ABSTRACT
        This document describes the Technology Education
Teacher Center, which was designed as a pilot model for a specific
field of study--technology education. The first section of the
document examines the development of the Center during its five years
of operation. The second section discusses the design of the Center,
concentrating on the following topics: (a) change process; (b)
technology model; (c) program design; and (d) purpose, function, and
scope of the Center's programs. The third section lists program
objectives, including a) organizational-operational objectives, b)
instructional-educational objectives, c) field and community
services, d) education and technology resources, and e) secondary
objectives. The fourth section deals with program organization,
focusing specifically on the following areas: (a) organizational
structure, (b) management function, (c) training function, (d)
contractual function, (e) research function, (f) resource function,
(g) evaluation function, (h) staffing the center, and (i) facilities.
The fifth section looks at program operation, which is determined by
the objectives of the Center together with the organizational design.
Lastly, assessment of the teacher center operation is examined.
(PB)

Session M 1:30 4

Technology Education
Teacher Center

Presented
at
4th International Conference
American Industrial Arts Association
Cincinnati, Ohio
March 24, 1975

Technology Education

Teacher Center

PAUL W. DeVORE

DAVID L. McCRORY

Numerous individuals in the field of education have
recognized a critical variable which militates against the
improvement of education and educational systems. The vari-
able is inservice teacher education in its many and diverse
forms.

The conclusion of most researchers has been that in-
service education, as traditionally conducted, is an outright
failure. It seems that Goodlad (p. 61) is correct when he
states that "education is probably the only large scale
enterprise that does not provide for systematic updating of
the skills and abilities of its employees."

more

Millions of dollars are spent each year by teachers and school systems on inservice courses and degree programs. Yet, the overall results are not generally observable or measurable with respect to the improvement of the education of children and youth. The primary result, if not the primary goal, is additional certification and salary increases, not measurable improvements in the education of children.

In addition to the extensive amount of money and time devoted to the inservice process, considerable time and effort has been devoted to research about teaching and learning. Only a brief analysis of the present state of the efforts in inservice education and research is required to determine that if breakthroughs in research about teaching and learning are to be transferred to practice, then a new and more effective system must be devised for the inservice education and training of teachers.

One approach to meeting the need for a more effective system of inservice education has been the design and development of a new delivery system, one committed to improving teaching and learning. The new delivery system is called a Teacher Center.

There are many types and styles of teacher centers, some with specific missions, such as the Technology Education Teacher Center at West Virginia University which is the subject of this report.

more

The Technology Education Teacher Center was designed as a pilot model for a specific field of study, technology education. The description of a teacher center, delimited to one field of study, should be a relatively easy task. This, however, is not the case, and for one specific reason. The teacher center is an entirely new concept. Educators with experiences in traditional inservice education efforts find the teacher center concept foreign to their thinking. They discover that to function effectively within a teacher center environment, they must develop entirely new ways of thinking and behaving with respect to inservice programs.

Those who have been involved in the design and implementation of the teacher center concept have discovered it is necessary to pursue the design and implementation from a perspective different from typical educational efforts. These efforts, for the most part, utilize workshops and graduate coursework for inservice education with the primary emphasis and focus on credentialling, not the improvement of instruction. The new inservice model is a change model. The criteria for success is actual, observable, measurable change in teaching and learning in real on-going classrooms. As a result, the subtleties of operation of a teacher center are highly complex and interrelated. The end results, however, for those interested in working with schools and teachers to improve the education of children, are significant and well

more

beyond the expectations of experienced educators.

There are several significant topics which need to be discussed if the fundamental concepts of the design, development and operation of a technology education teacher center are to be understood.  These include, historical background of the center, the design of the center (philosophy, assumptions, purpose and function), program plan, organizational plan, operational plan, and selected observations about the center with recommendations for future efforts.

## The Technology Education Teacher Center
### Historical Development

The Technology Education Teacher Center at West Virginia University was initiated through efforts by a Task Force of the NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth.  The work of the Task Force culminated in a publication entitled Teachers for the Real World, authored by B. Othanel Smith, Saul B. Cohen and Arthur Pearl, all members of the Task Force.

In the publication, the authors recommended the establishment of what they termed Training Complexes, the forerunner of teacher centers.  The rationale supporting the recommendation was impressive.  The focus was on training. The authors reminded educators that "student teaching was

more

rated high by prospective teachers because it was the only work they have which resembles a training experience." Yet, the authors found, when they examined teacher preparation programs, that "there has never been a program of teacher training, only a program of courses ending with student teaching." Their recommendation for the improvement of classroom teaching was to retain the critical research and theory elements of teacher education and add a new component to the system which would focus on <u>training</u>. The training component of the new model would be called a <u>training complex</u>.

It was from the publication entitled <u>Teachers for the Real World</u>, and the ideas associated with the question of in-service training and performance, that the Technology Education Teacher Center at West Virginia University developed. There were, of course, a number of intervening steps.

<u>Teachers for the Real World</u> provided the impetus for the United States Office of Education to establish several national advisory committees, one of which was the Advisory Committee on Training Complexes. The Advisory Committee on Training Complexes convened first on February 27-28, 1970, and concluded its initial work on July 1, 1970. During this time period, the committee formulated a design for training complexes including operational assumptions, a descriptive definition, and guidelines for the establishment of training complexes. In addition, a number of proposed models for

more

training complexes were reviewed and evaluated. Included were the Japanese model, the English model and training models developed and operated by business and industry.

Following these studies, the Advisory Committee recommended that five (5) micro-pilot models be funded and tested, beginning in July 1970.

One pilot program recommended for funding was known as the Northern Appalachian Training Center for Teachers in the Technologies at West Virginia University. Initial development of the pilot program began in July 1970. For field use the pilot program was called the Training Program for Teachers in the Technologies (TPTT).

The micro-pilot program at West Virginia University was operated from July 1970, through June 1971, and was successful beyond original expectations. The present effort, called the Technology Education Teacher Center, is based on experiences of the pilot program. Each year the program has been altered and expanded according to the results of experience and the original design criteria.

To date, there have been five (5) developmental stages in the evolution of the Technology Education Teacher Center. Each stage of development coincides with yearly plans and projections for training programs for teachers in the technologies in West Virginia and the Appalachia Region.

more

1970-71     First Year. Pilot program. Imple-
mentation and assessment of technology
training model developed for the pro-
ject. Five county supervisors and ten
teachers involved. Goal: Teach new
technical content, design new units of
instruction, and teach students in
participating teacher's own classroom
or laboratory. Cooperative program
established with State Department of
Education and Program Specialist for
Industrial Arts. Curriculum Research
and Resource Center established.

