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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum Materials Centers, traced as far back as the 1920's, have existed under a variety of names and with a variety of functions. The concept of a curriculum laboratory (one of the many commonly used terms) varies from that of a place or room with equipment and materials to that of a service in which leadership in the use of these materials is also provided. Church feels that they have survived because of this very ability to vary their functions to serve their particular parent institution; remaining adaptable to disseminate the curriculum and instructional materials needed in the form desired by their clientele.

Ironically, however, this ability to adapt and vary their functions has caused some confusion as to the primary purpose and goals of curriculum materials centers or laboratories. Institutions interested in the establishment of their own curriculum laboratories have expressed concern over how to begin. This phenomenon of uncertainty has been reported by several researchers: Church, 1957;


James, 4 1963; Mac Vean, 5 1960; Flandro, 6 1957; and Zembrodt, 7 1944.

While each of these studies (as will be reported later) were able to provide some initial guidelines, it would appear that it is necessary for each curriculum materials center to define its own needs and responsibilities. For this reason, information for a particular curriculum materials center must be solicited from the clientele it serves.

Statement of the Problem

Feedback and input from all members of the faculty of the College of Education at Utah State University concerning the development of future programs and services in the Curriculum Materials Center is an essential factor in its operation. At present, the only feedback being generated from this group is coming from a very small percentage of the whole via the newly organized Curriculum


7Sister Mary Cleta Zembrodt "A Plan for the Development of a Curriculum Laboratory at St. Louis University Based on Teachers Needs" (Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University, 1944).
Advisory Committee. There is no feedback being sought from the College of Education as a whole. The majority of the members are either not providing feedback or are not being given the opportunity to do so.

Objectives

Through the administration of the Delphi Techniques (discussed further in a later section) the researcher attempted to achieve these objectives:

1. to get specific statements from the faculty members concerning their needs and wants in relation to the Curriculum Materials Center;

2. and after careful analysis and structuring of these statements, to aid the members during additional rounds of the Delphi in reaching a consensus on the stated needs;

3. and to be able to use the data to make recommendations to the staff of the Curriculum Materials Center concerning programs and services that will come closer to meeting the needs and wants of the faculty;

4. and, finally, that the faculty of and related to the College of Education be appraised of the profile of the Curriculum Materials Center as developed through the present study.

Significance

This study will serve as an aid to the staff of the Curriculum Materials Center as they strive to update and improve their programs
and services to meet the needs of the individuals and programs it serves.

The data gathered during the course of the study is significant in several ways. The data is unique in that it addresses itself to this particular center and faculty; it will consist of information presently unavailable from any other source; it will be specifically designed to serve this specific institution, and will be used as a prime source of information for the purpose of the development of new programs in the Curriculum Materials Center.

**Assumptions**

There is one basic assumption: that a collection of materials, equipment and staff in such a facility is essential to the effective development of any curriculum and to preparation of quality teachers and staff development in institutions of teacher education. A second assumption is that the faculty of the College of Education has some definite ideas about what a Curriculum Materials Center is and should be.

**Limitations**

The greatest limitation to this study is that the data gathered will be specifically designed for this particular institution and Curriculum Materials Center and the information reported may not possibly be applicable to all or even any other institutions. In addition, the sample for this study did not include all those departments involved in certifying of specialists in education. For
example, the Department of Home Economic Education was overlooked. A
final limitation inherent in all Delphi studies is that the consensus
sought is not discovered by the researcher as much as it is built, a
step at a time with the administration of each successive round.

Definitions

The terms unique to the study are defined as:

A Curriculum Materials Center, also known as Curriculum
Laboratory, Education Library, Curriculum Library, Learning Resource
Center, and Curriculum Study Center is defined by the Dictionary of
Education as:

. . . a department within a library or a separate unit within
a school or college organized to provide teaching aids to students
such as elementary and/or secondary school textbooks, courses of
study, tests, sample units, pamphlet materials, a picture file,
film strips, slides and other materials which may be helpful to
the teacher in the preparation of a unit of work.8

Teacher education, again referring to Good, is

. . . all the formal and informal activities and experiences that
help to qualify a person to assume the responsibilities of a member
of the educational profession; the program of activities and
experiences developed by an institution responsible for the pre-
paration and growth of persons preparing for educational work.9

The Delphi Forecasting Technique is defined by Dalkey as

the systematic collection of expert opinions on a stated problem. It
is a methodology for eliciting and refining these opinions in an
attempt to build priorities and consensus.10

8Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education, 3rd ed. (New York:
9Ibid., p. 586.
10Norman C. Dalkey, Delphi (Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1967).
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Selecting the Sample

The purpose of this study was to obtain from the users of the Curriculum Materials Center their opinions as to the services and programs the center should provide. The particular group chosen was the faculty of the College of Education at Utah State University. An assistant dean of the College reviewed a complete faculty roster and eliminated the names of those individuals perceived as having little connection with, knowledge of, or a need for the Curriculum Materials Center at Utah State University. From that final list (an attempt was made to reach as many faculty members as possible and not to reach just a sample) seventy-two names remained. An additional eighteen were added; faculty members from the Departments of Business Education and Industrial and Technical Education. Finally, the Dean of the College was included. The final panel consisted of ten participants from Communicative Disorders; eleven from Elementary Education; ten from the Edith Bowen Laboratory; eight from Health, Physical Education and Recreation; eleven from Instructional Media; six from Psychology; seven from Secondary Education; seven from Special Education; two from Special Services; six from Industrial and Technical Education; twelve from Business Education; and the Dean.
A total of ninety-one individuals comprised the panel for round one of the Delphi.

The Instrument

A questionnaire, specifically the Delphi, was used to gather the data. The Delphi was used because it is designed to collect and refine opinion in an effort to aid the experts in reaching consensus. It is also designed to help researchers define priorities. For the purpose of this study, this priority setting was necessary. The instrument employed was one used by R. Kent Wood for his NATUL project, "A Needs Assessment of Teacher Use of Library Media Center, 1976."

Methodology

The data gathered was obtained through the administration of a Delphi Forecasting Technique. The Delphi is the systematic collection of expert opinions on a stated problem. It is a methodology for eliciting and refining the opinions of a group of experts. In a 1959 Management Science article, Olaf Helmer and N. Rescher presented the classic definition of the Delphi technique, a carefully designed program of sequential individual interrogations (best conducted by a questionnaire) interspersed with information and opinion feedback.

---


12 Norman C. Dalkey, Delphi.

It replaces direct confrontation. The Delphi is characterized by three elements:

1. the responses are anonymous
2. there is controlled feedback between each round
3. and there is some form of statistical group response reported

The elicitation and refinement of opinion upon which the Delphi is based is used to help experts reach a consensus. The Delphi is usually conducted in three to four rounds depending on when this consensus is reached.

The Delphi Rounds

A brief description of the Delphi, as usually conducted, is important to the cohesiveness of the study.

On the first questionnaire, the researcher gives the experts a statement of his goal or problem, after which he provides them with what is essentially a blank questionnaire. The questions which comprise any questionnaire inevitably reflect the attitudes, bias, and knowledge of those who formulate them. Helmer and Gordon recognized this, and this led them to begin the Delphi with the blank questionnaire or one with several very open-ended questions. So, Phase One consists of a statement of the problem and a series of open-ended questions to which experts are directed to respond with specific, rather than general, statements. The questionnaire is then returned to the researcher.

14 Norman C. Dalkey, Delphi.
In Phase Two, the many statements of the experts are compiled, compared and analyzed. The statements are reduced to a smaller, more manageable number, but carefully and adequately reflecting each opinion given in round one. Each statement is given a numerical scale. When the second questionnaire is returned to the panel, they are asked to rate its importance in their opinion in respect to the problem or goal statement. The questionnaire is then returned to the researcher.

In Phase Three, the ratings on each statement are averaged, using either the mean, mode or median (whichever is deemed most appropriate), the questionnaire is then reprinted with the averages and sent back to each panel member indicating for each statement the group priority average and the rating he had previously assigned to it. The participants may concur with the average (if his rating differs) or support a differing point of view. If his opinion does differ he is asked to give a rationale for it by writing a brief statement. The questionnaire is then returned to the researcher again.

