DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 950   95   EA 010 146

AUTHOR   Lasser, Barbara R.; Olson, Allan L.
TITLE   Strategies for Implementation of Competency Based
                Education Programs.
INSTITUTION   Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland,
                Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY   National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington,
                D.C.
PUB DATE   Apr 77
CONTRACT   400-76-0028
NOTE   146p.; For related documents, see EA 010 143-148 and
                ED 104 026; Appendix A may not reproduce clearly due
                to small print

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Bibliographies; *Change Strategies; Educational
                Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education;
                Guidelines; *Performance Based Education; *Program
                Development

ABSTRACT
                This publication identifies and discusses
considerations in facilitating the installation of competency-based
education (CBE) programs and for maintaining effective program
operation. Where appropriate there is also discussion of the possible
effectiveness of various strategies as used by change agents at
different stages of implementation and in operationally varied CBE
contexts. Major sections of the paper focus in turn on CBE
implementation strategy considerations for schools and districts,
implementation considerations for federal, state, and local agencies,
and potential problems of CBE implementation. A bibliography of
relevant publications is also included. (Author/JG)

STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF

COMPETENCY BASED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Barbara R. Lasser
Acting Director
Oregon Competency Based
Education Program

Allan L. Olson
Senior Associate for Development
Oregon Competency Based
Education Program

Oregon Competency Based Education Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
3000 Market Street N.E., Suite 323
Salem, Oregon 97301

April 1977

Table of Contents

Table of Contents
(continued)

Table of Contents
(continued)

Table of Contents
(continued)

PREFACE

. This paper identifies and discusses considerations
in facilitating the installation of competency based edu-
cation (CBE) programs and for maintaining effective program
operation. The paper reflects information presented in
other Oregon Competency Based Education (OCBE) Program
documents. For example Paper 1, The Minimum Standards for
Competency Based Education in Oregon: An Overview, describes
the Oregon context for OCBE program activities. Paper 2,
Alternative Models of Competency Based Education, presents
a working definition of competency based education.

INTRODUCTION

The introduction and operation of any innovation in schooling is influenced by considerations not directly related to characteristics of the innovation itself. These considerations are aspects of the school environment in which an innovation is introduced. They relate, for example, to procedures for staff orientation and training related to the innovation, to resource distribution, feedback operations, and to carefully sequenced implementation of the innovation.

These considerations may be addressed through various procedures to facilitate the smooth implementation of an educational innovation. Combinations of such procedures may be conceptualized as implementation strategies, or systematic action plans that reflect an interplay among the considerations.

Implementation strategies influence the form and the fate of specific educational innovations. Where such strategies are effective, new programs or changes are tried out in a context that enhances their potential success. Where implementation is poorly planned or ineffective, even the most promising innovations founder.

This paper discusses considerations related to strategies for the implementation of competency based education (CBE) approaches. Where appropriate there is also discussion of the possible differential effectiveness of various strategies, at different stages of installation, in operationally different CBE contexts, and by different change agents.

1

The paper is intended to be provocative rather than prescriptive; its suggestions are presented as alternatives rather than imperatives. The information presented derives from several sources. Professional literature highlights strategies for major or comprehensive change in education. Such changes are represented, for example, by innovations designated as competency based education and competency based teacher education, performance-based education, differentiated staffing, team teaching, and outcomes-based instruction. Additional literature reflected in this paper examines smaller scale change. Such change is represented, for example, by the incorporation of any concept, attitude, skill, or tool in education by a unit that has not incorporated it previously. Various unpublished sources provide further information. The paper also reflects the experiences of individuals engaged in introducing, installing, integrating, and maintaining the operation of planned change in education.

Competency Based Education: A Definition

The definition of competency based education employed in this paper is presented in "Alternative Models of Competency Based Education" (Schalock, 1976).

> [Competency based education is]....a process that facilitates with a known degree of effectiveness the acquisition of desired outcomes in learners -- including the ability to perform tasks related to success in job or life roles -- documents the achievement of these outcomes, and links graduation requirements to specific performance levels on a particular set of outcomes (pp. 42-43).

2

The definition details three categories of CBE charac-
teristics: defining, enabling, and unique characteristics.

Defining Characteristics

It is proposed by Schalock that the essential elements
of a competency based education program include:

o A listing of outcomes desired from instruction,
   including outcomes that reflect the ability to
   function effectively in life roles.

o The identification of a minimum set of these
   outcomes as those needing to be demonstrated
   as a basis for graduation;

o Instructional programs that enable students to
   achieve the various outcomes desired from
   schooling;

o The means by which to evaluate outcome achieve-
   ment, and certify that outcomes have in fact
   been achieved, including:
   --measures of outcome achievement that follow
      directly from the statement of desired out-
      comes;
   --standards that indicate clearly the level
      of performance (criterion) that must be met
      on each outcome measure for outcome achieve-
      ment to be judged satisfactory.

o Procedures that enable students to individualize
   learning programs and assessment processes;

3

o   Procedures that enable students to receive in-
    struction until learning outcomes are achieved;
    and

o   Procedures that assure the continuous adapta-
    tion and improvement of instructional programs
    on the basis of student performance in relation
    to the learning outcomes desired from the pro-
    gram.

These seven defining characteristics, it is suggested, are
critical to competency based education programs.

Enabling Characteristics

Schalock suggests that at least three enabling features
are required for a competency based program to function optim-
ally:

1. A means for identifying and obtaining agreement
    on the educational outcomes sought by a district,
    and a means for insuring that they reflect:

    o   social conditions, both present and antici-
        pated; and

    o   what is known about human development and
        learning.

2. A means for managing or administering the pro-
    gram which insures:

    o   the functional linkage of program planning,
        operating and budgeting procedures;

    o   an information management system that sup-
        ports data-dependent decisionmaking; and

o the appropriate preparation, placement and
utilization of personnel.

3. A means for arriving at program related decisions
that makes explicit for each major category
of decision to be made:

o the structure or "mechanism through which
the decision is to be made (e.g., an in-
dividual teacher or team of teachers, a
departmental or grade level committee, a
school-wide committee, a school-community
council);

o the groups to be represented in the
decisionmaking process;

o the procedures to be followed in arriving
at a decision; and

o the data to be considered in arriving at
a decision.

Unique Characteristics

Finally, Schalock suggests that there are only three
aspects of the defining and enabling characteristics that
have been identified that are unique to the idea of
competency based education. These are:

o The insistence that a minimum set of the outcomes
desired from schooling be defined in terms of the
ability of students to function effectively in
life roles when they complete school;

o The requirement that a minimum set of these

5

outcomes (competencies) be demonstrated as a
basis for graduation from school; and

o The requirement that performance in relation
to this minimum set of outcomes be summarized
and displayed as part of the certification
process.

CBE Implementation: A Continuum

The period of competency based education implementation
may be conceptualized as a continuum that begins with acti-
vities designed to orient potential users to CBE, and to
provide them with information necessary to make sound judg-
ments about the merits of the innovation. Subsequent activi-
ties relate to the "adoption" of CBE, or the decision to try
CBE out in schools and classrooms, and extend to procedures
designed to plan specific program characteristics, and to
reconcile the program and prevailing structures of the
adopting units. Activities designed to monitor, evaluate,
and maintain the effectiveness of total CBE program imple-
mentation complete the continuum.

