

①

AD-A160 269

BASIC SKILLS RESOURCE CENTER:

Final Report of the Military
Educators Resource NETWORK

for

Contracting Officer's Representative
Richard P. Kern

Instructional Technology Systems Technical Area
Zita M. Simutis, Chief

TRAINING RESEARCH LABORATORY
Harold F. O'Neil, Jr., Director

DTIC
ELECTE
OCT 17 1985
B

DTIC FILE COPY



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

May 1985

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

85 10 13 166

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

**A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel**

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

L. NEALE COSBY
Colonel, IN
Commander

This report, as submitted by the contractor, has been cleared for release to Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) to comply with regulatory requirements. It has been given no primary distribution other than to DTIC and will be available only through DTIC or other reference services such as the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
ARI Research Note 85-55	AD-A160269	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) BASIC SKILLS RESOURCE CENTER: Final Report of the Military Educators Resource Network		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report, Part One Feb. 1982 - Dec. 1984
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Russo, R.P. and Foster, J.A.		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) MDA 903-82-C-0169
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc. 1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 508 Rosslyn Virginia 22309		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263743A794 311-2102
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute in the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600		12. REPORT DATE May 1985
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 103
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) - -		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Richard P. Kern, contracting officer's representative. This report represents the final report of one of the two major components of the Basic Skills Resource Center contract (Tasks 6,8, and 10).		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Adult Education Army Education Information System Computer-based Information System Technical Information Center		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The Military Educators Resource NETWORK is part of the Basic Skills Resource Center. The NETWORK provides military educators, researchers, and administrators with information on basic skills and continuing education. This report identi- fies and describes the evaluation activities related to the information services provided by the NETWORK during its initial pilot test phase. In addition to the results of the evaluation activities, a set of recommendations is identified regarding the future operation of the NETWORK.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

FOREWORD

The Instructional Technology Systems Technical Area of the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, in coordination with the Adjutant General's Office, sought to improve the Army's Basic Skills Education Programs through the dissemination of information about educational resources to military educators. This goal was met through the establishment of the Military Educators Resource NETWORK. The NETWORK was pilot tested during an initial seventeen month operational period, from March 1983 through July 1984. Throughout the pilot test phase, evaluative data were solicited about the NETWORK. This report describes the results of these activities and provides a set of recommendations to guide decisions concerning the future operation of the NETWORK.



iii

Approved for Release		✓
By		
Date		
Distribution		
Accession		
Indexing		
Dist		
A-1		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1-1
Purpose and Objectives of the NETWORK's Evaluation Activities	1-2
Background	1-4
- Needs Assessment	1-4
- Operational Design Plan	1-6
- Implementation	1-7
The Inquiry Response Service	1-8
The Referral Service	1-8
The Publication Development and Dissemination Service	1-8
The Current Awareness Service	1-8
II. EVALUATION RESULTS	11-1
A. Inquiry Response and Referral Service	11-3
- Operational Information	11-3
The NETWORK's Clients	11-4
Frequency of Use	11-9
Method of Contact	11-9
Information Responses to User Requests	11-12
Response Turnaround Time	11-14

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

- User Reactions	11-16
User Satisfaction with Response Turnaround Time	11-22
User Satisfaction with Information Response	11-24
Anticipated Use of the Inquiry Response and Referral Services	11-27
B. Publication Development and Dissemination Service	11-29
- Helpfulness	11-30
- Quality	11-33
- Usefulness	11-33
C. Current Awareness Service	11-35
D. Computerized Database Development	11-37
- Database Description	11-38
- Development and Operation Costs	11-39
- User Information Interest	11-45
III. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	III-1
A. Inquiry Response and Referral Services	III-1
B. Publication Development and Dissemination Service	III-6
C. Current Awareness Service	III-7
D. Computerized Database Development	III-8

REFERENCES

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDICES

- A Information Request Log
- B Information Request Form
- C NETWORK Computer Search Form
- D Telephone Interview Questions
- E NETWORK User Questionnaire
- F NETWORK Reaction Sheet
- G NETWORK Profiles Service Opinion Form
- H Subject Area Checklist

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

<u>FIGURE</u>		<u>Page</u>
A	Overview of the NETWORK's Evaluation Activities and Key Questions Addressed	11-2
 <u>TABLE</u>		
1	Information Requests Recorded by Client and by Month	11-6
2	Information Requests Recorded by Clients' Military Service and by Month	11-8
3	Number of Information Requests by Clients' Title/Position	11-10
4	Clients' Method of Contact	11-11
5	Response Formats	11-13
6	Request Response Time	11-15
7	NETWORK Computer Search Evaluation Results	11-18
8	Telephone Interviews -- Response Results	11-20
9	Respondents to the NETWORK User Questionnaire	11-21
10	Summary of Responses to the NETWORK User Questionnaire by Military Service and by Items Related to the Direct Use of the NETWORK Services	11-23
11	Summary of Responses to the NETWORK User Questionnaire by Military Service and by Items Related to Information Requests	11-25
12	Summary of Responses to the NETWORK User Questionnaire by Military Service and by Items Related to the Future Use of Services	11-28
13	Respondents to the NETWORK Reaction Sheet	11-31
14	Mean Rating of the Helpfulness, Quality, and Usefulness of the NETWORK's Publications by Respondents' Title/Position	11-32

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES (continued)

PageTABLE (continued)

15	Summary of Responses to the NETWORK Reaction Sheet by Respondents' Title/Position and by Items Related to the Use of the NETWORK's Publications	11-34
16	Responses to the NETWORK Profiles Service Opinion Form	11-36
17	NETWORK Database Citations by Publication/Document Type	11-39
18	NETWORK Database Citations by Selected Key Descriptors	11-40
19	Monthly Computer Personnel Costs Associated with the NETWORK's Database	11-42
20	Monthly Computer Usage Costs Associated with the NETWORK's Database	11-44
21	Respondents to the Subject Area Checklist	11-47
22	Number and Percentage of Responses to the Subject Area Checklist by Military Service Affiliation	11-48

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Basic Skills Resource Center: Final Report of the Military

Educators Resource NETWORK

The Basic Skills Resource Center (BSRC) was developed and operated by InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc. under contract with the U.S. Army Research Institute. The BSRC project has two interfacing components: the implementation and monitoring of applied research in the area of adult basic skills and continuing education, and the design, implementation, and operation of an information service. Following the completion of a needs assessment, a design plan was identified for the operation of an information service entitled "The Military Educators Resource NETWORK." The design plan was implemented and pilot tested for an initial seventeen month period. Throughout this pilot test period evaluative data were collected relative to the operation of the NETWORK. This report serves as the final report of the BSRC information component and outlines the evaluation results on the initial operation of the NETWORK.

The primary purpose of this report is to provide a synthesis of the evaluative data maintained by the NETWORK and to identify a set of recommendations for the future operation of the NETWORK. Throughout the seventeen month operational period, project staff identified a variety of internal and external evaluative data on the NETWORK's operational procedures, perceived quality and use of services provided by the NETWORK, as well as the perceived quality of informational publications developed by the NETWORK staff. In total, nine evaluation activities were conducted

throughout the pilot test phase related to the NETWORK's Inquiry Response and Referral, Publication Development and Dissemination, and Current Awareness Services as well as the development of the Computerized Database. Each evaluation activity is described in terms of purpose, focus and distribution procedures. Results of the evaluation activities are summarized relative to the NETWORK's clients, user information needs, clients' perception of the NETWORK's services and use of the information provided by the NETWORK in response to their inquiries.

The primary users or clients of the NETWORK's services were educational practitioners directly associated with the education programs offered by the military services. This group of ESOs, ESSs, and Counselors had been identified as the target client group through the completion of the needs assessment activity. Administrators associated with these educational programs (e.g., command and headquarters staff) were found to be the second most frequent group of clients contacting the NETWORK. Overall, personnel affiliated with the Department of the Army accounted for the majority of inquiries recorded by the NETWORK staff.

These user groups preferred to contact the NETWORK with their information requests via mail and telephone. Although the majority of inquiries were submitted by mail rather than by telephone, no set pattern of preference was noted. Clients located at overseas installations did prefer to contact the NETWORK by mail.

Responses to user inquiries were prepared generally within a five working day time period as anticipated by the NETWORK staff. However, one-third of the client inquiries exceeded the anticipated response time period. Users evaluated the NETWORK's response turnaround time as more than satisfactory.

The materials provided by the NETWORK in response to information requests related to a variety of topics and required various formats. Users were more than satisfied with the materials provided to them in response to their requests. These responses were judged to be relevant to and useful in meeting the users' information needs. In addition, users tended to share the response materials with their colleagues. Finally, the materials provided to the NETWORK's clients were utilized in applications associated with administrative planning/review activities and counseling/testing tasks. It was surprising to note that response materials were not used in relation to teaching or training activities; however, some clients were resourceful in using the NETWORK's materials for in-service training and professional development activities.

Generally, all clients who utilized the NETWORK's Inquiry Response and Referral Services stated that they would continue to use these services and would recommend them to others. However, the NETWORK's user groups were basically not sure how often they would require direct assistance from the NETWORK.

Military educational personnel were very positive about the quality and usefulness of the NETWORK's publications. All publications were rated very high in terms of comprehensiveness, ease of understanding, accuracy of information, and format. The NETWORK's publications were considered to be an above average mechanism through which military educators were able to identify resources, stay updated on topics, and follow current research efforts.

Initial pilot testing of the NETWORK Profiles Service indicated that this specialized information service had moderate potential. One-half of the pilot test participants stated that they were satisfied with the information materials provided to them and found these materials to be useful to their professional activities. Finally, a majority of the participants noted that the Profiles Service should be continued and would be useful to their colleagues.

Generation of a computerized database was undertaken to support the information services offered by the NETWORK. Overall, computer usage and staff charges associated with the development of the NETWORK's database remained within projected expenditures.

A variety of subject areas were indicated to be of interest to military educational personnel. Information categories of special interest were: basic skills curricula, computer-assisted capabilities and evaluations; career planning and guidance; computer-based guidance systems; general management skills, needs assessment techniques; and program and curriculum evaluations.

Finally, a set of fifteen recommendations are offered to guide the future operation of the NETWORK. These recommendations capitalize on the NETWORK's proven success and suggest minor modifications to the information services offered through the NETWORK in order to better meet the professional development and information needs of military educators.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Basic Skills Resource Center (BSRC), developed and operated by InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc., was initiated in April 1982 under Contract Number MDA 903-82-C-0169 with the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI). The BSRC consists of two interfacing components: a research component that includes the design, implementation, and coordination of a learning strategies research agenda; and an information component that involves the design and operation of an information service entitled the "Military Educators Resource NETWORK." This report provides a final summary of the activities related to the BSRC information component. In addition, the information contained in this final report provides a synthesis of the results of the evaluative data solicited throughout the initial operational phase of the NETWORK.

This report is the last in a series of five reports which describe project activities as well as results and recommendations related to the BSRC information component. The first report (see Russo, Rivera, DeCarme, & French, in press-a) described the purpose and results of a needs assessment undertaken to focus the developmental efforts associated with the information service. The second report (see Rivera, Russo, & DeCarme, in press-b) delineated an operational design plan for the information services to be offered by the Military Educators Resource NETWORK. An interim report (see Russo, in press-c) was prepared as the third report and provided a description of the status of the NETWORK activities five months after the design plan was implemented. The fourth report (see Russo, Foster, & Modjeski, in press-d) detailed the NETWORK's operational

order to facilitate the continued operation of the NETWORK's services. This report, the fifth in the series, serves as the final report of the activities associated with the BSRC information component.

Purpose and Objectives of the NETWORK's Evaluation Activities

The Military Educators Resource NETWORK has been in full operation for seventeen months, from March 1983 through July 1984. This operational period has provided the NETWORK staff with the opportunity to pilot test the design plan specified and recommended by project staff associated with the BSRC. The design plan, implemented by the NETWORK staff, was a result of a needs assessment conducted by InterAmerica staff and the refinement of a procedural plan reviewed by InterAmerica and ARI staff as well as by personnel within the Department of the Army's Adjutant General's Office (TAGO).

Throughout the seventeen month operational period, a variety of internal and external evaluative data have been gathered for the purpose(s) of describing the NETWORK's operational procedures, perceived quality and use of services provided by the NETWORK, and perceived quality of informational publications developed by the NETWORK staff. These purposes are achieved through the accomplishment of the following objectives:

- o Describe the NETWORK's user population in terms of the educators title/position and military service affiliation.
- o Describe the method used to submit information requests, as well as response formats and the preparation time (turnaround time) for responses to inquiries logged by the NETWORK.
- o Describe the degree of satisfaction to information responses provided by the NETWORK.

- o Describe the perceived quality of information products/publications developed and disseminated by the NETWORK.
- o Describe the perceived usefulness of the NETWORK's specialized information services.
- o Describe and synthesize associated costs related to the development and operation of the NETWORK's computerized database.
- o Describe the perceived information needs, and anticipated usage rates relative to the NETWORK's target population.

Evaluative data were acquired through activities such as the maintenance of a user activity log and the distribution of questionnaires and checklists related to the NETWORK's services. This report provides a synthesis of the evaluative data maintained by the NETWORK and identifies a set of recommendations for the future operation of the NETWORK's information services.

The remaining portions of this chapter provide an overview of the results of needs assessment activities and a description of the operational design plan established for the Military Educators Resource NETWORK. Included with this background information is a description of the overriding purpose established for the NETWORK and identification of the purpose and objectives of each service offered by the NETWORK.