At this point the process may be concluded if the decision maker determines that consensus has been reached. If not, Phase Four is carried out, in which new averages are provided, and a summary of minority opinion is reported. Then the panel is asked for a final revision of opinion. At the conclusion of this round, the findings are again analyzed for results and consensus of opinion.

The Delphi is a favorable technique for gathering data because it has several advantages:

1. It gathers information often unavailable from other sources.
2. By building consensus, it helps a decision maker establish priorities.

3. It collects and organizes information in a systematic way.

4. It takes advantage of the "two heads are better than one" theory without face-to-face confrontation.

5. It reduces unwillingness to abandon a previously stated idea or opinion.

6. It provides feedback and revision.\textsuperscript{16}

Procedures

For this study the Delphi was conducted in three rounds. Phase One was mailed to ninety-one faculty members with a cover letter stating the purposes of the study and instructions for completing the first questionnaire (See Appendix A). On two occasions follow-up notices were sent out, and on a third attempt to increase returns, a second copy of the first questionnaire was sent to those who had not responded. The deadline was extended several times to accommodate the slower returns. This was necessary in order to gain a higher number of returns. Sixty-six returns of 72 percent were eventually received.

From the data gathered in round one, the second questionnaire was developed, consisting of 73 questions, each placed on a scale of 1-6 (See Appendix B). On this second questionnaire the participants were asked to circle the value that they place on the statement (1 being low, 6 being high) in relation to a program of services in the Curriculum Materials Center. This questionnaire was sent to sixty

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.
of the participants who had completed round one. Six of them were not followed through on for reasons such as faculty member being out of town, or expressing no interest in continuing the process. Of the sixty sent out a return of 43 or 71 percent was achieved in a relatively short time with the need for only one follow up. Of these 43 returned questionnaires 42 were used to figure the mean value for each statement. This value was then reported on the questionnaire and returned to the participant. At this point the participants were asked to concur with the group mean if their response differed by more than one point in either direction, or to support, with a sentence or two, a differing point of view. If no comments were made, on a statement that indicated a different position, the researcher assumed the participant was concurring with the group average. After a return of over 80 percent was received, the results were analyzed for consensus. More than 65 of the statements did show a consensus rating of higher than 70 percent, so the process was concluded and the results analyzed.

Handling of the Data

During Phase One, as each questionnaire was returned to the researcher, each statement or thought on each questionnaire was recorded onto an individual 3 x 5 index card. These cards were arranged into "like groups" (similar statements were grouped together). Approximately 500 responses were recorded and after careful analysis, making sure to reflect all opinions expressed, the second questionnaire was compiled. The researcher received input from two of her committee members in this process. Originally consisting of 100
statements, the questionnaire was pre-tested on four participants and subsequently the number of items was reduced to seventy-three. After all the returns were received, the mean average was determined for each statement. Then, the same questionnaire was sent back to the participant, indicating not only the previously assigned value, but, also the group mean. If an individual's average was greater than one point different in either direction, the respondent was asked to either concur by leaving the statement as presented or support a differing view with a single sentence (if possible) of explanation.

The questionnaire was then returned for analysis of consensus, using Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus. After consensus was determined to exist on 65 of the 73 statements, the process was concluded and results reported.

Leik's Measure

Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus was chosen as the device for measuring consensus because the measure is free of sample size, number of choice options, central tendency, and assumptions about intervals between choice options; yet it accurately reflects the degree to which choices are spread over the set of options available. The measure is designed to reflect a ratio of consensus that can be expressed in a percentage. The measure has other characteristics which make it an appropriate measure for this study. It is easily computed, makes no assumptions about equal intervals and tends to be conservative. In several distributions reported by Leik, he discovered
that interval consensus equalled or exceeded ordinal consensus making the later a more conservative measure.  

The measure, as used in studies by Jacobsen and Handley indicates that after a .50 agreement that the measure is approaching consensus. For this study, it was determined to use 70 percent as the indication of consensus.

19 David T. Handley, "A Forecast and Analysis of Educational Events Identified by Utah Educators" (Ph.D. dissertation, Utah State University, 1969).
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To relate certain aspects of a curriculum laboratory to the present study it is important to research the literature. Various aspects of curriculum laboratories have been determined and studied by many researchers (Ellis, 20 1969; Arnett, 21 1965; James, 22 1963; Flandro, 23 1957; and Drag, 24 1947). The aspects which are most often studied are (1) history, (2) purposes, (3) activities and functions, (4) staff and personnel, (5) budgeting, (6) holdings, and (7) relationships to other agencies. For this particular study, the researcher was mainly concerned with (1) briefly, the history, (2) purposes, and (3) activities and functions as reported by these researchers. The other areas will not be discussed in the review of literature. It was


21 Helen Mae Arnett, "Accessibility of Instructional Materials with Implications for the Organization of Curriculum Laboratories" (Ph.D. dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1965).

22 Marian L. James, "The Curriculum Laboratory in Teacher Education Institutions: Its Essential Characteristics."

23 Royce P. Flandro, "Curriculum Laboratories in Colleges of Teacher Education."

felt that the selected areas of history, purposes and activities were more germane to the present study.

"Teaching is a demanding task. It calls for fine intellect, creative application, and a quality and complexity of preparation that rival or surpass that of any other profession."\(^{25}\) These words by George Denemark stress the importance of teacher preparation for quality education. The beginnings of good preparation can be found in the pre-service education process, particularly through the experiences to be had in curriculum laboratories. The importance of the role of the curriculum lab in teacher education has been supported by many researchers. Grambs\(^{26}\) feels that a new teacher's inability to handle a variety of individual differences, interests, talents, and needs in the classroom is due in part to a lack of experience with a variety of teaching materials. Room 63, a materials center, was designed with the intention of exposing pre-service teachers to a variety of materials and in a variety of ways. The work done and the experiences provided in Room 63 caused some initial confusion, but the benefits were evident shortly after the student had been exposed for awhile to a live classroom situation.\(^{27}\)


\(^{27}\)Ibid.
Fox and Linley\(^{28}\) reported a similar experience in which pre-service teachers were given the opportunity to use a facility that familiarized them with a variety of materials and services, including units of work, selection of appropriate Audio Visual equipment and library materials and the necessity for being able to use them. The students came away from the experience confident that it had been a favorable one and that every pre-service teacher should be familiar with the curriculum lab, a valuable resource for assistance and materials. Yuhas\(^{29}\) reports that a curriculum laboratory is a basic means for teacher development through pre-service education and extended the research to include in-service training.

The curriculum laboratory is of inestimable value to the staff as a means of selecting, housing, and making available for ready use all those materials in order to keep pace with or to keep ahead of these newer trends and newer materials and resources.\(^{30}\) Bergmann also emphasizes that the resources used by teachers determine in part what is to be achieved in the way of educational objectives. The teachers should be introduced to the variety in the pre-service education.


In preparation for what Arnett calls "a significant part of the teachers role,"^{31} pre-service facilities such as curriculum labs can help prepare teachers for that role of finding, evaluating, selecting, utilizing and re-evaluating instructional materials for personal use or by pupils. Modern methods, individual instruction, independent learning, units of work, learning by inquiry, etc., necessitate a wide range of instructional materials.

Providing these instructional materials for the education of teachers has long been a goal of educators. Arnett has provided a lengthy list of significant dates in the history of this movement. The listing also highlights the important dates in the development of curriculum laboratories. That portion of the list is reproduced here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Organization of the Textbook and Curriculum Service Library at Western Michigan State College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The first facility designed expressly for the purpose of curriculum development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Establishment of the Bureau of Elementary Curriculum Research at Teachers College, Columbia University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Dr. Henry Harap at Western Reserve University first used the term &quot;curriculum laboratory.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Reorganization of the Bureau of Elementary Curriculum at Teachers College and called curriculum laboratory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Organization of the Curriculum Laboratory at the George Peabody College for Teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Establishment of a Curriculum Lab at Claremont Graduate School, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Publication of &quot;The Curriculum Laboratory&quot; by Henry Harap. The earliest available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^{31}Helen Mae Arnett, "Accessibility of Instructional Materials with Implications for the Organization of Curriculum Laboratories."
1933 | Organization of the Curriculum Laboratory at University of Alabama.
1934 | Organization of the Textbook and Curriculum Collections at University of Texas.
1935 | Establishment of the Curriculum Laboratory of the School of Education, Stanford University.
1936 | Establishment of the Curriculum Lab at Northwestern University.
1937 | Establishment of Curriculum Lab at University of Oregon.
1937 | Establishment of Curriculum Lab at University of North Carolina.
1938 | Organization of the Education Lab at the University of Pittsburgh.
1938 | Establishment of Curriculum Lab at the University of Kansas.
1939 | Establishment of the Curriculum Lab at the University of Denver.
1939 | Organization of the Florida Curriculum Lab in the College of Education, University of Florida.
1940 | Establishment of the Elementary Curriculum Workshop in the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.
1941 | Organization of the Curriculum Lab at the University of California, Berkeley.
1945 | Establishment of the Instructional Materials Center at the University of Chicago.
1946 | Establishment of the Curriculum Lab at Iowa State Teachers College.
1947 | Establishment of the AV Instructional Materials Center at Florida State University.
1950 | Official opening of the Curriculum Lab at Ball State Teachers College, Indiana.
1952 | Establishment of the Curriculum Lab at Boston College, School of Education.
1953 Establishment of the Educational Materials Lab in the U.S. Office of Education.