1971-72     Second Year. Continuation of first
year effort. Sixteen new teachers
involved. Program expanded to in-
clude efforts to train teachers
(Training Associates) as field
trainers. Two stages. Stage one
included new content, new strategies
of teaching in the technologies, the
design of units of instruction, and
the testing of the units in home
classrooms. Stage two involved the

more

development of beginning competencies
necessary to serve as field trainers
and adjunct staff members of the
Training Program for Teachers in the
Technologies.  Precision teaching-
learning unit development program
initiated with eight teachers.  Re-
gional Training Meetings and
Administrator Information Programs
designed and implemented.  Expan-
sion of Curriculum Research and
Resource Center.  Program Special-
ist for Industrial Arts appointed
as adjunct faculty member and co-
director of Teacher Center Program.

1972-73       Third Year.  Continuation of pro-
grams originated in first and
second year with emphasis on Re-
gional Training Meetings and
Administrators' Information
Meetings.  Precision Teaching
Learning Unit program continued.
Expansion of Curriculum Research
and Resource Center.  Field Asso-

more

ciate Training Program development
continued.  Design and operation
of inservice program by teachers
trained as field associates.  Pro-
ject Open Model conceived and
developed.  Two models initiated;
the Consultant Model and the
Teaching Model.  Two Project
Open contracts for curriculum de-
velopment initiated.  Training
Program for Teachers in the Tech-
nologies Newsletter initiated.

1973-74    Fourth Year.  Continuation of pro-
grams originated in first, second
and third years.  Full time coordi-
nator of Teacher Center (Field
Service Programs) employed.  Addi-
tional facilities for Teacher Center
obtained.  Project Open Models im-
plemented in two county school
systems.  N.A.S.A. program in
aerospace education initiated.  In-
service Workshops for teachers
and administrators continued with

more

emphasis on curriculum and instruc-
tional design.  Q.R.C. (Quick
Reaction Capability) program
initiated with workshops on metri-
cation and unified arts.

1974-75     Fifth Year.  Continuation of programs
originated in previous four years.
Regional teacher and administrator
workshops expanded.  Q.R.C. program
expanded to include programs on
energy.  Project Open Model expanded.
Unified Arts program developed.
N.A.S.A. program continued and Aero-
space Workshop program initiated.
Precision teaching-learning unit
development program continued.  Ex-
pansion of Project Open Model to
three counties, five schools.

The history of the Technology Education Teacher Cen-
ter has been one of constant growth and expansion of role.
Much of the success of the center can be traced to the ori-
ginal design committed to inservice education.

more

Design of the Technology
Education Teacher Center

The prime focus of the Technology Education Teacher
Center, as originally conceived, was _training_, the training
of inservice teachers.  The focus on _training_ required a new
perspective, a new mentality on the part of those responsi-
ble for the operation of the center.  Typical institutional
organizations and viewpoints related to inservice education
of teachers were found to be inadequate.  The Technology
Education Teacher Center, with a heritage derived from the
training complex concept proposed by B.O. Smith in _Teachers_
_for the Real World_, has a clearly defined training mission
directed toward the development of complex, integrated
skills appropriate for teaching in a variety of institu-
tional settings.  The present teacher center was developed
with a focus on characteristics which differentiate a
training complex or teacher center from other institutional
programs.  For instance, a training complex includes:

1.  Provision for the active participation of
    those concerned with decision making re-
    garding the training of educational
    personnel.

2.  utilization of a wide range of resources:
    the schools, colleges, universities and

more

community to develop and staff training
programs.

3.  opportunity for inservice (and pre-service)
    teacher training to be conducted in school
    settings, thus drawing on the strengths of
    the school by providing for real problems
    encountered in classrooms and in school or-
    ganizations during the change process.

4.  flexibility in employing personnel from
    varied backgrounds, with or without the
    standard credentials necessary in other
    settings.

5.  utilization of the center staff in patterns
    not considered possible or appropriate in
    traditional university or school based in-
    service training programs.

Teacher centers are designed to meet a wide range of
training needs.  The operational mode is problem centered
with the goal of solving problems, not of perpetuating
antequated systems.  The function of a teacher center is to
train, to capitalize upon its unique environment and rela-
tionship to the educational process, and thereby provide
direction to the kind of training required by educational per-
sonnel inservice.  To do so, the teacher center provides, for
personnel who have not been prepared to conduct successful

more

instructional programs, access to identifiable and specific training contexts.

The teacher center operation, therefore, must be flexible in the development of training services.  The services must be specific to the personnel, the region and to the educational environments in which they are provided.

Another characteristic which separates a teacher center and its activities from typical inservice efforts and curriculum development projects is that centers are inter-institutional and complex.  They provide multiple outputs and require multiple, diverse, and specifically designed inputs.  Centers are thus useful for installing systems which are innovative and expected to endure.  Programs in which teacher centers are involved are best thought of as long range change models.

The Syracuse University Teacher Center Study Project defines a teacher center as:

> "a place or places where a program exists that
> offers educational personnel (inservice teachers,
> pre-service teachers, administrators, para-pro-
> fessionals, etc.) the opportunity to share, to
> have access to a wide range of resources, and
> to receive specific training."

The Technology Education Teacher Center at West Virginia University is compatible with this definition but

differs significantly from typical teacher centers in many aspects, one of which is the focus on change.  The Technology Education Teacher Center is focused on change and the program design is based on research on change.  There are several reasons for this.

Many educators have stressed the need for change. They call for new curricula, new programs, new instructional media, and pilot programs, all for the purpose of improving the educational process.  Calling for change is one thing. Actually attaining substantive, meaningful, and long term change is another problem, and a major problem.

Change and improvement in the teaching-learning process take place only when people are ready for change, when people are prepared, and when they have the competencies to initiate and carry out change.  These criteria identify important functions which must be considered in the design of the teacher center.  The purpose of the teacher center, therefore, becomes one of increasing the competency levels of teachers so they are more secure with change, more capable of engaging the questions of the quality of instruction, and more knowledgeable about the structure of schools in relation to learning inhibition and good teaching.

The emphasis of the technology education teacher center at West Virginia University has been on the individual teacher and his development as a self-sustaining teacher-

more

scholar capable of engaging the questions and meeting the
challenge of change.  This process requires continual
<u>training</u> and the movement of the concern for <u>training</u> and
<u>improvement in competence</u> from the colleges, universities,
and other public agencies to the individual.  To attain
this goal requires knowledge and implementation of the
theories and practices of the change process.  There is a
vast body of literature on the change process which has im-
plications for change.  Some of the more important factors
derived from the study of the change process are included
in the following section on the Change Process.

## The Change Process

Change is always occurring.  The question is:  What
type and in what direction?  Planned change is possible and
is generally considered a desirable goal.  We know we can
attain change.  We also know there is a large gap between
theory and practice.  In the field of education knowledge
of both the theory and practice of change is weak.

We know that present day inservice teacher education
programs produce little change which affects the quality of
instruction.  We know that one of the reasons for this is
that programs are not evaluated.  And we know that programs
without precisely stated objectives are next to impossible
to evaluate.  In fact, evaluations of programs without

more

performance objectives or criteria are largely subjective exercises in futility.

