research in brief

Evaluating Food Concepts of Youth

A recent study was conducted to put into a slide-tape format a pictorial questionnaire developed by Ombwara (*Journal of Extension*, Summer, 1974) for use in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program for youth. It was the intent in this study to convert the instrument into a slide-tape presentation because of reading problems encountered with the pictorial questionnaire.

A script was written, which incorporated the 25 nutrition questions in a problem-solving situation. The 25 slides showing the 4 alternative answers for the nutrition questions were taken using real food. Pictures of people were also taken to relate the slide set to the content of the script. A total of 67 slides were contained in the slide presentation. A tape recording was made from the script and youth voices were used. Time was allowed on the tape after each question for the youth to answer on a simple form answer sheet.

The slide-tape presentation was administered in the fall of 1974 to one EFNEP youth group in each of the 12 Iowa counties participating in the program. A total of 108 youth, ages 8 to 11 years, provided data for analysis. The reliability of the instrument was found to be .64 using the Kuder-Richardson formula 20. Nineteen of the 25 items in the questionnaire were identified as good items and 6 items need some revision.

The following concepts were held by more than 60% of the EFNEP youth: (1) banana and milk as a good snack; (2) meat and meat substitutes as good sources of protein; (3) bone, part of the body requiring calcium; (4) four servings of bread, four of fruits/vegetables, three of milk, and two of meat the number of servings of the four food groups needed by youth; (5) roast beef, potato, green beans, bread, butter, and milk, a good supper; and (6) jumping rope, requiring the most energy of four choices.

A recommendation in the study was that the slide-tape presentation be used as a pre-test and post-test to evaluate food and nutrition concepts of EFNEP youth, and to identify areas in which more instruction is necessary.

"Food and Nutrition Concepts of Iowa Youth in the Expanded Nutrition Program." June Watson. Master's thesis, Iowa State University, Ames, 1975.

Irene Beavers

Evaluating Adult Learning

Learning is a troublesome phenomenon. Like intelligence and love, its definition is more general than specific. Yet, the Extension agent and adult educator are both frequently faced with the requirement to evaluate learning.

Learning Outcomes

Robert M. Gagne's work may be helpful to Extension personnel who are contemplating new strategies for evaluating learning. He suggests that there are categories of *learning outcomes*. Identification of these learning outcomes, or "capabilities" as he calls them, would appear to be helpful in the development of an evaluation strategy.

He has identified five kinds of learning outcomes. Extension personnel are frequently engaged in instructional activities that contribute to the achievement of capabilities in most of the five. The five categories are: (1) verbal information, or knowledge; (2) intellectual skills; (3) cognitive strategies; (4) attitudes; and (5) motor skills.

Early Identification

Identifying Extension activities early, so they may be placed in the appropriate category, is a necessary step that has important implications for both instruction and evaluation. It's not difficult to determine that different instruction and evaluation processes may be appropriate for different outcomes.

Gagne suggests that the above step is necessary before one can answer such questions as "why should a projected picture, a taped message, a television program, or a computer program, be of value in providing instruction to students? Are there reasons to suppose that they do, sometimes, have advantages for learning that are greater than those provided by the lecture, the book, and the chalkboard?"

"Educational Technology and the Learning Process." Robert M. Gagne. *Educational Researcher*, III (January, 1974), 3-8.

Huey Long

Evaluation of Faculty

No one process can enhance the professional life of the individual if at the same time it threatens to dismiss him!

The author contends that the major purpose of the evaluation process is to enhance professional growth through self-evaluation, and this won't happen if at the same time it's perceived as an institutional process for policing faculty ranks or passing "normative" judgments.

Intent of Evaluation

There will be come type of faculty evaluation scheme in all community colleges—first, because there always has been; second, because in many states it's the law. Confusion remains

in most colleges as to the intent of the evaluation process. In reading the formal guidelines, one senses an attempt to straddle a position between policing faculty ranks and helping with the professional well-being of individual instructors.

Unless the individual faculty member perceives the evaluation process as useful and relevant to him, he'll ignore it. Moreover, the evaluation scheme must reflect a climate of support, communication, and growth inducement.

The institution that has leaders who understand the difference between judgment and help will develop a two-stage process—the judgment portion taking over only after all attempts to help the individual have failed.