1954 Completion of the Materials Training Center at Chicago Teachers College.

1956 Establishment of the Curriculum Lab of the California State Department of Education.

1960 Establishment of the Laboratory in Junior College Administration at the University of California, Los Angeles.

1961 Opening of Toronto's Education Center with Curriculum Lab on the fifth and sixth floors.

1962 Establishment of the Educational Media Demonstration Center in U.S. Office of Education.

1964 Advertisement for a Curriculum Laboratory Service in a periodical.32

This list is provided for the reader to illustrate that once a curriculum laboratory was developed initially, it did not take too long before other institutions began to organize their own.

In 1922, the first facility designed for the purpose of curriculum development was formed. Marian L. James33 reports that this development was the result of the curriculum development movement when materials designed to facilitate curriculum revision first appeared. The rise of curriculum laboratories, she continues, closely parallels the curriculum development movement. The 1922 facility, the Textbook and Curriculum Service at Western Michigan State College, served its patrons by collecting, assembling, producing, lending, selling and

---

32 Ibid.

33 Marian L. James, "The Curriculum Laboratory in Teacher Education Institutions: Its Essential Characteristics."
distributing curriculum materials.\textsuperscript{34} The role taken by this laboratory was one of provision of curriculum materials not primarily one of curriculum revision. Over the years of curriculum laboratory development two types of curriculum labs have been identified, those whose functions include actual curriculum development and revision along with functions pertaining to curriculum materials, and those labs which emphasize functions pertaining primarily to the provision of curriculum materials with no curriculum revision.\textsuperscript{35}

The part of curriculum revision as a necessary function of the curriculum labs, while not emphasized in all labs, was recognized early in the history. Florence Stratemeyer, in 1925, as reported by Flandro states that, "a program aiming to make available to workers on the field of the elementary school curriculum the facts regarding the present curriculum situation, the scientific findings, and theoretical considerations which should be taken into account in making changes,"\textsuperscript{36} is an active curriculum revision lab as well.

Henry Harap, as reported by James,\textsuperscript{37} Flandro\textsuperscript{38} and Arnett\textsuperscript{39} was the first educator to use the term "curriculum laboratory" to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{35}Royce P. Flandro, "Curriculum Laboratories in Colleges of Teacher Education."
\item \textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 12.
\item \textsuperscript{37}Marian Lucia James, "The Curriculum Laboratory in Teacher Education Institutions: Its Essential Characteristics."
\item \textsuperscript{38}Royce P. Flandro, "Curriculum Laboratories in Colleges of Teacher Education."
\item \textsuperscript{39}Helen Mae Arnett, "Accessibility of Instructional Materials with Implications for the Organization of Curriculum Laboratories."
\end{itemize}
describe these facilities. He defined it as essentially a work place in which data are collected, studied, interpreted and organized for all types of curriculum work or research. The work area contains a complete collection of courses of study and reports on curriculum research. Both the roles outlined by Stratemeyer and Harap indicate a much more actively involved curriculum center.

To determine what role the curriculum laboratory plays in curriculum development and improvement one must know what they do. To know if the role they take is one of revision or provision of materials, the functions they perform have to be stated. In a 1938 study of curriculum labs in state departments of education, city school systems and institutions of higher learning, Leary attempted to determine these functions. After a questionnaire study of several hundred institutions she reported that for laboratories in colleges and universities the eight major categories of activities or functions were:

1. Collecting and assembling curriculum materials
2. Producing curriculum materials such as bibliographies, bulletins and courses of study
3. Advising and directing curriculum work
4. Investigating problems of the curriculum
5. Lending, selling and otherwise distributing curriculum materials
6. Offering courses in the curriculum
7. Sponsoring curriculum conferences
8. Editing and reviewing curriculum materials

In the same year, Wood outlined the functions of a curriculum laboratory. He stated that they should serve as:

1. Workrooms for students enrolled in regular courses in the construction of curriculum

2. A workroom for administrators, teachers, and supervisors

3. A source of leadership and facilities for conducting curriculum surveys and for providing consulting services to the schools in the area and for conducting basic curriculum research

4. An agency for the publication of curriculum research, units, study guides, and other curriculum materials

5. An agency to loan materials to students and teachers served by the Lab.

By 1947 curriculum laboratories had increased in number significantly; curriculum laboratories were reported in 145 institutions of higher learning. With this rapid increase in numbers an even greater variety of functions began to surface. This accounted for much confusion for those interested in determining guidelines for the development of their own curriculum labs. Attributing to this confusion, also, were the implications for the changes in the teacher-learning process. Completing a study at this time a study at this time, Drag

---


41 Hugh Wood, "How to Organize a Curriculum Laboratory," p. 346.

ascertained three purposes for curriculum laboratories. They should serve as centers for:

1. Development of curriculum for institutions,
2. Pre- and in-service teacher education,
3. Curriculum study and development projects.\(^{43}\)

Based on information from this study of 145 institutions that had curriculum labs, or a facility that they called a curriculum lab but was essentially a curriculum committee with no facilities or resources, etc., he recommended that the term curriculum laboratory be used to designate any division or department or any other type of organization, the purpose of which is to promote or facilitate curriculum development and which provides leaders, materials and facilities in harmonious functional relationships. He continues that it is specifically recommended that the curriculum laboratory be considered a functional part of the teacher education program.

One of the most comprehensive lists of functions to be used as guidelines for establishing a curriculum lab was prepared by Church in 1957. He describes the guidelines as criteria:

1. to give individual guidance to in- and pre-service teachers in learning about the variety of curriculum materials and practices,
2. to work with pre-service teachers to promote growth and development in teaching skills,
3. to promote growth and development in teaching skills with in-service teachers,

---

\(^{43}\)Francis L. Drag, Curriculum Laboratories in the United States: A Research Study.
4. to develop skill in locating, appraising and using a variety of AV materials,

5. to develop skill in finding, evaluating, and employing a variety of textbooks, study guides, courses of study, and teachers' manuals,

6. to assist in the acquisition of competence in locating diagnostic and remedial procedures and materials,

7. to establish the approach of utilizing available community educational resources,

8. to develop comprehension of curriculum trends and principles,

9. to develop the concept that curriculum includes all pupil activities over which the school exercises an influence,

10. to implement the principle that integration is basic to curriculum construction,

11. to reflect changes in elementary and high school curriculum in the materials and services of the teacher education institutions, and

12. to provide a curriculum lab with adequate materials and services to differentiate education in recognition of students' individual differences.44

Flandro's study the same year sought to determine the status of curriculum laboratories and the opinions of the directors as to their functions. Obviously the roles and functions did vary, but of the functions he did report, one or two of these functions was found in at least 75 percent to 90 percent of the labs surveyed. The functions he reported were:

1. Evaluate, procure, catalog, and house materials.

2. Maintain facilities to aid others in conducting their own curriculum study and revision.

John G. Church, "Development of Criteria for Evaluating Curriculum Laboratories in Teacher Education Institutions."
3. Teach the elements of curriculum study and building.
4. Assist in curriculum study and revision for public schools through action research, field or consultation services and school surveys.
5. Provide various types of curriculum materials.
6. Coordinate services of other agencies for curriculum study and revision.45

The two most often stated functions were to evaluate, procure, catalog and house materials, and assist in curriculum study revision. The directors thought that the services of other agencies should also be coordinated with theirs.