We know much more about change and the change process than most educators are willing to admit. It almost appears educators are reluctant to use the tools available to them for engaging in planned change.

We know that the variables affecting change involve diverse elements such as philosophy, people, programs, performance, places, practices, projections, and planning, to name a few. We know that the process of change is complex. We know that it requires knowledge and skill of a high order to direct planned change.

We know that many of the variables concerning change relate to the diversity of goals in education and the lack of a structure within the educational establishment to plan and manage change, including the preparation and training of such specialists as those required for quality control, the evaluators.

We know it will be necessary to create special organizations to service the change process including the critical variables of evaluation and training. School systems at present are not equipped to handle these functions without outside assistance.

more

There are many suggestions and recommendations that could be made with respect to changing inservice teacher education. In fact, there are lists ranging from four or five items to twenty or more. Some variables are more critical than others.

For instance, if a decision is made by a given political entity, with direction and control over education, to change inservice teacher education, _then_ action devoted to the following variables has been found to be in order.

1. Formulation of precise, long-term developmental plans.

2. Development of specialists including managers, change agents, and evaluation specialists.

3. Establishment of programs for the study of the change process, including research and evaluation.

4. Commitment of funding sources to long-term ventures so the critical variables of resources and follow-up can come into play.

5. Structuring all phases of the program so there is direct involvement of teachers in the process.

6. Designing all efforts so the focus of attention is directed from the part to the

more

whole.

7. Creation of an "outside force" such as
   Training Centers with the long-term task
   of engaging the problem of improvement
   in the quality of instruction with parti-
   cular attention to the first two years of
   a teacher's tenure.

Finally, a solution to the reward structure in edu-
cation is a critical variable for personnel at all levels.
This is important because:  In the last analysis it is
people who change programs.  The question is:  "Why
should they?"  (DeVore, p. 61).

These and other findings of research on change and
change models focus attention on the creation of a new
delivery system for teacher education, the teacher center.
Teacher centers vary considerably in their missions and
the designs and models utilized to carry out their mis-
sions.  The Technology Education Teacher Center at West
Virginia University is based on what has been described
as the technology model.

## The Technology Model

Fundamental to the design of the Center was the
selection of a model from which structural and program-
matic decisions could be made.  The present design was

more

based on a technology model with the assumption that self-realization, self-assurance and improved performance could be attained by teachers as their level of competency was raised.  Competence and the "ability to do" enhance self-realization and self-assurance, critical elements in a suc, essful teaching-learning equation.

The model, as conceived, was action oriented, as is technology, and met the center concept of providing brief, intensive opportunities for training in specific and identifiable categories.

Of the two training phases, pre-service and in-service, the center was primarily concerned with the inservice phase.  Concentration on inservice problems was based upon the tenet that the way problems are solved and situations changed is by "starting from where you are."

A teacher centr utilizing the technology model con-centrates on solving problems related to improving instruction in as economical and efficient manner as pos-sible.  The issue was one of putting to work knowledge and techniques already available.  Some of the basic pre-mises were:

1. that the tasks to be identified would be
   those which teachers and others expressed
   as needs or which, as a result of involve-
   ment in training programs, teachers found

more

relevant,

2.  that tasks would be those which could be
    specified in performance terms and could
    be attained in short periods of time,

3.  that the teacher center existed to pro-
    vide services to local or regional
    educational personnel on contractual and
    other bases, and

4.  that the success of the center would be
    measured in terms of continued use on the
    part of its clients.

## Program Design

Analysis of individuals who have performed consis-
tently at high levels indicated a lengthy training process
built in small incremental segments.  Each increment or
segment added to the repertoire of the individual and in-
creased his competence level.  A high level of performance
is reached in a step-by-step procedure and attained when
the total, consisting of all the parts, is put together
into a meaningful whole.  Unfortunately for many teachers,
some of the parts are missing and a vision of the whole
is never attained.

Many solutions have been proposed to correct these
voids.  However, most methods and procedures are so

more

complex that highly trained experts are required for their
application, thus making the solution low in efficiency
and high in cost.  In addition, the goal of disseminating
training procedures to the local school level is obviated.
The technology model is based on the assumption that the
function of the Teacher Center is to find the means to
teach all who are capable how to use and apply new tech-
niques.  Teachers have no faith in techniques which can
be applied only by experts.  This means the structure and
program of the Technology Education Teacher Center must be
geared to actual operational problems faced by the teachers
in the field.

The concept of "starting from where the teachers
are" is basic if real change is to take place.  It is very
difficult, if not impossible, to introduce radically new
ideas without a lengthy period of preparation.  Programs
geared to actual operations have a greater chance of suc-
cess.  They also provide a much better base for continual
change than do either short or long-term inservice programs
begun on highly sophisticated levels or based on foreign,
radical or esoteric ideas.

The real issues, then, are ones of structure and
program.  The technology model, starting from where the
individual is and operating on the principle that compe-
tence is attained in short, specific, incremental stages,

more

centers on tasks which are <u>action</u> or <u>doing</u> oriented. Prob-
lems are analyzed and divided into small segments suitable
for short, highly defined training sessions. <u>Immediacy</u>
and <u>application to practice</u> are the keys. The model is
constant and on-going, utilizing all resources and exper-
tise on an <u>ad hoc</u> basis as required by program goals and
individual needs. The <u>task analysis approach</u> is used.
Specificity is emphasized and the following assumptions
utilized.

> . . . when performance expectations can be
> defined in precise behavioral terms,
> systems can be developed to prepare
> teachers to perform them.

> . . . when variables enter into performance
> expectations, a series of diagnostic
> questions can be designed to aid in
> the definition of the problem. The
> model suggests that trainers can be
> prepared to ask diagnostic questions
> and to apply appropriate solutions or
> select appropriate learning systems
> for teachers.

> . . . when a reward or payoff is within
> sight, behavioral and attitudinal
> changes are not only probable but

<div align="center">more</div>

reasonably certain.

. . . when teachers see specific connections
between training programs, resultant
proficiency on the job, and the level
of status, responsibility, or income
for which the training is to prepare
them, attitudes toward training will
be more positive.

Involvement with the technology model has indicated
several other characteristics which should be noted.  The
focus is on the individual.  Each individual becomes in-
volved directly in the identification and development of
his own program of improvement.  The attempt is to develop
awareness of potential and the skills and competencies re-
quired to attain a given competency level.  The technology
model concentrates on "what is to be."  It is _action_
_oriented_.  It is designed to improve the teaching-learning
environment, including the modes of thinking, doing, acting,
and performing related to that environment.

The present program was designed and developed first
as a pilot program utilizing limited resources.  The goal
was to develop a delivery system which could meet the
criteria of _less costs_, _more options_.  It was designed to
determine answers with respect to the critical questions of

more

(1) program and (2) structure prior to committing exten-
sive resources to limited experience, know-how, and
professional competency.

