Formulated	Published? Yes or No
Alabama	Yes	1964	Yes	Montana	No		
Alaska	No			Nebraska	No		
Arkansas	Yes	1959	Yes	Nevada	No		
California	Yes	1920	Yes	New Hampshire	No		
Colorado	No			New Jersey	Yes		Yes
Connecticut	Yes		Yes	New Mexico	Yes		Yes
Delaware	Yes		Yes	New York	No		
Dist. of Columbia	No			North Carolina	Yes	1954	Yes
Florida	Yes	1951	Yes	North Dakota	Yes		Yes
Georgia	No			Ohio	No		
Hawaii	Yes		Yes	Oklahoma	No		
Idaho	No			Oregon	Yes	1932	Yes
Illinois	No			Pennsylvania	Yes	1966	No
Indiana	Yes	1936	Yes	Rhode Island	Yes	1965	No
Iowa	No			South Carolina	Yes	1952	Yes
Kansas	No			Tennessee	Yes	1963	Yes
Kentucky	Yes		No	Texas	Yes	1947	Yes
Louisiana	No			Utah	Yes	1931	Yes
Maine	No			Vermont	Yes	1960	Yes
Maryland	Yes	1964	Yes	Virginia	Yes	1920	Yes
Massachusetts	Yes	1922	No	Washington	Yes	1965	Yes
Michigan	No			West Virginia	Yes	1965	Yes
Minnesota	Yes		No	Wisconsin	No		
Mississippi	No			Wyoming	No		
Missouri	No						
				Total Yes	27		22
				Per Cent	55		77
				Total No	22		5
				Per Cent	45		23

those respondents who replied in the affirmative to this question had a separate Department of Health and Physical Education within their State Department of Education, whereas, those state education agencies indicating a negative response did not have this type arrangement. From these data one might infer that there is a relationship between the development of a statewide plan for health and physical education and the existence of a separate Department of Health and Physical Education within the state education agency.

Year When Plans Were Formulated

Table 10 also reveals that of the state departments which have developed a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education, only 19 could identify the year when such plans were formulated. A further examination showed that of the 19 respondents indicating the specific year when such plans were formulated, 11, or 58 per cent were developed prior to 1960, while 8, or 42 per cent were developed subsequent to that time. Although there may be a multitude of reasons for respondents not being able to identify the specific year when the comprehensive plans were formulated, the important fact is that since 1960 there seems to have been an increase in the number of plans developed by the various state departments of education in the area of health and physical education. It appears that this increase can be traced to two recent developments in American education which have had far-reaching implications for health and physical education programs. The first and most dramatic of these developments was the emphasis and support given to school physical fitness programs by the late President John F. Kennedy. President Kennedy urged that physical fitness become

a major concern of the American people. As a result, schools were asked to adopt three recommendations made by the National Council on Youth Fitness. These recommendations of the Council were that the school identify the physically under-developed pupil and work with him to improve his physical capacity; provide a minimum of fifteen minutes of vigorous physical activity every day for all pupils; and use valid fitness tests to determine pupils' physical abilities and evaluate their progress.⁵ It was felt that through the adoption of these recommendations the health and physical development of all children and youth could be strengthened. As a result of such emphasis by the President himself, many state departments of education have directed the implementation of the Council's recommendations in their schools.

The second recent development which gave impetus to the formulation of statewide plans in the area of health and physical education was the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This act ratified by Congress and signed by President Johnson on April 11, 1965, is considered to be the greatest single commitment ever made by the Federal Government for the improvement of education in the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation. Also, this act is the first federal legislation to identify school health and physical education although no funds are earmarked for these subjects or any other subject. Under Title V of this act, state departments of education are able to improve and expand their services in the area of health and physical education. Consequently, it seems imperative that those

⁵ Youth Physical Fitness: Suggested Elements of a School-Centered Program (Washington, D. C.: President's Council on Youth Fitness, 1961), Parts I and II.

official representatives of the various state departments of education in the area of health and physical education become fully knowledgeable about what is possible under the new act.

Publication of Comprehensive Plans

State education agencies have a responsibility to make available to the public a written record of the plans by which they operate. Not only must they interpret to the public the needs and conditions of health and physical education within the state, but it is also incumbent in their duties to relate to the public their plans for the future provisions of educational services in the area of health and physical education. Without this information the public can hardly be expected to enthusiastically support a strong program of health and physical education in the public schools. Table 10 shows that of the 27 state departments of education possessing a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education, 22, or 77 per cent have published this plan. Five, or 23 per cent of the responding state departments indicated that although a plan had been formulated it had not been published; thus over one-half of the state education agencies in the United States were unable to produce a publication identifying the guidelines by which they operate in the area of health and physical education.

Who Helps Plan?

A second factor which may be considered basic to the development of a comprehensive statewide plan of health and physical education is that the plan should be cooperatively formulated by persons representative of the major groups involved in the teacher-pupil learning situation.

This means that advisory organizations composed of teachers, supervisors, and administrators of local school systems, representatives of educational institutions and lay organizations are all partners in the planning process. Each person plays a part in shaping the goals, purposes, and the methods which are used in achieving the ends. The investigator attempted to discover who participated with state departments of education in developing their comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education. In response to the question pertaining to regular participants in such planning it can be seen from Table 11 that of those 27 state departments having formulated a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education, other members of the state department of education not in the area of health and physical education regularly participated in 24, or 89 per cent of the states; public school health and physical education teachers in 25, or 93 per cent; public school supervisors in 22, or 81 per cent; public school principals in 24, or 89 per cent; consultants from the American Association for Health and Physical Education in 8, or 30 per cent; representatives from the state association for health and physical education in 22, or 81 per cent; lay personnel in 12, or 44 per cent; and legislators in 6, or 22 per cent. Others included were coaches, psychologists, and members from the State Medical Society and State Department of Health. In view of these findings, it appeared that in those states having a comprehensive statewide plan of health and physical education, the planning group consisted of a representative cross-section of those vitally concerned with the teacher-pupil learning situation in this field.

TABLE 11

GROUPS REGULARLY INCLUDED IN DEVELOPING COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE PLANS
IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Groups Participating in Plannina									
	Other members of S.D.E.	Public School Teachers	Supervisors	Principals	Superintendents	College Personnel	Consultants from AAHPER	State Association of Health & Phy- sical Education	Lay personnel	Others ^a
Alabama	x	x	x	x		x		x		
Arkansas	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	
California	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Connecticut	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		
Delaware		x		x	x	x				
Florida	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Hawaii		x				x		x		
Indiana	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x
Kentucky	x	x		x		x		x	x	
Maryland	x		x	x	x			x		
Massachusetts	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Minnesota		x	x	x	x	x			x	
New Jersey	x	x	x	x	x			x		
New Mexico	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		
North Carolina	x	x	x	x	x					
North Dakota	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Oregon	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	
Pennsylvania	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		
Rhode Island	x				x	x				
South Carolina	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Tennessee	x	x	x	x	x			x		
Texas	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
Utah	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x
Vermont	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Virginia	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Washington	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
West Virginia	x	x	x		x	x		x		
Total	24	25	22	24	22	23	8	22	12	6
Per Cent	89	93	81	89	81	85	30	81	44	22

^aOthers included members from the State Medical Society, State Department of Health, Coaches, Psychologists, and representatives from voluntary agencies interested in health and physical education programs.

A third factor considered basic to the formulation of a comprehensive statewide plan in health and physical education is that such a plan should be periodically reviewed and revised in order to meet the changing needs of the society. With new discoveries, new inventions, new ideas, and new conditions, rigid blueprints, if adhered to, inhibit progress rather than enhance it. For this reason the statewide plan for health and physical education should be scrutinized periodically. In this study, it was found that each of the state departments of education having a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education periodically reviewed and revised those plans. Two of the respondents commenting on this question indicated that the plan was reviewed annually just prior to the development of the department's budget proposal for the next fiscal year.

Orientation of Professional Staff

If the state department of education is to properly fulfill its leadership role in health and physical education it is essential that the professional staff in that area be well informed. Therefore, it is important that the state education agency have a specific program of orientation to familiarize the professional staff members in the area of health and physical education with the long-term policies, procedures, and objectives that have been formulated. Table 12 discloses that of the 27 state departments which possessed a comprehensive plan for health and physical education, 23, or 85 per cent indicated that they had an orientation program to familiarize its staff members with the plan. Four, or 15 per cent indicated no such plan was

TABLE 12

ORIENTATION PRACTICES OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN THE
AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Departmental Plan For Orientation Of Staff Members? Yes or No	Orientation Practices			
		Staff Meetings	Workshops	Printed Materials	Others ^a
Alabama	Yes	x			
Arkansas	Yes	x	x	x	
California	Yes	x	x	x	
Connecticut	No				
Delaware	Yes			x	
Florida	Yes	x	x	x	
Hawaii	No				
Indiana	Yes	x	x	x	
Kentucky	No				
Maryland	Yes	x		x	
Massachusetts	Yes	x	x	x	
Minnesota	Yes		x	x	
New Jersey	Yes	x	x		
New Mexico	Yes	x		x	
North Carolina	Yes	x	x	x	
North Dakota	Yes		x	x	
Oregon	Yes	x		x	
Pennsylvania	Yes	x	x	x	x
Rhode Island	Yes	x		x	
South Carolina	Yes	x	x	x	
Tennessee	Yes	x			
Texas	Yes	x	x	x	
Utah	Yes	x		x	
Vermont	Yes		x	x	
Virginia	Yes	x	x	x	
Washington	No				
West Virginia	Yes			x	
Total Yes	23	18	14	20	1
Per Cent	85				
Total No	4				
Per Cent	15				

^aOthers in the one case cited referred to the practice of new staff members traveling throughout the state with an experienced staff member before being assigned a permanent job.

available. Table 12 also reveals that 18, or 67 per cent of the state departments of education used regularly scheduled staff meetings as part of the orientation program. In addition to this practice, 14, or 52 per cent of the departments utilized workshops and 20, or 74 per cent utilized printed materials covering policies and objectives as part of the orientation program. One respondent indicated that as an orientation practice his state department assigned new staff members to travel throughout the state with an experienced staff member before receiving an official assignment.

Since this study was not concerned with the orientation practices of state departments of education which did not have a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education, it was impossible to determine whether those 22 states had orientation programs comparable to those reported in the above paragraphs.

The Research Function

In this investigation the research function referred to the systematic gathering, analyzing, and interpretation of data which are basic to educational improvement in health and physical education for the purpose of discovering better ways of doing things and learning how to best achieve newer objectives which seem to be desirable.

Today all areas of human endeavor have found research and scientific study indispensable to improvement and advancement. Industry, having recognized that there is a high degree of correlation between progress and research, spends billions of dollars a year in its laboratories searching for new and better products. Research in medicine has brought about cures and preventive measures for scores of infirmities

affecting human welfare. Through the application of science and research the field of agriculture has advanced in productivity and efficiency. In view of these statements one could safely assert that research is the most likely method of keeping up with events and assuring progress in our dynamic society.

In recent years the field of education has made great strides through the application of research. Profound improvements in American education have occurred as a result of newly acquired knowledge derived from the application of research in school organization, pupil transportation, school finance, instructional services, methods and techniques of teaching, and educational psychology. That educational research has kept pace with other areas of man's endeavor is debatable, however, the important fact is that this function is coming to the fore because adequate research establishes a basis for educational improvement. About this matter Beach stated the following:

Modern education has progressed to the stage at which guesswork is no longer adequate as a basis for the determination of plans and policies. Facts are necessary. Policies and programs for education are more and more being determined on the basis of objective data, much of which must be obtained by scientific inquiry.⁶

Typically, research has not been a primary function of state departments of education although they have been concerned with certain routine and clerical phases of research. Basically those phases have been the gathering of statistics, the compilation of records, and the preparation of reports. That the research function is being recognized more and more as important can be seen by the results of two studies

⁶Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, op. cit., p. 4.

dealing with state departments of education. Beach, in a study embracing the functions of state departments of education, reported that during 1948-49, there were 63 persons working full-time in research and statistics in the forty-eight state education agencies.⁷ Fifteen years later, Riddle, in a questionnaire study pertaining to leadership functions of state departments of education in educational development, reported there were 113 persons engaged in research as their primary function in the forty-three state education agencies which cooperated in his investigation.⁸

Perhaps in no other field of the school curriculum has there been more practice based upon opinion, tradition, and expediency as in health and physical education. Because of a dearth of scientific evidence based upon the proper experimental approach it has been necessary to conduct programs in this area largely on the basis of the best thinking in the field. As a result of this approach the inclusion of health and physical education programs in the public school curriculum has been seriously challenged. If these programs are to keep abreast with the best modern practices and trends, it follows that some provision should be made for an organized research approach in this area. In this regard it appears that the state department of education is the most logical integration agency within the state to provide the type of leadership needed for such an organized approach. Standing in the position of having to work with both public schools and institutions of higher learning, which are actually the main dynamos for conducting

⁷Ibid., p. 18.

⁸Riddle, op. cit., p. 65.

research, the state department is in the strategic position for providing such leadership.

Who Conducts Research in Health and Physical Education?

An analysis of the questions relevant to the research function of state departments of education in the area of health and physical education revealed that most state departments were inadequately discharging their responsibility in this area. It was found that none of the state education agencies had on their staffs a research person to work chiefly in the area of health and physical education. Furthermore, as disclosed in Table 13, 84 per cent of the respondents indicated that their state departments were inadequately staffed to meet the research needs of the state in the area of health and physical education. In view of these findings one wonders whether or not state departments of education consider this function important enough to warrant the employment of professionally trained persons in this area.