Student Learning Data

Institutional procedures as implemented by faculty supervisors can assist in bringing meaning to the process. One way of doing this is through building the collection of evidence about student learning into the formal evaluation procedures. Each instructor can be encouraged to collect genuine data on his own students' learning—information on short-term learning through pre- and post-unit tests, on long-term learning by means of his own easily prepared follow-up studies. He can then estimate the results obtained through his instructional efforts and so assess himself.

Nothing in the profession compares with the knowledge, based on hard data, that one has had an impact on his students' attitudes and skills. As W. F. Shawl has noted, "The awareness of what his students have learned frees the instructor from all other evaluation processes."

The major premises on which evaluation is supposedly based, and reasons why instructors resist evaluation, identify or elaborate on comparable elements in evaluation of Extension programs.

"Evaluation of Faculty." Arthur M. Cohen. *Community College Review* (Summer, 1974), pp. 12-21.

Donald Blackburn

Analysis of TEMIS Data

The primary purpose of the study was to determine how Tennessee County Extension personnel *spent* their time in FY 1970 and 1971 according to the state summary. It was designed to find out how Extension personnel had *planned* their time in FY 1971 according to the state summary.

Objectives

Specific objectives of the study were to: (1) determine the number and percentage of *man-days planned* for work related to "elements" at the state level in FY 1971, (2) determine the number and percentage of *man-days* and *contacts* spent and the *number of contacts per man-day made* on work related to "elements" at the state level in FY 1970 and FY

1971, and (3) compare the number and percentage of *man-days planned* for FY 1971 and *time* and *contacts spent* on work related to "elements" at the state level in FY 1970 and 1971.

Information on *planned* and *expended* time was retrieved through TEMIS, which was started in Tennessee July 1, 1969.

Planned and *expended* planned time totals of all personnel were analyzed using the national Extension Management Information System-State Extension Management Information System (EMIS-SEMIS) "elements" for FY 1971.

Findings

Wide variations were found between time planned to be spent and actual time expended according to "elements."

Extension personnel in Tennessee underplanned on every "element" with the exceptions of "Forestry Production and Marketing," in which some overplanning occurred. Large increases in *time spent* and *contacts made* were noted for "elements" from FY 1970 and 1971.

It was recommended that study findings be used by administrators and supervisors to enhance future program planning and evaluation. Recommendations for further study were included.

"An Analysis of Selected Tennessee Extension Management Information System (TEMIS) Data." Charles T. McBroom, Jr. Smithfield: University of Tennessee, Agricultural Extension Service, no date given. (Mimeograph)

Curtis Trent

Youth Reject Censorship

Purdue Opinion Poll No. 100 deals primarily with First Amendment rights. The focus of the report is on censorship, as you might construe from its title of *Freedom To Read Issue* The high school youth rejected censorship in eight of the nine statements used in the poll to differentiate between attitudes toward censorship.

Pros and Cons

Here are the statements and percentages of high school students responding pro and con.

	Pro	*Con*
1. Citizens in one community recently burned "objectionable" books.	20%	78%
2. If books in their original edition contain "objectionable" materials, these materials should be removed from the editions used in classes for students of your age.	21	75
3. A local citizen's committee should be set up to review all books for "objectionable" material before		

they are available in class or library to students of your age.	24	71
4. Parents should have the right to review all books for "objectionable" materials before students of your age have access to them.	18	78
5. Censorship is self-defeating—it calls attention to books or materials that might have been simply ignored without anyone noticing them much.	64	34
6. Censorship violates basic American principles of freedom of expression and freedom to read.	78	18
7. The rights of an individual to use the library should not be denied or abridged because of his age, race, religion, national origin, or social or political views.	76	22
8. Every individual should have access to books that cover all shades and sides of political and social views.	85	11

The editor of the report, A. C. Erlich, notes that teachers are no more enlightened on constitutionally guaranteed freedoms than are other members of our society. Stanley M. Elam, editorializing in *Phi Delta Kappan*, commented on the disturbing proportions of those who agree with censorship. Also, on this same report, he said, "Poll No. 100 confirms what wise observers have long told us about an open society: its most serious threats often come from within, not from without."

Editor's Note

Are "community standards," as specified by the Supreme Court, the appropriate means of developing standards for written and visual materials? Are the recent "book burning episodes" a form of censorship? How do standards for reading material and the constitutional guarantees under the First Amendment relate to one another? Finally, who should decide?

Report of Poll No. 100 of the Purdue Opinion Panel, *Freedom To Read Issues*, 1974. [Available from: Purdue Opinion Panel, Measurement and Research Center, Engineering Administration Building, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907. Price: $2.50].

Donald Stormer