As can be noted from the reports above, both Church and Flandro are advocating an active role for the laboratories. A facility that provides the materials without any leadership or assistance to users is not providing the support needed in a teacher education program. Being merely a textbook depository facility is limiting and undermining the potential of these centers.

MacVean, reporting on an evaluation of curriculum laboratory services (1960) in a teachers college found that the primary purpose for which the curriculum laboratory was used were for faculty to familiarize themselves with new materials and for students to complete assignments.46 While they found it to be an excellent source for some publications, bulletins, and materials for units and other teaching, it is quite apparent that the facility was not operating at full

45 Royce P. Flandro, "Curriculum Laboratories in Colleges of Teacher Education."
46 MacVean, Donald, "Report of an Evaluation of Curriculum Laboratory Services in a Teachers College."
capacity when the primary reasons for existence seem to be for familiarizing one's self with the new materials. While this is vital to a training program in teacher education, there is more that could be done.

In 1960 Holley and Stull\(^{47}\) and again in 1963\(^{48}\) (this time joined by Fortado) reported some of the first disappointing incidences in curriculum laboratories. The institutions that they surveyed (and more so in 1960 than 1963) showed that the backbone of their centers were textbooks, units and courses of study. The multi-media approach to curriculum labs, while long being espoused by institutions of higher education, were not in reality being practiced. Their follow-up report in 1963 indicates that some progress was achieved but that as a rule the curriculum lab and AV specialist still go their separate ways. The variety of materials and equipment for use by pre-service teachers was not there. The dissertation reports by James, Flandro, Arnett, etc. that have been mentioned also reported, in some labs, a discouraging lack of variety, but the Holley-Stull study seems to indicate that the attempt to improve and update their services was really not there.

In 1968 Marian Lucia James' dissertation tried to break down for the beginning developer of curriculum laboratories the characteristic functions in a curriculum lab considered to be essential,


desirable, and undesirable. The essential characteristics were
(1) assisting users in the use of materials, (2) assisting users in
the selection of curriculum materials, and (3) disseminating information
on new curriculum materials. Considered desirable but not essential
were (1) assisting patrons in finding materials not in the lab,
(2) providing exhibits of curricular materials, (3) assisting others
in preparing displays, and (4) serving as a clearinghouse for information about community resources.49

Sister Francis Joseph states quite simply that a two-fold
purpose exists for the curriculum laboratory: (1) to provide prospective teachers with as complete and accessible a library of teaching materials as possible, and (2) to stimulate its uses to greater professional competence and richer creativity.50 The range of interpretation of her purposes is so broad that a curriculum lab designed under these two criteria has a potential for meeting the criteria set down by John Church.

Curriculum laboratories are pointed primarily toward assisting the teaching candidate to do the following:

1. become acquainted with the many types of curriculum materials that are available,
2. to employ these materials wisely,
3. to develop their own materials that will further their own plans and experiments most adequately, and


4. to continue their growth.  

As can be seen from the previous discussion, the functions of curriculum laboratories, as revealed in the various reports, can range from the very broad ("continue their growth") to the more specific ("publication of curriculum bulletins"). The functions have been many; they have been few. No matter the route taken by a curriculum laboratory, it must function to meet the individual needs of its users and parent institution. The future of curriculum laboratories depends on the potentiality for a variety and flexibility of functions.

Vernon Anderson in 1966 concludes for us that it is difficult to know what a curriculum laboratory will look like ten years from now. Educational technology and other innovations may make the conventional laboratory outmoded. Whatever the future does hold, though, curriculum laboratories will definitely become outmoded and out of touch if they do not accept the challenge to adopt a continuous program or re-evaluating and updating their services to meet educational goals. The curriculum laboratory can be a rich resource of ideas, however, they must have the personnel with the imagination to come up with ideas for the utilization of these centers, the courage to put ideas into practice and the wisdom to evaluate them for their potential.  

53Elinor V. Ellis, The Role of the Curriculum Laboratory in the Preparation of Quality Teachers.
CHAPTER IV

THE CURRICULUM MATERIALS CENTER AT
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

First organized in the early 1960's the Curriculum Materials Center is presently under the administration of the Merrill Library Learning Resource Program (MLLRP). The present director holds a Masters Degree in Instructional Media from Utah State University and has been in his present position since 1975. His duties in the Curriculum Materials Center are considered part-time. He has responsibilities outside the Curriculum Materials Center as the State Documents Librarian, a Reference Librarian, and a professor in the Instructional Media Department (IM). There is presently one graduate student from the Instructional Media Department working as a graduate assistant, two part-time work study students (undergraduates), and one full-time secretary.

In February 1964 the Curriculum Materials Center Director at the time wrote that the primary function of the new Curriculum Materials Center was to acquire, to organize and to make available the instructional materials needed by the pre- and in-service teachers, as well as faculty and graduate students working in the area of professional education.\textsuperscript{54} The move to the library, at that time, and

into the administration of the library, brought together the textbook collections of elementary and secondary education for the first time. Previous to this they had been housed in two separate locations. The primary function of the Curriculum Materials Center was at this time to serve as a textbook depository for the College of Education.

In 1975 the present director developed a concept paper which indicated that the attempt was being made to develop the Curriculum Materials Center into a more dynamic center. For the Curriculum Materials Center to be effective it must maintain an aggressive and dynamic program of communication, demonstration, and information with the faculty, teachers, and prospective teachers. The primary purpose of the Curriculum Materials Center is to provide means for teachers, media coordinators, and prospective teachers to utilize and evaluate a broad range of instructional materials and equipment. The concept paper outlines the principal objectives, however it also reflects a commitment to a higher degree of active involvement with the users of the Curriculum Materials Center's materials and services.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

For the convenience of the reader the following table is provided. The discussion of results that follows is based on the percentage and number of returns indicated in this table.

Table 1.--Returns on the three rounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Possible Participants</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Participants</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Returning</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 125 persons were eligible for the first round on the basis of their status in the various departments surveyed. Several, however, on the first round, six on the second round, and one on the third round were excluded. The reasons for their exclusion were based on several reasons. Either they were not interested in continuing the
process, had no involvement with the Curriculum Materials Center or at some point indicated they would be out of town and unable to continue with the study.

The Delphi Forecasting Technique was used to obtain information from the faculty of the College of Education at Utah State University concerning their needs in terms of a Curriculum Materials Center services.

There is a two fold outcome of results with a Delphi: it establishes priorities and it builds consensus. At the end of the second round, after all participants had recorded the value they assigned to each statement, the mean priority value was determined by computing the average using the mean. The consensus was then figured, using Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus. At that point, consensus of over 70 percent was indicated on only eight of the seventy-three statements. When round three was returned, the consensus was again figured. The results at the conclusion of round three are included on the nine tables which are included in this chapter. For each of the items, the consensus at the end of both round two and three are recorded, as are the mean priority values and the statement's ranking in relation to the rest of the items.

The discussion of the results will be treated in two manners. The first treatment will center around the discussion of the statements as they appear on the nine separate tables. For each table the highest and lowest priorities will be reported. The statements are ordered on the tables chronologically, the way they were presented on the questionnaire to the panel members, and are discussed that way in
this first section. Finally, the researcher arbitrarily decided that any mean priority value of 4.3 or below was considered a low priority. Anything above 4.5 was considered a high priority.

On Table 2, "What faculty and students should know, feel, and be able to do as a result of using the Curriculum Materials Center," all items show a high degree of consensus of opinion. The highest priority value is assigned to the statements that the users should feel free to use the facility when needed and to ask for additional help and materials if necessary. These two items also received a 100 percent consensus level. In addition, the faculty assigned a high priority to the students being able to develop teaching units using a full range of materials. The lowest priority value was given to items 1 and 6, dealing with the application of the principles of instructional development and curriculum development. As indicated by the low priority, the high consensus on it, and various comments recorded by the researcher from the returns, it is apparent that the faculty do not consider it a realistic goal to expect pre-service teachers to become familiar with these two areas as a result of using the Curriculum Materials Center. One participant stated on his return, "I would hope that these would come in other classes in their program."