If the state department of education does not employ a research person to work chiefly in the area of health and physical education, how then does it discharge this function? Data presented in Table 14 shows that 17 respondents indicated that such research was carried out by the Division of Research within the state education agency. Moreover, eight state departments indicated they depended upon colleges and universities within the state to conduct research. One state education agency indicated that this function was carried out by the state association for health and physical education and one department stated that such research was conducted by private research companies on a fee-for-service basis. Twenty-two respondents failed to answer this question.

TABLE 13

ADEQUACY OF RESEARCH STAFFS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Is State Department of Education Adequately Staffed to Meet the Research Needs in Health and Physical Education?		
Alabama	Yes	Montana	No
Alaska	No	Nebraska	No
Arkansas	No	Nevada	No
California	No	New Hampshire	No
Colorado	No	New Jersey	No
Connecticut	No	New Mexico	No
Delaware	No	New York	No
Dist. of Columbia	Yes	North Carolina	Yes
Florida	No	North Dakota	No
Georgia	No	Ohio	No
Hawaii	No	Oklahoma	No
Idaho	No	Oregon	No
Illinois	Yes	Pennsylvania	No
Indiana	No	Rhode Island	Yes
Iowa	No	South Carolina	No
Kansas	No	Tennessee	No
Kentucky	No	Texas	No
Maine	No	Utah	Yes
Maryland	Yes	Vermont	No
Massachusetts	No	Virginia	No
Michigan	No	Washington	Yes
Minnesota	No	West Virginia	No
Mississippi	No	Wisconsin	No
Missouri	No	Wyoming	No
		Total Yes	8
		Per Cent	16
		Total No	41
		Per Cent	84

TABLE 14

MANNER IN WHICH RESEARCH IS HANDLED BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Manner in Which Research is Handled	State	Manner in Which Research is Handled
Alabama	Division of Research	Montana	
Alaska		Nebraska	Division of Research
Arkansas		Nevada	
California	Colleges and Universities	New Hampshire	
Colorado		New Jersey	Colleges and Universities
Connecticut	Colleges and Universities	New Mexico	
Delaware		New York	Colleges and Universities
Dist. of Columbia		North Carolina	Division of Research
Florida		North Dakota	
Georgia		Ohio	Colleges and Universities
Hawaii	Division of Research	Oklahoma	
Idaho	Division of Research	Oregon	Division of Research
Illinois	Division of Research	Pennsylvania	Division of Research
Indiana	Joint Research Committee	Rhode Island	Contract on fee-for-service basis
Iowa		South Carolina	
Kansas		Tennessee	Division of Research
Kentucky	Division of Research	Texas	Colleges and Universities
Louisiana		Utah	Colleges and Universities
Maine	Division of Research	Vermont	Colleges and Universities
Maryland	Division of Research	Virginia	Division of Research
Massachusetts		Washington	Division of Research
Michigan	Division of Research	West Virginia	
Minnesota	Division of Research	Wisconsin	Division of Research
Mississippi		Wyoming	State Association for Health and Physical Education
Missouri	Division of Research		

Significant Research in Health
and Physical Education

The state department of education has a responsibility for publishing and distributing to the public schools within the state the findings of significant research conducted in the area of health and physical education. Only in this manner will the findings of research have practical value. From Table 15 it can be learned that 8, or 16 per cent of the state departments of education had conducted significant research studies in health and physical education since 1960, whereas 41, or 84 per cent of the state education agencies indicated they had not conducted any significant studies since that time. Of the eight state departments having conducted significant studies, seven departments indicated that the findings of those studies had been published and distributed to the public schools. Five of the respondents further indicated that the research published and distributed to the public schools were the results of physical fitness tests given throughout the state.

This study also attempted to find out if the various state departments of education were presently engaged in any significant studies in the area of health and physical education. From Table 16 it may be seen that only 14, or 29 per cent of the state departments were presently involved in any significant studies in this area. Thirty-five, or 71 per cent of the state education agencies indicated they were not involved in any studies in the area of health and physical education. Of the 14 state education agencies providing an affirmative answer to this question, 5 indicated they were conducting studies relevant to teacher preparation programs in health and physical education. Also, 5 departments indicated they were conducting studies of public

TABLE 15

SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH PUBLISHED BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN THE
AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION SINCE 1960

State	Significant Research Since 1960?	Published?	State	Significant Research Since 1960?	Published?
Alabama	No		Montana	No	
Alaska	No		Nebraska	No	
Arkansas	No		Nevada	No	
California	No		New Hampshire	No	
Colorado	No		New Jersey	No	
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	New Mexico	Yes	Yes
Delaware	No		New York	No	
Florida	No		North Carolina	No	
Georgia	No		North Dakota	No	
Hawaii	No		Ohio	No	
Idaho	No		Oklahoma	No	
Illinois	Yes	Yes	Oregon	Yes	Yes
Indiana	No		Pennsylvania	No	
Iowa	No		Rhode Island	No	
Kansas	No		South Carolina	No	
Kentucky	No		Tennessee	No	
Louisiana	No		Texas	No	
Maine	No		Utah	Yes	Yes
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Vermont	No	
Massachusetts	No		Virginia	No	
Michigan	No		Washington	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Yes	No	West Virginia	No	
Mississippi	No		Wisconsin	No	
Missouri	No		Wyoming	No	
			Total Yes	8	
			Per Cent	16	
			Total No	41	
			Per Cent	84	

TABLE 16
SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH PRESENTLY BEING CONDUCTED BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Engaged In Research	Area*	State	Engaged In Research	Area*
Alabama	No		Montana	No	
Alaska	No		Nebraska	No	
Arkansas	No		Nevada	No	
California	Yes	f, g	New Hampshire	No	
Colorado	No		New Jersey	No	
Connecticut	Yes	c, d	New Mexico	Yes	c, d
Delaware	No		New York	Yes	b
Dist. of Columbia	No		North Carolina	No	
Florida	No		North Dakota	No	
Georgia	No		Ohio	Yes	a, c, d, e, f, g
Hawaii	No		Oklahoma	No	
Idaho	Yes	b, c, d	Oregon	Yes	a, b, c, d, g
Illinois	No		Pennsylvania	No	
Indiana	No		Rhode Island	Yes	c
Iowa	No		South Carolina	Yes	a, b, f, g
Kansas	No		Tennessee	No	
Kentucky	No		Texas	No	
Louisiana	No		Utah	Yes	a, b, c, d, f, g
Maine	No		Vermont	No	
Maryland	Yes	b, c	Virginia	No	
Massachusetts	No		Washington	Yes	a, b, c, d, e, f
Michigan	No		West Virginia	No	
Minnesota	Yes	b, g	Wisconsin	No	
Mississippi	No		Wyoming	Yes	b, d
Missouri	No				

*Research Areas: (a) Teacher preparation programs in health and physical education, (b) Tests and programs of physical fitness, (c) Programs of health instruction, (d) Programs of physical education, (e) Health services, (f) Analysis of the qualities of those who teach in the area of health and physical education, (g) Certification requirements for teachers of health and physical education.

school physical fitness programs; 6 stated they were studying the certification requirements for teachers of health and physical education; 9 in programs of health instruction; 5 were analyzing the qualities of those who teach in this field; and 2 departments indicated they were presently conducting studies of the health services provided by the public schools within the state.

Supply and Demand of Health and Physical Education Teachers

Colleges and universities are conferring more degrees than ever before in the field of health and physical education. As a result there appears to be an overabundance of men teachers in this area. An examination of employment interview schedules for prospective graduates in the various teaching fields held at the University of Oklahoma from January 1, 1966, to May 1, 1966, revealed that a majority of interviewers from school districts hiring teachers were not interested in interviewing male candidates for degrees in health and physical education. This same situation does not appear to hold true for women teachers in the same field. As a matter of fact, the same interviewers voiced the opinion that there is a shortage of women teachers of health and physical education throughout the United States. In attempting to verify the validity of the above assertions, the respondents to the questionnaire were asked to reply to the following question, "Has the research staff in your state department of education made a study within the last four years of the supply and demand of men and women teachers of health and physical education within your state?" An analysis of responses to this question revealed that 18, or 37 per cent of the state education agencies

have made a study of this nature. Thirty, or 63 per cent of the state departments indicated that no such study had been made within the last four years. The respondents were also asked to indicate the findings of such a study if one had been conducted. As shown in Table 17, of the 15 respondents indicating the findings of such a study, 11 stated that there was an oversupply of men teachers of health and physical education and 13 indicated there was a shortage of women teachers in this field. Two respondents stated that the findings of such a study showed that the supply and demand of both men and women teachers in the area were about equal.

Because of the small number of state departments of education having conducted studies relative to this problem, it is impossible to make generalizations about the matter; however, if these same results were national in scope, such findings would have implications for the training of male teachers of health and physical education.

Research is one of the major objectives or functions of the university. In a university a researcher has opportunity for specialization and concentrated effort in a particular field. The state department of education typically can neither afford a large staff of research specialists nor can it provide the necessary climate needed to master the intellectual processes of research. If state departments of education are to assume their proper role, it should be one of leadership for research and for stimulation and coordination of research activities relating to all aspects of the state's educational program. The following might be labeled as basic principles concerning

TABLE 17

STUDIES CONDUCTED BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLY AND DEMAND
OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

State	Has the research staff in your state department of education made a study within the last four years of the supply and demand of men and women teachers of health and physical education within your state?						
	Men	Women	Findings*	Men	Women	Findings*	
Alabama	Yes	Yes		Montana	No	No	
Alaska	No	No		Nebraska	No	No	
Arkansas	No	No		Nevada	No	No	
California	Yes	Yes	a, b	New Hampshire	No	No	
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	a, b	New Jersey	Yes	Yes	a, b
Delaware	No	No		New Mexico	Yes	Yes	a, b
Dist. of Columbia	No	No		New York	No	No	
Florida	Yes	Yes	a, b	North Carolina	Yes	Yes	a, b
Georgia	No	No		North Dakota	No	No	
Hawaii	No	No		Ohio	Yes	Yes	
Idaho	Yes	Yes	a, b	Oklahoma	No	No	
Illinois	No	No		Oregon	Yes	Yes	a, b
Indiana	No	No		Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	b, d
Iowa	No	No		Rhode Island	No	No	
Kansas	No	No		South Carolina	No	Yes	b
Kentucky	No	No		Tennessee	No	No	
Louisiana	No	No		Texas	No	No	
Maine	Yes	Yes	c	Utah	Yes	Yes	a, b
Maryland	Yes	Yes	a, b	Vermont	Yes	Yes	
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes		Virginia	No	No	
Michigan	Yes	No		Washington	No	No	

TABLE 17--Continued

Has the research staff in your state department of education made a study within the last four years of the supply and demand of men and women teachers of health and physical education within your state?							
State	Men	Women	Findings*	State	Men	Women	Findings*
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	a, b	West Virginia	No	No	
Mississippi	No	No		Wisconsin	No	No	
Missouri	No	No		Wyoming	No	No	
				Total Yes	18	18	
				Per Cent	37	37	
				Total No	30	30	
				Per Cent	63	63	

- *
a. Oversupply of men
b. Shortage of women
c. Supply and demand of men and women equal
d. Supply of men about equal

the research function of state departments of education in the area of health and physical education.

1. The state department of education should attempt to stimulate local schools, colleges, and universities to conduct research projects in the area of health and physical education.

2. The state department of education should attempt to coordinate its research activities in health and physical education with those similar projects of other groups and professional organizations interested in health and physical education programs.

3. The state department of education should attempt to locate sources of available funds to make research possible in the area of health and physical education.

In an attempt to discover if the above labeled principles were being carried out by the various state departments of education, each statement was put into question form requesting a yes or no answer. As shown in Table 18, 83 per cent of the state education agencies reported they made an attempt to stimulate research in the area of health and physical education in local schools, colleges, and universities within the state. Seventeen per cent of the state education agencies indicated they made no attempt to carry out this task. This table also shows that 32, or 68 per cent of the state departments indicated that they did attempt to coordinate their research activities in health and physical education with similar projects of other groups interested in this area. Fifteen, or 32 per cent indicated they made no attempt to coordinate their research projects; thus by their own admission approximately one-third of the state departments of education are failing to carry out what

TABLE 18

OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Stimulate Research	Locate Funds for Research	Coordinate Research Activities	Have Access to Data Processing Equipment	Allocate Part of Budget to Research
Alabama	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Alaska	No	No	No	No	No
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
California	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Delaware	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Dist. of Columbia	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Hawaii	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Idaho	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Illinois	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Indiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Iowa	No	No	No	No	No
Kansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Maine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Michigan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Missouri	No	No	No	Yes	No
Montana	No	No	Yes	No	No
Nevada	No	Yes	No	No	No
New Hampshire	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
New York	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
North Carolina	Yes	No	No	No	No
North Dakota	Yes	No	No	Yes	No

TABLE 18--Continued

State	Stimulate Research	Locate Funds for Research	Coordinate Research Activities	Have Access to Data Processing Equipment	Allocate Part of Budget to Research
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Oregon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Pennsylvania	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Rhode Island	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Tennessee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Texas	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Utah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Vermont	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Virginia	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
West Virginia	No	No	No	Yes	No
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Wyoming	No	No	No	Yes	No
Total Yes	39	35	32	31	2
Per Cent	83	74	68	66	4
Total No	8	12	15	16	45
Per Cent	17	26	32	34	96

has been established as one of the most fundamental functions of that central education agency.