The problem was to design and develop a structure
and program for a technology education teacher center which
could reach critical mass; one that could provide sustained
leadership and training for teachers in the technologies in
the State of West Virginia and the Appalachia Region.
There was, of course, a present on-going day-by-day, edu-
cational program in operation in West Virginia; a program
with considerable tradition and much momentum.  The objec-
tive was not to build a totally new structure or program.
The objective was to work with what was, to start from
where we were.  The questions then became; "What is?"
"How can critical mass be attained which will alter or
change inadequate, and in many instances, non-existent
teaching-learning processes in the technologies?"

One conclusion reached during the early design
stages of the program was that the answers would rest with
the inservice teaching population.  It was assumed that if
real change was to be made in the teaching-learning process,
then the classroom teacher, the individual responsible for
program operation at the local level, must receive help.
The functions of the Technology Education Teacher Center
became evident as soon as this assumption was stated.

more

The present Center was designed to serve the function of providing the State and Region with a means for developing personnel qualified and capable of meeting the educational problems of a changing technological society. This required that procedures be designed to increase the knowledge and competency of educational personnel in:

1. facts, concepts, principles and processes of the discipline of technology

2. instructional strategies compatible with the discipline of technology

3. diagnostic skills consistent with the problems and issues of technology education

4. curriculum design for the study of technology

5. instructional design including precision teach ng-learning units and

6. instructional resources for the study of technology

Other characteristics of the technology model, critical to the implementation and success of inservice education programs for teachers in the technologies, are derived from the processes of technology. In this context process means modes of thinking, doing and performing. The technology model is primarily task oriented and

more

problem centered. It is, therefore, process oriented, focused on the future, adaptable and flexible. The emphasis is on problem solving and the methods of attacking problems using knowledge, analysis, synthesis, application to practice, evaluation and redesign, rather than problem doing which places emphasis on studying a body of knowledge for its own sake or dealing with problems already solved. Operated at its maximum potential, the technology model provides programs with a basis for projection and analogy, as well as a basis for assessment which utilizes two criteria, namely, economy and efficiency.

The technology model can be described best perhaps as a task analysis, performance based model. Implied is a hierarchy of goals and attainments which require different structural, programmatic and operational modes. The Technology Education Teacher Center at West Virginia University was designed not only as an on-going operational program but also as an on-going research effort to determine which structures, programs, or operational modes are most valid for the improvement of education in the technologies at all levels.

## Purpose and Function

The Technology Education Teacher Center has been concerned primarily with people and their needs and

more

competencies as teachers.  The purpose, function, and
scope of the programs of the Center have changed and
adapted as the needs, problems and competencies of the
clients have been altered by the program as well as by
their continuing professional involvement in day to day
teaching activities.  Purposes and functions are thus
altered by changes in the educational environment in which
the Center operates.  The criteria for success of the Cen-
ter and the criteria for continued operation have been
whether the program of the Center demonstrated to its
constituency that its services met identifiable and agreed
upon needs.  The business of the Center was not to stay
in business.  Its business has been to help provide answers
and meet the needs of teachers in the technologies in es-
tablishing contemporary and quality programs of instruction.
The ultimate goal has been to meet the educational needs of
the youth in West Virginia and Appalachia in the study of
technology.

These purposes and functions required that the
question of the types of training personnel and their
qualifications be identified.  In addition, operational
procedures had to be developed to train personnel for
program efforts at the local, county and district levels.
The latter goal required that Center personnel engage in
efforts which had the greater certainty of <u>multiplying</u>

the initial effort.   Critical to success in multiplying the
initial efforts of teacher center personnel was direct in-
volvement of inservice teachers in the change process, not
only as learners but also as teachers of other teachers.

Another function, in addition to the role of per-
sonnel development, identified the role of the Center as
an "outside force."  The Center has had as its mission, not
only the improvement of instruction through the retraining
of individuals but also a role as a third or neutral party
in the design and development of new educational programs.
The Center functions, not as a part of the local, county,
or district organization, but as a consultant with in-
fluence on positive change through legal agreement as well
as professional expertise.   Thus, the nature of relation-
ships and responsibilities are different from those of
typical inservice operations.   Those working for the Cen-
ter can initiate ideas, programs and procedures which
those inside the system cannot or would not.   The pro-
fessional and interpersonal relationship are different.
The Center then becomes a new variable, a positive vari-
able in the change process.   The Center as an <u>outside
force</u> serves as a catalyst for change.

The Center attempts to function, as much as possi-
ble, in a <u>neutral</u> role.   This means the Center delimits

more

its formal attachment to specific University or State
Education Department structures, other than to draw upon
available resources.  In a sense the Center exists as an
autonomous entity.  Therefore, those observing the opera-
tion of the Center recognize that the design, structure,
and programs, together with the neutrality factor, are
essential if the center is to fulfill its role.

In addition it is important to remember that the
Center was designed to draw together and organize resources
required to solve problems, rather than expend energies in
identifying problems capable of being solved by existing
resources and programs.  The mode of operation thus be-
comes ad hoc and open rather than static and closed.

## Program Objectives

The Program Plan for the Technology Education
Teacher Center requires the development of specific objec-
tives for specific and identified functional categories
related to the Center's operation.  The objectives provide
direction for the Center's operation as well as a substan-
tive base for assessment of the work of the Center.  An
indication of some of the objectives, by category, follow.
By design, all objectives are stated in behavioral and
performance.

## Primary Objectives

A. <u>Organizational-Operational</u>:

1. Provide direct, tangible and specific leadership
   for the people of the State and Region in meeting
   the needs of education in the technologies, at
   all levels, through the most economical and effi-
   cient means, by serving as a research, resource
   and personnel training center.

2. Study, develop, evaluate, and initiate activities
   which have the greater certainty of multiplying
   initial efforts in increasing the quality,
   scope, and effectiveness of teacher education
   programs in the technologies in the State and
   the Appalachian Region.

3. Provide the State and Region with an enterprise
   dedicated to aiding and assisting teachers in
   the technologies who are engaged in efforts to
   meet the needs of youth and adults through edu-
   cation in the technologies.

4. Provide the State and Region with an enterprise
   which serves as an "outside force" designed to
   create favorable climates conducive to motiva-
   tion, sustained systematic planning, and other
   efforts required to aid people in rising above
   non-adaptive educational patterns in the

more

technologies.

5. Develop and initiate effective and highly selective communication systems for the State to meet the problems and needs of education in the technologies. Systems should contain a "sensing" mode to determine weaknesses in the educational effort and a "scanning" mode designed to locate information and resources pertinent to the solution of identified problems.

6. Design, develop and operate an exemplary technological education research and resource facility adaptable to educational and technological change and capable of meeting the needs of the Center's programs.

7. Study, develop, initiate and evaluate change strategies suitable for improving education in the technologies in the Appalachian Region.