In presenting a framework for analyzing the levels of
installing a given innovation, Hall and his coworkers (1975)
observe that it is commonly overlooked "that innovation adop-
tion is a process rather than a decision-point -- a process
that each innovation user experiences individually" (p. 52).

McLaughlin (1975), in a discussion of classroom organ-
ization change projects, notes that the implementation of
such projects requires users to work out their own styles

6

and techniques within a broad philosophical framework. Project goals and methods are best formulated by users as they attain skills appropriate to the innovation.

It may be useful for some planning purposes to view the CBE implementation continuum as composed of two general phases: pre-adoption and post-adoption. Hall and Jones (1976), in a comprehensive discussion of competency based teacher education programs, emphasize the importance of carefully planned, systematic pre-adoption activities.

> A plan of action for actually getting the CBE program adopted must be designed along with the conceptual development of the program...the use of the term adoption does not mean that an educational institution is adopting someone else's CBE program, rather, the term refers to the assimilation of the CBE program being developed by the adopting institution. Ideally this CBE program includes "adapted" components from other programs as well as development of unique components. Regardless of the origin of the component innovations, the job is still to get the "box" into effective and widespread use within the institution (pp. 236-237).

Bassi and Watson (1974) studied certain variables perceived to "get the box into effective and widespread use," and to keep it there. They conceptualize the time at which installation is complete and effective, and the innovation is a well integrated part of the curriculum, as representing "institutionalization" of the innovation. Institutionalization, then, is seen by them as the promise at the end of the installation continuum. Systematically planned and applied implementation strategies should help ensure that this gold-bright vision does not yellow through inattention.

7

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY CONSIDERATIONS

Generating Support

Hall and Jones (1976) observe that changes may be attempted or introduced in a school system "from the outside with loud banging on the doors..." or "from the inside" with persuasive information and "steady logic" (p. 250). The reality and durability of change imposed from outside is not promising. Such changes tend to be short-lived, and to reflect the rhetoric but not the reality of the innovation.

A perceived element of choice or potential adaptability of the suggested change to user needs and preferences is of great value in creating a spirit of willingness and support. For example, even changes that are mandated by a state or local education agency, or encouraged through federal incentive programs, stand a better chance of acceptance if they are not presented to potential participants as unalterable. Rogers (1969) stresses that:

> ...changes and innovations which are decided upon...
> are likely to be implemented in practice, because
> they are self-chosen. It has been a familiar com-
> plaint that new ideas in teaching, in curriculum,
> in methods, are literally "a dime a dozen," but that
> they tend to be resisted by teachers and adminis-
> trators. But when individuals have <u>chosen</u> to try
> some of these new ideas, the outcome is quite dif-
> ferent (p. 312).

When discussing the importance of user choice and program adaptability, Fullan (1975) recommends that:

> ...in situations where the innovation is already
> selected or will be selected by a small group of
> users for political reasons (i.e., in situations
> where the adoption decision excludes user parti-
> cipation) eventual users should be heavily involved

8

in the planning for implementation stage (i.e., post-
adoption but pre-use activities) in order to decide
on the nature of the innovation and the appropriate
implementation strategies. This is particularly·
important for creating the 'capacity to use' the
innovation as wel as for increasing the 'commitment
to use it' (p. 116).

Orientation to Program

Program orientation is an important means of generating

support for educational change. Orientation activities pre-

pare potential participants in and recipients of a new program

to make more informed decisions regarding the proposed inno-

vation. The audience for orientation activities within a

district may include teachers, administrators, support per-

sonnel, pupils, parents and other members of the community.

Orientation information may be provided through newsletters,

newspapers, radio, television, meetings and conferences,

audiovisual presentations, and demonstrations -- all designed

to promote awareness and understanding of CBE-type programs

(Colyer, 1976).

Pincus (1974) identifies the informing and cooperative

planning functions included in orientation activities as

major contributors to the eventual fate of innovation effort.

Examining instances of innovation barriers, he cites Fullan:

> An important causal factor seems to be a lack of
> communication between sponsors of innovation and
> the ultimate users -- students, parents and teachers
> -- which tends to work against significant change
> at the user level (p. 126).

The potential dividends of carefully planned and sequenced

involvement in CBE orientation activities are suggested by

Woditsch:

There are all sorts of audiences that must be apprised of and involved with the institutionalization of CBE. But if you want the teachers and school administrators working for you, explore its consequences with them first. Involve all of the appropriate audiences -- parents, students, etc. -- as soon as you seek to design and implement, but familiarize school staffs first. CBE themes reach to the very roots of educational professionalism, and educators like to trace those roots themselves before others do it (Woditsch, Personal Communication, 1976).

Six basic techniques for bringing an innovation in education to the attention of practitioners have been identified by Guba (1967): telling, showing, helping, involving, training, and intervening. Guba distinguishes between helping and intervening on the basis of how and why the change agent, or innovator, first becomes involved. Direct involvement of the change agent on the potential adopter's terms is characterized as helping. Involvement on the change agent's terms is characterized as intervening. The six techniques are not discrete, and may be combined to promote favorable consideration of the innovation.

Lasser and Elam (1974), in a discussion of various orientation activities conducted prior to the field testing of comprehensive, exportable instructional programs,[1] observe that:

> ...it is desirable for administrators to conduct program orientation sessions for classroom teachers and to allow teachers to participate in decisionmaking regarding program adoption or field

---

[1] The authors define such programs as having the following characteristics: explicitly stated outcomes, classroom-validated materials and procedures for promoting those outcomes, outcomes-referenced assessment, and materials and procedures for providing supplementary instruction.

10

testing. Teachers who are consulted regarding
program use are generally...supportive when new
programs are introduced.. A teacher whose opinion
is typically sought regarding program adoption
may more frequently try to make a newly installed
program "work" even when he or she did not recom-
mend adoption of that particular program. Further,
teachers who are consulted prior to district or
school commitment to a program are aware of any
conditions of program use (e.g.. data collection
requirements for programs under development), and
are more likely to conscientiously satisfy those
conditions during field testing (p. 2).

In addition to the importance of orientation activities
for staff and students considering the introduction of CBE,
Huff (1976) notes a need for special attention to ongoing
orientation for new staff and students. She observes that
"considerably more time and attention [has been found neces-
sary for] orientation in CBE programs than in more traditional
programs" (p. 12).

Utopic and pragmatic models of change advocacy are de-
scribed by Gallaher (1965). The utopic model assumes that
change is best facilitated by planning for people rather than
planning with them. The pragmatic model defines the change
advocate's role as one of creating a climate conducive to
acceptance. Gallaher summarizes the desirability of the
latter approach:

I believe it is best because it is based on com-
plete and detailed knowledge of the target system
...There is...a large body of research to support
the basic assumptions underlying the pragmatic
model, that is that people will more readily ac-
cept innovations that they can understand and
perceive as relevant, and secondly, that they
have had a hand in planning (pp. 41-42).

Gallaher suggests that within the pragmatic model,
change advocates are more likely to be successful if potential

11

adopters perceive them as prestigious. However, even tentatively determining which individuals or groups are likely to have prestige, or the capability to influence others in a given educational setting, may be a difficult and dubious task.

Such determinations are nevertheless implicitly hypothesized when change advocates are selected or when advocacy functions are assumed. When program support by specific individuals can be planned in the design of systematic installation strategies, those strategies then can be tested, and confirmed or revised.

EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT

Evidence of support and interest can be critical in motivating potential participants to consider and to try out a new instructional program or system (Ansaldo, 1976; Taylor, 1976; Lasser and Elam, 1974). Administrators, peers, and authorities within the profession are among the individuals from whom such testimony may be desirable.