Table 18 also indicates that 35, or 74 per cent of the state departments of education do not attempt to locate sources of available funds to make research possible in the area of health and physical education. Twelve, or 26 per cent of the state departments indicated a

negative response to this question. Regarding this activity state departments of education should take cognizance of the enormous opportunities provided them by the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965. Under the various titles of this act funds are provided which may enable state education agencies to conduct research projects involving health and physical education programs on a multi-discipline approach.

Access to Data Processing Equipment

The use of computing and data-processing machines have made it possible for researchers to expand the scope of their investigations and has radically altered the techniques of scientific inquiry. Statistical projects, formerly prohibitive in time and money, now have become practical. Realizing this fact, state departments of education should have access to data-processing machinery that is adequate to meet the needs of its research activities in the area of health and physical education and other fields. As shown in Table 18, approximately two-thirds of the state education agencies reported they did have access to such equipment, whereas one-third of the state departments of education indicated they did not have access to adequate data-processing equipment.

Having recognized that research is indispensable to increased efficiency and profits, business enterprises allocate a part of its gains specifically to research activities. It does not seem unreasonable, to expect a government agency such as the state department of education to do the same in all of its service areas. Data presented in Table 18, shows that only two state departments of education in the United States reserve a part of its budget specifically to research activities in the area of health and physical education.

The Public Relations Function

In this investigation the public relations function referred to the maintenance of a two-way channel for a continuous flow of information between the state department of education and the public on the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education within the state.

The practice of public relations is germane to all areas of human activity: religion, education, business, politics, military, government, labor, and other matters in which individuals engage. A good public relations program is not hit-and-miss. It is planned with considerably care, and great amounts of time and effort are necessary to produce results. However defined, public relations calls for genuine cooperation, a two-flow of ideas between schools and community in planning and working for good schools. It involves more than just telling the people certain facts about the schools; the public must give as well as receive ideas.

The American Association of School Administrators have identified the following purposes of school public relations: (1) to inform the public about the work of the school, (2) to establish confidence in the schools, (3) to rally support for proper maintenance of the educational program, (4) to develop awareness of the importance of education in a democracy, (5) to improve the partnership concept by uniting the parents and teachers in meeting the educational needs of children, (6) to integrate the home, the school, and the community in improving educational opportunities for all children, (7) to evaluate the offerings of the

schools in meeting the needs of children in the community, and (8) to correct misunderstandings as to the aims and objectives of the school.⁹

The state department of education has, as a major function, the task of public relations. Although always important, this function is receiving a new and vital emphasis in light of the fact that at the present time Americans are deeply concerned about education. The entire staff of the state department of education should participate in the program of public relations. In fact, the state department of education should have a professionally trained person to direct and coordinate public relations activities in all areas of service including the area of health and physical education. An examination of data from Table 19, reveals that two-thirds of the state departments of education had on their staffs such a person. Seventeen, or 35 per cent of the state education agencies did not have such a person. An interesting comparison is that Riddle, two years earlier, reported only 19 of the 43 state departments of education cooperating in his study had such a person.¹⁰

Relevant to the public relations function is that the state department of education should specifically reserve a part of the total budget in health and physical education for public relations activities in that area. In this study it was found that only 5, or 10 per cent of the state departments reserved such funds, whereas 90 per cent of the departments indicated they did not earmark funds for this specific function.

⁹American Association of School Administrators, Public Relations for America's Schools, Twenty-Eighth Yearbook (Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1950), p. 14.

¹⁰Riddle, op. cit., p. 88.

TABLE 19

INFORMATION PERTAINING TO PERSONNEL AND FINANCE OF PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM OF STATE DEPARTMENTS
OF EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Public Relations Specialist	Allocate Funds For Public Relations	State	Public Relations Specialist	Allocate Funds For Public Relations
Alabama	No	No	Montana	No	No
Alaska	Yes	No	Nevada	No	No
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	New Hampshire	No	No
California	Yes	No	New Jersey	Yes	No
Colorado	Yes	No	New Mexico	No	No
Connecticut	Yes	No	New York	Yes	No
Delaware	Yes	No	North Carolina	No	No
Dist. of Columbia	No	No	North Dakota	No	No
Florida	Yes	No	Ohio	Yes	No
Georgia	Yes	No	Oklahoma	Yes	No
Hawaii	Yes	No	Oregon	Yes	No
Idaho	No	No	Pennsylvania	Yes	No
Illinois	Yes	Yes	Rhode Island	No	No
Indiana	No	No	South Carolina	Yes	No
Iowa	No	No	Tennessee	No	No
Kansas	Yes	Yes	Texas	Yes	No
Kentucky	No	No	Utah	Yes	No
Louisiana	Yes	No	Vermont	No	No
Maine	Yes	No	Virginia	Yes	No
Maryland	Yes	No	Washington	Yes	Yes
Massachusetts	Yes	No	West Virginia	Yes	Yes
Michigan	Yes	No	Wisconsin	Yes	No
Minnesota	Yes	No	Wyoming	No	No
Mississippi	Yes	No			
Missouri	No	No			
			Total Yes	31	5
			Per Cent	65	10
			Total No	17	44
			Per Cent	35	90

Public Relations Media

There are a multitude of media which can be used by state departments of education in carrying out its public relations program in the area of health and physical education. Some have more significance and are more accessible than others. However, the important consideration is that the state department utilize all available resources and media necessary to interpret the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education to the public. From data presented in Table 20, it was found that there were severe deficiencies on the part of many state departments of education with regard to utilizing all of their available resources in discharging the public relations function in the area of health and physical education. Specifically, 45 per cent of the departments indicated they did not utilize all resources necessary while 55 per cent reported they did utilize all necessary resources. It was also discovered that of the 31 state departments of education indicating the methods that were utilized in conducting the public relations program in the area of health and physical education, bulletins, newsletters, and articles in newspapers and magazines were used to a greater extent than any other method. Other methods used in order of their frequency were appearances before PTA and other lay groups; legislative appearances; appearances on television; appearances on radio; and production of film and other audio-visual materials.

The Advisory and Consultative Function

In this investigation the advisory and consultative function referred to the consultative and advisory assistance rendered on

TABLE 20

THE USE OF RESOURCES AND PUBLIC RELATIONS MEDIA BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Does S.D.E. Use All Available Resources?	Public Relations Media*	State	Does S.D.E. Use All Available Resources?	Public Relations Media*
Alabama	No		Montana	No	
Alaska	No	a,b,c,f	Nebraska	No	
Arkansas	No	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	Nevada	No	
California	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	New Hampshire	Yes	
Colorado	Yes	a,b,c,d,h	New Jersey	Yes	a,c,d,e,g
Connecticut	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	New Mexico	No	
Delaware	No	a,b,c	New York	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Dist. of Columbia	Yes		North Carolina	No	
Florida	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	North Dakota	No	
Georgia	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	Ohio	Yes	c,d,e,f,g
Hawaii	Yes	a,c,e,g	Oklahoma	Yes	a,b,c,f,g
Idaho	No		Oregon	Yes	a,b,d,e,f,g,h
Illinois	Yes	a,b,c,h	Pennsylvania	Yes	a,b,c
Indiana	Yes		Rhode Island	No	
Iowa	No		South Carolina	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,h
Kansas	Yes	b,c	Tennessee	Yes	
Kentucky	No		Texas	No	a
Louisiana	Yes	c,d,e,f,h	Utah	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Maine	Yes	a,b,c,e,f,g	Vermont	Yes	
Maryland	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	Virginia	No	a,c,d,e,f,g,h
Massachusetts	No	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	Washington	No	a,b,c,e,f,g
Michigan	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	West Virginia	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g
Minnesota	No	a,b,f,g	Wisconsin	No	a,b,c,d,f,g,h
Mississippi	Yes	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	Wyoming	No	
Missouri	No				

* Media Used in Conducting Public Relations Program: (a) Bulletins, (b) Newsletters, (c) Articles in newspapers and magazines, (d) Appearances on radio, (e) Appearances on television, (f) Appearances before PTA and other lay groups, (g) Legislative appearances, (h) Production of films and other audio-visual materials.

invitation or routinely to teachers and/or supervisors of health and physical education, school administrators, and school boards by a professional staff member of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education for the purpose of problem solving, planning, or evaluation of programs.

Historically, the advisory and consultative function of state departments of education has been an important operation. It was a basic function at the time of the establishment of that agency and today many authorities on school administration believe it is the most important of all its functions. The increasing complexity of public education creates a great need for advisory and consultative services on the part of state departments of education. Because of this need the state department has the responsibility for developing a reservoir of competent professional staff to serve the educational needs in all areas of service in which the department has been vested with responsibilities. Consequently, the state department should provide advisory and consultative services to local schools in the area of health and physical education.

Consultative Services Provided in Health and Physical Education

Data presented in Table 21 reveals that of the 49 state departments of education cooperating in this investigation, only two did not provide advisory and consultative services to local schools in the area of health and physical education. Also, there were a total of 122-1/2 persons employed by the various state departments of education to perform consultative services in this area. The number of consultants

TABLE 21

STATE DEPARTMENTS PROVIDING CONSULTATIVE SERVICES IN HEALTH AND PHYSICAL
EDUCATION AND NUMBER OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN SUCH SERVICES

State	Does S.D.E. Provide Consul- tative Services	Number Engaged In Consultative Work	State	Does S.D.E. Provide Consul- tative Services	Number Engaged In Consultative Work
Alabama	Yes	4	Montana	No	
Alaska	Yes	2	Nebraska	Yes	2
Arkansas	Yes	2	Nevada	Yes	1
California	Yes	4	New Hampshire	Yes	1
Colorado	Yes	1	New Jersey	Yes	3-1/2
Connecticut	Yes	2	New Mexico	Yes	1
Delaware	Yes	1	New York	Yes	12
Dist. of Columbia	Yes	7	North Carolina	Yes	4
Florida	Yes	6	North Dakota	Yes	3
Georgia	Yes	1	Ohio	Yes	4
Hawaii	Yes	1	Oklahoma	Yes	2
Idaho	Yes	1	Oregon	Yes	1
Illinois	Yes	2	Pennsylvania	Yes	3
Indiana	Yes	15	Rhode Island	Yes	1
Iowa	No		South Carolina	Yes	2
Kansas	Yes	1	Tennessee	Yes	1
Kentucky	Yes	1	Texas	Yes	2
Louisiana	Yes	3	Utah	Yes	1
Maine	Yes	1	Vermont	Yes	3
Maryland	Yes	2	Virginia	Yes	5
Massachusetts	Yes	1	Washington	Yes	2
Michigan	Yes	1	West Virginia	Yes	1
Minnesota	Yes	2	Wisconsin	Yes	1
Mississippi	Yes	3	Wyoming	Yes	5
Missouri	Yes	1			
			Total Yes	47	
			Per Cent	96	
			Total No	2	
			Per Cent	4	

employed by the various state education agencies varied from 1 to 15. The average number of consultants employed was 2.5 persons per state department of education. However, this average was greatly influenced by the number of consultants employed by the states of Indiana and New York. These two states employed approximately one-fifth of the total number of consultants working in the area of health and physical education in the states cooperating in this study. It is interesting to note that, as reported by Riddle, there were only 42 professional personnel employed by state education agencies in 1964 to assist, advise, or offer consultative services in the area of health and physical education.¹¹ Therefore, the findings in this investigation indicates that there has been a threefold increase in the number of consultants employed by state departments of education to work in the area of health and physical education since 1964.

Data presented in Table 22 showed that 84 per cent of the state departments reported they were unable to satisfy all requests for consultative services in the area of health and physical education from the public schools. Eight, or 16 per cent indicated they were able to satisfy such requests. Of particular interest is the fact that the states of Indiana and New York which employed 15 and 12 consultants respectively, indicated they were not able to satisfy all requests for advisory and consultative services while Colorado and Delaware employing each one consultant indicated they were able to satisfy such requests. From this response it is apparent that the latter two states are not receiving many

¹¹Riddle, op. cit., p. 52.

