

TITLE: BOB/BAIRD (PROPOSAL FOR PROGRAMMED LEARNING)
Approved For Release 2000/09/08 : CIA-RDP78-00365A001000050020-5

CONFIDENTIAL

ORIGINAL CL BY 061790

29 December 1965

DECL REVW ON 2010

Bob: EXT BYND 6 YRS BY same

REASON 3d(3)

25X1A9a

I'm sure [redacted] will do a fine job in preparing

the proposal for the Programmed Learning (PL) Survey. But if you want me to have something to do with it, as you once said you did, I believe you'd like to have my ideas on how the Survey should be conducted.

As far back as 1958, I learned of the, then considered, miraculous experiments being carried in the Roanoke, ^{VA.} ~~North-Carolina~~ School system in the teaching of Algebra. The results were almost unbelievable. Because psychologists rather than teachers seemed to be in the vanguard of the experiments, I directed

25X1A9a

[redacted] C/A&E/OTR to do some in-house and external research on what was then known as the "Teaching Machine."

25X1A9a

[redacted] spent part time for six months in an attempt to devise a machine and a "program" for the teaching of "tracecraft." OTR let a 3 year contract with [redacted] to do the same thing for the teaching of Mandarin Chinese.

25X1A5a1

Over the years since then, OTR and the Agency have used P.L. in several instances with success enough to warrant further research and validation studies.

OTR sponsored a series of Agency briefings by outside experts on both the "machines" and P.L. Only Commo and TSD showed any interest. Teachers mistakenly fear that the "machines" and P.L. will put them out of business. This is poppycock, of course, but the suspicion lingers.

I gave a 40 minute briefing in 1961 to the DDS and his staff on P.L. in the old East Building and another to the DCI's Staff at Langley. I tried to interest

ILLEGIB

Approved For Release 2000/09/08 : CIA-RDP78-0636 [redacted]

ILLEGIB

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

= 2 -

Bob Amory of B. O. B. in an interagency budget approach to the P. L. teaching of english to foreigners, and sponsored an inter-agency briefing by N. Y. C. experts at Langley on the same subject. I appointed [REDACTED] full time on P. L. and we contracted out two P. L. projects for OSI. [REDACTED] and I attended several D. C. and out of town conferences on P. L. We were off at a limping walk if not a run. Except among an enlightened few at the "indian" level, the concept of P. L. just didn't catch on.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

There were several reasons for this:

1. I hadn't the ability and certainly not the time to sell P. L. to the people who count.
3. The P. L. "industry" in the early days over sold their wares. Fly-by-night outfits sprouted up which sold "teaching machines" of little value and at exhorbitant prices. Irresponsible publishers in an attempt to get in on the ground floor rushed "Programs" into print which were not evaluated and which fell far short of the publishers' claims.
4. The above, inturn, gave the skeptical and insecure orthodox teachers opposition ammunition.
5. Inside the Agency budget and ceiling limitations gradually squeezed out research funds and manpower which had been devoted to P. L. Don't minimize the importance of this. It may not have applied to the DDS&T or

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

25X1A9a

NPIC or [REDACTED] but it most certainly did to OTR. [REDACTED] was

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

returned to the A & E Staff. [REDACTED] went to NPIC. To meet ever increasing requirements, OTR instructors who were working part time on P. L. applications to OTR courses had to devote full time to orthodox teaching. Outside OTR contracts for P. L. research and Programs were one by one lopped off the budget.

6. The USAF picked up and ran with the government ball which enabled the rest of us to rationalize a sit back and wait and see position.

So much for background. In spite of false starts, some admitted failures, unvalidated claims and insufficient research, I am convinced:

1. That P. L. principles are applicable to some OTR and Agency training requirements.
2. That where applicable, P. L. will very appreciably:
 - A. decrease the time students need to be in training
 - B. decrease the time instructors need in teaching
 - C. increase the efficiency of the learning process and retention of information
 - D. in the long run, decrease the cost of per capita student training
 - E. afford flexible training means where classroom space is not available and not needed.