(a) Administrator Approval

Rogers (1965) emphasizes "the crucial role of school administrators in causing a school to be more or less innovative..." (p. 61). Summarizing research findings supportive of adminstrator involvement, Rogers cites Demeter:

> Building principals are key figures in the process. Where they are both aware of and sympathetic to an innovation, it tends to prosper. Where they are ignorant of its existence, or apathetic if not hostile, it tends to remain outside the bloodstream of

12

the school (Rogers, 1965, p. 61).

A similar view regarding the importance of active
superintendent involvement is expressed by House
(1976):

> The superintendent [and his top staff] play
> a key role in introducing innovations into
> their districts...The superintendent acts as
> a carrier, a catalyst, and a gatekeeper for
> new ideas...(p. 338).

Kapfer, et al. (1970) describe the introduction and
implementation of "a life-internship instructional
program" in a southwestern urban school. Many char-
acteristics of the program are similar to those of
competency based education programs. They dis-
cuss the active role of the principal in demon-
strating support for the new program and in
coordinating and monitoring its implementation.

> Contrary to current worries by some edu-
> cators that the principal is doomed to
> replacement by a business manager, the
> role changes that have occurred...have
> made the principal's role as educational
> manager and instructional leader much
> more critical than ever to the successful
> operation of the school (p. 22).

The critical role of school principals in the ef-
fective operation of the League of Cooperating
Schools is emphasized by Goodlad (1967):

> It is the school principal who is the
> link between the League as an entity
> and the participating school...he car-
> ries word of ongoing League activities
> to his school and vice versa, he pro-
> vides leadership to his faculty in re-
> gard to League activities, and he con-
> veys League-centered business to fellow
> principals and educators in the total

13

21

district. Clearly, the investment in
the school principal is a substantial
one. In essence, as they go, so goes
the League -- and so goes the change
process (p. 2).

McLaughlin (1975), in a report of a study of change

agents conducted by the Rand Corporation, notes that:

The receptivity of the institutional
setting to a proposed innovation varied
greatly among the projects we examined --;
from active support to indifference to
hostility...In particular, the attitudes
and interest of central administrators
in effect provide a "signal" to project
participants as to how seriously they
should take project goals and how hard
they should work to achieve them (p. 3).

In considering some possible consequences of super-

intendent intervention in introducing an innovation

in education, Miles (1965) articulates four possible

roles that might be assumed by the superintendent:

content initiator, process initiator, mediator, and

squasher. As content initiator, the superintendent

asserts positive support for a given innovation. As

process initiator, the superintendent sets plans in

motion -- establishing a structure that will facili-

tate examination and cooperative planning related

to the innovation.

As mediator, the superintendent promotes the

active involvement of potential participants in

the planning prrocess, but is less active per-

sonally in such planning activities. As squasher,

the superintendent impedes the introduction of an

innovation by indicating skepticism or some other

14

negative reaction to the potential change.

These four roles do not lend themselves to mechanical assumption by an administrator, nor is each role necessarily available to all administrators. Some may be inconsistent with a given individual or organizational style. In addition, the sub-tasks or sub-changes that may be conceptualized within the scope of a given change in education may suggest the desirability of sequenced, differential assumption of administrator advocacy approaches.

For example, the superintendent might assume the role of content initiator to introduce the concept of CBE and to promote congenial staff perceptions of the innovation. At subsequent stages of program planning, however, the super-intendent might assume the role of mediator, or facilitator.

The degree to which the administrator's overall effectiveness might be compromised through the active advocacy of CBE is another factor in the implementation strategy equation. The superintendent serves many audiences, some with apparently conflicting demands. Because the function of the top district administrator often serves balancing purposes, many superin-tendents may view the process initiator role

15

as impracticable. Gallaher (1965) references
Spindler in this regard:

> [The administrator's] job is in large
> part that of maintaining a working
> equilibrium of at best antagonistical-
> ly cooperative forces. This is one
> of the reasons why <u>school administra-</u>
> <u>tors are rarely outspoken protagonists</u>
> <u>of a consistent and vigorously profiled</u>
> <u>point of view</u> (p. 50).

As with other installation considerations,
decisions regarding the manner in which admin-
istrative support of CBE should be communicated
require attention to a complex interplay of
district-specific variables. In Wilson's
words (1965), the superintendent "needs to
be a good guesser" (p. 84).

(b) Peer Approval

The approval of peer elites as a deter-
minant of innovation is cited by Pincus (1974)
in regard to influencing administrator percep-
tion of a given innovation.

> When key figures in the bureaucracy
> and their colleagues in other educa-
> tional bureaucracies can agree about
> the acceptability of the innovation
> [the circumstance is favorable to
> innovation] (p. 20).

Rogers (1969), in a discussion of intensive
workshop experiences for teachers, indicates
that the single most important determinant of
individual registration is the observation of
significant changes in acquaintances who were

24

16

previous workshop participants. Rogers adds
that early in the introduction of the group
experience he had no expectations of reaching
every teacher or faculty member directly.

> It is quite sufficient that any parti-
> cipant will have peers with whom he or
> she can share experiences growing out
> of the intensive workshop. Since many
> of the teachers' superiors will also
> have/had such growing experiences,
> the faculty member will be going back
> into a school environment which will
> be essentially responsive to any
> changes in his behavior, attitudes,
> purposes, and relationships (p. 312).

House (1976) observes that "the people super-
intendents find most credible as sources of
information about innovation are other superin-
tendents" (p. 338), and Taylor (1976) emphasizes
the persuasiveness of positive teacher support in
generating attitudes of acceptance among fellow
teachers.

(c) Authority Approval

The endorsement of an innovation in education
by authorities within the profession may help to
create a climate of acceptance among potential
adopters. In discussing the successful wide scale
implementation of several innovations within the
past ten years, Pincus notes that each program
was "widely publicized and praised by professional
education groups..." (p. 123).

Ansaldo (1976) observes that an important

17

criterion for the adoption of commercially developed curriculum materials has traditionally been the direct or indirect endorsement of established authorities or recognized experts. For example, textbook adoption committees have generally been interested in information regarding the contributing authors and consultants to textbook series. She also notes that, in regard to comprehensive, classroom validated instructional programs developed through the coordinated efforts of research and development teams, potential school users often seek information about the "experts" who have served as consultants or reviewers during development.

BROAD STAFF INVOLVEMENT IN ORIENTATION AND PLANNING

Orientation and planning activities preliminary to the introduction of the life internship curriculum described by Kapfer (1970) involve the active participation of school staff, parents, and other community members. Colyer's (1976) discussion of CBE program implementation at Oklahoma City University emphasizes the sense of ownership that developed from broad representation in orientation and planning.

> One of our strategies at OCU for involving faculty,
> students, administrators, and alumni on the grass-
> roots level of planning the competency based degree
> program was to involve members in each of these
> groups in five seminars which had the task of
> stating competency outcomes for the university...
> Each [seminar] generated an enormous amount of
> concern over education...[and] a reinvestment in
> the best way to teach. The result...was to cause

18

persons to want to participate more fully and to
want to do a more professional job. (Colyer,
Personal Communication, 1976).

Regarding open participation in district planning ac-
tivities, Colyer suggests that meetings intitially directed
toward identification of general educational goals provide
entree to the examination of CBE as a useful vehicle for
goal attainment.