B. Instructional-Educational:

1. Design, develop and implement procedures for monitoring the educational process in the technologies at all levels of education, both formal and informal, for the purpose of identifying present and projected human resource needs.

2. Design, develop, initiate, and evaluate short-

more

term training and retraining programs in the
technologies for teachers in the field, at all
levels of education, both formal and informal,
for the purpose of providing the State and
Region with personnel qualified and capable
of meeting the educational problems of a
changing technological society through proce-
dures designed to increase the competency of
these personnel in knowledge and performance
in the areas of curriculum design, materials
of instruction, technical content, instruc-
tional strategies, and leadership.

3. Identify and develop a taxonomy of teaching
   skills from which to determine selected in-
   structional program offerings for implementation
   by the Center for teachers in the technologies.

4. Develop a matrix of potential instructional
   offerings from which a competency hierarchy
   can be determined and programmed, and con-
   tractual arrangements determined.

C. Field and Community Service:

1. Design, develop and initiate an in-service
   educational model which meets the following
   criteria:

   a. motivates individuals toward continuous

   more

learning and maintains, improves, and adds
to the competencies of those teaching in
the technologies at various levels of edu-
cation.

b.  is flexible and adaptable to educational
and technological change, and

c.  is capable of serving the needs of individuals
or groups within the local community, at re-
gional centers or at the Technology Education
Teacher Center depending on need, complexity
of instruction, and resources required.

2.  Develop a Regional Organizational Model whereby
the Center serves as a resource for the initiation
and operation of programs for the solution of lo-
calized and immediate educational problems in the
technologies as a means of increasing the cost
effectiveness of efforts within the Region through
correlated and cooperative efforts.

3.  Provide technical and educational field assistance
for all levels of technological education in the
State and Region.

4.  Establish, in selected urban and rural areas of
the State and Region, experimental and exemplary
pilot programs designed to provide leadership in
meeting the needs of education of children and

more

youth in a technological society.

5. Initiate the utilization of pilot program facilities, on a contractual basis, for inservice technology education programs within the Region.

6. Coordinate and provide liaison activities with other organizations and enterprises in the State and Region concerned with technology and human resource development.

D. Education and Technology Resources:

1. Design, develop and evaluate program models, instructional models, materials of instruction, resource materials, teaching-learning units, physical facility designs and other software materials required for experimental, pilot and operating programs in the technologies as part of the technical, field service, and out-reach functions of the Center in meeting the needs of the State and the Region.

2. Develop, organize and publish a master Technology Education Resource File identifying human, physical, and published resources, both hardware and software, which are available to meet selected instructional and training needs.

3. Identify, evaluate, select, and publish a descriptive listing of basic readings and resources

more

for study in the technologies at several learning
levels.

## Secondary Objectives

In addition to the primary objectives, concerned
with rather specific areas of endeavor, the Center's acti-
vities are also determined by second order objectives.

1. Determine the specific nature of the many tasks
   related to the proper functioning of a Technology
   Education Teacher Center and establish a training
   hierarchy, in terms of personnel and the compe-
   tencies required.

2. Study, develop, and select reward structures
   which enhance the productivity of training pro-
   grams for teachers in the technologies by promoting
   interest in self improvement.

3. Evaluate the many types of performance categories
   required for the proper functioning of training
   programs for teachers in the technologies and de-
   termine the potential utilization of scientific
   and engineering manpower in meeting these needs.

4. Conduct a study of the type and nature of ser-
   vices desired and required by teachers and
   instructional programs. Utilize non-directive
   data gathering devices to determine contemporary

needs as well as exploratory discussions of the
future to determine potential needs.

5.  Investigate, evaluate, select, and prepare guide-
    lines for the operation of several modes of
    contractual programs.

6.  Explore, assess, and determine the potential of
    establishing a multiple funding consortium for
    the diverse activities and needs of a technology
    education teacher center.

7.  Design, develop, initiate, and operate pilot
    training centers in the technologies in
    selected schools in the Region for the purpose
    of establishing change models in an actual
    setting and as a base for training programs
    for teachers in the technologies.

8.  Establish and publish minimum standards for
    facilities for technology education programs.

9.  Establish operational procedures for satellite
    training centers and programs.

10. Investigate the practicability and potential
    of utilizing specifically designed mobile
    technology training laboratories for special-
    ized areas of technology in rural regions.

more

## Program Organization

The nature of the operation of the Technology Education Teacher Center requires an organizational structure adaptable to variable and changing needs.  It is not possible to foresee all the complexities of a teacher center operation, nor how best to ultimately organize, control and administer an on-going dynamic teacher center operation. However, there are some constants.  The constants are not line and staff constants but, rather, perceptual constants, constants that result from the way one perceives the function and mission of the Center.

### Organizational Structure

The constants determine governance and administrative structures as well as facilities and personnel.  Thus, the organizational structure and administrative procedures of the Technology Education Teacher Center are dictated by basic assumptions underlying the technology model and the relationship of these assumptions to the goals and the objectives of the Center.  The fact that the Center's mode of operation is problem oriented, task centered, and performance based determines, in large measure, the characteristics of the program and, therefore, the organizational structure and administrative procedures.

more

In the design of the Center, the goal was to move toward an organic model adaptable to specific problems, rather than a mechanistic model suitable for status quo operations only.  The result was the development of what is known as an ad hoc contractual approach.

The ad hoc contractual plan was adapted as the primary mode of operation of the Center and thus dictated, to a considerable extent, the organization structure of the Center.  The plan was compatible with the technology model and provided a flexible and adaptable system capable of meeting immediate and long term needs.

The ad hoc contractual plan, properly managed, adapts to change quickly when contrasted with existing institutional approaches to inservice teacher education in the technologies.

There are many examples of the failure of various institutionalized training and education programs developed two, three, or four decades ago.  The basic problem is the failure of these programs to come to grips with contemporary problems and needs.  They continue to operate out-of-date programs which produce out-of-date people while using limited resources to reach inappropriate goals inefficiently.  Contractual arrangements for space, equipment, materials, and instructional personnel provide a system superior to the establishment of permanent

more

buildings, staff, and programs.  Programs based on perma-
nency become dated quickly and, in reality, many times
stand in the way of progress, utilizing resources rather
than solving problems.

The ad hoc contractual approach is a new approach
to educational delivery and support systems for teacher
education in the technologies.  Several identifiable func-
tional components have been found to be necessary.  They
are:

1.  The Management Function

2.  The Training Function

3.  The Contractual Function

4.  Research Function

5.  Resource Function

6.  Evaluation Function

The Management Function

The management function consists of planning,
organizing, and controlling human and material resources
in the execution of a program of action designed to attain
given objectives.  The balanced interaction of these func-
tions is essential for the attainment of predetermined
objectives, such as the primary and secondary objectives
listed previously.  These are identified and program plans
developed based on the objectives prior to the initiation

more

of any activities.  This assures the fulfillment of the
overall purpose of the teacher center program.  The manage-
ment phase includes:   (1) _planning_, (2) _organizing_ through
the establishment of a precise "plan of action," (3) _mo-
tivating_ all personnel in the implementation of the program,
and (4) _controlling_ the operation after it is set in motion
to assure that the identified objectives are met.