What I do not know, and I don't think anybody else does, is the degree to which

#1 Approved For Release 2000/09/08 : CIA-RDP78-06365A001000050020-5
#1 & #2 above are pertinent. In this connection, I strongly urge you not to permit

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 4 -

the Agency to attempt to make up over night for the lost time of the last eight years. We quite frankly do not know enough about the state of the art and its applicability to CIA to embark at this time on any extensive P. L. ventures. The Air Training Command of the USAF in spite of its large outlay of money and personnel on P. L. has validated only a small percent of its Programs; and a still smaller percent give evidence of applicability to CIA requirements. Industry (Business) is ahead of the USAF, has spent millions (2 billion dollars was a figure given 3 years ago!) on P. L., but they are loathe to publicize their validation studies though acclaiming the successes of their program.

I believe that the Agency should move slowly at first but with determination along the following lines:

1. The head of the joint DCS&T/DDS P. L. Survey, whether it be I or someone else, should spend the rest of FY '66 in finding out first-hand the "state of the art." This would include the Programmers Course at Headquarters Air Training Command and trips of one day to one week at various places where promising work on P. L. is being undertaken -- ~~Raleigh~~ ^{Roanoke VA}, California, Chicago, Pittsburg, Boston, N. Y. C., Hqtrs. H. E. W. -- a total of about 12 weeks.
2. Simultaneously in FY '66, OTR and ORD should jointly examine existing P. L. projects in the Agency and attempt to validate them scientifically.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 5 -

3. Also during FY'66, ORD has volunteered to bring to the Agency and pay for, an expert consultant to help in #2 above.

4. In short, little more should be done in FY '66 than to assure ourselves what is is "the state of the art" as it may apply to CIA requirements, and to take a hard look at where we are P. L. -wise in CIA.

5. The closest team work and coordination on a continuing basis must obtain between ORD and OTR.

Soon after 1 July 1966, (to be budgeted for in FY '67) we should:

1. Identify existing Agency P. L. efforts which we believe should be abandoned, modified or continued.

2. Identify new requirements for P. L. efforts which can be accomplished within the Agency or by outside contract.

3. Continue ORD validation studies of Agency Programs and extra Agency P. L. efforts which appear to have Agency relevance.

4. Identify and train Agency personnel who will be actively engaged in designing component programs, i. e., in addition to OTR and ORD personnel, personnel from those components for which P.L. has been agreed as feasible to meet requirements.

I suggest the following type of organization:

1. The P. L. Survey, (or Project or Activity or whatever you want to call it) should be headed by a Coordinator who by agreement with DDS&T should report directly to the DDS.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 6 -

2. Initially (FY '66) the Coordinator should be assisted by a woman JOT type GS-9/11, preferably an Education major who would serve as an Admin. Ass't. / Secretary. She should be trained, learn the lingo and keep the shop going in the absence of the Coordinator.

3. Both the above positions should come from the DDS and not out of the hide of OTR.

4. In addition, I think it advisable if not essential that in FY '66 an OTR officer who will be responsible for programming full time be assigned to the Survey. This man (or woman) however, should be on the OTR T.O.

5. A similar arrangement might be advisable for an ORD officer.

6. Sometime toward the middle of FY '67, the DTR should appoint an officer who would succeed the Coordinator (if it be Baird) and assign him to the Coordinator.

7. When the present Coordinator's assignment is terminated, his slot and the slot of his Assistant should be transferred from the DDS to OTR and the Survey absorbed as another activity of OTR.

8. In FY '66 and '67, the P.L. Survey would look to OTR for logistics support, i.e., space, telephone, clerical supplies, travel vouchers, etc. and to ORD for budget support for travel and research, testing and evaluation.

9. I suggest that in the FY '67 budget, OTR budget only for those P.L. activities which will be for Agency courses of Agency-wide use., i.e.,

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 7 -

if such components as NPIC, OCS, OCR, Commo, etc., have requirements for P. L. which are approved by the Coordinator but which are of use to only one component, the costs of such programs by the component involved.

MATTHEW BAIRD

CONFIDENTIAL