Chapter Two summarizes the results of data collection efforts pertaining to each of the objectives outlined above. In addition, brief descriptions of the evaluation activities and/or questionnaires, as well as data collection procedures, are provided. Finally, Chapter Three provides a set of recommendations that should be considered in the future operation of the NETWORK.

Background

Prior to the actual provision of a set of information services for military educators, BSRC project staff were required to identify the scope and function of the BSRC information component. In addition, an operational plan for the information component needed to be specified. These tasks were accomplished through the completion of a needs assessment and development of a design plan. Each of these activities is discussed below.

Needs Assessment. The first activity undertaken by InterAmerica project staff related to the BSRC information component was a needs assessment study that was designed to provide a pool of information that would assist project staff in the development of an information service for military educators. Specifically, the following objectives were addressed:

- o to determine who would be the major users of the information service,
- o to assess the information needs of potential user groups,
- o to identify the scope of the database to be developed,
- o to identify the services that should be made available, and
- o to determine how information should be made available to users.

Information required to address each of these objectives was collected between April and June 1982. Data collection activities included: distribution of a questionnaire targeted for Education Services Officers (ESOs) and Education Services Specialists (ESSs); telephone and in-person interviews with Army educators/practitioners, researchers and policymakers;

site visits to two Major Commands (MACOMs), four installation education centers, and three military libraries/learning centers; and review of Army regulations and documents. These data were then synthesized by project staff so that each of the specific objectives could be addressed.

The needs assessment findings revealed that the target groups for the BSRC information service would be practitioners, researchers, and policymakers within the Department of the Army. The greatest proportion of potential users was found to be the Army's practitioner/educator group which includes ESOs, ESSs, counselors, and other education-related personnel at Army installations.

No specific trends were identified with regard to major subject areas to be addressed by the information system. Potential users identified a wide range of topics. These included: counseling information related to career planning and guidance and computer-based guidance systems; education information related to basic skills curricula, instructional materials and tests as well as computer-assisted instruction; management information related to contracting requirements, needs assessment techniques, program and curriculum evaluation techniques and research methods; and general military information regarding demographic data, and research and programmatic efforts in operation at other military installations.

Useful formats for this information cited by the potential user groups included abstracts of individual documents, bibliographies, curriculum and learning materials, literature searches, newsletters, referral services, research summaries, and statistical data. Potential users provided little guidance in estimating the frequency of use of an information service.

Generally, it was reported that the information center would be used approximately once a month.

The preferred method of accessing the information center was found to be by computer, with telephone access considered an acceptable alternative. All potential users indicated a need for prompt turnaround time for the receipt of information once a request was submitted. The most frequently acceptable turnaround time period was stated to be three to four days. Based on these findings, several recommendations were noted regarding design considerations for the BSRC information center. First, the center should include a computerized information database and inquiry response system that could actively reach out to users and supply them with information based on specific as well as anticipated requests. Second, the services to be offered by the information center should be targeted to educators/practitioners associated with Army education programs. Third, the focus of services and subject areas to be addressed by the information center should be limited to those areas identified by the primary target group. Fourth, the services offered by the information center should include a proactive component to encourage and stimulate user requests. Finally, telephone access should be the primary mode of accessing the information center, and an established schedule of expected response turnaround times should be identified.

Operational Design Plan. Following the completion of the needs assessment activities, project staff began the development of an operational design plan for the BSRC information center to be referred to as the Military Educators Resource NETWORK. Through a review of the needs assessment data and resulting design considerations as well as subsequent discussions with ARI and The Adjutant General's Office (TAGO) staff, an overriding mission

or purpose was detailed for the NETWORK. The stated purpose for the NETWORK is: to assist the Army in disseminating up-to-date information relevant to basic skills and continuing education issues to educational practitioners, researchers, and policymakers within the Department of the Army. The design plan (see Rivera, Russo, & DeCarme, in press-b) provided an operational framework that outlined the purposes and objectives of the NETWORK, the primary and secondary user groups, the services to be provided, and the content and focus of the services. Three basic functions were identified to carry out the mission established for the NETWORK. These included: (a) the development of a computerized database; (b) the dissemination of information through the provision of the Inquiry Response and Referral Services, a Publication Development and Dissemination Service, and a Current Awareness Service; and (c) the evaluation of these services relative to target group usage and reactions during the initial implementation period.

Implementation. The NETWORK design plan recommended by InterAmerica staff was implemented in March 1983 which marked the beginning of the formal pilot test of the NETWORK's services. At this time project staff also formalized the development of the NETWORK's computerized database. The computerized database provides the NETWORK staff with the capability and information to respond to user requests via the inquiry response service and to provide points-of-contact or referrals to relevant individuals and organizations. A complete description of the NETWORK's database is provided in an earlier report entitled "Documentation and Phaseover Report for the Military Educators Resource NETWORK" (see Russo, Foster, and Modjeski, in press-c). As noted, the database provides support to the information services offered by the NETWORK. Each of these services is discussed below in terms of its overall purpose and goals.

The Inquiry Response Service is designed to operate as a reference service assisting users in the identification and location of information. Using the NETWORK's database and library collection as well as related information sources, abstracts and citations, resources are identified and provided to users in response to their inquiries.

The Referral Service is intended to provide the user with the name of an individual or organization that would most likely be able to respond to the user's request or provide additional detailed information. Generally, referral information relates to on-going military research activities and educational programs.

The Publication Development and Dissemination Service is planned to provide a mechanism that allows for the proactive dissemination of information in the area of adult and continuing education and serves to stimulate user requests through the promotion of NETWORK services. These objectives are achieved primarily through the development and distribution of a quarterly newsletter entitled the NETWORK Circuit and a fact sheet that is intermittently disseminated entitled the NETWORK Fact Sheet.

The Current Awareness Service is designed to provide a link between the NETWORK's Inquiry Response and Referral Services and the Publication Development and Dissemination Service. This service disseminates information to users at periodic intervals based on projected or pre-identified user interests. There are two current awareness activities that distribute, on a regular basis, information about new resources or advances in the adult basic skills and continuing education field. These

activities are (a) periodic distribution of the NETWORK Vanguard which contains photocopies of the tables-of-contents of key journals in the education field and (b) the NETWORK Profile Service which provides information resources to a designated set of Army educators according to their pre-stated information interests.

Each of these services and associated activities are discussed in greater detail in the NETWORK Design Plan (see Rivera, Russo, & DeCarme, in press-b). In addition to the development of a computerized database and the offering of an integrated set of information services, the NETWORK's design plan specified an evaluation function intended to monitor the effectiveness of the NETWORK's activities during its initial operational or pilot test period. The specific evaluation activities designed and implemented by project staff are discussed in detail in the next section of this report.

II. EVALUATION RESULTS

An important function of the NETWORK is the collection and maintenance of evaluative information related to the NETWORK's activities. The basic intent of the NETWORK's evaluation is to determine the overall effectiveness of the NETWORK's information services and procedures in meeting its specified purpose and objectives. This was achieved through a series of evaluation activities that were planned by project staff to assess the NETWORK during its initial operational or pilot test phase. The evaluation activities were designed to study the NETWORK's services from both an internal and external perspective and to address a series of operational questions. The evaluation activities and key questions are highlighted in Figure A.

This section of the final report summarizes the responses to and results of the various evaluation activities completed by the NETWORK staff. Summaries are presented for each of the following services and/or components: (a) Inquiry Response and Referral Service; (b) Publication Development and Dissemination Service; (c) Current Awareness Service; and (d) Computerized Database Development. The evaluative information discussed in each of the summaries identifies the key questions that the evaluation activities addressed. In addition, a brief overview describing relevant instruments and maintenance and/or distribution procedures is provided. Finally, when appropriate, response rates are cited.

Together, these summaries are designed to provide a set of indicators by which the effectiveness and success of the information services offered by

FIGURE A
Overview of the NETWORK's Evaluation Activities
and Key Questions Addressed

Information Service/Component	Information Collected	Information Source	Key Questions Addressed
A. Inquiry Response and Referral Services	Operational (Internal)	Information Request Log Information Request Form	Description of the NETWORK's Clients Frequency of Use Method of Contact Response Formats to Inquiries Response Turnaround Time
	User Reaction (External)	Computer Search Evaluation Form Telephone Interviews User Questionnaire	Satisfaction with Response Turnaround Time Satisfaction with Information Response Anticipated Use of Inquiry Response and Referral Services
B. Publication Development and Dissemination Service	User Reactions (External) to: NETWORK Circuit & NETWORK Fact Sheet	NETWORK Reaction Sheet	General Helpfulness of Publications Quality of NETWORK Publications Usefulness of Publications Use of Publications
C. Current Awareness Service	User Reactions (External) to: NETWORK Vanguard	NETWORK Reactions Sheet	Helpfulness, Quality, and Usefulness of NETWORK Vanguard
	NETWORK Profile Service Service	NETWORK Profile Service Opinion Form	Satisfaction with materials provided by Profile Service Usefulness of Profiles Service
D. Computerized Database Development	Operational (Internal)	In-house records	Description of database: publication/document type and key descriptors Development and operation costs
	User Interests (External)	Subject Area Checklist	Identification of important subject areas for military educators

the NETWORK can be judged. This set of indicators also provides direction to the identification of recommendations for the future operation of the NETWORK. These recommendations are presented and discussed in the final section of this report.

A. Inquiry Response and Referral Services

These NETWORK services provide direct assistance to users through the identification and/or location of information relevant to the users' information requests. Several evaluation activities were conducted to obtain evaluative information about these services. These activities included the maintenance of operational information as well as the identification of user reactions to NETWORK procedures relevant to information provided through these services. Summaries of both the operational data and user reaction data are presented below.

Operational Information

Two internal evaluation activities (see Figure A) were implemented by project staff that were designed to gather operational data about the Inquiry Response and Referral Services. These activities were undertaken to address the following key questions:

- o Who were the users of these services?
- o How frequently did clients use these services?
- o What method did clients use to contact the NETWORK?
- o What type(s) of information was (were) provided to users in response to their request?
- o What was the response time for the information requests submitted to the NETWORK?

The operational information needed to address each of these questions was maintained by NETWORK staff throughout the pilot test period through the use of an Information Request Log and an Information Request Form. Project staff utilized the Request Log, exhibited in Appendix A, to record user requests in the order they were received via telephone, mail or in person. The Request Log provided a mechanism by which information inquiries were monitored and enabled staff to maintain basic statistical data about the Inquiry Response and Referral Services. The Information Request Form, exhibited in Appendix B, was used by the NETWORK clients and/or staff to articulate and record user inquiries. The Request Form elicits descriptive information related to the inquiry (e.g., key concepts related to the user's information needs, type of information user is interested in, required response format), basic demographic information about the client, and action taken by staff in the preparation of a response to the inquiry.

Together, the operational information maintained through the use of these internal documentation procedures allows data summaries to be prepared in response to the questions cited above. Evaluative information related to the operational questions associated with the Inquiry Response and Referral Services is presented in Tables 1 through 6 and is discussed below.

The NETWORK's Clients. A variety of military educational personnel utilized the NETWORK's services throughout the initial pilot test phase. Included is a practitioner group which includes Education Services Officers (ESOs), Education Services Specialists (ESSs), Guidance Counselors and various education-related staff, for example, users who title themselves interns, training officers, and testing officers. The practitioner

category is considered the primary user group since the NETWORK services were targeted specifically for these individuals. A second major group includes administrators which represent command and headquarters staff such as the MACOM Directors of Education and TAGO staff. Finally, a third group of users represents researchers such as ARI personnel. (Note: These user group categories are used throughout the remaining discussion presented in this report.)

Table 1 exhibits the number of information requests recorded by month of operation and by type of client. Overall, a total of 532 information requests were responded to over the NETWORK's seventeen month operational period. The practitioner group (ESOs - 23%; ESSs - 14%; guidance counselors - 16%; and education-related staff - 18%) accounted for 71% of the overall information inquiries while the administrator group and the researcher group accounted for 12% and 9% respectively. The client category entitled "others" accounted for 8% of the information requests and included military education personnel such as recruiters and installation librarians.

Reviewing the monthly request totals, the following benchmarks can be identified. The March and April 1983 requests coincided with the distribution of the NETWORK's first publication, the NETWORK Brochure and Rolodex Card. Requests for May, June, and July 1983 were to be stimulated by the distribution of the first newsletter and fact sheet. However, due to the Department of the Army's extremely lengthy review and approval cycles associated with these publications, they were not disseminated until August 1983. Thus, the monthly totals for August and September 1983 reflect the impact of the distribution of these initial publications on

TABLE 1
Information Requests Recorded by Client and by Month

CLIENT	MONTH																		TOTALS	PERCENT
	MAR '83	APR '83	MAY '83	JUN '83	JUL '83	AUG '83	SEP '83	OCT '83	NOV '83	DEC '83	JAN '84	FEB '84	MAR '84	APR '84	MAY '84	JUN '84	JUL '84			
ESO	12	7	3	2	1	6	5	3	11	10	7	13	14	12	6	2	5	119	23%	
ESS	1	-	-	-	-	5	6	3	9	8	15	2	9	5	5	6	2	76	14%	
GUIDANCE COUNSELORS	5	-	-	1	1	3	4	4	15	18	2	22	5	1	-	3	1	85	16%	
RESEARCHERS	7	5	2	1	-	1	3	3	2	3	10	2	3	2	2	3	-	49	9%	
EDUCATION-RELATED STAFF	-	6	-	-	-	15	5	5	18	9	11	6	8	5	2	5	2	97	18%	
ADMINISTRATORS	1	1	2	2	1	-	6	-	7	8	4	7	2	7	5	7	3	63	12%	
OTHERS	-	1	1	1	4	6	3	2	3	3	1	4	2	2	5	2	3	43	8%	
TOTALS	26	20	8	7	7	36	32	20	65	59	50	56	43	34	25	28	16	532	100%	
PERCENT	5%	4%	2%	1%	1%	7%	6%	4%	12%	11%	9%	10%	8%	6%	5%	6%	3%	100%	-	

user contacts. A slight decline was noted in October 1983 due to the lengthy review and approval cycles inhibiting the dissemination of the second issues of the newsletter and fact sheet. Requests for the months of November 1983, December 1983, January 1984, and February 1984 were again stimulated by the distribution of the NETWORK's publications and the inclusion of these publications with the DANTES newsletter.