> School level meetings for teachers, students,
> parents, and administrators...[are] highly
> useful in getting input from these groups on
> what they expect a good education system to
> deliver. Once outcomes...have been named,
> you [are] in a good position to suggest ways
> that CBE can help deliver these outcomes and
> expectations. After the program is underway, it
> [is] useful to continue [regularly scheduled]
> meetings...to update faculty, parents, and other
> interested members of the community on what is
> taking place in the new CBE program, and again
> elicit their feedback and input. [These] meet-
> ings contribute to the strengthening of an open
> structure:..one of the elements...[of] an effec-
> tive CBE program (Colyer, personal communication,
> 1976).

Bassi and Watson (1974) stress the importance of active
staff planning and involvement in contributing to the insti-
tutionalization of innovations. Their interviews with a
broad representation of Title III project staff suggest that
these functionaries regard such involvement as critical to:

> ...effecting a positive attitude toward change
> and a ...[commitment]....to the resources needed
> and planning necessary for carrying out project
> objectives (p. 10).

The experience of the Toledo diocesan school system in
formulating and installing a competency based education model
is described by Lawrence (1975). Staff, community, and sub-
ject matter specialists participated in and contributed to

19

orientation and planning activities. The curriculum guide-
lines and pupil learning goals that resulted from this coop-
erative effort were treated as planning documents by teachers.

> The specific classroom curriculum plan...allowed
> the teacher to take the objectives, activities,
> and resources in the guide and adapt them to the
> specific requirements of the intended instruc-
> tion...the systematic gearing up for curriculum
> change allowed the teacher to determine the
> appropriateness of districtwide objectives, ac-
> tivities and evaluation (p. 4).

ACCOMMODATING DIFFERENTIAL INFORMATION NEEDS

In planning and providing CBE program orientation acti-
vities, it is desirable to tentatively determine the
different information needs of various relevant audiences
(Taylor, 1976). In making such a determination, information
regarding the present functions or roles of various
individuals is important. Similarly, the projected impact
of CBE on those roles and functions is important in
defining both initial information needs and those likely
to emerge at successive stages of program implementation.

In summarizing the effects of introducing a structured,
outcome-based reading program into a kindergarten curriculum
which previously offered no reading instruction, Lasser and
Elam (1974) note that it is not only the kindergarten teachers
who will have need-to-know requirements,

> Teachers who will receive pupils for instruction
> the year after the pupils have participated in
> a new program should also be oriented to that
> program. For example, if a school is introduc-
> ing a new kindergarten reading program, use of
> that program has implications for the subsequent
> first-grade instruction of pupils. First-grade
> teachers whose curricula would be affected by
> the program should, at the very least, be

20

familiarized with its instructional features
and learning outcomes. This enables the
teachers to plan appropriate adjustments
in their first-grade reading and related
communication skills instruction — adjust-
ments that accommodate each pupil's reading
skills (p. 2).

The authors also discuss some dividends of community

orientation, and the types of information that have proven

valuable to such groups.

Community members are a particularly timely
target group, as they share increasing re-
sponsibility with educators for curricular
planning and decisionmaking...Community
groups benefit from information and discus-
sion regarding important characteristics of
effective instruction. Examples of class-
room activities...that may seem appealing
but do not appear to efficiently promote
pupil learning might also be discussed. [The
criteria emerging from such discussions] pro-
vide a meaningful basis for both program se-
lection and classroom observation activities
...Such information facilitates sound curri-
cular decisionmaking and increases the proba-
bility that appropriate criteria will be
applied to several aspects of program evalua-
tion. In addition, better informed community
members can contribute instructional and atti-
tudinal support during the critical period of
program installation (1974, pp. 3-4).

Guba (1968) suggests that some information needs may be

determined by the assumptions one makes concerning the nature

of the intended audience.

The potential adopter may be viewed (a) as
a rational entity who can be convinced on
the basis of hard data and logical argument
of the utility of proposed innovation; (b)
as an untrained entity who can be taught to
perform in relation to the innovation; (c)
as a psychological entity who can be per-
suaded; (d) as an economic entity who can be
compensated or deprived; (e) as a political
entity who can be influenced; (f) as a mem-
ber of a bureaucratic system who can be

compelled; (g) as a member of a profession who can be professionally obligated (p. 293).

Though the approaches suggested by Guba are not given operational definition, assumptions regarding the nature of the adopter need not be based on hypothesized underlying states, nor need they place potential adopters into rigid, mutually exclusive categories. Guba's categories may serve as organizers and as a check against some general types of information that might be provided during program orientation.

Another approach to analyzing and accommodating differential information needs has been suggested by Hall and his colleagues (1976). They propose level-of-use categories ranging from no knowledge of the innovation to sophisticated understanding and use of it. The level-of-use framework developed by Hall is presented in Appendix A.

Viewing CBE implementation as a developmental phenomenon, and recognizing that information needs may differ not only among functional groups but also within a given group, increases the potential complexity of orientation activities exponentially. At the same time, careful attention to different information requirements can be a powerful tool in sustaining planning and development of orientation activities. A framework such as Hall's permits systematic examination of the prevailing uncertainty related to program orientation functions. The framework also suggests program evaluation techniques, including examination of various orientation

22

activities as antecedent variables that may "facilitate... —
use of an innovation while minimizing the trauma of change"
(Hall, 1976, p. 56).

Program Information

The planning and provision of CBE program information
requires a thorough understanding of the innovation on the
part of the change agents.

> There is no question that an adoption agent must
> know what he is talking about. Preferably, he
> must have experienced the innovation in the
> trenches as an adopter. Lacking this he must
> learn vicariously from the experience of others.
> There is no substitute for knowledge, however.
> One cannot bluff his way through an adoption
> interaction with users; to do so is to court
> disaster. (Hall & Jones, 1976, p. 262).

During initial CBE orientation, various audiences can
benefit from basic information covering the program effec-
tiveness, training requirements, resource requirements, and
when appropriate, the history and projected future of devel-
opment.

PROGRAM DEFINITION AND OBJECTIVES

Information on any proposed innovation in education
should be communicated to relevant audiences clearly and unam-
biguously. Even when support for change in education is
apparently widespread, its implementation may be unsuccessful
because audiences do not clearly understand objectives or
methods attendant to the innovation (Pincus, 1972). Gross
and his colleagues observed implementation efforts that were
undertaken by teachers in good faith and with seriousness of

23

31

purpose, and identified the obstacles to those attempts.

> One barrier that blocked the teachers' efforts to
> implement the innovation throughout the six-month
> period was their lack of clarity about the new
> role model. Our observations of teachers indi-
> cated that most of them did not have a clear
> image of the role performance expected of them.
> Our formal interviews...revealed that the teachers
> never had a clear understanding of the innovation
> (1971, p. 196).

Information for potential users regarding program def-
inition should address specific characteristics of the
innovation. When misinterpretation or misunderstanding may
be anticipated, characteristics that are not implied by the
innovation or required by the change agent should be addressed
as well.

Competency based education may be variously defined by
different adopting agencies, each definition being consis-
tent with a general, simplified set of CBE characteristics.
The wide range of potential phenotypic variations in CBE
applications is implied by Hersh, Mallan, and Welton (1976),
in a discussion of content considerations related to compe-
tency based teacher education.

> CBTE is not a Program (and as such is not trans-
> ferable from place to place). (It is not a
> model program, or even the program). Rather,
> CBTE is a process, a strategy for raising a var-
> iety of hypotheses about teacher training and a
> means for testing those hypotheses..." (p. 100).