TABLE 22

AREAS IN WHICH CONSULTATIVE SERVICES ARE MOST NEEDED IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Services Most Needed *	Able to Satisfy All Requests For Services?	State	Services Most Needed *	Able to Satisfy All Requests For Services?
Alabama	i,h,f,b,c	No	Montana		No
Alaska	i,a,h,f,d	No	Nebraska	g,i,h,c,b	No
Arkansas	h,a,i,b,f	No	Nevada	i,c,h,b,a	No
California	i,a,h,c,g	No	New Hampshire	i,h,a,c,d	No
Colorado	g,i,h,a,b	Yes	New Jersey	a,c,i,h,f	No
Connecticut	i,h,a,f,g	No	New Mexico	h,i,a,g,c	No
Delaware	c,f,a,h,i	Yes	New York	a,c,f,i,h	No
Dist. of Columbia	h,a,c,f,g	Yes	North Carolina	i,h,a,g,f	No
Florida	i,h,a,c,f	No	North Dakota	i,h,g,a,c	No
Georgia	i,h,a,c,f	No	Ohio	h,i,f,g,a	No
Hawaii	f,h,i,a,c	No	Oklahoma	i,g,c,a,h	No
Idaho	i,h,c,a,g	No	Oregon	i,h,a,f,g	No
Illinois	c,a,h,i,g	No	Pennsylvania	i,a,h,c,d	Yes
Indiana	i,h,a,b,g	No	Rhode Island	i,h,g,c,d	No
Iowa		No	South Carolina	i,c,h,a,e	No
Kansas	i,g,h,e,a	No	Tennessee	i,g,a,h,c	No
Kentucky	i,h,g,f,e	No	Texas	i,h,g,a,c	No
Louisiana	i,h,g,c,a	No	Utah	i,h,a,g,f	No
Maine	c,i,g,h,a	No	Vermont	a,i,h,g,f	Yes
Maryland	i,f,h,a,c	No	Virginia	h,c,i,g,a	No
Massachusetts	i,h,a,g,f	No	Washington	h,i,a,c,b	No
Michigan	i,g,h,a,b	No	West Virginia	i,h,c,a,b	Yes
Minnesota	i,h,a,f,c	No	Wisconsin	g,a,c,i,h	Yes
Mississippi	h,g,a,e,b	Yes	Wyoming		No
Missouri	h,i,a,f,b	No			

* Areas in Which Consultative Services are Most Needed: (a) Buildings and grounds, (b) Finance, (c) Financial aid, (d) Legal assistance and/or information, (e) Reports required by the state department of education, (f) School athletics, (g) Accreditation, (h) Instructional aids and materials, (i) Curriculum planning or revision.

requests for consultative services from the public schools or the schools are requesting such services from sources other than the state department of education.

In this investigation the respondents were questioned regarding the need for advisory and consultative services within the state in the area of health and physical education. Data presented in Table 22 also shows that in order of their frequency the areas in which advisory and consultative service were most needed was: (1) instructional aids and materials, (2) curricular planning or revision, (3) buildings and grounds, (4) financial aid, (5) accreditation, (6) school athletics, (7) finance-- budgets and bond issues, (8) legal assistance and/or information and reports required by the state department of education, and (9) community relationship programs. It is evident from the above list that the areas which were ranked first and second have some attributes of an in-service education program. This topic will be considered later in this study.

Savage, in 1955, conducted a study of the consultative services provided by eight midwestern state departments of education.¹² In this study he concluded that state departments of education are the major sources of consultative services rendered to the public schools. Based upon this conclusion it appears that state departments of education are potentially the major influence in the improvement of public education. If they are to achieve this potential it is imperative that they attempt to make local schools aware of their needs in all areas of the total school operation. In this study it was found that virtually all of the

¹²Savage, op. cit.

state education agencies attempted to carry out this task. However, in connection with this task it was found that over half of the state education agencies felt that local school personnel in the area of health and physical education were insufficiently aware of the need for assistance in improving programs in this area. This indicates that local schools are perhaps, drastically uninformed regarding the characteristics of good health and physical education programs.

The Coordination Function

In this investigation the coordination function referred to the establishment of effective lines of communication among the professional staff members of the state department of education in the areas of health and physical education, other divisions of the state education agency, and other state agencies concerned with health and physical education for the purposes of preventing duplication and fostering mutual understanding.

There are many agencies within the state that are concerned with planning, promoting, developing, and carrying out school health and physical education programs. Each of these agencies having an interest and concern has significant and legitimate contributions to make which will enrich these programs. Only by fusing the efforts of those groups will there be unity of purpose in the statewide program of health and physical education. Consequently, state departments of education have an obligation to share appropriately in the coordination of the efforts of the many groups concerned with programs of health and physical education within the state.

A coordinated statewide program of health and physical education is one in which the activities of those concerned with such programs are harmonious, dovetailed, and integrated toward a common objective. Each agency should be so attuned to all the others that together they form a unified educational enterprise. To achieve the coordinated effort that has been described it is necessary that state departments of education seek opportunities to enhance the cooperative effort of those concerned with upgrading health and physical education programs. Administrators, teachers, parents, physicians, public health personnel, recreation leaders, and others concerned should be assembled through such mechanisms as joint committees, councils, and other similar structures which provide means of coordinating the efforts of program improvement. If these devices do not exist within the state it is incumbent upon the state education agency to take the initiative in organizing them. Data presented in Table 23 reveals information relative to the discharge of the coordination function by state departments of education in the area of health and physical education. As shown in this table, 46, or 94 per cent of the state education agencies indicated that they did attempt to establish liaison with and coordinate their efforts in the area of health and physical education with those official, voluntary, and professional agencies concerned with the improvement and betterment of programs in this area of the school curriculum. Also, 44, or 90 per cent of the state departments indicated they utilized such devices as joint committees and councils in an effort to enhance the coordination or programs in health and physical education. Several respondents indicated they were in the process of developing a coordinating committee

TABLE 23

INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE COORDINATION FUNCTION OF STATE DEPARTMENTS
OF EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Is Liaison Established With Other Agencies?	Is Variety of Mechanisms Used?	State	Is Liaison Established With Other Agencies?	Is Variety of Mechanisms Used?
Alabama	Yes	Yes	Montana	No	Yes
Alaska	Yes	Yes	Nevada	Yes	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Nebraska	Yes	Yes
California	Yes	Yes	New Hampshire	Yes	Yes
Colorado	Yes	Yes	New Jersey	Yes	Yes
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	New Mexico	Yes	Yes
Delaware	Yes	Yes	New York	Yes	No
Dist. of Columbia	Yes	Yes	North Carolina	Yes	Yes
Florida	Yes	Yes	North Dakota	No	Yes
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Ohio	Yes	Yes
Hawaii	Yes	Yes	Oklahoma	Yes	Yes
Idaho	Yes	No	Oregon	Yes	Yes
Illinois	Yes	Yes	Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes
Indiana	Yes	Yes	Rhode Island	Yes	Yes
Iowa	No	No	South Carolina	Yes	Yes
Kansas	Yes	Yes	Tennessee	Yes	Yes
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Texas	Yes	Yes
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Utah	Yes	Yes
Maine	Yes	Yes	Vermont	Yes	Yes
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Virginia	Yes	Yes
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Washington	Yes	Yes
Michigan	Yes	Yes	West Virginia	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Wisconsin	Yes	Yes
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	Wyoming	Yes	Yes
Missouri	Yes	No			
			Total Yes	46	44
			Per Cent	94	90
			Total No	3	5
			Per Cent	6	10

composed of representatives from all agencies in a position to provide resources for promoting the program of health and physical education

within the state. They further indicated that such a committee would meet on a regular schedule based on a carefully prepared agenda.

The In-Service Education Function

In this investigation the in-service education function referred to the activities conducted by the state department of education designed to increase the effectiveness of public school personnel in the area of health and physical education.

Traditionally, in-service education for school personnel has been an important state function. History records that early chief state school officers such as Henry Barnard and Horace Mann employed discussions, conferences, institutes, and state education journals as a means of improving teacher competence in providing instruction. The normal school, first organized by Horace Mann in Massachusetts, was a direct move by the state education agency to strengthen and improve instruction in the schools. Since that time state departments of education have utilized a variety of structures, in addition to those previously mentioned, in an effort to provide in-service education programs for teachers in many subject areas. Consequently, local schools have relied upon state education agencies to stimulate, organize, and provide leadership in planning such activities.

The state department of education can be of great help to local schools in several ways in developing in-service education programs in the area of health and physical education. First of all, they can assume leadership in the development of instructional guides and teaching aids designed to improve instruction in health and physical education.

Secondly, they can collaborate with teacher education institutions in developing the most challenging pre-service and in-service preparation programs for public school personnel in the area of health and physical education. Finally, they can organize district, regional, and/or state-wide committees, conferences, workshops, clinics, and other similar structures in an effort to increase the professional growth of teachers in this area of the school curriculum.

Preparation of Curriculum Materials

Generally, state departments of education use a wide variety of methods to improve instruction and curriculum in the state. The curriculum guide constitutes a potentially important influence on individual teachers of health and physical education especially when they consider changing a program or become involved in a departmental curriculum evaluation and revision effort. An examination of numerous guides in this area revealed that they give primary emphasis to the philosophy of health and physical education held by the state department of education for the relevant grade levels and then describe in detail the selection of activities, grade placement, and sequential teaching efforts. Other details included are evaluation methods, grouping procedures, organization of classes, teaching methods and equipment, facilities, and supplies.

Data presented in Table 24 disclosed that 46 of the state departments published official curriculum guides for teachers in health and physical education. Typically, there was a separate guide for health and for physical education; however there were a few states which

TABLE 24

CURRICULUM GUIDES PUBLISHED BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF
HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Separate Physical Education Guide	Separate Health Education Guide	Combination Health and Physical Education Guide	State	Separate Physical Education Guide	Separate Health Education Guide	Combination Health and Physical Education Guide
Alabama			a,b,c	Mississippi	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Alaska	c	a,b		Missouri	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Arkansas	a,b,c	a,b,c		Montana		a,b,c	
California	a,b,c	a,b,c		Nebraska			a c
Colorado	a,b,c	a		New Hampshire	a,b,c		
Connecticut	b,c	b,c		New Jersey	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Delaware	b,c	b,c	a	New Mexico	a,b,c		
Dist.of Columbia	a,b,c	a,b,c		New York	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Florida	a,b,c	a,b,c		North Dakota	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Georgia	c	a,b,c		North Carolina	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Hawaii	a,b,c			Oklahoma	a,b,c		
Idaho				Oregon	a c	a c	
Illinois	a,b,c	a,b,c		Pennsylvania	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Indiana	a,b,c	a,b,c		South Carolina	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Iowa				Tennessee	a,b,c		
Kansas	a,b,c	a,b,c		Texas	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Kentucky	a,b,c			Utah	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Louisiana			a,b,c	Vermont	a	a	
Maine	c	c		Virginia	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Maryland				Washington	a,b,c	a,b,c	
Massachusetts			a,b,c	West Virginia			a,b,c
Michigan	a,b,c	a,b,c		Wisconsin	a,b,c		
Minnesota	a,b,c	a,b,c		Wyoming			

Note: Indicates Various Grade Levels: a. Elementary school, b. Junior high school, c. Senior high school.

published combination guides in this area. Also, there were several approaches in organizing these guides according to educational level. Some were elementary school guides covering grades kindergarten through six; others were junior high school guides covering grades seven, eight, and nine; and still others were senior high school guides covering grades nine through twelve or grades ten through twelve. Some state departments of education published separate guides for boys and girls physical education on the senior high school level.

In addition to curriculum guides, state departments of education published many other types of materials that were related to the health and physical education curriculum. This information was made available to local schools in the form of ditto reports, pamphlets, booklets, professional magazine articles and reprints, mimeographed statements and manuals, and illustrated posters and summary reports.

This study also attempted to discover the manner in which the cost for the preparation and distribution of curricular materials was handled by the various state departments of education in the area of health and physical education. As shown in Table 25, virtually all of the state education agencies finance the costs for the preparation and distribution of curricular materials in this field; however two states indicated that such expenses were financed by a statewide curriculum committee. Three states indicated that the costs for curricular materials in this area were partly defrayed by local school districts.

Collaboration with Teacher Education Institutions

The state department of education has many opportunities to cooperate with teacher education institutions within the state in order

TABLE 25

MANNER IN WHICH THE COST WAS HANDLED FOR PREPARATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF CURRICULAR MATERIALS IN HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	State Department of Education	Curriculum Committee or Commission	Local School Districts	State	State Department of Education	Curriculum Committee or Commission	Local School Districts
Alabama	x			Mississippi	x		
Alaska	x			Montana	x	x	x
Arkansas	x			Nebraska	x		
California		x		New Hampshire	x		x
Colorado	x			New Jersey	x		
Connecticut	x			New Mexico	x		
Delaware	x			New York	x		
Dist. of Columbia		x		North Carolina	x		x
Florida		x		North Dakota	x		
Georgia	x			Ohio	x		
Hawaii	x			Oklahoma	x	x	
Idaho	x			Oregon	x		
Illinois	x			Pennsylvania	x		
Indiana	x			South Carolina	x		
Iowa	x			Tennessee	x		
Kansas	x			Texas	x		
Kentucky	x			Utah	x		
Louisiana	x			Vermont	x		
Maine	x			Virginia	x		
Maryland	x			Washington	x		
Massachusetts	x			West Virginia	x		
Michigan	x			Wisconsin	x		x
Minnesota	x						

to develop in-service education programs for public school personnel in the field of health and physical education. In addition to co-sponsoring conferences and workshops on the problems and conditions of health and physical education within the state, the state department should work with college faculties to assist in the professional preparation of teachers in this area. State education agencies should encourage colleges to upgrade teacher education programs in health and physical education as well as cooperate with teacher education institutions in conducting continued study and research on such problems as certification requirements for those who teach in this field. They should also cooperate in strengthening the undergraduate courses in health and physical education for elementary classroom teachers. Finally, the state department of education should keep teacher education institutions informed of the educational needs and requirements of the state in the field of health and physical education.

Data presented in Table 26 discloses that 40, or 82 per cent of the state departments indicated that they did collaborate with teacher education institutions in this task. Nine, or 18 per cent of the state education agencies indicated that they made no effort to cooperate with teacher education institutions in such endeavors. Unfortunately, it was not possible to determine the degree of collaboration among these agencies.