The time period of March 1984 through July 1984 exhibited a continued decline in total requests due primarily to the fact that the initial operational phase for the NETWORK was advertised to conclude in February 1984. The operational timeframe was extended through July 1984 because of the delays experienced in the review and approval of the NETWORK's publications. Throughout this period, the remaining issues of the NETWORK's publications were disseminated both by the NETWORK staff and in coordination with the DANTES newsletter.

Table 2 presents monthly information request totals by the military service affiliation of the NETWORK's clients. Overall, 66% of the NETWORK's user population were affiliated with the Department of the Army. The remaining one-third included users associated with the Air Force - 14%; the Navy - 7%, the Coast Guard - 4%; and the Marines - 7%. The category referenced as "other" contains 7% of the client population and includes users affiliated with the Department of Defense and clients associated with military education and training programs. As exhibited in Table 2, the Department of the Army was the primary target population of the NETWORK's information services from March 1983 through October 1983. In November 1983 and throughout the remaining operational period, the information services were made available to all military service branches. This was

TABLE 2
Information Requests Recorded by Clients' Military Service and by Month

SERVICE	MONTH																		TOTALS	PERCENT
	MAR '83	APR '83	MAY '83	JUN '83	JUL '83	AUG '83	SEP '83	OCT '83	NOV '83	DEC '83	JAN '84	FEB '84	MAR '84	APR '84	MAY '84	JUN '84	JUL '84			
AIR FORCE	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	10	10	8	12	13	7	3	4	2	73	14%	
ARMY	24	17	7	7	6	27	29	13	33	29	32	39	23	24	13	15	13	351	66%	
COAST GUARD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	8	2	2	1	-	2	1	3	1	23	4%	
MARINES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	2	-	2	-	-	8	2%	
NAVY	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	10	8	7	2	4	-	2	1	-	38	7%	
OTHER	1	1	1	-	-	6	2	4	2	10	-	1	1	1	4	5	-	39	7%	
TOTALS	26	20	8	7	7	36	32	20	65	59	50	56	43	34	25	28	16	532	100%	

accomplished with the dissemination of information about the NETWORK and the inclusion of NETWORK publications with monthly issues of the DANTES newsletter. However, throughout the pilot test period, the Department of the Army represented at least 50% of the NETWORK's monthly clients.

Frequency of Use. A summary of the number of information requests submitted to the NETWORK by the requestor title/position is presented in Table 3. Overall, 80% (303/381) of the NETWORK's clients utilized the NETWORK's services only once. The remaining 20% were identified as repeat users of the information services. Specifically, 27% (20/73) of the Education Services Officers; 25% (14/56) of the Education Services Specialists; and 24% (14/59) of the guidance counselors contacted the NETWORK with two or more information requests. Overall, only 7% of the NETWORK's clients were considered Researchers.

Method of Contact. Table 4 provides a summary of the method by which users contacted the NETWORK. Throughout the NETWORK's pilot test period, three methods of inquiry were available. These were: telephone, mail, and answering machine. Access to an answering machine service was provided in order to facilitate use of the NETWORK's services by individuals assigned to overseas locations and with work hours other than between 9:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. eastern time.

The primary method of contact was by mail (55%). Users also contacted the NETWORK by telephone (43%). The preferred method of contact varied monthly between mail and telephone and exhibited no logical pattern. Only one information request was logged using the answering machine indicating that this method is not a viable approach for receiving information inquiries.

TABLE 3
Number of Information Requests by Clients' Title/Position

Title/Position	Client Total		Number of Requests												Eight	
	n	%	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Education Services Officer	73	20%	53	17%	3	19%	3	30%	1	33%	1	50%	2	67%	-	0%
Education Services Specialist	56	15%	42	14%	2	13%	2	20%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
Guidance Counselor	59	15%	45	15%	1	7%	1	10%	-	0%	1	50%	1	33%	-	0%
Researcher	27	7%	14	4%	4	27%	1	10%	1	33%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
Education-related staff	74	19%	63	21%	4	27%	1	10%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	1	100%
Administrator	54	14%	50	17%	-	0%	1	10%	1	34%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
Other	38	10%	36	12%	1	7%	1	10%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
TOTAL CLIENTS	381	100%	303	100%	15	100%	10	100%	3	100%	2	100%	3	100%	1	100%
NUMBER OF REQUESTS			x1	x2	x3	-	x4	-	x5	-	x6	-	x7	-	x8	-
TOTAL REQUESTS	532		303	88	45	-	40	-	15	-	12	-	21	-	8	-

TABLE 4
Clients Method of Contact

METHOD \ MONTH	MAR '83	APR '83	MAY '83	JUN '83	JUL '83	AUG '83	SEP '83	OCT '83	NOV '83	DEC '83	JAN '84	FEB '84	MAR '84	APR '84	MAY '84	JUN '84	JUL '84	TOTALS	PERCENT
TELEPHONE	21	6	4	5	3	8	10	12	31	11	30	16	17	20	11	15	11	231	43%
MAIL	5	12	4	2	4	28	22	7	34	48	19	38	26	14	14	13	3	293	55%
ANSWERING MACHINE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1%
OTHER	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	7	1%
TOTALS	26	20	8	7	7	36	32	20	65	59	50	56	43	34	25	28	16	532	100%

Finally, a small percentage (7%) of requests was recorded through in-person visits to the NETWORK offices or at professional conferences where the NETWORK offered an exhibit. These latter methods of contact are recorded in the "other" category in Table 4.

Information Responses to User Requests. The response formats related to the information inquiries logged by the NETWORK are exhibited in Table 5. Depending upon the user's information request, a unique response was prepared by the NETWORK staff and transmitted to a requestor. The format of response could include: citations of information resources related to the inquiry; points-of-contact to individuals and/or organizations; related materials such as newsletters, conference announcements, and vendor pamphlets; explanatory material about the NETWORK's services; or an addition or update to the NETWORK's mailing list. A user's inquiry may involve one or more of these categories or formats of responses. Monthly totals for the response formats are exhibited in Table 5. Overall, responses to inquiries required information citations approximately 30% of the time and required points-of-contact and related materials approximately 20% of the time. In addition, roughly 25% of the responses required an update of the NETWORK's mailing list.

Inspection of the monthly totals reveals, as can be expected, that the "mailing list update" and "information on the NETWORK" formats were highest during periods where the NETWORK's services were highly publicized. These were: March and April 1983 following the distribution of the NETWORK's Brochure and Rolodex Card; August and September 1983 following dissemination of the first issues of the newsletter and fact sheet; November and December 1983 following the initial incorporation of materials

TABLE 5
Response Formats

FORMAT	MONTH																		TOTALS	PERCENT
	MAR '83	APR '83	MAY '83	JUN '83	JUL '83	AUG '83	SEP '83	OCT '83	NOV '83	DEC '83	JAN '84	FEB '84	MAR '84	APR '84	MAY '84	JUN '84	JUL '84			
Database Citations	14	8	4	2	1	-	2	12	22	23	29	25	18	20	4	11	10	205	29%	
Point-of-Contact	11	6	2	2	-	2	4	10	19	14	11	26	20	5	5	5	-	142	20%	
Other Material	11	4	5	2	2	3	4	-	24	15	11	14	5	10	11	11	4	136	19%	
Mailing List Update	6	12	4	3	4	29	22	4	21	16	9	5	-	6	13	9	2	165	24%	
Information on NETWORK	3	2	3	2	3	11	3	1	5	1	1	6	9	1	7	1	-	59	8%	
TOTALS	45	32	18	11	10	45	35	27	91	69	61	76	52	42	40	37	16	707	100%	
PERCENT	6%	5%	3%	2%	1%	6%	5%	4%	13%	9%	9%	11%	7%	6%	6%	5%	2%	100%	-	

about the NETWORK in the DANTES newsletter, and May 1984 following the dissemination of the DANTES newsletter to the Recruiting Commands. In total, inquiries for additional "information on the NETWORK" accounted for 8% of the response formats. This small percentage rate may indicate that the explanatory materials about the NETWORK's services included in the NETWORK's publications were useful to users in conveying the goals and functions of the NETWORK.

Response Turnaround Time. The NETWORK staff, in recognition of the need for a prompt turnaround time to user inquiries, have established a policy of responding to requests within three to five working days. Monthly request response times for the seventeen month pilot test phase are exhibited in Table 6. Overall, 67% of all requests were responded to in five working days or less. Approximately one-third (34%) of all requests were responded to the same day the inquiry was logged by the NETWORK staff. These latter requests often required response formats for points-of-contact, NETWORK materials, and/or mailing list updates. Responses requiring numerous database searches and the identification of supplemental information materials took longer than five working days to prepare, and occurred with 33% of the responses. The only trend apparent in the preparation of responses as summarized in Table 6 is that the greater the number of requests the NETWORK logged the longer the response turnaround time.

It should be noted that the request-response time summary was based on the availability of one full-time Information Specialist assigned to the NETWORK. Such a staffing pattern proved sufficient to respond effectively to all requests requiring response formats for points-of-contact, NETWORK

TABLE 6
Request Response Time

MONTH RESPONSE TIME	MAR '83	APR '83	MAY '83	JUN '83	JUL '83	AUG '83	SEP '83	OCT '83	NOV '83	DEC '83	JAN '84	FEB '84	MAR '84	APR '84	MAY '84	JUN '84	JUL '84	TOTALS	PERCENT
SAME DAY	7	7	5	3	4	29	18	3	22	19	10	10	3	7	17	12	4	180	34%
1 DAY	6	7	2	3	2	6	8	4	7	1	5	1	2	-	2	1	-	57	11%
2 DAYS	9	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	5	1	1	6	9	2	2	1	-	39	7%
3 DAYS	4	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	6	-	1	4	2	5	2	3	3	34	6%
4 DAYS	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	2	4	4	-	2	2	1	-	1	1	20	4%
5 DAYS	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	9	1	2	-	2	4	-	3	2	27	5%
OVER 5 DAYS	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	11	12	33	31	33	23	15	2	7	6	175	33%
TOTALS	26	20	8	7	7	36	32	20	65	59	50	56	43	34	25	28	16	532	100%

materials and/or mailing list updates at the projected level or load of requests recorded during the NETWORK's operational cycle. In addition to this load, a full-time Information Specialist would be able to effectively process 60% to 70% of the information requests requiring response formats of detailed database searches and the identification of supplemental materials. Thus, an additional Information Specialist or support staff person would be required to respond efficiently to all requests within three to five working days for peak request levels as experienced during the pilot test phase.

User Reactions

The Inquiry Response and Referral Services operate as a reference service to assist users in the identification and location of information as well as points-of-contacts relevant to the user information needs. Depending upon the user's information request, a response is prepared and transmitted to the requestor. As previously noted, responses to requests can involve one or more formats of information. These include: computerized database searches; points-of-contact to individuals and/or organizations; and related materials such as newsletters, conference announcements, and vendor pamphlets.

In order to solicit information about user reaction to the Inquiry Response and Referral Services, the NETWORK conducted three related evaluation activities. Together, these activities allowed judgements to be made regarding the following major questions:

- o Were users satisfied with the response turnaround time?
- o Were the NETWORK's clients satisfied with the information provided to them in response to their request?
- o Do users plan to continue to utilize the NETWORK's services?

In order to address these questions, information was acquired through the three activities discussed below. First, project staff used a brief, six-item instrument designed to identify the degree of user satisfaction with the results of computerized database searches conducted to locate information citations pertinent to the user's information needs. The NETWORK Computer Search Evaluation Form (see Appendix C) was included with the search results provided to the inquirer in response to their request. Participation in this evaluation activity was strictly voluntary and respondents remained anonymous. A total of 48 evaluation forms were distributed with all search results prepared in response to inquiries logged during the time period from February 1984 through July 1984. However, users who submitted multiple requests during this time period were provided with only one copy of the Search Form in order to avoid response duplication. The NETWORK's staff received a total of 26 completed evaluation forms yielding a response rate of 54%. These responses are summarized in Table 7.

Second, a set of telephone interviews was conducted to assist in determining user satisfaction with information responses prepared to meet their information needs. Roughly every twentieth military educator who used the Inquiry Response or Referral Service was asked to participate in a brief telephone interview. During the telephone call the educator was asked to respond to six questions (see Appendix D) that focused on their

TABLE 7
NETWORK Computer Search Evaluation Results

ITEM	RESPONSES*
1. Were you satisfied with the results of this search?	Yes--85% No--15%
2. Were the results of this search:	Too Numerous--3% Sufficient--85% Not Sufficient--12%
3. What percentage of the citations were relevant to your needs?	0 to 49 percent--27% 50 to 79 percent--30% 80 to 100 percent--31% No Response--12%
4. How would you rate the response time to this request?	Excellent--62% Good--23% Average--15% Poor--0%
5. Did you receive satisfactory assistance from the NETWORK staff when you contacted us with this information request?	Yes--100% No--0%
6. Do you plan to use the NETWORK services again?	Yes--100% No--0%

* n=26

satisfaction with the information response provided by the NETWORK to their inquiry.