Woditsch (1976) emphasizes the value of introducing and
defining CBE in a manner that encourages adaptation and embel-
lishment by potential participants. He suggests treating CBE
as "a wise and sympathetic colleague to what is sound in
current practice," rather than as a radical departure from such

24

32

practice. Woditsch sees:

> CBE's emphasis on explicitness [as] not so
> revolutionary as reconstructionist. It is
> unique in that it amplifies and strengthens
> what has grown weak in educational practice.
> It does not propose unprecendented new edu-
> cational objectives or techniques. If it did,
> it would be "like" countless other approaches
> to educational reform and innovation. Conse-
> quently, it should not be prefigured as a
> new "contestant" for educational dominance
> ...CBE is.. better seen as a way of marshal-
> ling largely obvious techniques (objective-
> setting, assessment, feedback, etc.) in
> order to keep the central issues central,
> and educators at work on them (Personal com-
> munication, 1976).

The specific CBE characteristics adopted by members of a given education unit may usefully be considered idiosyncratic embellishments on the general CBE theme. When certain program specifics are defined in advance by or for the adopting agency, they can be clearly communicated to program participants, thereby lessening the risk that implementation will founder because of misunderstanding or misinterpretation of those program features.

The "dilemma of explicitness" regarding the introduction of an innovation in education has been discussed by Fullan (1975). This dilemma is suggested by earlier discussions in this document -- for example, on the one hand, it appears desirable to treat implementation as an adaptive process in which program goals and procedures are determined coopera-tively by developers and users; on the other hand, it appears desirable to explicate program characteristics for potential users, to facilitate implementation and evaluation of the innovation. Fullan suggests the following guidelines for

33

dealing with this dilemma (which he acknowledges can never be fully resolved):

- o Developers or other sponsors of innovations should not be the only ones responsible for specifying the implementation characteristic of the innovation, nor should these characteristics be fully specified a priori...;
- o (Despite the guideline noted above,) developers and other sponsors of innovations would provide considerable clarity if they attempted some detailed specification of the innovation;
- o Users of an innovation will develop some effective specification of it based on their more detailed knowledge of the situation, but we have to distinguish between non-use or superficial use, and effective adaptations;
- o (Following the guidelines noted immediately above,) some idea of the range of standardized structural and behavioral specification is necessary if the innovation is to be implemented in ways consistent with its basic principles. In light of the previous points the process of implementation would involve interaction between developers and users with the intent of deliberately and continuously specifying the innovation (pp. 70-71).

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

To the extent that CBE -- as defined by potential users -- has specific characteristics consistent with operating programs, available data on program effectiveness should be useful in making decisions about program adoption. For example, performance data on previous program operations may provide information on the degree to which stated outcomes were attained in a range of school settings. Such data may assist potential users in making tentative judgments regarding the effectiveness of the broad CBE planning and management system characteristics under consideration. Unless the specific instructional outcomes and the specific instructional strategies and materials used in an earlier program are also

26

34

education unit, however, the potential user is not assisted in making projections about the effectiveness of different instructional approaches that may be introduced to promote unique local objectives.

In summarizing the CBE implementation experiences of the Toledo Public Schools and the Toledo Diocesan Schools, Utz and co-workers (1974) emphasize the value of pupil performance data in promoting new implementation efforts as well as refining ongoing efforts. Such data, they feel, facilitate judgments regarding the relevance of stated outcomes, and the effectiveness of specific, replicable instructional interventions (materials or procedures) in promoting those outcomes.

Empirical pupil performance data resulting from the widescale use of extant instructional materials, products or replicable procedures to promote CBE program outcomes should facilitate sound selection decisions. Niedermeyer and Moncrief (1974) discuss program information which can be valuable to school decisionmakers when considering the use of commercially available instructional programs.

> Primary criteria for determining the effectiveness
> of an instructional program are data resulting
> from assessment of the program's stated outcomes.
> These data should clearly indicate the contribution
> of the instructional program in promoting the out-
> comes (i.e., baseline data and control groups).
> They should be straightforward and interpretable,
> so that a statistician is not required to evaluate
> their credibility (pp. 6-7).

In addition to pupil performance information, anecdotal data and user reactions are important sources of information

for potential adopters. The reactions of previous users to CBE applications, along with information regarding the specific characteristics of those applications, should facilitate more informed decisions regarding CBE adoption or adaptation.

When such user information is quantified, or is balanced for representativeness, potential adopters can better estimate the predictability of a particular user response. Niedermeyer and Moncrief (1974) note the too common tendency of publishers to:

> ...rely on a few carefully chosen testimonials to substantiate the credibility of a program. While such testimonials are invariably positive, they may not be representative of the majority of users. Quantitative data should be presented when reporting the [satisfaction users have within a program] (1974, p. 6).

Data on a program's cost effectiveness should also assist potential users in making enlightened adoption decisions. Schalock's (1976) documentation of Competency Based Teacher Education implementation at the Oregon College of Education provides useful information regaridng cost effectiveness, and serves as a model for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data for internal program evaluation and for communication to the broad education community.

TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Potential users of CBE may need training to develop appropriate understanding or skills; in such cases, they may find information regarding training requirements helpful (Utz, et al., 1974). That information might address such

28

30

questions as the following:

- o What staff members will receive training?
- o What staff members (if any) will have responsibility for conducting training?
- o What materials and equipment will be required?
- o How much time will be required?
- o When (e.g., before school, after school, during release time) will training be conducted?
- o Over how long a period of program installation will training extend?
- o What existing teacher skills will training assume?
- o What teacher skills will training be designed to promote?
- o In addition to staff time, what training costs can be projected?
- o What mechanisms are provided for teacher participation in the formulation of training plans?

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

Program information might also address resource requirements that accompany the installation of an innovation in education (O'Hare, et al., 1972). Information regarding resource requirements might answer such questions as the following:

- o What does the proposed program require in terms of human and material resources?
- o What does the program require in terms of a configuration or allocation of resources different from what currently exists in the adopting unit?

o Does the program provide opportunity and mechanisms
   for using previously untapped available resources?

Observation of External Programs

Program orientation activities can frequently be supple-
mented by providing potential participants an opportunity to
observe the operation of the proposed innovation at existing
sites (Taylor, 1976, McLaughlin, 1975), Baird and Belt (1973)
cite the operation of ongoing CBTE programs as a significant
resource for new CBE program planning and staff orientation
activities.

Visits to selected schools in four states provided dis-
trict personnel with information and experience helpful in
formulating and refining specifications for the experimental
Life Internship Curriculum in the Clark County, Nevada, School
District (Kapfer, et al., 1970). After the new curriculum
had been installed in the district's experimental school,
that school functioned as a demonstration site for inter-
ested educators from the broad education community as well
as those within the district.

The organization and monitoring of five program
demonstration sites is described by O'Hare, Lasser, and Bossing
(1972). The sites, called Information Resource Centers, pro-
vide a means, (a) of informing the education community about
a new research-based instructional program that has been ex-
tensively field tested, and (b) for developing generalizable
installation procedures for research-based instructional

30

products.

In addition to guidelines for demonstration site organization, the authors present empirical data regarding the advantages and costs of demonstration site operation.