TABLE 26

INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FUNCTION OF STATE
DEPARTMENTS IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Does Department Collaborate With Teacher Education Institutions?	Does Department Utilize Variety of Structures to Stimulate In-Service Programs on Local Level?	Is Provision Made Within Budget for Conducting Work- shops, Conferences in the Area of Health and Physical Education?
Alabama	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alaska	No	No	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes
California	Yes	Yes	No
Colorado	Yes	Yes	Yes
Connecticut	No	Yes	Yes
Delaware	Yes	Yes	No
Dist. of Columbia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hawaii	Yes	Yes	Yes
Idaho	Yes	Yes	No
Illinois	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indiana	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iowa	No	No	No
Kansas	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	No
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	No
Maine	Yes	Yes	No
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes
Massachusetts	No	Yes	No
Michigan	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	Yes
Missouri	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montana	No	No	No
Nebraska	Yes	Yes	No
Nevada	No	No	No
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	Yes
New York	Yes	Yes	No
North Carolina	No	Yes	Yes
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	No
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	No

TABLE 26--Continued

State	Does Department Collaborate With Teacher Education Institutions?	Does Department Utilize Variety of Structures to Stimulate In-Service Programs on Local Level?	Is Provision Made Within Budget for Conducting Workshops, Conferences in the Area of Health and Physical Education?
Oregon	Yes	Yes	No
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rhode Island	Yes	No	No
South Carolina	Yes	No	No
Tennessee	No	Yes	Yes
Texas	Yes	Yes	No
Utah	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vermont	Yes	Yes	No
Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wyoming	No	No	No
Total Yes	40	43	28
Per Cent	82	88	57
Total No	9	6	21
Per Cent	18	12	43

Stimulation of In-Service Education on the Local Level

There are numerous ways in which the state department of education can stimulate in-service education programs on the local school level in the area of health and physical education. In addition to planning for conferences and developing instructional guides and courses of study, the state department can aid local schools in developing written policies related to the program of health and physical education as well as in the evaluation of existing programs. Also, state departments can

work with local schools in planning for new facilities, more effective use of class time, and interpreting new programs sponsored by the state and/or federal government. As an in-service practice state education agencies should interpret to local school officials the state laws, regulations, and policies regarding this portion of the program.

Table 26 shows that 43, or 88 per cent of the state departments of education indicated they did utilize such structures as conferences, workshops, clinics, and committees in an effort to stimulate in-service education programs on the local school level in the area of health and physical education. Six, or 12 per cent of the state departments indicated a negative answer to the question relative to this responsibility. The same table shows that 28, or 57 per cent of the central education agencies reported that provision was made within the state department budget for conducting statewide and/or regional workshops and conferences for curriculum improvement in the area of health and physical education. Twenty-one, or 43 per cent of the departments indicated that this practice was not followed in their states.

Statewide Curriculum Committee in Health and Physical Education

Perhaps one of the most significant developments in curriculum improvement in recent years has been the establishment of statewide curriculum committees or commissions. First organized as a means of establishing rapport with the public on matters pertaining to education, these committees have become increasingly significant factors in assisting state departments of education in conducting curricular and instructional research, establishing statewide curriculum policy and

coordination, and the development and dissemination of curricular materials. Normally, it is a function of these committees to survey the curriculum needs of the state in the various subject areas and to select and direct committees that will do the actual work of curriculum study and development. Also, it is a function of these committees to evaluate and recommend approval of all curriculum studies coming under its jurisdiction.

In answer to the question, "Does an official statewide curriculum committee or commission which cooperates with the state department of education exist in the state in the area of health and physical education?", 26, or 53 per cent of the states reported that such a committee existed within the state. Twenty-three, or 47 per cent of the state education agencies indicated a negative response to this question. One respondent reported that a separate health education and physical education committee existed within the state. In the states having a statewide curriculum committee in health and physical education the size ranged from 5 to 40 members, however, a majority of the committees varied from 12 to 25 persons.

As reported by 20 state departments, the most commonly used method of financing statewide curriculum committees in health and physical education was through regular appropriations received from the state legislature. Four states indicated that in addition to regular appropriations local school funds supplemented the financing of the statewide curriculum committee in health and physical education. Three states indicated that such a committee was financed by special appropriations from the legislature for curriculum revision and one state department

TABLE 27

STATE CURRICULUM COMMISSIONS IN HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

State	Does a Statewide Curriculum Committee or Commission Exist in the Area of Health and Physical Education?	Number of Persons on Committee	How Financed? *
Alabama	No		
Alaska	Yes	10	b
Arkansas	No		
California	Yes	Health 24 Phy.education 20	a,c
Colorado	Yes	24	
Connecticut	No		
Delaware	No		
Dist. of Columbia	Yes		a
Florida	No		
Georgia	Yes		b
Hawaii	No		
Idaho	No		
Illinois	Yes	25	a
Indiana	No		
Iowa	Yes	5	a
Kansas	Yes	5	d
Kentucky	No		
Louisiana	No		
Maine	Yes	12	a
Maryland	Yes	15	a
Massachusetts	Yes	40	a
Michigan	Yes	31	c
Minnesota	Yes	22	a
Mississippi	No		
Missouri	Yes	12	a,c
Montana	Yes	15	c
Nebraska	Yes		a,c
Nevada	No		
New Hampshire	Yes	12	a
New Jersey	No		
New Mexico	Yes	7	b
New York	No		
North Carolina	No		
North Dakota	Yes	20	a
Ohio	No		

TABLE 27--Continued

State	Does a Statewide Curriculum Committee or Commission Exist in the Area of Health and Physical Education?	Number of Persons on Committee	How Financed? *
Oklahoma	Yes	15	a,c
Oregon	Yes		a
Pennsylvania	No		
Rhode Island	No		
South Carolina	No		
Tennessee	No		
Texas	Yes	20	a
Utah	Yes	18	a
Vermont	No		
Virginia	No		
Washington	Yes	25	a
West Virginia	No		
Wisconsin	Yes	12	a,c
Wyoming	Yes	10	a
Total Yes	26		
Per Cent	53		
Total No	23		
Per Cent	47		

* Manner in Which Curriculum Committee or Commission is Financed:
(a) Regular appropriations received from the state legislature, (b) Special appropriations from the legislature for curriculum revision, (c) Local school funds, (d) Nonschool sources such as foundations and grants.

reported that nonschool sources such as foundations and grants were used to finance that committee.

Cross-sectional thinking and diverse opinion are necessary factors in curricular development. It is important that there be a representative involvement of those concerned with programs of health and physical education throughout the state. As shown in Table 28, it

TABLE 28

AREAS FROM WHICH PARTICIPANTS ARE REPRESENTED ON STATEWIDE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
IN HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

	Elementary Teachers	Junior High Teachers	High School Teachers	Junior College Teachers	College and University Teachers	Principals	Superin- tendents	Citizen's Groups	Other Governmental Agencies	Others ^a
Alaska	x	x	x		x					
California	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
Colorado	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	
Dist. of Columbia	x									
Georgia	x	x	x							
Illinois	x	x	x	x	x				x	x
Iowa	x	x	x		x					
Kansas			x		x	x			x	
Maine		x	x		x	x				
Maryland	x	x	x			x	x	x		
Massachusetts	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		
Michigan	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		
Minnesota	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Missouri	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		
Montana	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	
Nebraska	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
New Hampshire	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	
New Mexico	x	x	x		x	x	x			
North Dakota	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		

TABLE 28--Continued

		Elementary Teachers																	
Oklahoma	x																		
Oregon	x																		
Texas	x																		
Utah	x																		
Washington	x																		
Wisconsin	x																		
Wyoming	x																		
Totals	24	23	25	6	23	18	18	13	8	2									

^aOthers included school board members, state medical society, and state board of health.

is apparent that a good cross-section of the health and physical education profession within the state was represented on existing statewide curriculum committees in this area. High school teachers of health and physical education participated on 25 committees while elementary teachers of health and physical education were represented on 24 of these organizations. Junior high school, college, and university teachers of health and physical education were represented on 18 statewide committees. Principals and superintendents participated on 18 committees and representatives from citizen's groups participated on 13 such committees. Also, representatives from other governmental agencies participated on 8 statewide committees and junior college teachers of health and physical education were represented on 6 of these committees. Others reported as being represented on such committees were school board members, members of the State Medical Society, and State Board of Health personnel.

Summary

The problem with which this study dealt with was that of determining, analyzing, and interpreting the provisions made by the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia in carrying out the selected leadership functions of planning, research, public relations, advising, coordination, and in-service education in the area of health and physical education. An attempt was made to identify areas of strength, weakness, and needs as revealed by the official representatives of the state departments of education in the area of health and physical education.

General Information Pertaining to Staff

A summary of responses to the questionnaire revealed that virtually all of the persons officially representing the state departments of education in the area of health and physical education were meeting the minimum degree requirements for that position as advocated by the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. Specifically, 6 official representatives held the Doctor's degree, 16 a diploma or certificate beyond the Master's degree; 26 held just the Master's degree; and 1 official representative held a Bachelor's degree as his highest level of preparation. In addition to the person who officially represents the state department of education in the area of health and physical education there were 107 other professional staff members employed by the various state education agencies to work in this area. Of these, 95 worked on a full-time basis; 4 worked half-time; and 8 worked less than half-time. Furthermore, 96 per cent of those professional staff members were found to possess at least a Master's degree.

This study also found that 42, or 86 per cent of the responding state departments of education did have minimal requirements for employment as a professional staff member in the area of health and physical education. Seven, or 14 per cent of the state departments indicated they had no minimum requirements. A majority of the states having such requirements indicated that a Master's degree and five years of teaching experience in the field was prerequisite for employment.

The Planning Function

Analysis of responses from state departments of education relative to the planning function in the area of health and physical education revealed weaknesses on the part of many of the departments. Only 27, or 55 per cent of the departments had formulated long term policies, procedures, and objectives for a comprehensive program in the area of health and physical education. Of the 27 state education agencies having formulated such a plan, 19 identified the year when the plans were developed. Of these, 11 or 58 per cent reported they were formulated prior to 1960 and 8, or 42 per cent indicated that such plans were developed subsequent to that time. Of the 27 state departments of education having formulated a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education, three-fourths of the departments indicated that the plan had been published and distributed to the public schools. It was also found that, of the state education agencies having formulated a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education, a representative cross-section of those concerned with the teacher-pupil learning situation in this area aided in developing the plans.

This study also showed that all of the state departments of education which formulated a comprehensive statewide plan in the area of health and physical education periodically reviewed and revised that plan. Twenty-three, or 85 per cent of the departments having a plan, reported that they also had an orientation program to familiarize the professional in the state department with the plan. Regular staff meetings and printed materials covering policies and procedures were the methods most commonly used in implementing the orientation program.

The Research Function

This investigation disclosed that although the research function of state departments of education is being recognized more and more as an important function of that agency, none of the departments had on their staffs a research person to work chiefly in the area of health and physical education. A majority of the states indicated that research in this area was carried out by the Division of Research within the state education agency and by colleges and universities within the state. One state department reported that research in health and physical education was conducted by private companies on a fee-for-service basis. Furthermore, 41, or 84 per cent of the respondents reported that their state departments of education were inadequately staffed to meet the research needs of the state in the area of health and physical education.

A majority of the state education agencies indicated that they were not presently engaged in any significant studies in the area of health and physical education. However, of the 14 state departments indicating that they were engaged in significant studies at the present time; 5 were conducting studies relevant to teacher preparation programs in health and physical education; 5 in physical fitness programs; 6 in certification requirements for teachers of health and physical education; 9 in programs of health instruction; 5 were analyzing the qualities of those who teach in this field; and 2 were conducting studies of the health services provided by the public schools within the state. Eighteen of the state departments of education reported that they had made a study of the supply and demand of men and women teachers in the area of health and physical education within the last four years. Of these, 11

reported that there was an overabundance of men teachers in the field and 13 indicated there was a shortage of women teachers in the area.

Relevant to the research function it was found that four-fifths of the state education agencies attempted to stimulate research on the local school level and in colleges and universities in the area of health and physical education. Also, 35 of the departments reported they attempted to locate sources of available funds for research in the area of health and physical education and 32 of the state education agencies disclosed that they attempt to coordinate their research activities with similar projects of other groups interested in health and physical education.

Thirty-one, or 66 per cent of the state departments reported that they had access to data processing equipment that was adequate to meet the needs of its research activities in the area of health and physical education. One-third of the state departments of education indicated they did not have access to such equipment.

It was found in the study that only two of the central education agencies specifically reserved a part of their budget for research activities in the area of health and physical education.

The Public Relations Function

Thirty-one, or 65 per cent of the state departments of education reported that they had on their staffs a professionally trained person whose responsibility was the direction and coordination of public relation activities including those in the area of health and physical education. Seventeen, or 35 per cent of the state departments did not have such a person. It was also found that there were weaknesses on the part

of most state departments of education regarding the utilization of all available resources in discharging the public relations function in health and physical education. Specifically, 22, or 45 per cent of the departments indicated that they did utilize all necessary resources in discharging this function while 27, or 55 per cent reported they did not.

Relevant to the financing of public relations activities it was found that only 5 of the state departments reserved a part of the total budget in health and physical education for public relations work in that area.

State departments of education responding to the questionnaire disclosed that the media most commonly used in conducting public relations programs in the area of health and physical education were bulletins, newspapers, and articles in newspapers and magazines. Other methods such as appearances before PTA and other lay groups, radio, television, and the production of films and other audio-visual materials were used.