The planning phase plays a crucial role in the
operation of a Teacher Center program.  Each activity of
the Center involves careful delineation of the task or
tasks in performance terms.  Each plan of action involves
activities in the categories of (1) organization, (2) data
collection, (3) analysis, (4) synthesis, (5) proposed solu-
tions and alternatives, (6) application to practice, and
(7) evaluation.  These are management functions as are
those associated with controlling, which is based on spe-
cific delimited objectives and the development of reward
structures and sanctions applicable to specific situations.
Also included is the use of proven management tools such as
PERT, GANTT, and PPBS, together with techniques such as
discrepancy evaluation, trend analysis and management by
exception.  These techniques fix responsibilities and
enable the Center to function in an economical and effi-
cient manner.

more

41

## The Training Function

The training function includes the <u>training</u> of Center staff as well as the primary mission of inservice teacher <u>training</u>. Resident personnel at the Center and field personnel require continual training in order to carry out the mission of the Center. Included in the training efforts are regional trainers, curriculum developers, instructional designers, technical specialists, field instructors and field associates who are class oom teachers selected to serve as field trainers on an <u>ad hoc</u> contractual basis.

The training function is carried out by resident staff whenever possible. Otherwise contractual arrangements are made with qualified personnel.

## The Contractual Function

This function consists of two components. One component involves the legal arrangements required for agreements developed between the Teacher Center and the schools or school systems for given services. The second component involves contracting by the Center for specific personnel and other services as required by the contracts with the school systems for training programs and other services.

<div align="center">more</div>

Included in the contracts are arrangements enlisting
the assistance of schools and teachers in conducting ex-
perimental and pilot programs designed to develop and
evaluate curriculum designs, instructional designs and
training systems.  Schools involved in pilot programs be-
come operational technology education pilot programs and
training centers.  The contractual function thus serves a
number of essential purposes including:

1.  visibility of the Center's efforts in training,
    curriculum development and other services by
    education personnel and others through direct
    involvement and contribution to the Center's
    program and overall mission,

2.  development of a cadre of teachers as poten-
    tial field trainers for the Center,

3.  development of instructional supervisors as
    potential managers of the Center's field op-
    erations,

4.  establishment of a base from which to de-
    vel p a hierarchy of trainers with various
    skill levels,

5.  improvement of the nature of the educational
    system within which the pilot programs op-
    erate, and

more

6.  provision of a testing ground, at the operational and instructional level, for continued development of Center programs, structures and procedures.

There are several types of contractual programs in operation.

1.  Inservice programs of various lengths which provide a series of training programs to selected groups of teachers on selected topics.  These are conducted by resident staff of the Center and are usually one year in length.

2.  Consultant programs which provide weekly inservice programs for two to five teachers for the purpose of developing and implementing new curriculum designs and instructional procedures.  These are conducted by consultants employed for a specific school and are usually three years in length.

3.  Teaching programs which provide curriculum development and implementation at a given school and grade level.  These are conducted by a team of two doctoral level students who design, develop, and teach the new curriculum in the contract school.

more

4.  Inservice training programs and workshops.
    Usually one-session programs conducted by
    the Center staff after school hours, in the
    evening or on week-ends.

5.  Services to schools and school districts
    in areas such as (a) curriculum design,
    (b) preparation of funding proposals, (c)
    course revision, (d) physical facility de-
    sign, (e) curriculum evaluation, and (f)
    instructional resource planning.

## Research Function

The research function of the Center involves a
wide array of endeavors including:  (a) curriculum design,
(b) instructional design, (c) training techniques and pro-
cedures, (d) instructional models, (e) evaluation models,
(f) value clarification, (g) personnel development systems,
(h) technical developments, (i) status studies, and (j)
projective studies, among others.

The Center is also involved in the continual study
of technology and technological systems in order to main-
tain a base for the development of present and future
endeavors in improving education in the technologies in
the State and Region.

more

## Resource Function

This function is served primarily through the
Technology Education Research and Resource Center of the
Technology Education Program which provides print and
physical resources including hardware and software for
use by Center personnel and teachers from the field who
are engaged in pilot or field programs of the Center.  In-
cluded are primary reference and resource materials for
the study of transportation systems, communication systems
and production systems as well as reference materials for
the study of technology and society.

The Research and Resource Center provides services
such as information packets, which include materials on
various new technical materials and devices, portable dis-
plays for use in field programs, technology bookshelves
for specific technologies, and metric resource units.

## Evaluation Function

The evaluation function is composed of two distinct
efforts.  One is the on-going day-by-day function carried
on by the management phase of the program.  The other is
carefully delineated evaluation research conducted on a
contract basis by an outside evaluation team and based on
specified program goals and objectives.

The former is based primarily on the Program Evaluation and Review Technique which is used as a management tool. The Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) arranges activities in a logical framework for planning and controlling the operation and assures that the overall program goals are met within specified budgets and time limits. Prior to the initiation of a program, all major activities (phases) are PERT'ed. Major activities are designated by levels. Time required to complete activities and the resources needed for each are estimated. The PERT operation becomes quite complex and is more efficient if conducted by use of a computer. A short FORTRAN "front end" program is used which matches the data format to that of the Center's PERT program. Computer readouts then provide the staff with estimated completion dates for all activities, critical paths, and the slack times along non-critical paths. This is done for all levels prior to the implementation of field programs.

Charts are made for each activity and correlated with higher level charts. These charts, together with instructions for use, are published in a Program Planning Guide.

Estimated completion dates, generated through the computer program facilitate the scheduling of personnel and resources for major program activities. Ancillary or

more

secondary level activities are scheduled by individual
staff members who are responsible for the implementation
of specific programs.

The PERT planning tool aids teacher center staff
in reaching objectives and allows a series of concurrent
yet different tasks to be accomplished in a prescribed
order.  Many individuals and educational organizations are
involved in Center programs.  Planning by the PERT process
aids in coordinating efforts and in the fulfillment of the
overall functions and goals of the teacher center.

In addition to PERT, GANTT and PPBS, other tech-
niques are used in an on-going management and evaluation
process.

## Staffing the Center

The success of teacher centers will, in final
analysis, be determined by one factor, personnel.  This is
a critical variable and raises the issue of the character-
istics required of staff for Teacher Centers.  Evidence
indicates there are at least two broad categories of
characteristics.  One can be titled competencies and the
other can be called perspective.  Both are necessary com-
ponents.  The former, competencies, involves skills and
knowledge.  The latter, perspective, involves attitudes,
values and conceptualization.

more

Past experience indicates that staff for a teacher center involved in pilot programs and inservice education must have a far broader range and depth of skill and expertise than those who have been involved in typical inservice teacher education programs in the past.