Telephone calls were made to a total of 10 users during July 1983 in preparation for the NETWORK's Interim Report and a total of 20 additional users during August 1984 in preparation for the NETWORK's Final Report. A summary of responses to the telephone calls is exhibited in Table 8.

Finally, project staff developed a structured evaluation instrument designed to determine the effectiveness of the Inquiry Response and Referral Services as judged by the users of these services. This brief thirteen item instrument, entitled the NETWORK User Questionnaire (see Appendix E), was disseminated with the third issue of the NETWORK Fact Sheet. This questionnaire was distributed to approximately 750 military educators listed on the NETWORK's mailing list. In addition, copies of the questionnaire were disseminated with a DANTES newsletter. A total of 191 completed questionnaires were voluntarily returned to the NETWORK. An accurate response rate cannot be determined because (1) respondents remained anonymous and were encouraged to duplicate the NETWORK's materials for use by colleagues, and (2) the total number of questionnaires distributed by DANTES is unknown.

The military service affiliation and the title/position of the respondents to the NETWORK User Questionnaire are summarized in Table 9. Overall, 48% of the returned questionnaires were received from educators associated with the Department of the Army. In addition, 24% were received from educators affiliated with the Navy and 15% from Air Force related educators. The Education Service Officers were the largest group of respondents for each

TABLE 8
Telephone Interviews--Response Results

ITEM	RESPONSES*
1. How often have you used the NETWORK's services?	Once--43% Twice--27% Three or more--30%
2. In reference to the materials provided to you by the NETWORK in response to your request, how useful were the materials?	Extremely Useful--40% Useful--50% Not Useful--10%
3. How would you rate the turnaround time or response time to your request?	Excellent--63% Good--27% Average--7% Poor--3%
4. Did the information the NETWORK provided to you...	Exceed your Expectations--23% Meet your Expectations--74% Not meet your Expectations--3%
5. How helpful were the NETWORK staff in assisting you with your information needs?	Very Helpful--93% Helpful--7% Not Helpful--0%
6. Do you plan to use the NETWORK in the future?	Yes--100% No--0%

* n=30

TABLE 9
Respondents to the NETWORK User Questionnaire

Respondents Title/Position	MILITARY SERVICES													
	Total		Air Force		Army		Coast Guard		Marines		Navy		Other	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Education Services Officer	81	42%	11	38%	34	37%	6	55%	3	43%	26	58%	1	13%
Education Services Specialist	36	19%	6	21%	17	18%	-	0%	-	0%	13	29%	-	0%
Guidance Counselor	34	18%	9	31%	22	24%	-	0%	-	0%	1	2%	2	25%
Researcher	2	1%	-	0%	2	3%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
Administrator	8	4%	1	3%	3	4%	1	9%	1	14%	-	0%	2	25%
Other	30	16%	2	7%	13	14%	4	36%	3	43%	5	11%	3	37%
TOTAL	191	100%	29	100%	91	100%	11	100%	7	100%	45	100%	8	100%

of the service branches and accounted for 42% (n=81) of the respondents overall. The Education Service Specialists and Guidance Counselors accounted for 19% and 18% of the respondents, respectively.

User Satisfaction with Response Turnaround Time. The NETWORK User Questionnaire contained a series of items related to how often the respondent used the NETWORK's services, the NETWORK's response time to the requests, and the respondent's satisfaction with the speed of response. The responses to these items are exhibited in Table 10. Overall, 66% of the respondents indicated that they had not submitted an information request to the NETWORK. Responses to this item ranged from 57% for Army educators to 100% for Marine educators. Those educators who had used the NETWORK's services indicated that primarily they had submitted at least one request (20%; n=38) and sometimes as many as two to four requests (9%; n=18). This request pattern is consistent across the service branches.

Overall, 84% of the respondents who used these services indicated that their request(s) was responded to within three weeks following the submission of their information request. Respondents (72%) rated their satisfaction with the speed of response as "more than acceptable" to "extremely good." Overall, the speed of response was not rated lower than acceptable by any of the respondents, with only 6% of the respondents rating response turnaround time as "slightly less than acceptable."

These findings were confirmed by the evaluative information acquired via the Computer Search Evaluation Form and the Telephone Interviews. Responses to the Search Evaluation Form (see Table 7) indicated that all respondents judged the response time to their requests as "average" to

TABLE 10
Summary of Responses to the NETWORK User Questionnaire by Military Service
and by Items Related to the Direct Use of the NETWORK Services

Items Related to the Direct Use of the NETWORK's Services	MILITARY SERVICES													
	Total	Air Force		Army		Coast Guard		Marines		Navy		Other		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Request Submitted to the NETWORK														
One request	38	20%	4	14%	26	29%	1	9%	-	0%	5	11%	2	25%
Two to four requests	18	9%	4	14%	11	12%	1	9%	-	0%	2	5%	-	0%
Five or more requests	6	3%	3	10%	2	2%	-	0%	-	0%	1	2%	-	0%
Have not contacted the NETWORK	126	66%	18	62%	52	57%	8	73%	7	100%	36	80%	5	63%
No response	3	2%	-	0%	-	0%	1	9%	-	0%	1	2%	1	12%
TOTAL	191	100%	29	100%	91	100%	11	100%	7	100%	45	100%	8	100%
Average Response Time to Requests														
Within one week of request	10	16%	3	27%	5	13%	-	0%	-	0%	2	25%	-	0%
Within two weeks of request	12	19%	2	18%	8	21%	-	0%	-	0%	2	25%	-	0%
Within three weeks of request	30	49%	3	27%	20	51%	2	100%	-	0%	3	38%	2	100%
More than three weeks after request	8	13%	3	28%	4	10%	-	0%	-	0%	1	12%	-	0%
No response	2	3%	-	0%	2	5%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
Satisfaction with Speed of Response														
"5" Extremely Good	23	37%	3	27%	16	41%	-	0%	-	0%	3	38%	1	50%
"4" Acceptable	22	35%	5	45%	12	31%	2	100%	-	0%	3	37%	-	0%
"3" Acceptable	11	18%	1	9%	7	18%	-	0%	-	0%	2	25%	1	50%
"2" Very Poor	4	6%	2	19%	2	5%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
"1" Cannot judge/not applicable	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
"0" No response	1	2%	-	0%	1	2%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
No response	1	2%	-	0%	1	3%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
TOTAL	62	100%	11	100%	39	100%	2	100%	-	0%	8	100%	2	100%

"excellent." The response time to requests was rated "excellent" by 62% of the respondents. In addition, 63% of the NETWORK's clients who participated in the telephone interviews judged the response time to requests as "excellent." Only 3% of the educators interviewed indicated that the turnaround time was "poor" (see Table 8).

User Satisfaction with Information Response. The NETWORK User Questionnaire also contained a set of items which required respondents to rate their satisfaction with the information provided by the NETWORK in response to their inquiry, to indicate how the information was used, to specify if the information was shared with others, to judge the ease of using the information, and to identify the appropriateness of the referral information. A summary of responses to these items is exhibited in Table 11. Overall, respondents indicated that the information materials were useful primarily for administrative planning/review activities (48%), counseling/ testing activities (40%), and research activities (40%). Surprisingly, few educators (5%) indicated that the information materials were used in association with teaching or training activities.

Army educators indicated that the information was used for administrative planning/review (51%) as well as counseling/testing (49%) activities. These trends are not as apparent in the responses from educators associated with the other service branches. Responses categorized as "other" indicate that both Army and Air Force educators were creative in the use of information materials in their in-service training and professional development activities.

Primarily, respondents (76%) rated their satisfaction with the information materials provided to them as "acceptable" to "extremely good." Respondent

TABLE 11
Summary of Responses to the NETWORK User Questionnaire by Military Service
and by Items Related to Information Responses

Items Related to the Information Responses	Total n	%	MILITARY SERVICES					
			Air Force	Army	Coast Guard	Marines	Navy	Other
Use of the Information Provided by the NETWORK # Teaching or Training Research Counseling/Testing Administrative Planning/Review Personal Other	9	15%	4	2	1	-	1	1
			36%	52	50%	0%	12%	50%
	25	40%	4	13	1	-	6	1
			36%	33%	50%	0%	75%	50%
	25	40%	4	19	-	-	2	-
			37%	49%	0%	0%	25%	0%
Satisfaction with the Information Provided "5" Extremely Good "4" Acceptable "3" Very Good "2" Very Poor "1" Cannot judge/not applicable No response	30	48%	5	20	1	-	4	-
			45%	51%	50%	0%	50%	0%
	5	8%	1	2	-	-	2	-
			9%	52	0%	0%	25%	0%
Sharing of Information with others Yes No No response	4	6%	2	1	-	-	-	-
			18%	22	0%	0%	0%	0%
	44	71%	6	32	2	-	3	1
			55%	82%	100%	0%	38%	50%
	14	23%	3	6	-	-	5	-
			27%	15%	0%	0%	62%	0%
Ease of Use of the Information as Formatted and Organized Yes No No response	6	10%	1	5	-	-	-	-
			9%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	51	82%	10	31	2	-	6	2
			91%	79%	100%	0%	75%	100%
Appropriateness of Referral Information Yes No Not requested/not applicable No response	5	8%	-	3	-	-	2	-
			0%	8%	0%	0%	25%	0%
	40	64%	7	29	1	-	2	1
			64%	74%	50%	0%	25%	50%
	5	8%	-	4	-	-	-	-
			0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL	14	23%	4	5	1	-	4	-
			36%	13	50	0	50	0
	3	5%	0	1	0	-	2	0
			0%	3%	0	0	25	0
TOTAL			11	39	2	0	8	2
			100%	100%	100%	0	100	100

Percentages may add to more than 100% since respondents checked "all that applied."

satisfaction with the materials was also demonstrated by their indication that the materials were shared with others. A total of 71% of the military educators shared the NETWORK information with others. Respondents were also asked to indicate the number of persons with whom the materials were shared. Sixty-three percent of the respondents indicated that they shared the NETWORK's materials with one to as many as six other individuals. The format and organization of materials provided to inquirers were judged to be "easy to use" by 82% of the respondents. Finally, the points-of-contact or referrals provided in response to user information requests were cited by 64% of the respondents as being "appropriate" to their request. Only 8% of the respondents indicated that the referral information was "inappropriate."

Information identified through the Computer Search Evaluation Form and Telephone Interview confirmed the above findings. Specifically, 85% of the respondents to the Search Evaluation Form (see Table 7) indicated they were satisfied with the results of the customized search and that the number of information citations identified was sufficient. In addition, 61% of the respondents indicated that 50 to 100 percent of the information citations identified for them were relevant to their information needs.

NETWORK clients who participated in the telephone interviews (see Table 8) judged the information materials provided by the NETWORK in response to the individual's requests as being "useful" (50%) to "extremely useful" (40%). Overall, the information provided to inquirers "met the expectations" of 74% of the respondents. Additionally, 23% of the educators stated that the materials "exceeded their expectations."

Anticipated Use of the Inquiry Response and Referral Services. A third and final set of items included in the NETWORK's User Questionnaire asked users to indicate if they would recommend the NETWORK's services to others and if they planned to use the NETWORK's services again and if so, how often. Responses to these items are summarized and presented in Table 12. Ninety-four percent of the respondents indicated that they would use the NETWORK's services again. Primarily, respondents were not sure how often they would use the information services, although 29% of the educators indicated that services would be used six or more times during a calendar year and 26% indicated that they would use the NETWORK less than six times during a calendar year. No predictable patterns were noted for respondents affiliated with the different service branches. In addition, 85% of the respondents indicated that they would recommend the NETWORK's services to others.

As in prior cases, the evaluation information collected through the Computer Search Evaluation Form and the Telephone Interview served to confirm users' intentions about the continued use of the NETWORK. All respondents to the search evaluation form (see Table 7) indicated that they received satisfactory assistance from the NETWORK staff and that they planned to utilize the NETWORK's services again. In addition, all participants in the telephone interviews (see Table 8) stated that the NETWORK staff were "very helpful" (93%) or "helpful" (7%) in assisting users with their information needs. Finally, all respondents indicated that they planned to use the NETWORK in the future.

TABLE 12
Summary of Responses to the NETWORK User Questionnaire By Military Service
and by Items Related to the Future Use of Services

Items Related to the Future Use of the NETWORK Services	MILITARY SERVICES									
	Total n	Total %	Air Force n	Air Force %	Army n	Army %	Coast Guard n	Marines n	Navy n	Other n
Plan to use the NETWORK again Yes - Once a week - Once a month - Six or more times during a calendar year - Less than six times during a calendar year - Other (not sure/as needed) No - Other (information did not serve purpose) Undecided No response	1	2%	-	0%	1	3%	-	0%	-	0%
	4	6%	1	9%	2	5%	-	0%	1	12%
	18	29%	5	45%	10	26%	1	50%	1	13%
	16	26%	2	18%	10	26%	-	0%	4	50%
	19	31%	1	9%	14	36%	1	50%	2	25%
	1	2%	1	9%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
	2	3%	1	9%	1	2%	-	0%	-	0%
Recommend the NETWORK's services to others Yes No Undecided No response	1	2%	-	0%	1	2%	-	0%	-	0%
	53	85%	8	73%	35	90%	2	100%	7	88%
	1	2%	1	9%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
	1	2%	-	0%	1	2%	-	0%	-	0%
	7	11%	2	18%	3	8%	-	0%	1	12%
TOTAL	62	100%	11	100%	39	100%	2	100%	8	100%

B. Publication Development and Dissemination Service

This NETWORK service was designed to distribute to military educators information about the NETWORK's services and information related to current topics in adult and continuing education. This goal was achieved through the preparation of publications entitled the NETWORK Circuit, the NETWORK Fact Sheet, and the NETWORK Vanguard. (Note: This latter publication is considered a component of the Current Awareness Service, but is discussed in this section of the final report since evaluative information about all publications was coordinated through one evaluation instrument). In order to assess these publications, project staff developed an evaluation instrument that would address the following key questions:

- o How helpful are the publications to the NETWORK's users?
- o What is the perceived quality of the NETWORK's publications?
- o What is the perceived usefulness of the NETWORK's publications?