The Advisory and Consultative Function

It was found in the study that only two state departments of education did not provide advisory and consultative services to local schools in the area of health and physical education; however, of those states which did provide such services, 84 per cent indicated they were unable to satisfy all requests from the public schools for those advisory and consultative services. There were a total of 122-1/2 persons engaged in advisory and consultative work to local schools in the area of health

and physical education in the 47 states which provide such services. The states of New York and Indiana employed the greatest number of consultants with 12 and 15 respectively.

It was also discovered that in order of their frequency the areas in which advisory and consultative services were most needed in health and physical education by those requesting such services were: (1) instructional aids and materials; (2) curriculum planning or revision; (3) buildings and grounds; (4) qualifying for federal and state aid; (5) accreditation; (6) school athletics; (7) finance--budgets and bond issues; (8) legal assistance and/or reports required by the state department of education; and (9) community relationship programs.

The Coordination Function

Due to the many agencies concerned with planning, promoting, developing, and carrying out school health and physical education programs, there is a need for the efforts of these groups to be coordinated. State departments of education provide leadership in the coordination of these efforts statewide. Forty-six, or 94 per cent of the state education agencies reported that they did attempt to establish liaison and coordinate the efforts of those groups genuinely concerned with the improvement of health and physical education programs in the state. In carrying out the coordination function, a majority of the states reported that they utilized such devices as joint committees, councils, workshops, and other similar structures. Several state education agencies indicated that they were in the process of developing a coordinating committee for health and physical education within the state.

The In-Service Education Function

This investigation discovered that 46 of the state departments of education publish an official state curriculum guide in health and physical education. There were several ways of organizing these guides according to grade level. A majority of the states published a separate guide for health and physical education on the various school levels. Some states even published separate guides for boys and girls on the senior high school level in the area of health and physical education.

Virtually, all of the state departments of education finance the costs for the preparation and distribution of curricular materials in the area of health and physical education; however 2 departments reported that such expenses were borne by the statewide curriculum committee. Three state education agencies reported that such costs were partly defrayed by local school districts.

Forty, or 82 per cent of the state departments indicated that they did collaborate with teacher education institutions in developing in-service programs in the area of health and physical education. Also, 88 per cent of the departments indicated that they utilized such mechanisms as conferences, workshops, clinics, and committees in an effort to stimulate in-service education programs on the local level in this field. Twenty-three, or 47 per cent of the state departments of education reported that an official statewide curriculum committee or commission existed within the state in the area of health and physical education. Of the 23 states reporting such a committee, 20 indicated that this committee was financed through regular appropriations received from the legislature.

This study also found that in those states having a statewide curriculum committee in health and physical education a good cross-section of the health and physical education profession was represented on the committee.

-

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this chapter are to review the purposes and procedures of the investigation; to summarize the findings of the study; and to make conclusions and recommendations based upon the analysis of the data secured in the study.

Problem and Purposes of the Study

The problem of this investigation was that of determining, analyzing, and interpreting the provisions made by the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia in carrying out selected leadership functions of that agency in the area of health and physical education. More specifically, it was intended to analyze in the area of health and physical education, the provisions made by the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia in discharging those leadership functions identified by the National Council of Chief State School Officers in 1952 as being the key leadership functions of state education agencies in all areas of service. These functions are: (1) planning, (2) research, (3) public relations, (4) advising, (5) coordination, and (6) in-service education.¹

¹The National Council of Chief State School Officers, op. cit.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the extent and kinds of provisions that the fifty state departments of education and the District of Columbia were making toward discharging their leadership responsibility in health and physical education in the areas of planning, research, public relations, advising, coordination, and in-service education. Additional purposes of the investigation were those of discovering common practices and patterns of leadership provisions among the fifty state departments of education in the area of health and physical education as well as the identification of strengths, weaknesses, and needs of the various states in making adequate provisions for leadership in this area.

Method of Investigation and Procedure

Owing to the nature of the problem in this investigation the following procedure was employed in its implementation.

First, a comprehensive review of available literature and research related to the problem was made. Every effort was made to investigate the various aspects of state departments of education particularly those concerning the leadership functions of that agency in the area of health and physical education. This investigation revealed that there was a dearth of specific research related to state departments of education and that no study of the nature or scope as the one described herein had been undertaken.

Based upon the information gleaned in this examination, it was found that the leadership functions of state departments of education in all areas of service could be grouped into six broad categories. Therefore, the second step involved the matter of defining each function in

terms of the manner in which each related to the state department of education and the statewide program of health and physical education. These definitions appear in Chapter I, pages 8 and 9.

The third step involved the development and validation of evaluative criteria in each of the functions used in the study. These criteria were delineated in thirty statements and forwarded to a jury of twenty highly qualified persons able to meet one of the standards described in Chapter III, page 29. Four weeks after the initial criteria were forwarded to the jury the responses were tabulated so that the validity status of each criterion could be determined. This procedure constituted the fourth step in this investigation.

From the criteria validated by the jury a questionnaire was developed embracing seven sections. These were: I--General Information Pertaining to Staff, II--Planning Function, III--Research Function, IV--Public Relations Function, V--Advisory and Consultative Function, VI--Coordination Function, and VII--In-Service Education Function. In constructing the questionnaire an attempt was made to formulate questions which would reflect the criteria validated by the jury and at the same time evaluate present provisions that the various state education agencies were making toward discharging each selected function in the area of health and physical education. The final draft of the questionnaire was mailed to the official representatives of the state departments of education in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia in the area of health and physical education. Eight weeks after the initial questionnaires were mailed, 49 of the 51 state education agencies had responded. This represented a 96 per cent return.

The final step in this study involved an analysis and interpretation of the data secured from the respondents. To facilitate as simple an analysis as possible the data were organized into tables. Numbers and percentages were indicated for most items studied relative to the total number of questionnaires answered and returned to the investigator. Also, percentages were calculated to the nearest whole number.

Summary of Findings

The following is a summary of the data received from the respondents to the questionnaire:

General Information Pertaining to Staff

In this study it was found that there were 39 states, including the District of Columbia, which provides for a separate Department of Health and Physical Education within the State Department of Public Instruction. Each of these departments are headed by a person most commonly called the Director of Health and Physical Education. In the remaining 12 states which do not have this type arrangement, the official representative of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education is usually a general coordinator, or supervisor, or his assistant, who has other duties and assignments.

It was also discovered that virtually all of the official representatives of the various state departments of education were meeting the minimum degree requirements advocated for that position by the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. However, only 6, or 12 per cent of the official representatives in this area

possessed a Doctor's degree which is a desirable level of training for that position recommended by the Society of State Directors.

In addition to the persons officially representing the state departments of education in the area of health and physical education, there were 107 other professional staff members employed by the various state education agencies to work in this area. Of these, 95 worked on a full-time basis while the remainder worked half-time or less. Ninety-six per cent of the professional staff members held at least a Master's degree.

As a requirement for employment as a professional staff member of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education a majority of the states indicated that a Master's degree plus five years of teaching experience in the field was a prerequisite.

The Planning Function

In the study it was found that slightly over one-half of the state education agencies had formulated long term policies, procedures, and objectives for a comprehensive statewide program in the area of health and physical education. Of the 19 state departments identifying the specific year when such plans were developed, 11 reported they were formulated prior to 1960 and 8 indicated that such plans were developed since that time. Also, three-fourths of the departments having developed a comprehensive statewide plan of health and physical education indicated that the plan had been published and distributed to the public schools within the state.

The study showed that, of the state education agencies having formulated a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical

education, a representative cross-section of those concerned with the teacher-pupil learning situation in this area aided in developing the plans. (See Table 11, page 55.)

The Research Function

This study showed that none of the state departments of education had on their staffs a research person to work chiefly in the area of health and physical education. Furthermore, 41, or 84 per cent of the state education agencies indicated that they were inadequately staffed to meet the research needs of the state in the area of health and physical education.

A majority of the states disclosed that research in this area was handled by the Division of Research within the state department and by colleges and universities within the state. One state department of education reported that research for the department in the area of health and physical education was handled by private research companies on a fee-for-service basis.

Less than one-third of the state education agencies indicated that they were engaged in studies of any significance at the present time. Areas in which studies were presently being conducted were: teacher preparation programs in health and physical education, physical fitness programs, certification requirements for teachers of health and physical education, programs of health instruction, and health services provided by the public schools within the state. Eighteen state departments reported that they had made a study of the supply and demand of men and women teachers of health and physical education within the last

four years. Of these, 11 indicated that there was an oversupply of men teachers in the field and 13 reported there was a shortage of women.

It was also found that only two of the state departments reserved a part of their budget for research activities in the area of health and physical education and that two-thirds of the state education agencies had access to data processing equipment that was adequate to meet the needs of its research activities in this area. Thirty-five of the state departments reported that they attempted to locate sources of available funds for research in the area of health and physical education.

Relevant to the research function it was found that 83 per cent of the state education agencies reported that they attempt to stimulate research on the local school level and in colleges and universities in the area of health and physical education. Also, 32, or 68 per cent of the state departments disclosed that they attempt to coordinate their research activities with similar projects of other groups interested in health and physical education.

The Public Relations Function

Two-thirds of the state education agencies reported that they had on their staffs a professionally trained person who directed and coordinated public relations activities including those in the areas of health and physical education. However, almost one-half of the departments indicated that they did not utilize all necessary resources in discharging the public relations function in this area.

It was also found that only 10 per cent of the state education agencies allocated a part of the total budget in health and physical education for public relations activities in that area.

The three most common media used by state departments in conducting public relations activities in health and physical education were: bulletins, newspapers, and articles in newspapers and magazines. Other methods such as appearances before PTA and other lay groups, radio, television, and the production of films and other audio-visual materials were utilized to some extent.

The Advisory and Consultative Function

It was found that 47 of the 49 state departments of education responding to the questionnaire indicated that they provided advisory and consultative services to local schools in the area of health and physical education. These 47 states employed 122-1/2 persons to provide such services. However, 84 per cent of the states which did provide advisory and consultative services to local school in the area of health and physical education indicated that they were unable to satisfy all requests for such services.

It was also discovered that in order of their frequency the areas in which advisory and consultative services were most needed by local schools were: instructional aids and materials, curriculum planning or revision, buildings and grounds, qualifying for federal and/or state aid, accreditation, school athletics, finance--budgets and bond issues, legal assistance and/or reports required by the state department of education, and community relationship programs.

The Coordination Function

Forty-six of the state education agencies reported that they did attempt to establish liaison and coordinate the efforts of the many

groups within the state concerned with health and physical education programs. Also, a majority of the states indicated that they utilized such devices as joint committees, councils, workshops, clinics, and other similar structures in an effort to coordinate those activities.

The In-Service Education Function

Relevant to the in-service education function it was found that 46 of the state departments of education publish an official state curriculum guide in health and physical education. There were several ways of organizing these guides according to grade level.

Most state departments of education finance the costs for the preparation and distribution of curricular materials in this area; however, a few states reported that such expenses were borne by statewide curriculum committees in health and physical education and by local school districts.

Four-fifths of the state education agencies reported that they did collaborate with teacher education institutions in developing the most challenging pre-service and in-service preparation programs for teachers in the area of health and physical education. Also, 88 per cent of the departments indicated that they utilized such mechanisms as conferences, workshops, clinics, and committees in an effort to stimulate in-service education programs on the local school level in the area of health and physical education.

As part of the in-service education program, approximately half of the states indicated that an official statewide curriculum committee or commission existed within the state in the area of health and physical

education. Of the states reporting such a committee, 87 per cent were financed through regular appropriations received from the legislature. Also, in the states reporting such a committee, a good cross-section of the health and physical education profession was represented.

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be drawn from the findings of this investigation:

1. There is widespread need for leadership in state education agencies in developing long-range planning of policies, procedures, and objectives for the improvement of health and physical education programs.
2. State departments of education have played a minor role in conducting and stimulating research activities and in locating sources of available funds for research in the area of health and physical education.
3. Most state departments of education have not utilized enough of their available resources in discharging the public relations function and have not provided adequate finance for the public relations function to be carried out in the area of health and physical education.
4. State departments of education have not been adequately staffed to provide adequate advisory and consultative services for local schools in the area of health and physical education.
5. A major reason for the present low status of health and physical education programs in the public schools is the lack of leadership provided at the state level by a majority of state education agencies.
6. From an analysis of prior research and from this investigation, most state education agencies have not provided effective leadership generally in the improvement of educational programs.

Recommendations

On the basis of the data secured by this study the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Many state departments of education should take immediate steps in developing long-term policies, procedures, and objectives for a comprehensive statewide program of health and physical education.

2. Those state departments of education not having a full-time State Director of Health and Physical Education should take the necessary steps needed to employ one.

3. All state departments of education should have a professionally trained and competent research person to work full-time in the area of health and physical education.

4. State departments of education should employ a greater number of professionally trained persons to provide advisory and consultative services to local schools in the area of health and physical education.

5. Many state departments of education should take immediate steps to develop an official statewide curriculum committee or commission in the area of health and physical education.