> Let us consider first the "benefits" of the sites.
> They did function well in further informing the
> educational community about the program. The par-
> ticipating districts and the broader school and
> higher eduction communities all found the demon-
> stration sites useful...The data generated in
> connection with establishing and operating the
> sites provide the basis for developing...instal-
> lation procedures that will make it possible to
> accomplish "visiting" functions for research-based
> products while avoiding the costs of treating the
> functions as separately costed projects. The for-
> mat procedures used...were carefully designed to
> be generalizable. Using these prototype materials
> it is now feasible to develop a component for an
> instructional program that will permit each local
> education agency to establish its own [demonstration
> center] (O'Hare, et al., 1972, pp. 33-34).

SIMULATIONS AT CONVENTIONS/CONFERENCES

Conventions and conferences sponsored by professional associations provide conference attendants an opportunity to observe and participate in program or procedure simulations and workshops. To the extent that such simulations or workshops address CBE-relevant procedures (e.g., providing instruction directed toward specific outcomes, inferring competencies from demonstrated performance, providing appropriate instructional activities, etc.) potential users may observe or even try out procedures that are under consideration before trying them in their own districts. They also have the opportunity to discuss aspects of program operation with individuals who have experienced or implemented them in school settings.

Short-term installations that permit individual teachers to try out various aspects of CBE in an experimental context are recommended by Taylor (1976). The tentative nature of experimentation often contributes to the ultimate success of the innovation. That is, participants may be more inclined to give the innovation a fair trial if they perceive it as experimental, and feel that they will have a voice in subsequent decisions regarding its adoption or adaptation.

Generating Support: A Retrospective View

Techniques discussed in preceding sections relate to the broad issue of generating program support. The discussion has addressed potential problems as well as payoffs attending various support generation techniques. Although such a discussion is not intended to be directive, it should suggest possible direction -- options for facilitating the installation of competency based education.

The weaving of specific techniques into an overall design for CBE installation is of necessity a creative and self-conscious activity. To attempt to prepare installation fabric for off-the-rack consumption is to deny the consumer the fun as well as the fit of self-tailoring.

To the extent that the techniques described in this paper represent tested options, they deserve consideration by agencies or individuals contemplating the introduction of a change in education. To the extent that they were

33

demonstrated effective in introducing innovations similar
to those being considered locally, generalizations may be
particularly apt.

Personalization is the very critical requirement in making
any installation generalization work. It is the process of
taking useful information about what has happened many times
to many people, or sometimes to some people, or rarely...and
adding information about what is unique about your circumstance,
your place, your people. It is what Herb Gardner means by
having "the good eye" (1962), and what James Wilson (1965)
means by being a "good guesser." It is knowing what makes
you, institutionally and individually, special.

The preceding discussion of techniques for generating
program support reflects such a respect for user personali-
zation. Subsequent sections of this paper, which deal with
resource utilization and scope of program implementation
attempt to maintain that spirit.

Resource Utilization

The effective use of available resources is particularly
critical during a period of major change in schooling. An
appropriate balance between a perceived need and the avail-
ability of resources to meet that need promotes staff commit-
ment and facilitates personal contribution to the organization.
In a discussion of resource utilization Miles (1965) observes
that in "healthy" organizations

The fit between people's own dispositions and the role
demands of the system is good. Beyond this, people feel

reasonably 'self-actualized'; they not only 'feel good' in their jobs, but they have a genuine sense of learning, growing, and developing as persons in the process of making their organizational contribution (p. 19).

In the following discussion, considerations of human and material resource utilization are addressed. Attention to such considerations should prove useful in formulating a CBE implementation plan.

Human Resource Utilization

THE SOCIAL ORGANIZER

A "social organizer" (House 1976) -- (also known as "program manager" (Hall, 1976), "change agent" (Rogers, 1962) or "entrepreneur" (House, 1974) is considered by some to be essential to impelmenting major change. The social organizer assumes or shares responsibility for advocating and managing the introduction of change.

Within the school district organization, a superintendent, program director, support staff member, curriculum director, principal or teacher may function as a social organizer. The identification of someone to fill this role should be guided by careful consideration of the personality characteristics as well as the ability and experience of those available for the position (House, 1976).

High on the list of desirable general skills for social organizers is the range of their authority and responsibility within the group they wish to influence. Social organizers concerned with promoting CBE implementation will, of course, find a comprehensive knowledge of competency

based education advantageous in providng support to both policy makers and practitioners. For example, they may need to conceptualize operational models of CBE, and to discuss the history, the rationale, and the possible consequences of implementing CBE-type programs. They should be prepared to provide CBE-related information to all decisionmakers, and to answer major conceptual questions. It would be desirable to possess a familiarity with CBE position papers, major policy decisions related to CBE, and the development of CBE implementation plans. Frequently, social organizers will make inquiries outside the immediate organization to secure adequate answers or resources; thus the ability to establish liaison with available resource agencies is also desirable.

It is sometimes considered appropriate to introduce organizers from outside the organization in leadership roles as well as in support roles (Goodlad, 1967, 1968). Professional consultants, specialists from other agencies such as intermediate education districts or state departments of education and publishers' representatives may help facilitate CBE installation. Because the time allocated to such outside agents is generally limited, it is important that they interact directly with the administrators and staff members who will initiate implementation efforts. As school personnel gain expertise in CBE, they can formulate specific models and procedures to meet local needs.

Outside agents can provide training in conceptual development, and can facilitate the implementation of CBE. They can help establish liaison with other districts

attempting similar activities. Gradually districts will
rely more heavily on their own skills and those of neighboring
districts.

Evidence from numerous studies reveal that most
individuals consider outside agents less credible or helpful
than their professional peers or internal agents (Rogers, 1962).
This suggests that outside agents may be most valuable during
the early stages of development, and that their utility will
diminish as local expertise and experience increase (Rogers,
1962; Goodlad, 1967). McLaughlin (1975) notes that where
outside agents were considered useful in classroom organiza-
tion projects, their involvement was direct and concrete, and
included working with teachers in their classrooms and in
"hands-on" workshops. Abstract theorizing and interpersonal
distancing, then, both tend to decrease the likelihood that the
outside agent will be effective in stimulating program implemen-
tation.

The credibility of an outside agent depends in part upon
the political environment and the nature of any previous
relationships between that agent and the local school or
district being served. Rogers (1962) suggests that over a
period of time, outside change agents can become highly
respected and gain significant influence. He also
suggests that outside agents who are perceived as peers
rather than as disseminators are more likely to influence
adoption of a process, product or idea.

Social organizers who are knowledgable and sensitive to
dynamics of change can anticipate problems that users are

likely to experience. Hall (1976) calls this anticipation activity manipulation. He suggests that

> manipulation strategies used by internal agents are more likely to be of a type that will ensure development of ongoing relationships among users that... can [be monitored] on a day-to-day basis. The external agent is more likely to manipulate users as resources to one another (p. 262).

In summary, effective social organizers should be knowledgable regarding the desired innovation able to coordinate available resources to facilitate program exploration, decisionmaiking, and training, and able to identify and arrange for the use of extra-organization resources, when appropriate. In addition, social organizers, like others seeking to influence and support other people, need to be liked by the "social" beings they are attempting to "organize."

Additional human resource considerations important in implementing CBE are discussed in the following subsections.