Users' perceptions were identified through the distribution of the NETWORK Reaction Sheet (see Appendix F) which was distributed to approximately 750 military educators listed on the NETWORK's mailing list. In addition, copies of the instrument were disseminated with a DANES newsletter. A total of 125 completed instruments were voluntarily returned to the NETWORK. An accurate response rate cannot be determined because (1) respondents remained anonymous and were encouraged to duplicate the NETWORK's materials for use by colleagues, and (2) the total number of questionnaires distributed by DANES is unknown.

The military service affiliation and the title/position of the respondents to the NETWORK Reaction Sheet are summarized in Table 13. Overall, 62% of the returned questionnaires were received from Army education personnel. In addition, 16% were received from educators associated with the Navy and 10% with Air Force affiliated personnel. Education Services Officers and Education Services Specialists accounted for 35% and 25% of the responding population respectively. Overall, these two groups of respondents accounted for 60% of the completed instruments.

Helpfulness. The evaluation instrument requested the NETWORK's target population to indicate the general level of helpfulness of the three publications on a five-point scale defined as: very helpful ("5"), moderately helpful ("4", "3", or "2"), and not helpful ("1"). The rating scale included a no opinion/not received ("0") response option. In addition, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the quality and usefulness of the NETWORK's publications. The following five-point scale was used: extremely good ("5"), acceptable ("4", "3", or "2"), and very poor ("1"). This rating scale also included a no opinion ("0") response option. Table 14 exhibits the mean ratings of the helpfulness, quality, and usefulness of the NETWORK's publications by the respondents' title/position. Three segments of the respondent population are presented (i.e., ESOs, ESSs, and Guidance Counselors) because these groups represent 60% of the response ratings. The "other" category combines the responses received from researchers, administrators, and others. The three educator groups responded very similarly in their rating of the helpfulness of the NETWORK Circuit, Fact Sheet, and Vanguard. All groups indicated that these publications were "more than moderately helpful" as indicated by mean ratings which ranged from 3.5 to 3.8.

TABLE 13
Respondents to the NETWORK Reaction Sheet

Respondents Title/Position	MILITARY SERVICES															
	Total		Air Force		Army		Coast Guard		Marines		Navy		Other			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Education Services Officer	44	35%	4	31%	28	36%	1	25%	-	0%	11	55%	-	0%		
Education Services Specialist	31	25%	3	22%	21	27%	1	25%	-	0%	5	25%	1	12%		
Guidance Counselor	18	14%	4	31%	14	18%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%		
Researcher	9	7%	-	0%	7	9%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	2	25%		
Administrator	10	8%	1	8%	4	5%	-	0%	3	100%	-	0%	2	25%		
Other	13	11%	1	8%	3	4%	2	50%	-	0%	4	20%	3	38%		
TOTAL	125	100%	13	100%	77	100%	4	100%	3	100%	20	100%	8	100%		

TABLE 14
Mean Rating of the Helpfulness, Quality and Usefulness of
the NETWORK's Publications by Respondents' Title/Position

	Total			ESS			Guidance Counselor			Other		
	n	\bar{x}	s	n	\bar{x}	s	n	\bar{x}	s	n	\bar{x}	s
Helpfulness of Publications												
NETWORK Circuit	110	3.6	1.2	38	3.4	1.4	29	3.5	1.1	18	3.6	1.0
NETWORK Fact Sheet	101	3.8	1.1	35	3.7	1.3	28	3.8	1.1	17	3.8	.9
NETWORK Vanguard	75	3.5	1.3	28	3.7	1.4	22	3.2	1.1	10	3.6	.8
Quality of Publications												
Comprehensiveness	104	4.0	.9	40	4.1	1.1	28	4.0	.8	18	4.1	.8
Ease of understanding	107	4.2	.9	41	4.1	1.1	26	4.1	.8	18	4.4	.8
Accuracy of information	94	4.3	.8	37	4.3	1.0	22	4.4	.8	16	4.4	.6
Format	98	4.2	.8	37	4.1	.9	23	4.2	.9	16	4.1	.8
Usefulness of Publications												
Usefulness as a means of learning about a topic	102	3.9	1.0	38	4.0	1.0	28	3.6	1.0	16	3.8	.9
Value in identifying resources for yourself and others	110	3.8	1.2	41	3.8	1.2	29	3.4	1.2	18	4.1	.9
Overall usefulness in your work	101	3.4	1.2	38	3.4	1.3	25	3.2	1.1	16	3.2	1.1

Quality. The quality of the NETWORK's publications was judged in terms of comprehensiveness, ease of understanding, accuracy of information, and format based on the following five-point scale: extremely good ("5"), acceptable ("4", "3", or "2") and very poor ("1"). Each of these factors was rated moderately below "extremely good" as indicated by mean ratings ranging from 4.0 to 4.3. Mean ratings representative of the various titles/positions were fairly consistent.

Usefulness. The NETWORK's publications were also judged by respondents relative to their usefulness which was defined in the following terms: usefulness as a means of learning about a topic, value in identifying resources for military educators, and overall usefulness in the educator's work. Respondents were asked to use the following five-point scale: extremely good ("5"), acceptable ("4", "3", or "2") and very poor ("1"). Overall, the mean rating for these factors was judged to be "more than acceptable" as exhibited by the mean ratings ranging from 3.4 to 3.9.

The NETWORK Reaction Sheet also asked respondents to indicate the various ways the publications were used and to indicate if the publications were shared with their colleagues. The responses provided to these items are summarized in Table 15. Responses are summarized by three primary respondent groups, that is, ES0s, ESSs, and Guidance Counselors. All groups indicated that the information was used primarily to obtain an update on topics and to identify resources. ES0s also used the publications to follow current research efforts. In addition, all educator groups strongly indicated that the NETWORK publications were shared with their colleagues.

TABLE 15
Summary of Responses to the NETWORK Reaction Sheet by Respondents' Title/Position
and by Items Related to the Use of the NETWORK's Publications

Item	Respondents' Title/Position									
	Total		ESS		ESS		Guidance Counselor		Other	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Use of the NETWORK's Publications *										
Update on topics	67	54%	28	64%	15	48%	11	61%	13	41%
Identify resources	71	57%	30	68%	18	58%	11	61%	12	38%
Follow current research efforts	52	42%	20	45%	12	39%	5	28%	15	47%
Identify Point-of-Contacts	41	33%	20	45%	10	32%	2	11%	9	28%
Other	17	14%	9	20%	4	13%	4	22%	-	0%
Share the NETWORK Publications										
Yes	87	70%	33	75%	19	61%	14	78%	21	66%
No	23	18%	6	14%	7	23%	3	17%	7	22%
No response	15	12%	5	11%	5	16%	1	5%	4	12%
TOTAL	125	100%	44	100%	31	100%	18	100%	32	100%

* Totals may add to more than 100% since respondents indicated "all that applied."

C. Current Awareness Service

As noted earlier, this information service is composed of two activities. First, the preparation and distribution of the NETWORK Vanguard, containing photocopies of professional journal tables-of-contents, is designed to increase military educators' awareness of current articles, book reviews, etc. User reactions regarding the usefulness, quality, and helpfulness of this NETWORK publication were identified through the NETWORK Reaction Sheet. Responses to this evaluation instrument were presented and summarized in the preceding section (see Tables 14 and 15).

A second current awareness activity involved the pilot testing of the NETWORK Profile Service. A small group (n=19) of overseas Army educators were asked to participate in the initial offering of this specialized service. Fourteen of the nineteen military educators who elected to participate were provided special sets of information materials that related to their pre-stated information interests profile. Participants were asked to complete a brief questionnaire designed to identify their satisfaction with the information materials and to determine the usefulness of this specialized service. This questionnaire, entitled the NETWORK Profile Service Opinion Form (see Appendix G), was completed by 79% (n=11) of the participants. The voluntary responses to the Opinion Form are summarized in Table 16.

Participants in the pilot testing of the NETWORK Profile Service indicated that they were generally "satisfied" (64%) with the information materials provided to them; however, 18% of the educators indicated that they were

TABLE 16
Responses to the NETWORK Profiles Service Opinion Form

Item	Responses*
1. Were you satisfied with the information provided to you?	Very Satisfied--9% Satisfied--64% Not Satisfied--18% No Opinion--9%
2. How useful were these materials to your professional activities?	Very Useful--0% Useful--55% Not Useful--36% No Opinion--9%
3. Did you share these materials with your colleagues?	Yes--73% No--27%
4. How useful would the NETWORK Profiles Service be to your colleagues?	Very Useful--0% Useful--64% Not Useful--18% No Opinion--18%
5. Would you recommend that the NETWORK continue to offer this specialized service?	Yes--64% No--27% Undecided--9%

* n=11

"not satisfied" with the materials. About one-half (55%) of the participants indicated that the information materials were "useful" to their professional activities as compared to 36% of the respondents who indicated the materials were "not useful." As a related indicator to the usefulness of materials and the participant's satisfaction with this specialized service, respondents were asked to indicate if the information materials provided to them were shared with their colleagues. The majority (73%) of the participants indicated that they did share the materials with their colleagues.

Finally, participants were asked to indicate the usefulness of this service to other military educators and to recommend whether or not the NETWORK should continue to offer the Profile Service. In both instances, approximately two-thirds (64%) of the respondents indicated that this specialized service would be "useful" to their colleagues and that the NETWORK should continue to offer the Profile Service.

D. Computerized Database Development

The design plan developed for the NETWORK specified the formation of a computerized database that would support the various information services offered by the NETWORK. As identified through the needs assessment activities, the collection of materials contained in the database would include information representative of programmatic and research efforts in basic skills education. In addition, the collection would include citations of resources describing Army basic skills education programs as well as reference and referral information. During the NETWORK's initial operational phase, project staff developed a computerized database that

would meet the information needs expressed by military educators. This section of the final report addresses the following key questions:

- o What kind and type of information is contained in the NETWORK's database?
- o What costs are associated with the development and operation of the NETWORK's database?
- o What subject areas are of interest to the NETWORK's users?

Database Description. Tables 17 and 18 provide summary descriptions of the database in terms of publication/document type and key descriptors. The majority of the citations included in the database describe resources that are of the following types: Reports (436), Journal Articles (257), and Guides (220). In addition, the major key descriptors assigned to the citations maintained in the NETWORK's database include: Computer-Assisted Instruction (183), Instructional Materials (141), Teaching Methods (108), Military Training (98), Reading Instruction (97), and Program Evaluation (94).

Development and Operation Costs. A computerized database facilitates the standardization of the information storage and retrieval processes needed to provide information to users. Development of a computer-based information system can potentially be a high resource expenditure. Thus, costs associated with the NETWORK's database developmental tasks were monitored throughout the pilot test period.

Computer costs monitored for this period include computer staff time charges incurred during the construction of the in-house NETWORK database as well as fees associated with the use of the NETWORK and commercially available databases to respond to inquiries.

TABLE 17
NETWORK DATABASE CITATIONS BY PUBLICATION/DOCUMENT TYPE

PUBLICATION/DOCUMENT TYPE	TOTAL
Books	37
Collected Works	32
Dissertations/Theses	5
Guides	220
Historical Materials	13
Information Analyses (Literature Reviews, State-of-the-Art Papers)	53
Journal Articles	257
Legislative/Regulatory Materials	4
Statistical Data	12
Viewpoints (Opinion Papers, Position Papers, Essays, etc.)	96
Reference Materials	67
Reports	436
Speeches, Conference Papers	81
Tests, Evaluation Instruments	27
Other/Miscellaneous	9
GRAND TOTAL	1,349*

* Represents overlapping totals.

TABLE 18
NETWORK DATABASE CITATIONS BY SELECTED KEY DESCRIPTORS

KEY DESCRIPTOR	TOTAL*	KEY DESCRIPTOR	TOTAL
Adult-Basic-Education	85	Job-Skills	51
Adult-Education	76	Job-Training	34
Adult-Literacy	70	Literacy-Education	59
Adult-Reading-Programs	63	Material-Development	31
Basic-Skills	82	Mathematics-Instruction	52
Competency-Based-Education	46	Microcomputers	76
Computer-Assisted-Instruction	183	Military-Personnel	78
Computer-Managed-Instruction	47	Military-Training	98
Computer-Programs	68	Program-Descriptions	56
Continuing Education	36	Program-Development	59
Curriculum-Development	43	Program-Effectiveness	70
Daily-Living-Skills	41	Program-Evaluation	94
Educational-Research	53	Programed-Instruction	33
Educational-Technology	39	Reading-Instruction	97
English-Second-Language	81	Reading-Skills	52
Evaluation-Methods	60	Resource-Materials	32
High-School-Equivalency-Programs	38	Teacher-Education	45
Illiteracy	30	Teaching-Methods	108
Individualized-Instruction	63	Tests	75
Instructional-Materials	141	Vocational-Education	66

* Represents overlapping totals.