6. A study of the quality and effectiveness of the services provided by state departments of education as judged by the recipients to those services should be made in the area of health and physical education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Periodicals

- American Association of School Administrators. The American School Superintendency: Thirtieth Yearbook. Washington: The Association, 1952.
- American Association of School Administrators. The Superintendent of Schools and His Work. Washington: The Association, 1940.
- American Association of School Administrators. Inservice Education for School Administrators. Washington: The Association, 1963.
- Beach, Fred F. The Functions of State Departments of Education. Bulletin of the Federal Security Agency, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950.
- Beach, Fred F., and Andrew H. Gibbs. The Structure of State Departments of Education. Bulletin of the Federal Security Agency, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1949.
- Beach, Fred F., and Andrew H. Gibbs, The Personnel of State Departments of Education. Bulletin of the Federal Security Agency, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952.
- Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Cocking, Walter D. "State Department of Education Regulations," The School Executive, June, 1954.
- Cook, David R. A Guide to Educational Research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.
- Council of State Governments. The Forty-Eight State School Systems. Chicago: The Council, 1949.
- Cubberly, Ellwood P. Public Education in the United States. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934.

- Cummings, Howard H., and Helen K. Mackintosh. Curriculum Responsibilities of State Departments of Education, Bulletin of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1958.
- Ferneau, Elmer F. "Which Consultant?" Administrator's Notebook. Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, Volume II, April, 1964.
- Fuller, Edgar. "You and Your State Department of Education," NEA Journal, March, 1956.
- Good, Carter V., Barr, A. S., and Scates, Douglass E. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1938.
- Hamilton, Robert R. and Mort, Paul R. The Law and Public Education. Brooklyn: The Foundation Press, Inc., 1959.
- Irwin, Leslie W. The Curriculum in Health and Physical Education, Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Publishers, 1960.
- Knight, Edgar W. Education in the United States. New York: Ginn and Company, 1941.
- Koos, Leonard V. The Questionnaire in Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Maynard, Zollie and Rinaldi, Salvatore. State School Laws and Regulations for Health, Safety, Driver, Outdoor, and Physical Education. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.
- Moehlman, Arthur B. School Administration. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940.
- Monahan, A. C. Organization of State Departments of Education. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1915.
- Morphet, Edgar L., Johns, Roe L., and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- National Council of Chief State School Officers. The State Department of Education. Washington: The Council, 1953.
- Savage, William W. Consultative Services to Local School Systems. Chicago: Midwestern Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959.

- Savage, William W. "Local School Systems and Their Consultants." Administrator's Notebook. Midwestern Administration Center, University of Chicago, Volume IV, October, 1955.
- _____. "Making the Most of the Consultant." Administrator's Notebook. Midwestern Administration Center, University of Chicago, Volume I, October, 1952.
- _____. "The Value of State Consultative Service." Administrator's Notebook. Midwestern Administration Center, University of Chicago, Volume IV, November, 1955.
- Schrammel, Henry E. The Organization of State Departments of Education. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1926.
- Southwestern Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. Educational Leadership: The Emerging Role of State Departments of Education. Austin, Texas, 1953.
- Thurston, Lee M. and Roe, William H. State School Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957.
- Travers, Lee M. An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.
- Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations. The University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.
- Voltmer, Edward F. and Esslinger, Arthur A. The Organization and Administration of Physical Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958.

Unpublished Materials

- Hawk, James Donald. "An Examination and Evaluation of Consultative Services of the Georgia State Department of Education." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1958.
- Hilton, Lynn M. "Consultant Services Offered by Three State Departments of Education to School Administrators." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1952.

Riddle, Bruce E. "An Analysis of State Departments of Education With Respect to Their Emerging Leadership Functions in Educational Improvement." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, 1964.

Savage, William W. "An Examination of Consultative Services Provided by Eight State Departments of Education." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1955.

A P P E N D I X

APPENDIX A

A CHECKLIST OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR LEADERSHIP FUNCTIONS
OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE
AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Directions: Please read each criterion on the left side of each page and indicate your most accurate response by placing an (X) in the appropriate column at the right of each page. The abbreviations in the right hand columns represent the following responses.

- SA - Strongly Agree
- A - Agree
- U - Uncertain
- D - Disagree
- SD - Strongly Disagree

Please feel free to write any comments concerning these criteria.

Evaluative Criteria

- I. Planning Function: refers to the formulation of a comprehensive state-wide plan of health and physical education for the public schools within the state which includes long and short-term policies, procedures, and objectives.

CRITERIA

1. The state department of education should have a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education which includes long and short-term policies, procedures, and objectives.
2. The state department of education should publish and make available to all public schools within the state its statewide plan for health and physical education.

	SA	A	U	D	SD

3. The statewide plan for health and physical education should be cooperatively formulated by persons representative of the major groups involved in the area of health and physical education.
4. The development of a comprehensive statewide plan for health and physical education should be periodically reviewed and revised in order to meet the changing needs of our society.
5. The statewide plan for health and physical education should be flexible with the idea in mind that the needs of students are numerous and varied.
6. The state department of education should have a specific program of orientation to familiarize the professional staff members in the area of health and physical education with the statewide plan for health and physical education.

SA	A	U	D	SD

II. Research Function: refers to the systematic gathering, analyzing, and interpretation of data which are basic to educational improvement in health and physical education for the purpose of discovering better ways of doing things and learning how to best achieve newer objectives which seem to be desirable.

CRITERIA

1. The state department of education should have an adequately trained research person to work chiefly in the area of health and physical education.
2. The state department of education should publish and distribute to the public schools within the state the results of significant research in the area of health and physical education.

SA	A	U	D	SD

III. Public Relations Functions: refers to the maintenance of a two-way channel for a continuous flow of information between the state department of education and the public on the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education within the state.

CRITERIA

1. The state department of education should have a person whose chief responsibility is the direction and coordination of public relations activities including those in the area of health and physical education.
2. The state department of education should utilize all available resources and media necessary to interpret the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education to the public.
3. The state department of education should disseminate information pertaining to the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education within the state in a continuous and reliable manner.
4. The state department of education should specifically reserve a part of the total budget in health and physical education to public relations activities in that area.

	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. The state department of education should have a person whose chief responsibility is the direction and coordination of public relations activities including those in the area of health and physical education.					
2. The state department of education should utilize all available resources and media necessary to interpret the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education to the public.					
3. The state department of education should disseminate information pertaining to the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education within the state in a continuous and reliable manner.					
4. The state department of education should specifically reserve a part of the total budget in health and physical education to public relations activities in that area.					

IV. Advisory and Consultative Function: refers to consultative and advisory assistance rendered on invitation or routinely to teachers and/or supervisors of health and physical education, school administrators, and school boards by a professional staff member of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education for the purpose of problem solving, planning, or evaluation of programs.

CRITERIA

1. The state department of education should provide advisory and consultative services to local schools in the area of health and physical education.
2. The state department of education should in the area of health and physical education provide advisory and consultative services based on the needs of the recipients.
3. The state department of education should through advisory and consultative services attempt to make local schools aware of their needs in the area of health and physical education.

SA	A	U	D	SD

- V. Coordination Function: refers to the establishment of effective lines of communication among the professional staff members of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education, other divisions of the state education agency, and other state agencies concerned with health and physical education for the purposes of preventing duplication and fostering mutual understanding.

CRITERIA

1. The state department of education should establish liaison with and coordinate its efforts with those official, voluntary, and professional agencies within the state concerned with the improvement and betterment of health and physical education programs in the public schools.
2. The state department of education should make use of such mechanisms as joint committees, councils, and other similar structures designed to provide for more effective focusing of the total efforts for program improvement in health and physical education.

SA	A	U	D	SD

VI. In-Service Education Function: refers to the activities conducted by the state department of education designed to increase the instructional and administrative effectiveness of public school personnel in the area of health and physical education.

CRITERIA

	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. The state department of education should encourage in-service education programs on the local level in the area of health and physical education for public school personnel.					
2. The state department of education should collaborate with teacher education institutions in developing the most challenging pre-service and in-service preparation programs in the area of health and physical education for public school personnel.					
3. The state department of education should utilize district and/or statewide committees, conferences, workshops, clinics, and other similar structures in an effort to stimulate in-service education programs on the local school level in the area of health and physical education.					
4. The state department of education should assume leadership in the development of appropriate instructional guides and teaching aids designed to improve instruction and the total curriculum in health and physical education.					
5. The state department of education should make a continuous effort to evaluate its in-service education program in the area of health and physical education.					

APPENDIX B

LETTER SENT TO MEMBERS OF THE JURY

Norman, Oklahoma
January 27, 1966

Dear Dr. ----

There is general agreement among competent educational administrators that the most important role of state departments of education is that of providing effective leadership in securing the best education for all. The National Council of Chief State School Officers has, in reiterating this belief, identified six key leadership functions of state departments of education. These are planning, research, public relations, advising, coordination, and in-service education.

I am conducting, as my dissertation study, an investigation which will analyze the provisions made by the fifty state departments of education in carrying out the above named leadership functions in the area of health and physical education. Prior to such an investigation, it will be necessary that appropriate evaluative criteria be developed and validated in each leadership function area. As an outstanding member of the health and physical education profession, as evidenced by your contribution to professional literature dealing with the organization and administration of health and physical education programs, you have been selected to participate in the validation of these criteria. I am hopeful that you will agree to be of assistance in this task.

Enclosed is a checklist containing the criteria to be validated. This instrument has been designed so it will consume only a minimum amount of your valuable time. For your convenience and to facilitate a prompt response a self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed.

I am cognizant of the fact that this request for your assistance is really an imposition. My only defense, however, is that I truly believe that the development of these criteria will make a professional contribution which in the future may improve the health and physical education programs in our schools.

Yours truly,

John L. Dayries, Instructor
Department of Health and Physical
Education

APPENDIX C

JURY OF EXPERTS WHO VALIDATED CRITERIA

1. Dr. Charles A. Bucher
Professor of Education
New York University
New York, New York
2. Dr. Raymond O. Duncan, Dean
School of Health and Physical Education
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia
3. Dr. Arthur A. Esslinger, Chairman
Department of Health and Physical Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon
4. Mrs. Anne Finlayson
Supervisor of Health and Physical Education
Kalamazoo Public Schools
Kalamazoo, Michigan
5. Dr. Esther French, Professor
Department of Health and Physical Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan
6. Mr. Robert H. George
De La Warr High School
Garfield Park
New Castle, Delaware
7. Mr. Quentin Groves
Supervisor of Health and Physical Education
Topeka Public Schools
Topeka, Kansas
8. Mr. William E. Haroldson
Supervisor of Health and Physical Education
Seattle Public Schools
Seattle, Washington

9. Dr. Glenn W. Howard
Dean of Administration
Queens College
Flushing, New York
10. Dr. Joy W. Kistler, Chairman
Department of Health and Physical Education
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
11. Mrs. Carolyn B. Mathis
Sherwood Junior High School
Memphis, Tennessee
12. Mr. Charles H. Moser
Supervisor of Health and Physical Education
Abilene Public Schools
Abilene, Texas
13. Dr. Delbert Oberteuffer, Professor
Department of Health and Physical Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
14. Mrs. Rachael E. Peters
Annandale High School
Annandale, Virginia
15. Dr. Raymond A. Snyder, Professor
Department of Health and Physical Education
University of California
Los Angeles, California
16. Mr. Robert M. Taylor
Southwest High School
Kansas City, Missouri
17. Dr. Elmon L. Vernier
Supervisor of Health and Physical Education
Baltimore Public Schools
Baltimore, Maryland
18. Mr. Walter Washnik
Clifton High School
Clifton, New Jersey
19. Dr. Earle F. Zeigler, Professor
College of Health, Physical Education & Recreation
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

APPENDIX D

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED FUNCTIONS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF
EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

(Note--State Department of Education is defined as that agency of government headed by the chief state school officer and his staff which have the principal duties and responsibilities of the state government in education.)

SECTION I - GENERAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO STAFF - Please provide your most accurate response to each question.

1. In the space provided please indicate the administrative title of the person who officially represents your state department of education in the area of health and physical education.

2. Kindly check the highest degree held by the official representative of the state department of education in your state in the area of health and physical education.

- a. Doctor's degree _____
- b. Diploma or specialist's certificate beyond the Master's degree _____
- c. Master's degree _____
- d. Bachelor's degree _____
- e. Less than a Bachelor's degree..... _____

3. Please indicate the area in which the official representative of your state department of education in health and physical education holds his highest degree.

- a. Physical education _____
- b. Health education _____
- c. Combination health and physical education _____
- d. Education _____
- e. Other (Kindly specify) _____

4. Please indicate the number of professional staff members excluding the state director employed by your state department of education who work in the area of health and physical education. (Does not include clerks, secretaries, etc.)
 - a. Number of full-time professional staff _____
 - b. Number of half-time professional staff _____
 - c. Number of professional staff who work less than half-time _____

5. Please indicate the highest degree that each professional staff member in your state department of education in the area of health and physical education holds, regardless of the amount of time they devote to health and physical education. (Example: If three professional staff members possess the Master's degree, place the number 3 in the appropriate space provided). (Does not include State Director.)
 - a. Doctor's degree _____
 - b. Diploma or specialist's certificate beyond a Master's degree _____
 - c. Master's degree _____
 - d. Bachelor's degree _____
 - e. Less than a Bachelor's degree _____

6. Are there any minimal requirements for professional staff members of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education in your state? (Degree, experience, age, etc.) _____ Yes
 _____ No. If yes, please describe these requirements in the space provided below.

SECTION II - PLANNING FUNCTION: refers to the formulation of a comprehensive statewide plan of health and physical education for the public schools within the state which includes long and short-term policies, procedures and objectives.

1. Have long term policies, procedures, and objectives been formulated for a statewide program of health and physical education in your state? _____ Yes _____ No. If yes, when? _____(year). If your answer is no to this question please disregard the remainder of questions in this section and proceed to section 3.