Table 3, indicating the "Programs and services that the Curriculum Materials Center should provide," shows only one item reaching 100 percent consensus. All participants thought it important that the center should increase its collection of materials in
Table 2.--Consensus scores, mean priority values and ranking. As a result of using the Curriculum Materials Center, faculty and students should ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>be able to apply the instructional development process, instructional needs, develop or identify appropriate materials &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>know how to become familiar with publishers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>know the sources of books &amp; other materials</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.975</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>be able to develop teaching units &amp; lesson plans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.475</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>be able to identify &amp; easily access a wide variety of materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.425</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>know more about the process of curriculum development</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.850</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>be able to evaluate &amp; select curriculum materials</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>feel free to use the facility when needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.575</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
Table 2.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>feel free to ask for additional materials and help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.550</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>feel comfortable in using all curriculum materials</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.075</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>feel confident that the materials they select are the best</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.050</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>feel that the Curriculum Materials Center is essential</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.

accordance with the needs and demands expressed by the faculty and students. On the other hand, the lowest priority and one that received a high consensus of opinion was statement number 17. The faculty seem unconcerned with the Computer Assisted Instruction terminals that are at present in the center. A few individuals stated that they saw this as a fairly low priority for this center because it was felt that very few teachers would encounter this type of instruction in the public schools. Another individual suggested that Computer Assisted Instruction materials be available, but not the terminals themselves. Of interest is the fact that a center for the local production of materials, which at first seemed to have a strong following, rated a
Table 3.--Consensus scores, mean priority values and ranking. The Curriculum Materials Center should . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>maintain existing services and programs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.692</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>increase size of collection in accordance with needs &amp; demands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.325</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>provide service to students &amp; teachers in surrounding communities</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>maintain Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) terminals</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>be improved by adding more CAI terminals</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.725</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>increase use of auto-tutorial (self-instruction) programs</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>provide equipment orientation &amp; operating instruction</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.289</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>develop an equipment utilization self-instructional laboratory</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.974</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
### Table 3.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>maintain existing cooperative textbook depository relationship with College of Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.825</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>provide a basic reference program (self-instructional) for locating materials</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.925</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>develop a facility for local production</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>develop or attract special loan exhibits with special curriculum emphasis</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.075</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>develop a current display of most recent textbooks</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.675</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>provide &quot;quick &amp; dirty&quot; duplicating equipment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.789</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.

Value of only 4.1, and is therefore not a strong priority item. It was indicated by some respondents that another agency on campus, such as Instructional Development, could provide this service. The necessity for equipment to duplicate materials was evidenced, and as one participant suggested: "This is especially important if a checkout system cannot be implemented."
On Table 4 those statements dealing with the organization of the Curriculum Materials Center are indicated. The highest priority is assigned to the need for the development of a system to allow for circulating materials, at least on an overnight basis. Several participants indicated the desire to be able to give this item a value of 10 on the 1-6 scale. One participant strongly stated that it should be a "top priority." The panel also indicated that the university library system should maintain the Curriculum Materials Center under its management; that it should not be placed under the management of the College of Education. While one individual thought that it would better suit the purposes of the faculty to have it in the College of Education, most participants reported that it would result in a loss of funding, space and quality if it was taken out of the library's administration. In James' study it was shown that the majority of directors of Curriculum Materials Centers also felt that it was essential that the center be within the university library's scope of services. To maintain current records of all available materials in the center was rated high. It was stated that a current record system would provide increased and better access to the materials.

Table 5 illustrates statements or concerns about the collection of material in the center. The highest priority was given to the need for the center to seek increased funding to provide for the purchase of items. To date, the center has been largely dependent on donated items, and the faculty feels this has been inadequate. One individual stated that increased funding would allow the center to purchase some items...
Table 4.--Consensus scores, mean priority values and ranking. The Curriculum Materials Center should . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>develop a more efficient retrieval system</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.710</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>develop a comprehensive bibliography of all materials</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.615</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>maintain current records of materials available in the center</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.025</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>develop a system to allow for checking out (at least overnight) of materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.230</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>provide access to all curriculum materials commonly found in schools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.125</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>be taken out of the administration of the library</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.740</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>reduce the current number of places in the library where one must go</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
Table 5.--Consensus scores, mean priority values and ranking. The Curriculum Materials Center should . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>increase the collection of non-print materials</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.666</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>reduce the need for departmental holdings</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>provide generally state and school district curriculum guides</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.135</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>seek increased funding to provide for purchase of items</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.325</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>provide samples of all materials on state textbook adoption list</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.135</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>provide scope &amp; sequence charts for each subject area, if available</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.743</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>&quot;weed out&quot; old materials regularly</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>develop a test file</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.512</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>provide up-to-date print &amp; non-print materials in all areas of the curriculum</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.789</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
Table 5.--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>provide examples of all print &amp; non-print materials used in all curriculum areas of Utah</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.538</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>provide examples of all print &amp; non-print materials used in curriculum areas out of state</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.550</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>provide a wider variety of materials from other publishers than text</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.740</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>maintain the current availability of college catalogs</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.940</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>maintain the current microfiche collection of college catalogs</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.870</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>provide samples &amp; lists of sources of free &amp; inexpensive teaching materials</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.179</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>increase the amount of college curriculum materials</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.435</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>increase junior/community college materials</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
Table 5.--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>maintain model teaching packets</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.615</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>maintain a sample collection of all textbooks used on campus</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.282</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.

at the request of faculty and students. The panel also assigned high priorities to other items. They indicated a need for an increase of non-print materials such as films, filmstrips, slide tapes and models; scope and sequence charts, and sources for free and inexpensive teaching materials. One item that rated low was the need for out-of-state curriculum materials. It was stated that the center should work on improving the home state collection before branching out. In addition, the necessity for a current collection of college catalogs, in hard bound and in microfiche format, was not rated highly. Several panel members thought that this service should be transferred to the reference area of the library. It was also indicated that it was unrealistic to maintain a sample collection of all textbooks used on campus. The "texts change too often" and it would "complicate the life" of the center were comments which indicated that this was thought to be an unrealistic charge of the center.
Table 6, the items concerned with the physical facilities, show that the desire for seminar style conference rooms and a graduate reading room were given ratings of 4.4 and 4.3. While these are not particularly strong ratings, the attending comments indicate that both these services would be nice if the present space and staffing patterns allow. One panel member suggested that these facilities were desired because they had no such facilities in their building. Another

Table 6. Consensus scores, mean priority values and ranking. The Curriculum Materials Center should . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>develop &amp; maintain a graduate reading room</td>
<td>53 4.263</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>provide space &amp; facilities for small group conferences</td>
<td>44 4.440</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>provide a more comfortable atmosphere in which to browse</td>
<td>50 4.368</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>reduce &quot;garbage &amp; clutter&quot; in the area</td>
<td>56 4.108</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>provide &quot;better&quot; facilities for planned interaction of students</td>
<td>51 4.315</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
participant indicated very strongly that it was needed to support the graduate program.

On Table 7 the three ratings all received high consensus and fairly high priorities. The student and secretarial staff should be provided with specific training for work in the center. It was stated that to aid the users in getting at and using materials the staff should have some additional training and skills above that usually provided, and that some staffing should be arranged to provide for coverage of hours more consistent with general library hours.

Table 7.--Consensus scores, mean priority values and ranking. The Curriculum Materials Center should . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>provide better training of student staffing &amp; secretarial help</td>
<td>26 4.789 57</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>provide increased access to curriculum materials at scheduled convenient hours</td>
<td>12 5.076 65</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>develop a greater emphasis on providing professional staff &amp; the personal services</td>
<td>21 4.871 64</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
Table 8 outlines special interests, and as can be expected, those participants with professional interests in those areas rated them highly. The general indication, however, was that the center should provide those materials needed by the users. The materials should be provided, but the center need not attempt a role of developing the materials. Participants from Business Education indicated that the center was lacking in materials for their area, especially the areas of typing, shorthand, and accounting.

Table 8.--Consensus scores, mean priority values and ranking. The Curriculum Materials Center should . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>provide curriculum materials in communication disorders</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.054</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>increase holdings in &quot;slow learner&quot; materials</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.416</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>increase holdings in business education</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.190</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>develop materials for the hearing impaired</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.864</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>increase early childhood materials K-3 in all areas of the curriculum</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.405</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
On Table 9 the items indicate a concern by the faculty that the center take an active role in assisting the students in the selection, use, integration, interpretation and evaluation of the various materials available, and how they can meet specific needs. The need for a wide range of preview services, including the preview of texts, slide tapes, and films, etc. is also expressed. The faculty also indicated that another valuable service to the students would involve assistance in becoming familiar with the standard catalogs, reviewing sources and bibliographies of curriculum materials.