ADVOCACY GROUPS

"The successful implementation of an innovation ultimately depends on whether an internal advocacy group is formed around it" (House, 1976, p. 338). An advocacy group is usually a small group that forms spontaneously to keep an innovation alive. Taylor (1976) provides an example of such a group: Active supporters at Rainier Beach High School in Seattle viewed their performance-based instructional program as valuable both to the school and to themselves. They fought hard for resources and public support. Taylor suggests that the innovation survived primarily because of the group's persistent effort, even during hard times.

House (1976) concurs with Taylor: "The advocacy group provides the real work energy on which the innovation lives" (p. 338). House also suggests that a strong advocacy group is important during times of challenge and economic difficulty. When an innovation is strongly supported, needed resources can usually be found.

Taylor indicates that the performance-based instruction advocacy group at Rainier Beach were able to secure outside funds, gain local publicity, disseminate and share materials with schools in the United States, Canada, and Europe, and publish articles in national education publications. Members of the advocacy group received incentives through promotion, public recognition, release time for program development work and opportunities to share their work at national conferences. Such advocacy group incentives may work to enhance or to retard the acceptance and implementation of an innovation in schooling. For example, House (1976) notes that:

> If the advocacy group is successful in competing for resources, others in the district are naturally opposed. To the extent that the advocates absorb money and promotions, there is less available for everyone else. A counter group almost always forms, comprised of those who are excluded from the innovation (p. 339).

Members of the counter group may concentrate on weak or potentially threatening aspects of CBE, finding it consistent with their interests to resist its implementation. Pincus' (1972) suggestion that the schools will tend to resist innovations which may disrupt existing bureaucratic structures

39

40

also suggests a potential source of opposition to CBE.

Hall and Jones (1976), when discussing competency based teacher education suggest the following:-

> When beginning an experimental CBE program, be sure to begin with a staff of interested and willing people...Be warned, however, that small dedicated groups can be a hazard to the growth and spread of the program in your situation if they are not open to new people (p. 250).

Open communication and freedom of participation in advocacy groups is important to the smooth implementation of CBE, or of any innovation in schooling.

Advocacy groups can serve many functions and can exist in many forms. Pellegrin (1975) describes a small ad hoc group of administrators and specialists that formed during an early planning phase of program implementation, remained intact, and developed the basic precepts of a major project in differentiated staffing. Taylor (1976) describes another advocacy group which formed only as a result of district level initiative to stimulate interest.

Goodlad (1975) discusses the League of Cooperating Schools, an organization which assumes many functions of an advocacy group, but at a higher administrative level. In Goodlad's model for change, the individual school is the change agent, and the school principal is the responsible leader. The League provides a forum within which principals of cooperating schools can share ideas and solve problems. It takes effort to establish an environment within which persons feel confident enough to take risk and to initiate changes. Goodlad (1967) references Guba in this regard:

47

"Generally speaking, the bureaucratic structure of
existing agencies will not allow for the factors
of high risk-taking, sanctioned freedom to fail,
and delayed gratification which will be required
to attack meaningfully the conceptual, personnel and
organizational impediments to effective planned
change in education" (p. 2).

The League offers districts one means of establishing and
maintaining an environment conducive to change.

Schools considering the adoption of a CBE-related
innovation need some means of dealing with the social and
organizational factors identified by Guba. They must be
able to combine and utilize internal and external resources
to facilitate CBE exploration, planning and implementation.
This may require modifications in present organizational
operations (e.g., new staff positions, new or changed
authority/responsibility structures, new reward systems)
and new or changed institutional relationships (e.g., the
League of Cooperating Schools, the consortia of schools,
universities and community representatives).

Discussion of school services and procedures that may be
important to support CBE implementation is presented in the
following subsections. Program planners have found the
services provided through training activities, program support
staff and resource or material centers to be critical in pro-
moting the implementation of innovations in schooling. Those
services characterized by human resource support are discussed
first.

46

Support Services

Colyer (1976) suggests it is important to give teachers a "hand hold" when beginning to implement CBE. Adequate supporting human resources she suggests, could provide the "lifeline" that makes change possible.

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP

Intensive in-service training appears to be a critical ingredient of effective program implementation. Such training frequently provides teachers and other participants with demonstration models, "hands-on" practice, and psychological support and reinforcement (Fullan, 1975). It has been suggested that using a variety of training approaches increases responsiveness to the needs of participating individuals and to the requirements of the program (Taylor, 1976).

McLaughlin (1975) indicates that "one-shot" training or training provided only at the beginning of a new project or program is generally ineffective.

> Although such training designs have the virtue of efficiency and lower cost, they ignore the critical fact that project implementors cannot know what it is they need to know until project operations are well underway...there is just so much that a would-be implementor can be taught or can understand until problems have arisen in the course of project implementation and solutions must be devised. Similarly, it is difficult to anticipate in advance exactly what implementor needs might be at different points in project implementation. Training programs that attempt to be comprehensive and cover all contingencies at the outset are bound to miss their mark and also to be less than meaningful to project participants (p. 7).

Weikart and Banet (1976) express similar observations, based on the attempted training related to implementation of a Piagetian Follow Through model:

49

> To our embarrassment, we must admit that our
> assumptions about training five years ago were
> that (1) one could describe a "model" in
> largely verbal terms, with perhaps a few charts
> and diagrams; and that (2) this simple verbal
> description, presented before a gathering of
> teachers in a preservice workshop, should
> persuade them to modify radically their
> teaching behavior in the coming year....
> We learned the hard way that these expecta-
> tions were absurd...not surprisingly, our
> training began to be focused increasingly
> on concrete teaching strategies that put
> into practice our theoretical conceptions,
> and on concrete examples provided by class-
> room settings, either at the center or on
> film or videotape (pp. 129-130).

Many opportunities are being tapped for provision of

CBE-related personnel development. Well established

competency based teacher education programs (mandated in

at least 20 states) are being implemented to various degrees

in colleges and universities nationwide. Many of these

programs can help provide appropriate preservice experiences

useful to teachers who will be practicing in a CBE context.

Preservice training in CBTE programs represents one point on

what may be conceptualized as a CBE training continuum.

Some school districts also cooperate with teacher training

institutions to provide in-school training experiences. Trainees

are sometimes given employment as aides or intern teachers

while completing their university preparation. Goodlad (1970)

supports such extension of preservice training to school

settings:

> Teacher-training programs must get off the college
> campuses into schools serving as teacher-education
> centers. On entry into such programs, future teachers
> must become members of teacher teams in collaborating
> schools, and receive ascending stipends as they progress

from minimal responsibility as aides to maximal responsibility as resident teachers (p. 425).

A subsequent point on the CBE training continuum is represented by provision of training for practicing teachers and administrators. While persons implementing CBE will present a broad array of training need, it is desirable that any in-service program be based on continuing assessment of specific, current faculty needs. The types of training required in the early stages of implementation can be quite different from that required as implementation progresses.

In identifying major barriers to the implementation of an innovation, Gross et al. (1971) found that many serious problems arose very early because teachers lacked needed skills and knowledge. Practitioners need familiarity with new materials and methods, and they need an opportunity to consider and work on implementation plans before attempting to implement a major change. The timeline and scope of implementation should be consistent with that knowledge and experience. Gross found that inadequately prepared teachers often entered into an implementation effort with positive attitudes, but quickly lost their motivation as the frustration mounted.

Many structured models for aspects of CBE-related in-service training are available. One workshop is described by Olson (1974):

> The workshop is an attempt to provide teachers, administrators and teacher aides with an opportunity to become familiar with the concept and processes of individualized instruction. Unlike many earlier efforts, this workshop models all the characteristics of a good individualized program. The workshop facilitator functions as a teacher in the classroom.