The costs associated with computer personnel apply to the design, development, and implementation phase of the NETWORK database and are exhibited in Table 19. Monthly, yearly and total costs for computer personnel are listed in this table for the nineteen month period from February 1983 to July 1984. These charges reflect personnel expenditures for computer programmers and systems analysts as well as data entry staff. For the nineteen month developmental period, a total of 1,219 staff hours were expended for an associated total direct cost (excluding fringe benefits) of \$7,420.00.

In the initial phase of the operation of the project, a large part of computer staff time was devoted to database design and development involving such activities as formatting records for input, report design, and internal database construction within the InterAmerica Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC) system. Formatting records for input involved the generation of forms for both NETWORK database files which provided the pertinent information to be included in each record to be added to the database (see Russo, Foster, and Modjeski, in press-c). Report design by various computer staff produced printed output in the form of an easy-to-read citation which would be forwarded in response to information requests. These citations were designed in two distinct forms reflecting the information contained in each NETWORK file (see Russo, Foster, and Modjeski, in press-c) and depending upon the type of information requested. Internal database construction involved programmers who adapted the specifications of the NETWORK database to be compatible with the Data Retrieval System (DRS) software package used with the DEC system. This initial phase occurred from February to August 1983 and accounted for

TABLE 20
Monthly Computer Usage Costs Associated with the NETWORK's Database*

Costs	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
1983													
Internal Connect Time (in house)	1	57	42	114	66	67	56	25	4	13	54	31	5264
Internal Connect Charges (in dollars)	\$10	\$662	\$489	\$1,332	\$773	\$774	\$648	\$296	\$3	\$147	\$633	\$356	\$6,123.00
External Connect Charges (in dollars)	\$105**	\$150	-	\$154	\$211	\$83	\$63	\$98	-	\$13	\$145	\$273	\$1,295.00
1984													
Internal Connect Time (in house)	39	40	45	31	35	22	20	-	-	-	-	-	232
Internal Connect Charges (in dollars)	\$723	\$765	\$850	\$589	\$668	\$417	\$377	-	-	-	-	-	\$4,389.00
External Connect Charges (in dollars)	\$379	\$440	\$298	\$380	\$106	\$305	\$317	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,725.00
TOTAL--Internal Time													7584
TOTAL--Internal Charges													\$10,512.00
TOTAL--External Charges													\$3,520.00

* Rates may vary by year and by database and amounts shown have been rounded off.

** Includes \$73.00 charge incurred in July 1982.

approximately 75% of the staff time and staff charges associated with the NETWORK's database.

Data entry staff were used throughout the project beginning in February 1983 until completion of the initial construction phase in July 1984. Data entry staff duties included original input, edited input, and other functions necessary for the construction of the database. Data entry staff also provided the support needed for report generation to produce necessary reports and print out citations in the special NETWORK formats. The monthly, yearly and total costs for computer personnel are listed in this table. Also included in the table are the monthly costs of indexers who periodically assisted the Information Specialist with the preparation of records for inclusion into the database.

Total costs for computer connect time, both in-house and on commercially available databases, are listed in Table 20. Included in the figures for the InterAmerica DEC system is the time used by the Information Specialist for searching the NETWORK database for pertinent citations to respond to inquiries. Also included in the InterAmerica connect time charges are the computer usage costs for the time data entry staff input new records or edited previous input. Additional computer time was incurred while various reports were generated. Monthly charges for searching external commercial databases are also presented in Table 20. These latter computer usage charges consisted of communication costs, royalties, individual database connect time charges, and offline printing fees.

Over the nineteen month period, in-house computer usage totaled approximately 758 connect hours reflecting an associated cost of \$10,512.00

TABLE 20
Monthly Computer Usage Costs Associated with the NETWORK's Database*

Costs	Month													TOTAL
		JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	
1983														
Internal Connect Time (in house)		1	57	42	114	66	67	56	25	4	13	54	31	5264
Internal Connect Charges (in dollars)		\$10	\$662	\$489	\$1,332	\$773	\$774	\$648	\$296	\$3	\$147	\$633	\$356	\$6,123.00
External Connect Charges (in dollars)		\$105 ^{aa}	\$150	-	\$154	\$211	\$83	\$63	\$98	-	\$13	\$145	\$273	\$1,295.00
1984														
Internal Connect Time (in house)		39	40	45	31	35	22	20	-	-	-	-	-	232
Internal Connect Charges (in dollars)		\$723	\$765	\$850	\$589	\$668	\$417	\$377	-	-	-	-	-	\$4,389.00
External Connect Charges (in dollars)		\$379	\$440	\$298	\$380	\$106	\$305	\$317	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,225.00
TOTAL -- Internal Time														7584
TOTAL -- Internal Charges														\$10,512.00
TOTAL -- External Charges														\$3,520.00

* Rates may vary by year and by database and amounts shown have been rounded off.

^{aa} Includes \$73.00 charge incurred in July 1982.

In addition, external computer usage resulted in a direct cost of \$3,520.00, roughly 25% of the total net computer usage costs (\$14,032.00).

The seven month initial developmental period for February 1983 through August 1983 accounted for approximately 47% of the total internal connect charges. The remaining months and related charges reflect the operational period associated with the maintenance of the database in support of the NETWORK's information services. Computer usage activities during this time frame included editing, inputting, report generation, and direct searching of the database.

User Information Interest. A specialized survey was conducted by project staff to assist in the generation of the NETWORK's computerized database. A Subject Area Checklist (see Appendix H) was designed to provide NETWORK staff with information to determine which subject areas are most important and/or of the greatest interest to military educators. Based on the results of this survey, citations in these subject areas were incorporated into the NETWORK database as it was expanded during the construction phase. Results from this survey can also be used to provide guidance for future growth of the database.

The Subject Area Checklist was distributed to approximately 650 military educators listed on the NETWORK's mailing list. In addition, copies of the instrument were distributed with a DANTES newsletter. A total of 172 survey forms were returned to the NETWORK. An accurate response rate cannot be determined because (1) respondents remained anonymous and were encouraged to duplicate the NETWORK's materials for use by colleagues, and (2) the total number of checklists distributed by DANTES is unknown.

Table 21 presents a summary of the respondents to the Subject Area Checklist by title or position within each of the military services. Overall, 65% of the respondents were ESSs (36%) and ESOs (29%). In addition, 67% of the respondents were military educators associated with the Department of the Army. Educators affiliated with the Air Force (57%) and Coast Guard (50%) represented a majority of the ESO respondent category as compared to the Navy (73%) and Army (30%) which represented a majority of the ESS respondent category. Counselors comprised another 23% of the total respondent group while "Researchers" and "Others" only accounted for 12% of the total number of respondents.

The responses to the Subject Area Checklist are presented in Table 22. Responses are summarized by the military service affiliations of respondents and by subject areas in five major categories: Education, Counseling, Computer Systems, Government/Military Information, and Management. Respondents were asked to check all the areas in which information would be useful to them in the operation of their ACES programs. Each individual subject area listed in Table 22 denotes the number of times an area was checked and the percentage this number represents in regard to the total number of respondents.

The category with the most subject areas is that of Education. Significant totals were recorded in the Basic Skills Curricula, Computer-Assisted Instruction, and Reading Skills areas. In each case, approximately 50% of the total number of respondents chose these areas. In all three areas, the Army and Marines were significantly higher than the other three services. Of secondary interest to educators were the areas of Functional Skills,

TABLE 21
Respondents to the Subject Area Checklist

Title/Position	MILITARY SERVICE											
	Total n	%	Air Force n	%	Army n	%	Coast Guard n	%	Marines n	%	Navy n	%
Education Services Officer, Education Services Manager, Education Director	49	29%	13	57%	31	27%	2	50%	2	50%	1	4%
Education Services Specialist, Supervisory Education Specialist, Education Technician	62	36%	5	22%	35	30%	1	25%	2	50%	19	73%
Education Counselor, Test Administrator, Career Information Specialist	40	23%	5	21%	30	26%	1	25%	-	0%	4	15%
Researcher	9	5%	-	0%	9	8%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
Other -- Library Director, Human Goals Officer, Action Officer	12	7%	-	0%	10	9%	-	0%	-	0%	2	8%
TOTAL	72	100%	23	100%	115	100%	4	100%	4	100%	26	100%

TABLE 2?
Number and Percentage of Responses to the Subject Area Checklist by Military Service Affiliation

Subject Area	Total n	MILITARY SERVICES				
		Air Force n	Army n	Coast Guard n	Marines n	Navy n
Education						
Audiovisual courseware evaluations	48	8	31	1	1	7
Audiovisual equipment evaluations	34	3	24	1	1	5
Basic skills curricula	90	6	67	1	4	12
Computer assisted instruction	92	8	69	2	3	10
Curriculum development	62	3	43	2	2	12
Curriculum evaluations	63	6	43	2	2	10
Educational achievement levels	53	5	39	-	2	7
Educational research	60	3	48	-	1	8
Functional basic skills	85	7	65	1	2	10
Individualized instruction	62	7	46	-	1	8
Instruction design	45	3	31	1	1	9
Literacy standards	51	2	38	-	3	8
Psychology of learning	55	5	37	1	1	11
Quality assurance for adult programs	69	8	51	1	2	7
Self-paced instructional programs	78	7	60	1	1	9
Specific Skills						
Computation	61	5	47	-	2	7
ESL	63	5	50	-	-	8
Listening	47	5	36	1	-	5
Reading	87	8	64	1	4	10
Writing	64	7	45	1	1	10
Psychomotor	20	4	13	-	-	3
Daily life coping	31	4	19	1	-	7
Teacher evaluation	50	4	36	1	1	8
Teaching methods	52	6	36	-	-	10
Tests & measurements	78	8	58	2	2	8
Tuition rates	54	9	33	-	1	11
TOTAL	172	23	115	4	4	26

* Percentages may add to more than 100% since respondents checked "all that applied."

TABLE 22 (con't)

Subject Area	MILITARY SERVICES									
	Total n	Total %	Air Force n	Air Force %	Army n	Army %	Coast Guard n	Coast Guard %	Marines n	Navy n
Counseling										
Career maturity	38	22%	6	26%	17	15%	1	25%	-	14
Career planning & guidance	92	53%	18	78%	55	48%	1	25%	1	17
Civilian labor force market data	78	45%	11	48%	51	44%	1	25%	-	15
Computer-based guidance systems	80	47%	5	22%	62	54%	1	25%	1	11
Counseling methods	67	39%	13	57%	40	35%	1	25%	1	12
Cross-cultural counseling	50	29%	7	30%	30	26%	-	-	1	12
Information on colleges, vocational schools & other educational institutions	89	52%	11	48%	60	52%	-	-	1	17
Computer Systems										
Computer equipment evaluations	89	52%	-	-	79	69%	2	50%	2	6
Computer systems capability	69	40%	-	-	60	52%	2	50%	2	5
Computer systems evaluations	77	45%	-	-	69	60%	1	25%	2	5
Software evaluations	100	58%	-	-	91	79%	1	25%	2	6
TOTAL	172	*	23	*	115	*	4	*	4	26

* Percentages may add to more than 100% since respondents checked "all that applied."

TABLE 22 (con't)

Subject Area	MILITARY SERVICES											
	Total n	%	Air Force n	%	Army n	%	Coast Guard n	%	Marines n	%	Navy n	%
Government/Military Information												
Demographic data	48	28%	2	9%	35	30%	-	-	2	50%	9	35%
Directives & regulatory information	45	26%	3	13%	33	29%	-	-	2	50%	7	27%
Federal budget appropriations	37	22%	2	9%	31	27%	-	-	1	25%	3	12%
Research & programs - Army	74	43%	1	4%	69	60%	-	-	-	-	4	15%
Research & programs - other military	72	42%	8	35%	43	37%	2	50%	4	100%	15	58%
State educational agencies policies	73	42%	9	39%	45	39%	-	-	3	75%	16	62%
Management												
Contracting requirements	71	41%	5	22%	61	53%	-	-	-	-	5	19%
Economic analysis	49	28%	3	13%	38	33%	1	25%	-	-	7	27%
General management skills	72	42%	10	43%	49	43%	1	25%	-	-	12	46%
Marketing educational programs	72	42%	6	26%	48	42%	-	-	1	25%	17	65%
Needs assessment techniques	114	66%	13	57%	80	70%	2	50%	1	25%	18	69%
Program & curriculum evaluation	82	48%	6	26%	59	51%	2	50%	1	25%	14	54%
Research methods	38	22%	2	9%	27	23%	1	25%	-	-	8	31%
TOTAL	172	*	23	*	115	*	4	*	4	*	26	*

* Percentages may add to more than 100% since respondents checked "all that applied."

Quality Assurance, Self-Paced Instructional Programs, and Tests and Measurements. Consistently low percentages of 12% and 18% were recorded in the areas of Psychomotor and Daily Life Coping Skills.

In the category of Counseling, the primary areas of interest to respondents were Career Planning and Guidance (53%) and Information on Colleges (52%). Secondary areas of interest were Computer-Based Guidance Systems (47%) and Civilian Labor Force Market Data (47%). Overall, Air Force, Army, and Navy personnel recorded higher total percentages, indicating a higher interest in counseling than Coast Guard or Marine personnel.

Each of the subject areas included in the Computer Systems category was rated very highly, indicating avid interest in this category. However, in view of the summary of responses by military service, much disparity is apparent. The percentage of responses provided by Air Force and Navy personnel ranged from 0% to 23%. Educators associated with the Army, Coast Guard and Marines provided a range of response percentages from 50% to 79%. High total percentages were recorded in the areas of Computer Equipment (52%) and Software (58%) Evaluations.