Table 9.--Consensus scores, mean priority values and ranking. The Curriculum Materials Center should . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionnaire Two</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>provide greater assistance in showing how materials relate to specific curriculums</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>develop an evaluation &amp; assessment system</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.743</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>provide a wide range of preview services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.076</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>increase general awareness of bibliographic control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.717</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
On the final Table 10, the statements concerned with the communications between the staff of the center and its users, are rated. Three of the four items received high priority. A brochure summarizing the services and materials currently available received the highest priority. The need for an in-service program to introduce faculty and/or education classes to various types of media "should be available to provide maximum use of the Curriculum Materials Center." A monthly memo of updated materials was also indicated as a high priority item.

Table 10.--Consensus scores, mean priority values and ranking. The Curriculum Materials Center should . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Shortened Item Statements from Questionaire Two</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean Priority Values*</th>
<th>Delphi Two Consensus Score by %</th>
<th>Delphi Three Consensus Score by %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>develop brochures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.150</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>provide open lines of communication</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.820</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>develop a professional internship training program</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.440</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>develop in-service programs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.920</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean priority values indicate the average, as computed using the mean, that existed on each statement.
The second treatment of the data revolves around the arrangement of items by their mean priority ranking in relation to the total number of items. These are arranged and displayed in Appendix D. This appendix is provided for two reasons. It serves as a checklist which may prove helpful in planning for future development of the Curriculum Materials Center at Utah State University specifically, and, generally, for other similar programs. Secondly, it is a quick reference source for purposes of following this next discussion. This discussion includes reports on those top priority statements at the 5.0 mean level or above, and the low priority items at the 4.0 level and below. Other high and low priority items not included in this range have been discussed in the first treatment of the data.

When arranged according to their mean priority ranking in relation to all the other items, the highest priority (5.575) is assigned to item number eight, "the need for users to feel free to use the facility when needed." Item number nine, the need to feel "free to ask for additional help and materials when needed" ranks second. Other items considered of high priority include the following: (1) the need for students to be able to identify and access a wide variety of materials; (2) an increase in the size of the collection in accordance with the needs and requests as expressed by the users; (3) a need to seek increased funding to provide for the purchase of items; (4) a system allowing for circulation of the materials; (5) a list of sources of free and inexpensive materials; (6) a need for a brochure outlining current services available in the Curriculum Materials Center; (7) samples of all materials on adoption lists;
(8) a collection of curriculum guides; (9) increased hours of access; (10) a wide range of preview services, such as texts, films, slide tapes, learning kits, etc.; (11) a current record of all materials available in the center; and finally, (12) a need to "weed out" old materials regularly. These items were seen as having the highest priority for the Curriculum Materials Center at Utah State University.

Those items reaching a mean priority level of 4.0 or below are the low priority concerns of the faculty. At this time, the faculty considers the following items to be unnecessary roles for or out of the realm of responsibility of the Curriculum Materials Center at Utah State University. Low priority was established for each of the following: (1) the need for the Curriculum Materials Center to provide services to the students and teachers in surrounding areas; (2) to maintain the Computer Assisted Instruction; (3) to increase the amount of junior/community college materials; (4) to increase the use of auto-tutorial programs; (5) to develop an equipment utilization (self-instructional) lab; (6) to maintain the current availability of hard bound or microfiche collection of college catalogs; (7) for students to be able to apply either the instructional development or the curriculum development process as a result of using the center; (8) to develop materials for the hearing impaired; (9) to provide non-print and print materials used in curriculum areas outside the state; (10) to maintain a sample collection of all textbooks used on the campus; and finally (11) that the Curriculum Materials Center be taken out of the administration of the library. For the most part, the items rated as low priorities either dealt with those areas which the faculty
thought were being met or could be met elsewhere, e.g. by another department and/or agency; and/or were those items which faculty felt were not the responsibility of a curriculum materials center on this campus.

In summary, data were analyzed in two ways: initially where each item was examined in relation to statements of similar subject (on the Tables 2-10) and secondly, as it stood in relation to the overall ranking of all seventy-three statements (Appendix D).

Summary and Conclusions

The major purposes of this study were to generate information from the faculty of the College of Education at Utah State University concerning their needs in a curriculum materials center, and to provide an open line of communication for them to express those needs. Through the administration of the Delphi Forecasting Technique this was accomplished by allowing the faculty members to have input into the main questionnaire. In fact, the main questionnaire was comprised totally of faculty needs, ideas, and concerns. These statements were then fed back to the faculty so that a rating and consensus of opinion could be assessed.

Based on the results of the first questionnaire, it was evident that the faculty does have definite ideas as to what their needs and wants in a curriculum materials center are. Through succeeding rounds a pattern indicating consensus of opinion became evident.

The following conclusions are based on the analysis by tables and the analysis from the ranking and they are a combination of both
the high and low priorities as represented in the tables and in Appendix D. The order in which the conclusions are presented has not been prioritized.

Conclusions that can be drawn from the findings indicate that the faculty:

1. thinks students (as a result of using the Curriculum Materials Center) should be able to develop teaching units and lesson plans using a full range of materials
2. feels a system of checkout of materials (at least overnight) should be developed
3. does not feel it necessary for the Curriculum Materials Center to be under the direct management of the College of Education to be effective; that it should remain within the library's administration
4. thinks the center should seek increased funding for purchase of materials. These funds will allow faculty and students to make special requests for purchase of materials with a better chance of seeing their request met
5. thinks the Curriculum Materials Center should provide a wider variety of print and non-print materials.
6. feel the Curriculum Materials Center should provide a wide range of preview services, for films, filmstrips, slide tapes, textbooks, models, etc.
7. feel the Curriculum Materials Center should develop
brochures and/or monthly memos which summarize the new materials and services available

8. has little interest in maintaining the Computer Assisted Instruction in the Curriculum Materials Center. It could better be handled elsewhere.

9. has little interest in maintaining the current college catalog collection in the Curriculum Materials Center; it would be better handled in the reference area of the library

10. would like to have some equipment for duplicating materials in the center, especially if an adequate check out system is not implemented

11. feel the size of the collection could be increased in accordance with the expressed needs of the faculty and students

12. feels a facility for the local production of instructional materials is not a high priority and could maybe better be served by being a part of another agency, such as the Instructional Development Division

13. feel a current record of all materials should be maintained to provide increased and better access to materials

14. feel that better and more specialized training of student staff and secretarial help is needed to provide adequate assistance and guidance to the student users

15. feel students should be assisted in learning the selection, use, integration, interpretation and evaluation of the curriculum materials
16. feel students should receive help in recognizing the standard catalogs, reviewing sources and bibliographies of materials
17. feels no need for a junior/community college materials collection
18. does not see a high priority for the Curriculum Materials Center to provide services at this time to students and teachers in surrounding areas.
19. see a low priority for students learning the processes of instructional and curriculum development through their use of or as a result of using the center.
20. feel a sample collection of textbooks used on this campus is not a prime responsibility of the center
21. feel students should be comfortable using all the materials
22. feel students should be able to identify and access a wide variety of materials
23. feel students should have access to all curriculum materials found in schools in the state of Utah
24. would like to see scheduled hours of the center be in tune with the general library hours
25. students should feel free to use the facility when needed, and to ask for additional help and materials when needed
26. feel materials should be "weeded out" regularly

It is apparent from the information received from the group that the faculty sees the Curriculum Materials Center as having a
definite role in the improvement of both teaching and learning. Relating this back to the literature and Flandro's study, the faculty would like to see this center become a place where materials are not only provided for the teacher education student, but a place where assistance or guidance in the use of these materials, the understanding of the variety of materials available and the sources for locating them are provided.

A final conclusion that can be drawn from the study is that, based on the quality of the statements received from the panel, the use of the Delphi for this type of information seeking process was an effective one. The information for the most part, generated from the group was specific and directly related to the facility and institution concerned.