The operation of a teacher center for teachers in the technologies is complex. The primary mission is training. The primary organizational plan utilizes a technology model. These two factors relate to the second category of characteristics required by teacher center staff, namely, attitudes, values and conceptualization. Unless the commitment of the staff to the training function is explicit and firm, the Center cannot be successful. The function of the teacher center is not to duplicate the research and instruction of pre-service teacher education programs. The function of a teacher center is training.

In addition, unless the staff comprehends and understands the technology model and utilizes precisely planned and executed training programs based on explicitly stated objectives, the teacher center program will not be any more successful than typical inservice programs. How the staff conceives the Center and its mission and their role as a part of the mission will determine to a considerable degree the success of the Center. The other

more

variable is the requirement that the center staff be
skilled, that they have the basic competencies necessary
to function in a highly complex environment.

Staff training is an essential ingredient to the
continued success of a teacher center.  The entire opera-
tion requires the establishment of well defined goals,
detailed planning and skillful implementation.  Each phase
requires highly trained individuals.  This implies that
personnel functioning as staff of the Center are involved
in continual training.  One of the myths of the educational
profession in the past has been that credentialed individ-
uals were qualified individuals.  Experience with the
operation of a technology education teacher center has
proven this assumption false.  Therefore, not only must
the center be structured to meet the needs of its clients,
it must also be structured to provide on-going training
programs for center personnel and others associated with
the program.  Without this component, evidence indicates
the effort will not be successful.

## Facilities

The need for physical facilities varies with the
on-going programs of the teacher center.  There are,
however, two types of facilities as well as several con-
stants which provide a base for determining minimal

more

facilities.   The two categories of facilities are Field
(on-site) facilities and Center facilities.

Field facilities are those facilities which the
Center utilizes on a contractual loan or lease basis,
either for short terms or long terms, depending on the
type of program in which the Center is involved.   Ordi-
narily the center utilizes classrooms or laboratories
although private, public school, or community resources
are also potential sources of facilities and have been
utilized.

Center facilities are those facilities the Center
utilizes on a permanent base for day-to-day operations.
Based on experience, minimum facilities for a technology
education teacher center should consist of:

1.   Management Function Facilities

    a.   Office for Center Coordinator

    b.   Planning facilities

    c.   Conference facilities

    d.   Secretarial and clerical facilities

    e.   Communication facilities including
       duplication facilities

2.   Training Facilities

    a.   Instructional facilities for staff
       training and resident inservice
       training programs

more

    b.  Mobile laboratories to provide for
       specialized field training needs

3.  Research and Resource Facilities

    a.  Technical laboratories

      (1) development of instructional
          materials and devices

      (2) testing of prototype instruc-
          tional devices

      (3) testing of instructional
          strategies with children

      (4) development of laboratory de-
          signs and arrangements for
          programs of instruction

      (5) teaching of technical skills
          for inservice programs

      (6) teaching of technical informa-
          tion for inservice programs

    b.  Resource Center

      (1) Curriculum development materials

         (a) basic reference materials

         (b) technical publications

         (c) curriculum guides

      (2) Publications--technical

         (a) Production Systems

         (b) Transportation Systems

more

    (c) Communication Systems

    (d) Energy

    (e) Materials

    (f) Periodicals

(3) Publications--social/cultural

    (a) Historical Studies

    (b) Technology and Society

    (c) Technology Assessment

    (d) Technology Forecasting

    (e) Technology and the Future

    (f) Periodicals

(4) Publications--professional

    (a) Curriculum Development

    (b) Instructional Design

    (c) History of Education

    (d) Education Research

    (e) Sociology of Education

    (f) Philosophy of Education

    (g) Periodicals

(5) Instructional Materials and Devices

    (a) Films

    (b) Transparencies

    (c) Slides

    (d) Film strips

more

 (e) Instructional kits

 (f) Games

 (g) Simulations

 (h) Video tape cassettes

 (i) Audio tapes

 (j) Charts

 (k) Pictures

 (l) Precision teaching-learning units

 (m) Vertical files

 (n) Other

(6) Computer terminal

 (a) PERT programs

 (b) Wylbur programs

 (c) Literature search, ERIC, etc.

 (d) Research data

 (e) Statistical analysis

Program Operation

 The objectives of the Center, together with the organizational design developed to attain the objectives, determine the operational style of the Center. Operationally the Technology Education Teacher Center can be best described as a complex multi-faceted program with numerous major endeavors, including:

more

1. regional inservice teacher education programs
2. field associate training programs
3. contractual precision teaching-learning unit development programs
4. experimental elementary school technology programs
5. cooperatively formulated contractual programs for the development of new curriculums and instructional programs for school systems
6. special workshops on:
   a. metrication
   b. elementary school technology
   c. unified arts
   d. transportation technology
   e. communication technology
   f. production technology
   g. aerospace education
7. Administrators' Information Meetings on Technology Education
8. Technology Education Research and Resource Center Development

All the programs conducted by the teacher center have been initiated and conducted cooperatively with the State Department of Education through the Program Specialist for Industrial Arts who serves as a liaison

more

between county school systems and the teacher center.

The operational mode of the Center is also influenced by research findings on change and the change process. For instance, there are several conditions affecting educational change which dictate the operational procedures and structure of the Center. It has been found that the change process is enhanced when the following variables are operating:

1. participants are involved directly in the change process,

2. participants receive immediate feedback of the consequences of their behavior,

3. activities are perceived by the participants to be relevant to their needs,

4. learning activities are obviously carefully designed and directed to the attainment of established purposes, and

5. learning activities are reinforced by application to practice in actual field settings of new content and instructional strategies as part of the change process together with direct support from Center personnel during the application effort.

more

Other findings related to the change process, which affect the operational mode and structure of the Center, concern educational personnel other than teachers. Analysis of research findings and experience with pilot programs in actual practice indicate that the involvement of chief school administrators, curriculum specialists, and principals is imperative if organized change is to occur.

Operationally, then, it is essential that the plans, procedures and activities of the Center involve these educators in the change model. For example, experience in the operation of the Center, has indicated that the following factors are critical:

1. analysis of the role of administrators, including superintendents, supervisors, curriculum directors and principals, is required to determine the level of involvement of each in determining direction for change in the local system,

2. determination of inducements which create a personal commitment for planned change on the part of administration is critical,

3. the sharing of the responsibility for change by all administrators is necessary if change is to become a continuous

more

process, and

4. the commitment of administrators is critical
   if teachers implementing change are to receive
   the support necessary to assure success of the
   planned change.

In addition to these factors being essential in
initiating planned change, adequate patterns of communica-
tion have been found to be necessary to guarantee a
continued functioning of the change process.