In the Government/Military Information category, none of the subject areas showed high percentages with the exception of "Research Programs - Army" by the Army group (60%) and "Research Programs - Other Military" by the Coast Guard at 50%, Marines at 100%, and Navy at 58%. These findings may suggest that educators are interested only in information about research that is supported by their military service branch. Low percentages were noted in the areas of Federal Budget Appropriations (22%), Directives and Regulatory Information (26%), and Demographic Data (28%).

The subject area of Needs Assessment Techniques had the highest percentage of responses both in the Management category and in overall responses. One hundred fourteen respondents constituting 60% of the total population indicated an interest in this subject with the Army at 70% and the Navy at 69%. Also in the Management category, the areas of General Management Skills (42%) and Program and Curriculum Evaluation (48%) were significant while the least amount of interest was exhibited in Research Methods (22%). High interest was indicated by the Navy (65%) in Marketing Education programs and the Army showed high interest (53%) in Contracting Requirements. Overall, respondents indicated a high degree of interest for most of the subject areas cited in the Management category.

Findings associated with the internal and external evaluation activities were identified in this section of the final report. Discussions of these findings and their implications relative to the future operation of the NETWORK are presented in the following section.

III. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the three basic functions established for the operation of the NETWORK was the completion of a set of evaluation activities related to the assessment of the NETWORK. Nine evaluation activities were undertaken to study the NETWORK from both an internal and external perspective. The information services were judged in terms of the extent to which the services were used by the NETWORK's targeted user groups and the users' perceptions of the overall usefulness and quality of services during the initial operational period established for the NETWORK. This section of the report includes a discussion of the evaluation results presented in the preceding section. In addition, a set of recommendations relative to the future operation of the NETWORK is presented for each of the following information components: Inquiry Response and Referral Services, Publication Development and Dissemination Service, Current Awareness Service, and Computerized Database Development.

A. Inquiry Response and Referral Services

The primary users of these two NETWORK services were education practitioners. This group of military educators includes Education Services Officers (ESOs), Education Services Specialists (ESSs), counselors and education-related staff. Overall, ESOs utilized these services most frequently. In addition, practitioners were the most frequent repeat users. Practitioners had been the specific group of educators expected to have the most contact with the NETWORK. As indicated by the needs assessment results, it was anticipated that researchers and administrators

respectively would follow the practitioner group in terms of overall inquiries for information. However, the administrator group utilized the NETWORK's services more frequently than the researcher group. Based on the total number of requests, the NETWORK provided the most services to practitioners and program administrators who had direct contact with the educational programs offered by the military services.

As would be expected, educators affiliated with the Department of the Army accounted for a majority of the NETWORK's user population throughout the initial operational period. Once access to the information services was provided to non-Army service branches, Air Force personnel proved to be the second most frequent group of users. Findings suggest that during the future operation of the NETWORK, at least one-half of the user population would be affiliated with the Department of the Army and would represent practitioners associated with the military educational programs. Based on these findings the following recommendations are offered:

Recommendation 1: Continue to focus the NETWORK's information services for the educator groups directly associated with the military educational programs. Specifically, ESOs, ESSs, counselors, and program administrators.

Recommendation 2: Continue to publicize the availability of the NETWORK's services to Department of the Army educators and expand publicity about the NETWORK among educators affiliated with the Departments of the Air Force, Coast Guard, Marines, and Navy.

The NETWORK's clients preferred to contact the NETWORK with their information requests via mail and telephone. Although the majority of inquiries were submitted by mail rather than by telephone, no set pattern or preference was clearly indicated. However, written communication was chosen primarily by educators located outside the continental United States. The availability of an answering machine for logging requests

proved not to be viable. Since this option was provided to meet the special needs of educators located overseas, alternative modes of contact need to be explored. Based on the user contact patterns noted during the operational phase, the following recommendations are offered:

Recommendation 3: Continue to provide clients with access to the NETWORK's information services via telephone and mail. A dedicated telephone number and mailing address, possibly a Post Office Box Number, should be established and maintained.

Recommendation 4: Terminate access to the NETWORK's services via a telephone answering machine. The feasibility of alternative modes of contact should be explored such as the establishment of a toll-free "800" telephone number, or the utilization of an Autovon and/or Federal Telephone System number. The alternatives should be considerate of the special needs of overseas military educators.

Information requests recorded by the NETWORK staff required the preparation of a variety of responses. On the average, one-half of the information inquiries required responses consisting of computerized database searches and/or the identification of points-of-contact. The remaining inquiries included requests for information about the NETWORK's services, updates to the NETWORK's mailing list, and requests for information materials such as the NETWORK's publications. Responses were prepared as quickly and efficiently as possible. The NETWORK staff responded to two-thirds of all requests within five working days. However, detailed requests and peak inquiry periods extended the NETWORK's response turnaround time. Feedback provided by the NETWORK's clients indicated that the response turnaround to inquiries was more than acceptable. Therefore, the following recommendation is offered:

Recommendation 5: Maintain the policy of preparing and transmitting responses to inquiries within three to five working days. Clients submitting detailed inquiries should be informed that a response to their request will require additional time for preparation.

The response formats to information requests included information citations identified through database searches, information materials and resources as well as referrals to individuals and professional organizations. A vast majority of the users of these information services indicated that they were more than satisfied with the information the NETWORK provided in response to their inquiry. In addition, a vast majority of the NETWORK's clients judged the materials to be relevant to their information needs. Finally, a majority of clients indicated that the information materials were acceptable and useful for their needs and that they often shared the materials with their colleagues.

The NETWORK's primary user groups indicated that the materials provided to them by the NETWORK was primarily used for activities associated with administrative planning/review and counseling/testing tasks. This trend was most apparent with educators affiliated with the Department of the Army. Overall, very few military educators indicated that the materials provided to them were used in relation to teaching or training activities. This finding may suggest that military educators who work with "contracted" personnel responsible for direct instruction and/or training did not share the NETWORK's information materials with these colleagues. Because the feasibility of allowing contract personnel access to the NETWORK's services during the pilot test phase remained ambiguous, this potential group of users was not actively solicited as a target audience. If military educators remain the sole target audience, the NETWORK will enhance activities (e.g., program planning/review, counseling/testing) that indirectly impact on the actual teaching or training environment. Expanding the user group to include "contract" teachers and/or trainers may result in a more direct impact on teaching and training activities.

Finally, a few educators proved to be very resourceful in the application of materials provided to them by the NETWORK. Both Army and Air Force clients indicated that the materials were useful for in-service training and professional development activities. In consideration of these findings, the following recommendation is offered:

Recommendation 6: Determine the feasibility of expanding the NETWORK target groups to include teachers and trainers associated with military educational programs. If appropriate, publicity about the availability of the NETWORK's services should be expanded and targeted to teachers and trainers in order to facilitate the NETWORK's impact on teaching and training activities.

Generally, all clients who used the NETWORK's Inquiry Response and Referral Services indicated that they would use these services again. In addition, users of these services stated that they would recommend these services to others. These findings suggest that once an educator becomes an active participant in the services offered by the NETWORK they plan to become repeat users and will encourage others to become actively involved in the NETWORK. These findings also suggest that the NETWORK staff have been able to convey to the NETWORK's clients an accurate description of services and results to be expected through use of the NETWORK's information services.

The NETWORK's targeted user groups were basically not sure how often they would require direct assistance from the NETWORK. Approximately, one in five educators anticipated using the Inquiry Response and Referral Services roughly six times throughout a calendar year. Generally, those educators who utilized these services would use them again and would recommend their use to others, but no predictable usage patterns could be noted. Thus, the following recommendation is offered:

Recommendation 7: Conduct a follow-up study to identify why the NETWORK's clients have difficulty in determining how often they will utilize the NETWORK's services and to obtain a more accurate estimate of the projected usage rates of the information services.

B. Publication Development and Dissemination Service

Military educators who reviewed and judged the NETWORK's publications were very positive about their quality and usefulness. The NETWORK Fact Sheet appeared to be the slightly favored publication. All publications were rated very high in terms of quality with respect to comprehensiveness, ease of understanding, accuracy of information, and format. The perceived usefulness of the NETWORK's publications proved to be above average in terms of learning about topics, identifying resources and applications to educators' work responsibilities.

Military educators indicated that the NETWORK's publications provided them with a mechanism through which they were able to identify resources, stay updated on topics, and follow current research efforts. In addition, the publications were seen as a means of identifying points-of-contact. A large majority of the NETWORK's clients shared the NETWORK's publications with their colleagues. In consideration of these findings, the following recommendations are offered:

Recommendation 8: Continue to publish and disseminate the NETWORK Circuit and NETWORK Fact Sheet, maintaining their current format.

Recommendation 9: Consider expanding the length of the NETWORK Circuit to include additional articles on educational resources and current research efforts.

Recommendation 10: Consider publishing the NETWORK Fact Sheet on a monthly basis to provide educators with brief updates on current issues and topics.

C. Current Awareness Service

One component activity of the NETWORK service included the development and distribution of the NETWORK Vanguard. Although the Vanguard was rated lower in comparison to the other NETWORK publications, military educators still rated the quality and usefulness to be above average. Comments provided by some educators indicated that they found moderate use for information about current journal articles. Given these positive, yet mixed reviews, the following recommendations are offered:

Recommendation 11: Maintain publication of the NETWORK Vanguard on a quarterly basis.

Recommendation 12: In consideration of an expanded version of the newsletter and monthly releases of fact sheets, the Vanguard could be terminated. Selected information cited in the Vanguard could be incorporated as a separate column in the newsletter.

The second component of the Current Awareness Service involved pilot testing of the NETWORK Profiles Services. About one-half of the small group of educators provided with this individualized service stated they were satisfied with the information materials provided to them. In addition, one-half of the participants indicated that the materials were useful to their professional activities. Comments provided by some educators were very enthusiastic about the information provided to them and they indicated that the NETWORK was their only source of help.

A majority of the participants stated that they shared the information materials provided to them through the Profiles Service. In addition, two-thirds of the participants noted that the Profile Service should be continued and suggested that this specialized service would be useful to their colleagues. The following recommendation is offered:

Recommendation 13: The NETWORK Profiles Service should not be expanded until additional pilot testing is completed. This specialized service should be tailored to meet the needs of isolated education personnel, thereby avoiding an overlap in information services available to more accessible personnel.

D. Computerized Database Development

A primary function established for the NETWORK included the development of a computerized database. Information citations included in the database were designed to support the information services offered by the NETWORK. Computer costs were monitored throughout the developmental and operational periods associated with the generation of the database. Overall, computer usage and staff charges remained within projected expenditures.

Military educators were asked to identify information categories and subject areas that were of most interest to them. Generally, military educators indicated that information in the following categories would be most useful to them in the operation of their ACES programs: Education, Computer Systems, and Management. Within the Education category, primary areas of interest included information about Basic Skills Curricula; Computer-Assisted Instruction and Reading Skills Materials. Secondary areas of interest included the topics of Functional Basic Skills, Quality Assurance of Programs, Self-Paced Instructional Programs, and Tests and Measurements. Of least interest to educators was information related to topics addressing Psychomotor Skills and Daily Life Coping Skills.

These education interests appeared to be fairly stable across the service branches. Subject areas within the Computer Systems category were indicated to be high areas of interest. However, a wide disparity of

interest was revealed across military services. Army, Coast Guard and Marine personnel indicated interest in all related subject areas such as Computer Equipment Evaluations, Computer Systems Capability, Computer Systems Evaluation, and Software Evaluations. Air Force and Navy personnel indicated little, if any, interest in these topics.

The information category of Management was rated to be a significant area of interest. Generally all military service personnel were interested in the following subject areas: Contracting Requirements, General Management Skills, Marketing Educational Programs, Needs Assessment Techniques, and Program and Curriculum Evaluation. Little interest was noted on the topics of Economic Analysis and Research Methods.

Finally, two other areas noted to be of interest to military educators were: Career Planning and Guidance, Information on Educational Institutions, and Military Research Programs. In consideration of these findings the following recommendations are offered:

Recommendation 14: Updates to and expansions of the NETWORK's computerized database should include citations of information resources that address the following topics:

Education

- Basic skills curricula
- Computer-assisted instruction
- Reading skills
- Functional basic skills
- Quality assurances for adult programs
- Self-paced instructional programs
- Tests and measurements

Computer Systems

- Computer equipment evaluation
- Computer systems capability
- Computer systems evaluation
- Software evaluations

Management

- Contracting requirements
- General management skills
- Marketing educational programs
- Needs assessment techniques
- Program and curriculum evaluation

Counseling

- Career planning and guidance
- Civilian labor force market data
- Computer-based guidance systems
- Information on colleges, vocational schools, and other educational institutions

Government/Military Information

- Military research and programs
- State educational agencies policies

Recommendation 15: Format the NETWORK's publications to address the categories of information interests stated by military educators. Specifically, the NETWORK Circuit could establish on-going columns such as the "Computer Corner" and a "Management Corner." Periodic columns that address secondary topics of interest could be established such as a "Research Corner" and/or "Counseling Corner."

In conclusion, the design established for the offering of information services to military educators proved to be a success. Those educators who interacted with the NETWORK were satisfied with the services provided to them. The materials and publications more than meet the needs of the NETWORK's clients and have been judged to be very high in quality and usefulness.

One lingering and basic question remains relative to the expected volume of information requests that will be submitted to the NETWORK by its primary and secondary targeted user groups. Data gathered throughout the initial operational period found that users are not able to determine how frequently they will interact with the NETWORK. Additional assessments need to be undertaken to understand the difficulty clients have in judging

their anticipated use of the NETWORK's services and to identify projected inquiry loads to be handled by the NETWORK.