Recommendations

Based on the results and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. that a systematic and regular system of communication between faculty and Curriculum Materials Center staff be developed, maintained, and encouraged, whether it be through a simple process of providing a suggestion box or a more involved process of written brochures and monthly memos, or a combination of these

2. that a uniform system allowing for the circulation of materials be established
3. The center should involve the administration of the library in an effort to seek increased funding to provide those materials that are requested and available but not presently provided through the existing program of donation of materials. Many of the donated texts have accompanying games, kits, boxes of materials that are not donated by the publisher. Without increased funding to purchase these items they do not become available to students and therefore the students are not able to evaluate or utilize them.

4. At present no attempt should be made to establish a collection of textbooks used on the campus.

5. The Curriculum Materials Center should restrict itself to providing materials in the elementary and secondary schools and not provide materials on the junior college level.

6. The Curriculum Materials Center should concentrate on providing materials for its users on the campus and not try to serve those teachers in surrounding areas.

7. The center should not strive to teach the process of instructional and curriculum development to its student users.

8. The center should continue to provide access to all curriculum materials found in the schools in the state.

9. The center should continue its program of constantly "weeding out" materials.

10. The center should increase the variety and amount of non-
print materials and other curricular materials such as kits, games, models and simulations.

11. The center should provide a wide range of preview services, either independently or with the cooperation and assistance of the AV Services division of the library.

12. The center should provide duplicating equipment (mimeograph, ditto, Xerox, etc.) for duplication of materials.

13. The center should move the hard copy and the microfiche collection of college catalogs to the reference area of the University Library.

14. The center should provide adequate staff to aid pre-service teachers in interpreting and relating of materials to specific curriculum. This may involve limiting the graduate assistantship to an individual who has training and/or experience in the teaching profession. Their skills might prove more helpful to the users.

15. The Curriculum Materials Center should be maintained under the administration of the library and not moved to the College of Education's management.

16. The need for the Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) terminals in the center was viewed as a very low priority by the faculty. It is recommended that alternate placement of that service be considered.

17. The response resulting from the study was very positive; the participants made several comments as to their
appreciation for the opportunity to express their needs. The final recommendation is that the staff of the Curriculum Materials Center continually and actively pursue interaction with the faculty and students and others who have business in the center.

In summary, this study reviewed the literature pertaining to curriculum materials centers and identified the need for faculty to provide input and feedback for planning the future development of the Utah State University Curriculum Materials Center programs. The Delphi Technique was utilized so as to provide for input, reiteration and feedback of faculty so as to provide recommendations to the staff of the center and the college and university administrators responsible for the continued development of programs. It is recommended that the study be reviewed by these staff members, administrators, and faculty as part of the ongoing process necessary to keep such a service and center dynamic and responsive to changing needs.

Anderson, Vernon E. "Service is the Center." Educational Leadership 23: 444-50.


Appendix A
Faculty of the College of Education:

In order to ensure proper direction for future program and service development in the Curriculum Materials Center of the Merrill Library, a needs assessment has been initiated.

Faculty input is an essential element of the assessment. To obtain this input, Robert Wooley, the Curriculum Librarian, and Janie L. Rudrud, a graduate student in Instructional Media, are employing a delphi with the faculty of the College serving as the primary panel of experts. This exercise will be conducted in three or four rounds (depending on when a consensus of opinion is reached), with feedback provided between each round. Final results of the assessment will be made available to all faculty. Phase One of the delphi is enclosed with this letter.

Your cooperation and assistance with this study will be appreciated and should help to ensure a program in the Curriculum Materials Center that comes closer to meeting both departmental and Library needs.

After you have completed Phase One, please return it to the Curriculum Materials Center in the envelope provided.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Oral L. Ballam, Dean
College of Education

OLB/aw
enclosures
When you respond to the questions below, think in terms of present and probable future needs you may have for services and materials likely to be associated with a curriculum materials center at USU. Specific statements will be more helpful than general ones.

1) Are you familiar with the Curriculum Materials Center? __________

Based upon your experience and need, an ideal curriculum materials center should

2) provide ______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

3) develop _____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

4) increase _____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

5) maintain ____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

6) reduce ______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
As a result of using the curriculum materials center, faculty and students should

7) be able to ____________________________________________________________

8) feel ________________________________________________________________

9) know ______________________________________________________________

10) Existing services could or should be improved by ________________________

11) The best services offered through the curriculum materials center are __________

12) Additional comments or suggestions ____________________________________

(Attach additional pages if needed)
MEMORANDUM

TO: College of Education Faculty

FROM: Dean Oral Ballam

SUBJECT: Delphi Questionnaire on Curriculum Materials Center

DATE: March 8, 1977

Based on the response to the first phase of the Delphi Study (left open ended by design), some 300 items were generated. From that data the attached questionnaire was developed.

In the initial sample testing of this instrument, the average time needed to complete the form was 20 minutes.

I personally hope you will respond as soon as possible this week but not later than March 22, 1977.

Your time and attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Oral Ballam
Dean of the College of Education
**DELPHI QUESTIONNAIRE TWO**

**USU CURRICULUM MATERIALS CENTER PROGRAM AND SERVICES**

When you respond to the questions below, consider what programs and services should be provided by the Curriculum Materials Center at Utah State University.

**PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR PRIORITY RATINGS FOR EACH ITEM** on the scale the left side of each question. Note that 1 is low and 6 is high.

As the result of using the Utah State University University Curriculum Materials Center student and faculty should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. be able to apply the instructional development process of defining instructional needs, develop or identify appropriate materials and evaluation.

2. know how to become familiar with publishers.

3. know the sources of books and other materials.

4. be able to develop teaching units and lesson plans using a full range of curriculum materials.

5. be able to identify and easily access a wide variety of available instructional and curriculum materials.

6. know more about the process of curriculum development.

7. be able to evaluate and select curriculum materials and feel comfortable with their choices.

8. feel free to use the facility when needed.

9. feel free to ask for additional materials and help.

10. feel comfortable in using all curriculum materials.
11. feel confident that the materials they select are the "best" currently available.

12. feel that the Curriculum Materials Center is essential to the development of quality curriculum and instruction.

The Curriculum Materials Center Should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMS/SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. maintain existing services and programs.

14. increase size of collection in accordance with needs and demands expressed by faculty and students.

15. provide service to students and teachers in surrounding communities in what is available in curriculum materials.

16. maintain CAI (Computer Assisted Instruction) terminals as an example of curriculum materials development and testing.

17. be improved by adding more CAI terminals and encouraging faculty to develop more programs.

18. increase use of auto-tutorial (self-instruction) programs.

19. provide equipment orientation and operating instruction.

20. develop an equipment utilization self-instructional laboratory.

21. maintain existing co-operative textbook depository relationships with College of Education.

22. provide a basic reference program (self-instructional) for locating available curriculum related materials.
23. develop a facility for local production whereby teachers and students in teacher education may create their own instructional materials.

24. develop or attract special loan exhibits with special curricular emphasis.

25. develop a current display of most recent textbooks, showing trends toward demands of culture, community, federal agencies.

26. provide "quick and dirty" duplicating equipment for reproducing those materials needed, but not available for check-out.

The Curriculum Materials Center Should:

ORGANIZATION

27. develop a more efficient retrieval system.

28. develop a comprehensive bibliography of all materials (text, tapes, transparencies, etc.).

29. maintain current records of materials available in the center.

30. develop a system to allow for checking out (at least overnight) of materials.

31. provide access to all curriculum materials commonly found in schools.

32. be taken out of the administration of the Library and placed directly under the College of Education's management.

33. reduce the current number of places in the University Library where one must go for services (re. reference, AV, etc.) relating to curriculum materials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. increase the collection of non-print materials such as films, filmstrips, models, etc.

35. reduce the need for departmental or individual holdings of curriculum materials.

36. provide generally state and school district curriculum guides.

37. seek increased funding to provide for purchase of items (so not to be totally dependent on donated materials).

38. provide samples of all materials on state textbook adoption list.

39. provide scope and sequence charts for each subject area, if available.

40. "weed out" old materials regularly and note whether materials are currently used in Utah.

41. develop a test file, consisting of commonly used standardized tests in elementary, secondary and higher education.

42. provide up-to-date print and non-print materials in all areas of the curriculum.

43. provide examples of all print and non-print materials used in all curriculum areas in Utah.

44. provide examples of all print and non-print materials used in all curriculum areas out of state.

45. provide a wider variety of materials from other publishers than text.

46. maintain the current availability of selected and current college and university catalogs.
47. maintain the current microfiche collection of all current college and university catalogs.