2. If your answer is yes to the above question, have these long term policies, procedures, and objectives for a comprehensive statewide program of health and physical education been published? _____Yes
 _____No.

3. If long term policies, procedures, and objectives have been formulated for a comprehensive statewide program of health and physical education, which of the following groups were regularly included in the development of these plans? (Note: regularly denotes that the group functioned by a plan and at meetings that were scheduled so that group members were able to participate in the development of a planned program of health and physical education for schools of the state.)

- a. Members of the state department of education not in the area of health and physical education _____
- b. Public school teachers in the area of health and physical education _____
- c. Public school supervisors of health and physical education _____
- d. Public school principals _____
- e. Public school superintendents _____
- f. College or university teachers in the area of health and physical education _____
- g. Consultants from the American Association of Health and Physical Education _____
- h. Representatives from the state association in the area of health and physical education _____
- i. Lay personnel _____
- j. Legislators _____
- k. Others (Kindly specify) _____

4. Does your state department of education in the area of health and physical education periodically review and make recommendations as to possible revisions in the statewide program of health and physical education? _____Yes _____No

5. Do you have in your state department of education a specific program of orientation to familiarize the professional staff members in the area of health and physical education with the long term policies, procedures, and objectives that have been formulated for the statewide program of health and physical education? _____Yes _____No

6. If your answer is yes to the above question, please indicate the practices that are utilized in conducting the orientation program for professional staff members in the area of health and physical education.

- a. Regularly scheduled staff meetings _____
- b. Workshops _____
- c. Printed materials covering policies and objectives _____
- d. Others (Kindly specify) _____

SECTION III - RESEARCH FUNCTION: refers to the systematic gathering, analyzing, and interpretation of data which are basic to educational improvement in health and physical education for the purpose of discovering better ways of doing things and learning how to best achieve newer objectives which seem to be desirable.

1. Does your state department of education have a research person who works chiefly in the area of health and physical education? ___Yes ___No. If your answer is yes to the above question, please reply to the statements below.

a. Graduate work or degrees held: _____

b. Brief background of experience: _____

2. If you do not have in your state department of education a research person who works chiefly in the area of health and physical education, please use the space below and briefly describe the manner in which research is handled by your state department in the area of health and physical education.

3. As you envision the need for research in health and physical education, do you feel that your state department of education is adequately staffed to meet the needs for research in this area? ___Yes ___No

4. Has your research staff in the state department of education produced any significant research in the area of health and physical education within the last five years? ___Yes ___No If yes, were the results published and distributed to the public schools in your state? ___Yes ___No

5. Is the research staff in your state department of education in the area of health and physical education presently engaged in any significant studies? ___Yes ___No. If yes, please indicate the areas in which the studies are being conducted.

- a. Teacher preparation programs in health and physical education _____
- b. Tests and programs of physical fitness _____
- c. Programs of health instruction in the public schools... _____
- d. Programs of physical education in the public schools... _____
- e. Health services _____
- f. Analysis of the qualities of those who teach in the area of health and physical education _____
- g. Certification requirements for health and physical educators _____

5. h. Others (Kindly specify) _____

6. Has the research staff in your state department of education made a study within the last four years of the supply and demand of men and women teachers of health and physical education in your state?
- a. Men Yes No
 b. Women Yes No
7. If your answer is yes to the above question, please indicate the findings of that study in the space below.
8. Does your state department of education in the area of health and physical education attempt to stimulate local schools, colleges, and universities to conduct research projects in the area of health and physical education? Yes No
9. Does your state department of education attempt to locate sources of available funds to make research possible in the area of health and physical education? Yes No
10. Does your state department of education attempt to coordinate its research activities in health and physical education with those similar projects of other groups and professional organizations interested in health and physical education programs? Yes No
11. Does your state department of education in the area of health and physical education have access to data processing equipment that is adequate to meet the needs of its research activities in that area? Yes No
12. Does your state department of education in the area of health and physical education utilize the findings of research in developing experimental or pilot programs in the public schools? Yes No
13. Does your state department of education allocate a part of its total budget in health and physical education specifically to research activities in that area? Yes No

SECTION IV - PUBLIC RELATIONS FUNCTION: refers to the maintenance of a two-way channel for a continuous flow of information between the state department of education and the public on the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education within the state.

1. Do you have in your state department of education a person whose chief responsibility is the direction and coordination of public relations activities including those in the area of health and physical education? Yes No

2. If you do have in your state department of education a person whose chief responsibility is the direction and coordination of public relations activities including those in the area of health and physical education, please indicate the methods that are utilized in conducting such a program.

- a. Bulletins _____
- b. Newsletters _____
- c. Articles in newspapers and magazines _____
- d. Appearances on radio _____
- e. Appearances on television _____
- f. Appearances before PTA and other lay groups _____
- g. Legislative appearances _____
- h. Production of films and other audio-visual materials .. _____
- i. Other (Kindly specify) _____

3. Does your state department of education utilize all available resources and media necessary to interpret the needs, progress, and conditions of health and physical education to the public? Yes No

4. If your state department of education does not have a person whose chief responsibility is the direction and coordination of public relations activities including those in the area of health and physical education, please use the space below and describe the manner in which public relations is carried out in your state department in the area of health and physical education.

5. Does your state department of education specifically reserve a part of the total budget in health and physical education for public relations activities in that area? Yes No

SECTION V - ADVISORY AND CONSULTATIVE FUNCTION: refers to consultative and advisory assistance rendered on invitation or routinely to teachers and/or supervisors of health and physical education, school administrators, and school boards by a professional staff member of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education for the purpose of problem solving, planning, or evaluation of programs.

1. Does your state department of education provide consultative services to local schools in the area of health and physical education?
 Yes No

2. How many professional staff members in your state department of education are engaged in consultative work to local schools in the area of health and physical education? _____

3. Indicate the need for advisory and consultative services in the area of health and physical education in your state. (Please rank the five most needed areas)
- a. Buildings and grounds (Planning, constructing, etc.) .. _____
 - b. Finance (Budgets, bond issues) _____
 - c. Financial aid (Qualifying for, obtaining, and using state and federal aid to schools) _____
 - d. Legal assistance and/or information _____
 - e. Reports required by the state department of education . _____
 - f. School athletics _____
 - g. Accreditation _____
 - h. Instructional aids and materials _____
 - i. Curriculum planning or revision _____
 - j. Others (Kindly specify) _____
-
4. Is your state department of education able to satisfy all requests for consultative services to the public schools in your state in the area of health and physical education? ____Yes ____No
5. Does your state department of education through advisory and consultative services attempt to make local schools aware of their needs in the area of health and physical education? ____Yes ____No
6. As you envision the need for advisory and consultative services in the area of health and physical education, do you feel that local school personnel in this area are insufficiently aware of the need for assistance in improving programs in this area? ____Yes ____No

SECTION VI - COORDINATION FUNCTION: refers to the establishment of effective lines of communication among the professional staff members of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education, other divisions of the state education agency, and other state agencies concerned with health and physical education for the purposes of preventing duplication and fostering mutual understanding.

1. Does your state department of education attempt to establish liaison with and coordinate its efforts in the area of health and physical education with those official, voluntary, and professional agencies within the state concerned with the improvement and betterment of health and physical education programs in the public schools?
____Yes ____No
2. Does your state department of education in the area of health and physical education act as a clearinghouse to disseminate information on research studies projected, in progress, and completed in the area of health and physical education? ____Yes ____No

3. Does your state department of education in the area of health and physical education make use of such mechanisms as joint committees, councils, and other similar structures designed to provide for more effective focusing of the total efforts for program improvement in health and physical education? Yes No
4. Is health and physical education in the public schools in your state compulsory on the following school levels?

Health Education

Physical Education

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. Elementary School.. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | a. Elementary School.. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| b. Junior High School.. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | b. Junior High School.. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| c. High School <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | c. High School <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
5. If health and physical education is compulsory at any school level in your state, please indicate the authority upon which the requirement is based.
 - a. The requirement is written in the state constitution ..
 - b. The requirements is based upon an act of the legislature
 - c. The requirement is based upon a regulation of the state board of education
 - d. The requirements is based upon a regulation of the state department of education
 6. Have state department of education requirements for graduation in high school in your state changed in the area of health and physical education since January 1, 1960? Yes No. If yes, please use the space below and indicate change.

SECTION VII - IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FUNCTION: refers to the activities conducted by the state department of education designed to increase the effectiveness of public school personnel in the area of health and physical education.

1. Does an official statewide curriculum committee or commission which cooperates with the state department of education exist in your state in the area of health and physical education? Yes No
 If answered No disregard the remainder of this question as well as numbers 2, 3, and 4. If yes, please indicate the manner in which the curriculum committee or commission is financed.
 - a. From the regular appropriation received by the state department of education
 - b. From special appropriations from the legislature for curriculum revision

1.
 - c. From local school funds (Foundation grants, etc.) _____
 - d. From nonschool sources _____
 - e. Others (Kindly specify) _____

2. If a statewide curriculum committee or commission in health any physical education does exist in your state, please indicate the total number of members represented on the committee. _____

3. If a statewide curriculum committee or commission in health and physical education does exist in your state, please indicate the areas from which the participants are represented on your committee.

- a. Elementary teachers of health and physical education .. _____
- b. Junior high school teachers of health and physical education _____
- c. High school teachers of health and physical education . _____
- d. Junior college teachers of health and physical education _____
- e. College and university teachers of health and physical education _____
- f. Public school principals _____
- g. Public school superintendents _____
- h. Representatives from citizen's groups _____
- i. Representatives from other governmental agencies _____
- j. Others (Kindly specify) _____

4. If a statewide curriculum committee or commission in health and physical education does exist in your state, has this committee produced any recommendations with regard to health and physical education in the last four years? Yes No If yes, briefly state the recommendations in the space below.

5. Does your state department of education publish a curriculum guide in health and physical education for use in public schools? Yes No

	Separate Health Education Guide	Combination Health and Physical Education Guide	Separate Physical Education Guide
a. Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Junior high ...	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. High school ...	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

6. Please indicate the manner in which the cost for the preparation and distribution of curricular materials in health and physical education in your state is handled.
- a. The state department of education _____
 - b. Curriculum committee or commission _____
 - c. Local school districts _____
 - d. Others (Kindly specify) _____
7. Does your state department of education collaborate with teacher education institutions in developing the most challenging pre-service and in-service preparation programs for teachers in health and physical education? _____Yes _____No
8. Does your state department of education plan for district and/or statewide committees, conferences, workshops, clinics and other similar structures in an effort to stimulate in-service education programs on the local school level in the area of health and physical education? _____Yes _____No
9. Is provision made within the state department of education budget for conducting statewide and/or regional workshops and/or work conferences in the field of curriculum improvement in the area of health and physical education in your state? _____Yes _____No

APPENDIX E

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma - 73105

February 25, 1966

Dear Colleague:

Mr. John L. Dayries of the University of Oklahoma is making a study "An Analysis of Selected Functions of State Departments of Education in the Area of Health and Physical Education."

I believe that you will agree with me that the information that he will compile will be valuable to us as State Directors in fulfilling our responsibility to our people.

You will note that it is in 'check list form'; therefore will not consume a lot of your time. I will seldom write this kind of letter to you knowing of the amount of similar material that you are called on to furnish, but I believe that this is something very pertinent and I will consider it a personal favor if you will take time to give John the information he desires.

Yours sincerely,

Henry A. Vaughan, Director
Safety, Health and Physical Education

HV:ap

APPENDIX F

LETTER SENT TO STATE DIRECTORS OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Norman, Oklahoma
February 28, 1966

Dear Director:

There is general agreement among competent educational administrators that the most important role of state departments of education is that of providing effective leadership in securing the best education for all. The National Council of Chief State School Officers has, in reiterating this belief, identified six key leadership functions of state departments of education that are present in all areas of service. These are planning, research, public relations, advising, coordination, and in-service education.

I am conducting, as my dissertation study, an investigation which will analyze the provisions made by the fifty state departments of education in carrying out the above named leadership functions in the area of health and physical education. The study will require certain data that only you as a State Director of Health and Physical Education can furnish. Therefore, I solicit your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me at your earliest convenience. Although your questionnaire is identified, you may have my assurance that the information will be treated anonymously and confidentially.

The enclosed questionnaire is based upon a set of 30 criteria validated by a jury of experts consisting of authors, supervisors, and teachers of health and physical education.

For your convenience and to facilitate a prompt response a self-addressed envelope is enclosed.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

John L. Dayries, Instructor
Department of Health and Physical
Education

APPENDIX G

FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO STATE DIRECTORS OF
HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Norman, Oklahoma
April 1, 1966

Dear Director:

A short time ago I forwarded to you a questionnaire concerned with the functions of the state department of education in the area of health and physical education relative to planning, research, public relations, advising, coordination, and in-service education. As indicated in my cover letter this study is connected with my dissertation at the University of Oklahoma.

Since this questionnaire was mailed to just a select group it is important that I have your reaction. Please check the enclosed card and return it so I may determine the status of your participation.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

John L. Dayries, Instructor
Department of Health and
Physical Education

APPENDIX H

POSTAL CARD SENT TO STATE DIRECTORS OF HEALTH AND
PHYSICAL EDUCATION

_____ I do not care to participate

_____ I have lost the questionnaire

_____ I am returning it immediately

_____ I have already returned it

Signed _____