REFERENCES

- Russo, R.P., Rivera, C., DeCarme, J., & French, A. (in press-a). Basic skills resource center: Information component needs assessment report. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Rivera, C., Russo, R.P., & DeCarme, J. (in press-b). Basic skills resource center: Military educators resource NETWORK. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Russo, R.P. (in press-c). Basic skills resource center: Military educators resource NETWORK interim report. Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc.
- Russo, R.P., Foster, J.A., & Modjeski, R.B. (in press-d). Basic skills resource center: Documentation and phaseover report for the military educators resource NETWORK. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

APPENDIX A
Information Request Log

[illegible]

APPENDIX B
Information Request Form

MILITARY EDUCATORS RESOURCE NETWORK INFORMATION REQUEST FORM

Directions. Please provide the information outlined below in order that our response to your request may be as thorough as possible. Please complete one form for each topic.

Name _____
Position _____
Address _____

Phone _____

I. Requestor Profile. Are you a:

- ☐ Educator/Practitioner
☐ Researcher
☐ Administrator/Policy maker
☐ Other (describe) _____

How did you learn about The NETWORK? _____

How many times have you used our services? ☐ first time ☐ 2-3 times ☐ 6 or more

II. In the space below, describe your request in narrative form.

III. Describe the subject of your request in 3 or 4 precise terms (e.g., reading skills, computer assisted instruction, adult literacy, etc.).

IV. Are you interested in:

- ☐ Locating large quantities of references on this topic?
(How many? _____)
☐ Finding a few of the most current references?
☐ Finding a few of the "best" items?
☐ Being added to mailing list?

V. What forms of information interest you?

- ☐ Citations and abstracts of research papers and journal articles, covering the years from _____ to _____.
☐ Current research project summaries.
☐ Education program descriptions.
☐ Referral to other sources of information (persons to contact).

VI. Please describe how you plan to use the information we provide, and provide us with any other information that may help us understand your request.

STAFF USE ONLY

Request No. _____

Phone _____

Date Received _____

Written _____

Date Responded _____

Other _____

ACTION TAKEN:

☐ Telephone Response

☐ MERN Publications Sent

☐ Written Response (attach copy)

☐ Mailing List: add chg dlt

☐ Database Searched _____

☐ MERN Brochure Sent

☐ Referrals to: _____

☐ Materials Sent: _____

☐ Memo or Letter (attach copy)

☐ Search Results (attach copy)

☐ Copy from MERN Collection

☐ Other _____

COMMENTS: _____

SEARCH STRATEGY

APPENDIX C
Computer Search Evaluation Form

NETWORK COMPUTER SEARCH EVALUATION

Please take a minute to answer the following questions about the results of the enclosed online search completed for you. Please return this form to us in the stamped, self-addressed return envelope attached to this form. Thank you for your cooperation.

1. Were you satisfied with the results of this search? YES ☐ NO ☐
2. Were the results of this search:
TOO NUMEROUS ☐ SUFFICIENT ☐ NOT SUFFICIENT ☐
3. What percentage of the citations were relevant to your needs? _____ %
4. How would you rate the response time to this request?
EXCELLENT ☐ GOOD ☐ AVERAGE ☐ POOR ☐
5. Did you receive satisfactory assistance from the NETWORK staff when you contacted us with this information request?
YES ☐ NO ☐
6. Do you plan to use the NETWORK's services again? YES ☐ NO ☐

COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS:

APPENDIX D

Telephone Interview Questions

Telephone Interview Questions

- o How often have you used the NETWORK's services?
(Response options: Once, Twice, More than twice)
- o In reference to the materials or information provided to you by the NETWORK in response to your request, how useful were the materials? (Response options: Extremely useful, useful, or not useful)
- o How would you rate the turnaround time or response time to your request?
(Response options: Excellent, good, average, or poor)
- o Did the information the NETWORK provided to you...
(Response options: Exceed your expectations, meet your expectations, or not meet your expectations)
- o How helpful were the NETWORK staff in assisting you with your information needs?
(Response options: Very helpful, helpful, or not helpful)
- o Do you plan to use the NETWORK in the future?
(Response options: Yes or no)

APPENDIX E

NETWORK User Questionnaire



Network User Questionnaire

The Military Educators Resource NETWORK has assisted many military educators in identifying information resources to help in providing effective educational programs. To evaluate the effectiveness of our services, we would appreciate your completing this questionnaire. Please mark an "X" in the appropriate boxes to indicate your responses.

After you have completed this form, please return it to the NETWORK at the address indicated below using a government franked envelope. **THANK YOU!**

Military Educators Resource NETWORK
1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 508
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209

A Note From HQDA Education Division (DAPE-MPE)

Please help us determine the effectiveness of the NETWORK's services by completing and returning this brief form. Your frank responses will aid in the overall evaluation of the NETWORK. Your prompt attention is appreciated.

BRUCE T. BATTEY (LTC, GS)
Chief, Education Division

1. What is your title/position? (check one only)

- ☐ Education Services Officer
☐ Education Services Specialist
☐ Guidance Counselor

- ☐ Researcher
☐ Administrator
☐ Other (specify) _____

2. What is your military service affiliation? (check one only)

- ☐ Air Force
☐ Army
☐ Coast Guard

- ☐ Marines
☐ Navy
☐ Other (specify) _____

3. During the past six months, how many questions or requests have you submitted to the NETWORK?

- ☐ One Request ☐ 2-4 Requests ☐ 5 or More Requests ☐ Have not contacted the NETWORK
(If you check this box, skip to question 13)

4. On the average, how promptly did you receive a response to your request?

- ☐ Within one week of request ☐ Within three weeks of request
☐ Within two weeks of request ☐ More than three weeks after request

5. Indicate your level of satisfaction with the speed of response.

Extremely Good	Acceptable			Very Poor	Cannot judge/ Not applicable
5	4	3	2	1	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. How did you use the information you obtained from the NETWORK? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Teaching or Training
☐ Research
☐ Counseling/Testing

- ☐ Administrative Planning/Review
☐ Personal
☐ Other (specify) _____

7. Indicate your level of satisfaction with the information you received in response to your request(s).

Extremely Good	Acceptable			Very Poor	Cannot judge/ Not applicable
5	4	3	2	1	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Have you shared the information you received in response to your request(s) with others?

☐ Yes ☐ No
How many others? _____

9. Did you find the format and organization of the response materials easy to use?

☐ Yes ☐ No Comments: _____

10. Were the points-of-contact or referrals to other sources of information provided by the NETWORK appropriate?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not requested/not applicable

11. Do you plan to use the NETWORK's services again?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Undecided
If "Yes", approximately how often?	If "No", indicate the reason why.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Once a week	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not need it any longer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Once a month	<input type="checkbox"/> Too difficult to use the system	
<input type="checkbox"/> Six or more times during a calendar year	<input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied with previous experience	
<input type="checkbox"/> Less than six times during a calendar year	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____	_____	
_____	_____	
_____	_____	

12. Would you recommend the NETWORK's services to others?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided

13. Please provide additional comments below.

APPENDIX F

NETWORK Reaction Sheet



Network Reaction Sheet

The Military Educators Resource NETWORK develops and distributes a variety of publications. These include: the *NETWORK Circuit*, a quarterly newsletter; the *NETWORK Fact Sheet*, a brief summary of a high interest topic; and the *NETWORK Vanguard*, photocopies of current professional journal tables-of-contents. To evaluate the usefulness of these publications, we would appreciate your completing this questionnaire. Please mark an "X" in the appropriate boxes to indicate your response.

After you have completed this form, please return it to the NETWORK at the address indicated below using a government franked envelope. THANK YOU!

Military Educators Resource NETWORK
1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 508
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209

A Note From HQDA Education Division (DAPE-MPE)

Please help us determine the usefulness of the NETWORK's publications by completing and returning this brief form. Your frank responses will aid in the overall evaluation of the NETWORK. Your prompt attention is appreciated.

Bruce T. Battey
BRUCE T. BATTEY (LTC, GS)
Chief, Education Division

1. What is your title/position? (check one only)

- ☐ Education Services Officer
☐ Education Services Specialist
☐ Guidance Counselor

- ☐ Researcher
☐ Administrator
☐ Other (specify) _____

2. What is your military service affiliation? (check one only)

- ☐ Air Force
☐ Army
☐ Coast Guard

- ☐ Marines
☐ Navy
☐ Other (specify) _____

3. For each of the NETWORK publications, please indicate the level of helpfulness each provides.

	Very Helpful		Moderately Helpful		Not Helpful	No opinion/ Not received
	5	4	3	2	1	0
<i>NETWORK Circuit</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>NETWORK Fact Sheet</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>NETWORK Vanguard</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Considering all of the NETWORK's publications as a whole, please indicate your level of satisfaction with their quality and usefulness.

	Extremely Good		Acceptable		Very Poor	No opinion
	5	4	3	2	1	0
QUALITY						
a. Comprehensiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Ease of understanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Accuracy of information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[illegible]

5. How do you use the NETWORK's publications? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Use as update on topics
- ☐ Use to identify resources
- ☐ Use to follow current research efforts
- ☐ Use to identify points-of-contact
- ☐ Other (specify) _____


6. Do you share the NETWORK publications with your colleagues?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If "Yes", on an average, how many colleagues see each publication?
- ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5-6 ☐ 7-10 ☐ 10 +

Please provide any additional comments below.

APPENDIX G

NETWORK Profiles Service Opinion Form



NETWORK PROFILES SERVICE -- OPINION FORM

The Military Educators Resource NETWORK has undertaken a pilot test of a specialized service entitled the "NETWORK Profiles." You were selected to participate in the pilot test because you are the primary contact for the education programs offered at your installation. The Profiles service provides Army educators with current information related to the individual educator's interests. As a participant, you receive information periodically about current research efforts, publications, and/or other resources which match your pre-stated profile.

Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions about the usefulness of the NETWORK Profiles service. Place an "X" in the appropriate boxes to indicate your responses. Please return the completed form to the NETWORK in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. THANK YOU!

1. Were you satisfied with the information materials provided to you?

Very Satisfied

☐

Satisfied

☐

Not Satisfied

☐

No Opinion

☐

2. How useful were these materials to your professional activities?

Very Useful

☐

Useful

☐

Not Useful

☐

No Opinion

☐

3. Did you share these materials with your colleagues?

☐ Yes

☐ No

→ If "Yes", how many colleagues did you share the information with?

☐ 1-2

☐ 3-4

☐ 5-6

☐ 7-9

☐ 10+

4. How useful would the NETWORK Profiles service be to your colleagues?

(Please provide any additional comments on the reverse side of this form.)

Very Useful

☐

Useful

☐

Not Useful

☐

No Opinion

☐

5. Would you recommend that the NETWORK continue to offer this specialized service?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Undecided

Please provide any additional comments on the reverse side of this form.

APPENDIX H

Subject Area Checklist

Subject Area Checklist

To further develop the NETWORK computerized database, we need to know the topics and/or subject areas that are of primary interest to you. From the list below, indicate those areas for which information would be beneficial to you in the operation of your ACES programs. (Check all that apply.)

Education

- ☐ Audiovisual courseware evaluations
- ☐ Audiovisual equipment evaluations
- ☐ Basic skills curricula, instructional materials and tests
- ☐ Computer-assisted instruction
- ☐ Curriculum development
- ☐ Curriculum evaluations
- ☐ Educational achievement levels
- ☐ Educational research
- ☐ Functional basic skills, including job-related training, occupational planning, functional literacy and evaluation techniques
- ☐ Individualized instruction
- ☐ Instruction design
- ☐ Literacy standards
- ☐ Psychology of learning
- ☐ Quality assurance for adult programs
- ☐ Self-paced instructional programs
- ☐ Specific skills:
 - ☐ Computation
 - ☐ ESL
 - ☐ Listening
 - ☐ Reading
 - ☐ Writing
 - ☐ Psychomotor
 - ☐ Daily life coping
- ☐ Teacher evaluation
- ☐ Teaching methods
- ☐ Tests and measurements
- ☐ Tuition rates
- ☐ OTHER (specify): _____

Computer Systems

- ☐ Computer equipment evaluations
- ☐ Computer systems compatibility
- ☐ Computer systems evaluation
- ☐ Software evaluations
- ☐ OTHER (specify): _____

Counseling

- ☐ Career maturity
- ☐ Career planning and guidance
- ☐ Civilian labor force market data
- ☐ Computer-based guidance systems
- ☐ Counseling methods
- ☐ Cross-cultural counseling
- ☐ Information of colleges, vocational schools and other educational institutions
- ☐ OTHER (specify): _____

Management

- ☐ Contracting requirements
- ☐ Economic analysis; cost-benefit analysis; effectiveness analysis
- ☐ General management skills
- ☐ Marketing educational programs
- ☐ Needs assessment techniques
- ☐ Program and curriculum evaluation techniques
- ☐ Research methods
- ☐ OTHER (specify): _____

Government/Military Information

- ☐ Demographic data
- ☐ Directives and regulatory information
- ☐ Federal budget appropriations
- ☐ Research and programs in other Army installations
- ☐ Research and programs in other branches of the military
- ☐ State educational agencies policies; educational requirements; legal issues
- ☐ OTHER (specify): _____

Title/Position: _____

Military Service (circle one): Air Force Army Coast Guard Marines Navy

Military Installation _____

Thanks for your help!

Once completed, place this checklist in a government franked envelope and mail using the enclosed label.