48. provide samples and lists of sources of free and inexpensive teaching materials.

49. increase the amount of college curriculum materials.

50. increase junior/community college materials.

51. maintain model teaching packets that can be replicated and adopted to other subject areas.

52. maintain a sample collection of all textbooks used on campus.

53. develop and maintain a graduate reading room area.

54. provide space and facilities for small group conferences (seminar style).

55. provide a more comfortable atmosphere in which to browse.

56. reduce "garbage and clutter" in the area.

57. provide "better" facilities for planned interaction of students/faculty/Curriculum Materials Center staff with content, resources and processes.

58. provide better training of student staffing and secretarial help.

59. provide increased access to curriculum materials at scheduled convenient hours, more consistent with general library schedule.
LOW           HIGH
1 2 3 4 5 6

60. develop a greater emphasis on providing professional staff and the personal services available when needed.

SPECIAL INTERESTS

1 2 3 4 5 6

61. provide curriculum materials in communication disorders (speech pathology, audiology, etc.).

1 2 3 4 5 6

62. increase holdings in "slow learner" materials.

1 2 3 4 5 6

63. increase holdings in business education (especially typing, shorthand, and accounting).

1 2 3 4 5 6

64. develop materials for the hearing impaired.

1 2 3 4 5 6

65. increase early childhood materials K-3 in all areas of the curriculum.

SKILLS

1 2 3 4 5 6

66. provide greater assistance in showing how materials related to specific curriculums and how they best can be integrated and used.

1 2 3 4 5 6

67. develop an evaluation and assessment system to help students and faculty decide on appropriate curriculum materials to meet specific needs.

1 2 3 4 5 6

68. provide a wide range of preview services, including preview of textbooks, slide tapes, learning kits, films, video tapes, computer programs, etc.

1 2 3 4 5 6

69. increase general awareness of bibliographic control (standard catalogs, reviewing services, bibliographies) and techniques for surveying availability of curriculum materials.
The Curriculum Materials Center Should:

COMMUNICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>70. develop brochures which summarizes what services and materials are currently available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>71. provide open lines of communication--i.e., through monthly memo of up-dated materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>72. develop a professional internship training program to aid those desiring to work in the area of curriculum development and curriculum materials center management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>73. develop in-service programs to introduce faculty and/or education classes to various types of media in the Curriculum Materials Center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 29, 1977

Dear Faculty Member:

On the enclosed Delphi Questionnaire you will notice that for each item your previous priority is circled. The calculated group mean for each item is indicated in red ink, enclosed in a triangle.

In view of this additional information, please briefly study each question again. If your previous value does not differ by more than one point in either direction from the group mean or if you wish to now agree with the group mean you need do nothing. If you decide, however, that the group mean reflected in the triangle does not represent your opinion please state briefly your reason. If a fourth round of the Delphi is necessary, your responses at this point will be summarized and provided for the group to consider.

Please attach additional sheets to respond, or use the bottom of the last page if needed.

Your early response in the self-addressed envelope will be appreciated.

Thank you for your continued cooperation and assistance with this study.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Woolley
Education and Curriculum Librarian

RDW:lc
Appendix D
## Arrangement of Items According to Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Shortened statement</th>
<th>Mean priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>feel free to use the facility when needed (#8)</td>
<td>5.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>feel free to ask for additional help with materials (#9)</td>
<td>5.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>be able to identify and access a wide variety of materials (#5)</td>
<td>5.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>increase size of the collection in accordance with needs and demands (#14)</td>
<td>5.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>seek increased funding to provide for purchase of items (#37)</td>
<td>5.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>develop a system to allow for checkout of materials (#30)</td>
<td>5.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>provide samples and lists of sources of free and inexpensive materials (#48)</td>
<td>5.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>develop brochures (#70)</td>
<td>5.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>provide samples of all materials on adoption list (#38)</td>
<td>5.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>provide state and school district curriculum guides (#36)</td>
<td>5.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>provide access to all curriculum materials found in schools (#31)</td>
<td>5.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>provide increased access to materials at convenient hours (#59)</td>
<td>5.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>provide a wide range of preview services (#68)</td>
<td>5.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>feel comfortable in using all materials (#10)</td>
<td>5.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>feel comfortable that the materials they select are the best (#11)</td>
<td>5.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Shortened statement</td>
<td>Mean priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>maintain current records of materials available (#29)</td>
<td>5.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>weed out old materials regularly (#40)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>know the sources of books and other materials (#3)</td>
<td>4.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>provide a basic reference program for locating materials (#22)</td>
<td>4.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>develop in-service programs (#73)</td>
<td>4.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>provide a greater emphasis on professional staff (#60)</td>
<td>4.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>maintain existing cooperative textbook depository relationship with the college (#21)</td>
<td>4.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>provide open lines of communication (#71)</td>
<td>4.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>be able to evaluate and select materials (#7)</td>
<td>4.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>provide quick and dirty duplicating equipment (#26)</td>
<td>4.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>provide better training of student staffing (#58)</td>
<td>4.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>provide up to date print and non-print materials (#42)</td>
<td>4.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>develop an evaluation and assessment system (#67)</td>
<td>4.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>provide scope and sequence charts (#39)</td>
<td>4.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>be able to develop teaching units (#4)</td>
<td>4.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>provide a wider variety of materials (#45)</td>
<td>4.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Shortened statement</td>
<td>Mean priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>increase general awareness of bibliographic control (#69)</td>
<td>4.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>develop a more efficient retrieval system (#27)</td>
<td>4.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>maintain existing programs and services (#13)</td>
<td>4.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>develop a current display of most recent textbooks (#25)</td>
<td>4.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>increase the collection of non-print materials (#34)</td>
<td>4.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>feels that the CMC is essential (#12)</td>
<td>4.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>develop a comprehensive bibliography of materials (#28)</td>
<td>4.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>maintain model teaching packets (#51)</td>
<td>4.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>provide examples of all print and non-print materials used in all curriculum areas in Utah (#43)</td>
<td>4.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>develop a test file (#41)</td>
<td>4.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>reduce the need for departmental holdings (#35)</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>provide greater assistance in showing how materials relate to specific curriculum (#66)</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>provide space and facilities for small group conferences (#54)</td>
<td>4.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>develop a professional internship training program (#72)</td>
<td>4.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>increase the amount of college curriculum materials (#49)</td>
<td>4.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>increase holdings in slow learner materials (#62)</td>
<td>4.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>increase early childhood materials K-3 in all areas of the curriculum (#65)</td>
<td>4.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Shortened statement</td>
<td>Mean priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>know how to become familiar with publishers (#2)</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>provide a more comfortable atmosphere in which to browse (#55)</td>
<td>4.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>provide better facilities for planned interaction of the students (#57)</td>
<td>4.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>provide equipment orientation and operating instruction (#19)</td>
<td>4.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>develop and maintain graduate reading room (#53)</td>
<td>4.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>develop a facility for local production (#23)</td>
<td>4.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>increase holdings in business education (#63)</td>
<td>4.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>reduce &quot;garbage and clutter in the area&quot; (#56)</td>
<td>4.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>develop or attract special loan exhibits with special curricular emphasis (#24)</td>
<td>4.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>provide curriculum materials in communicative disorders (#61)</td>
<td>4.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>provide service to teachers and students in surrounding areas (#15)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>maintain CAI terminals (#16)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>increase junior/community college materials (#50)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>increase use of auto tutorial programs (#18)</td>
<td>3.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>develop an equipment utilization self-instructional lab (#20)</td>
<td>3.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Shortened statement</td>
<td>Mean priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>maintain the current availability of college catalogs (#46)</td>
<td>3.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>be able to apply the instructional development process (#1)</td>
<td>3.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>reduce the current number of places in the library where one must go (#33)</td>
<td>3.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>maintain the current microfiche collection of college catalogs (#47)</td>
<td>3.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>develop materials for the hearing impaired (#64)</td>
<td>3.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>know more about the process of curriculum development (#6)</td>
<td>3.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>be improved by adding more CAI terminals (#17)</td>
<td>3.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>provide examples of all print and non-print materials used in curriculum areas out of state (#44)</td>
<td>3.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>maintain a sample collection of all textbooks used on campus (#52)</td>
<td>3.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>be taken out of the administration of the library</td>
<td>2.740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>