Operationally, the program specialist from the
State Education Department has been instrumental in estab-
lishing initial communication links between the Teacher
Center and local education agencies and individual class-
room teachers.  Developing and maintaining communication
with the field, once contractual arrangements have been
completed, is the function of the Teacher Center Coordi-
nator.  During the operational phase of each project, all
standard communication techniques are utilized including
letters, reports, telephone reports, newsletter and field
meetings.

In addition, the general mode of operation in-
cludes weekly planning and debriefing meetings by the
Center staff where each project is discussed and actions
initiated.

<div align="center">more</div>

## Operational-Financing

The Technology Education Teacher Center has been supported from four sources since 1970. The primary source has been the United States Office of Education. Other support, in decreasing amounts, has been from contracts with: (1) local school systems, (2) the University, primarily in the form of physical facilities and part time personnel, and (3) the State Department of Education, both monetarily and through support personnel.

At the conclusion of the fourth year of operation, the Center reached the point in its development where the possibility of a self-sustaining operation, one without direct grants, was possible. At no time during the development of the Center have direct yearly grants exceeded $45,000. The range has been from $18,000 to $45,000. The past two years of operation have provided evidence that the contractual mode of financial support will provide the Center with the means of attaining self-sufficiency.

## Operational--Staffing

The Teacher Center has been staffed, with the exception of the last two years, by part-time personnel. In 1973, the University created a full-time position, called the coordinator of field service programs, for the Technology Education Program. The Teacher Center is the

more

field service operation of the Technology Education Program.

All other staff positions, with the exception of a full-time clerical position, have been part-time positions held by doctoral students in the Technology Education Program. This arrangement has not been entirely satisfactory, primarily because of the limited time part-time staff have for field work, a major element in the technology education teacher center model. Therefore, future plans call for the establishment of at least two full-time technology education extension positions.

<div align="center">

Assessment

of the

Teacher Center Operation

</div>

A critical review of the organization and operation of the Technology Education Teacher Center leads to the conclusion that no large scale success has been attained. Significant numbers of teachers have not been retrained. Nor have large numbers of new curriculum development programs been initiated in public schools. What success the Center has had has been in the development, implementation and testing of a new delivery system for educational change in the technologies; a delivery system which has been proven, in a series of pilot programs, to be highly effective and for several specific reasons. The

<div align="center">

more

</div>

prime reason for success of the pilot efforts was due to the
design of a model which called attention to variables such as
problem identification, performance objectives, planning,
task analysis, immediacy, application to practice, evaluation
and personal involvement, all factors critical to the change
process.  The focus of the teacher center operation on change
and the change process, together with basing the design and
application of the Center's programs on research on change,
provided a set of criteria by which the Center's programs
could be designed and from which success could be measured.

The entire process of the inservice teacher educa-
tion efffot was, therefore, change oriented.  The criteria
for success was whether the objectives were reached and
whether the planned for change took place.  This has been
found to be critical factors if valid improvement of the
teaching-learning process in the technologies is to be
attained.  It was learned, for instance, that the most
effective conditions for dealing with change occurred when
participants in inservice programs:

1. were directly involved in dialogue, discus-
   sion, and planning of their program of study.

2. received immediate feedback of the conse-
   quences of their behavior,

3. perceived the activities to be relevant to
   their concerns,

more

4. were aware learning activities were carefully designed to accomplish clearly conceived purposes, and

5. were aware the efforts of the program focused attention toward the ultimate goal of field application.

These and other criteria are factors requiring consideratj a in the planning of any successful inservice program.

The Technology Education Teacher Center at West Virginia University has designed and tested a model which has the potential of providing and sustaining inservice education for teachers in the technologies. The organizational and operational patterns have proven to be effective in meeting the educational problems of a changing technological society. During the past five years the Center staff, utilizing a teacher center design based on the technology model and research on change, has been able to accomplish the following:

1. Motivated individuals toward <u>continuous learning</u> and the maintenance and improvement of their competencies in the technologies.

2. Designed a <u>flexible and adaptable</u> structure capable of meeting the needs of educational and technological change.

more

3. Developed a model capable of serving the <u>needs of individuals</u> or groups within a local community, at regional centers or at the University Center depending on need, complexity of instruction and resources required.

4. Developed a model for <u>short-term training and retraining</u> programs for teachers at all levels in the technologies.

5. Developed procedures for <u>contractual arrangements</u> with schools and county education systems in fulfilling needs for curriculum design, instructional design, inservice education and other related efforts.

6. Served as an <u>outside force</u> for aiding personnel and schools in the design and implementation of change.

7. Developed a model for the <u>identification, design, development and delivery</u> of teaching-learning units for improving classroom instruction.

The teacher center is more than an alternative to traditional inservice programs.  It is, in fact, a totally different type of organization which has the potential of fulfilling long standing needs of inservice teachers.  As such, the teacher center concept may be the missing link

more

in the teacher education process, namely, the training function. Properly conceived, organized, and operated, the teacher center has the potential for bridging the always present gap between theory and research and practice. If this ever present gap can be bridged, then there will be an increasing probability that education of young men and women in the technologies and other areas of the school curriculum can and will be improved. To do so, however, will require more than the singular effort evidenced by this report. What will be required is the multiplication of the effort by those interested in change, those committed to training, those committed to field work, and those committed to planning and the objective form of management. If individuals with these commitments begin the development of Technology Education Teacher Centers with the eventual goal of a network of centers nationally, then there can be a significant improvement of education in the technologies.

The authors of this report would be pleased to hear from individuals interested in teacher center development.

Drs. DeVore and McCrory are members of the faculty of Technology Education at West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cohen, Saul B.  Final Report, Ad Hoc National Advisory
    Committee on Training Complexes.  Worcester,
    Massachusetts:  Training Complex Administrative
    Center, Clark University, July 1970.

DeVore, Paul W.  Variables Affecting Change in Inservice
    Teacher Education.  Washington, D.C.:  U.S. De-
    partment of Health, Education and Welfare,
    Division of Assessment and Coordination, Septem-
    ber 1971.

Final Report, Inventory of Training Centers, Ad Hoc National
    Advisory Committee on Training Complexes.  Worcester,
    Massachusetts:  Training Complex Administrative
    Center, Clark University, June 1970.

Final Report, Training Program for Teachers in the Tech-
    nologies.  Morgantown, WV:  West Virginia University,
    1973.

Goodlad, John.  "The Schools vs. Education."  Saturday Re-
    view, Number 61, April 19, 1969.

Linvill, William K.  Man, Technology and Society.  pp 104-
    132.

Marshall, A.R. (ed.) "Comment," Futurology.  School Tech-
    nology, Volume 6, Number 25, March 1973.

Smith, B. Othanel, Saul B. Cohen and Arthur Pearl.
    Teachers for the Real World.  Washington, D.C.:
    The American Association of Colleges for Teacher
    Education, 1969.

End