51

He defines the goals and objectives, adjusts the objectives for individual differences, provides alternative learning strategies for each participant, organizes the environment, interacts with the learners so that they achieve the objectives, evaluates progress toward the objectives, and helps participants decide on the next appropriate instructional steps (p. 41).

The functions outlined by Olson describe some probable characteristics of many CBE programs, and may be appropriate for consideration in planning in-service training programs.

Olson specifies diagnostic activity as one important aspect of the individualized instruction workshop. Participants have an opportunity to conduct an informal self-diagnosis, and they select the objectives that best meet their individual needs. Learners do not have to study something they already know or for which they do not feel ready. Since the workshop is flexible, the learner and facilitator frequently work out new objectives based on the learner's individual needs. Attaining these objectives often requires locating additional resources, or visiting an operational program in a nearby school.

An important component of the workshop, and of any staff development effort, is evaluation. Within the workshop, evaluation occurs during the small-group discussions that follow completion of each learning package. In the course of these sessions, learners share their concerns, ideas, and products with others who have worked on the same objectives. This type of evaluation is intended to be formative in nature. It provides excellent feedback to the facilitator, to help in determining the effectiveness of the instruction provided,

45

52

and to identify areas in which supplementary instruction may be desirable.

Utz (1974) suggests that "the necessary teacher in-servicing process should require teachers to build their own curriculum modules, thus creating a psychological investment for teacher implementation" (p. 8). Olson (1974) addresses this concern by asking workshop participants to prepare outcome statements, learning packages, or evaluation items germane to their classrooms. Upon returning to the classroom, participants use these materials with students and prepare a critique before returning to the next session. During that session, they share their work and critique with the facilitator, and then develop a final modified version.

Utz (1974) observes that teacher involvement in training is promoted additionally by some form of reward for in-service participation (p. 8). Olson (1974) identifies release time, in-service credit, public recognition, and free materials as rewards which encourage participation in the individualized instruction workshop. Such incentive considerations in planning program implementation are discussed in more detail in a subsequent subsection of this paper.

As teachers and administrators begin to implement CBE, they may benefit from an opportunity to learn required skills in an environment that models effective CBE program characteristics. For example, teachers might work toward stated or negotiated objectives at their own rate, using resources best suited to their personal learning styles.

46

Observing the elements of a total CBE system in operation gives participants one basis of comparison as they begin to implement a CBE program in their own schools.

Burns (1969) suggests that follow-up training (after an innovative program has been implemented) consist of:

> Frequent, but short, staff meetings. Only require those to attend who are directly involved in the agenda. Frequent meetings insure progress and provide for all phases of the project to come under observation. This prevents minor problems from growing into major problems and also insures that all problems receive immediate attention (p. 422).

Huff (1975) notes that new arrivals, or those joining the program after it has been initiated, may feel left out and be left out, unless follow-up training is provided on a regular basis.

The complex training needs related to CBE are best met by preservice and in-service training supported by the schools themselves if quality CBE programs are to be successfully implemented. Goodlad (1970) notes that:

> Training should be provided on company time and at company expense. Public schooling is one of the largest enterprises in the country that does not provide for systematic updating of skills of its employees and for payment of the costs involved (p. 425).

Training programs are needed for specialists in CBE program development and staff renewal. It has been suggested that comprehensive program development would benefit greatly if personnel trained in the complexities of CBE implementation were widely available throughout the educational community (Taylor, 1976). At least one such program to train general

47

change facilitators is under development at the Indiana
University School of Education, Division of Instructional
Systems Technology (Bhola, 1973).

Materials Resource Support

RESOURCE ROOMS AND MATERIALS CENTERS

The more aware a person functioning as social organizer
is of available resources, the more helpful that person can
be to teachers and administrators. Gross et al. (1971),
Charters and Pellegrin (1973), and Crowther (1972), all
cite the unavailability or inadequacy of required materials,
equipment and resources as a major barrier to the implemen-
tation of an innovation.

"You need to have use of outside resources. You need
to know how to tap consultants from institutions where things
have already been done. Faculty need to be aware of materials
that already exist" (Hall and Jones, p. 264).

Once identified, it is desirable that resources relevant,
to the innovation be made easily accessible to teachers and
other intended staff. For example, related to CBE, a state
office of education might develop a comprehensive index to all
relevant CBE related materials, references, and even consultants or
practitioners. That index could be published and disseminated
to districts and schools for their use in selecting appropri-
ate materials and identifying other relevant resources. Inter-
mediate and larger districts might develop media support for
staff training and for instructional use. It is particularly
desirable that teachers and other school personnel have access
to those CBE resources that have been found useful in CBE

classrooms. Some schools maintain an "in-house" collection of books and tapes related to new programs and procedures, for teacher use (Taylor, 1976). Such resources can be made accessible through an informal checkout system.

Some districts maintain a curriculum library in which they display instructional materials currently available from publishers and other schools or districts. Such a curriculum library is also a convenient place from which to disseminate materials developed by teachers and other staff within the district.

A district resource room or curriculum library might also display available collections of goals, objectives, and evaluation items. If it is impractical to display complete collections, it might be possible to provide services that facilitate retrieving items from extant collections.

PROGRAM SUPPORT STAFF NEEDS

Personal communication is a basic element of educational change. The implementation of competency based education-type programs frequently require major change, and the costs involved in ensuring adequate personal contact to promote that change can be great. Schools may attempt to minimize the expense by disseminating written materials or resorting to other, less personal types of communication. Although news-letters, articles, books, and sample materials can help communicate simple, routine information, personal contact is considered critical in many situations involving an element of

uncertainity -- for example, in problem solving, planning or negotiating sessions. The adequacy of personal, direct support provided by program staff at all levels (i.e., state, county, district and school) can have a major effect on the rate, scope and success of CBE implementation. Unless adequate support provisions are made, much of the burden of attempting to plan and implement CBE programs fall on teachers alone.

The Oregon Department of Education (Hall, 1976) has developed a list of school personnel competencies which school districts specified as necessary for implementing the instructional portions of Oregon's Minimum Standards for Public Schools. The list is Oregon-specific and its elements do not all correspond directly or solely to the elements of CBE presented in the present document. It does, however, provide the Oregon Department of Education, colleges, universities, districts and schools in Oregon an opportunity to assess current staff competencies, staff development opportunities, and research and development plans. The list also provides a framework for determining whether school organizational characteristics are compatible with the personnel competencies suggested by the Minimum Standards.

- Specialized personnel can be employed to provide support and assistance in the assumption of tasks such as outcome identification, needs assessment, program evaluation and information management (Pellegrin, 1975). Depending on the size and nature of the district or school, these and other functions may be supported by existing personnel. It is, of course, important not to superimpose CBE-type functions on the

existing administrative and instructional functions but rather, through accommodation and adaptation by staff, to design and implement a program that represents a set of consistent, complementary functions. ..

Freeing teachers from certain regular classroom responsibilities gives them an opportunity to develop the necessary skills and knowledge to evaluate and to participate in CBE planning and implementation. They not only learn from such involvement, but they also have a chance to influence program adoption and development, and they have the opportunity to gain a sense of commitment to, and ownership of, any new program that may be installed. Many CBE functions can be planned, implemented and facilitated by teachers who are given adequate training, release time and incentives.

INCENTIVES

Many schools have a highly restrictive reward structure, and offer few opportunities for professional advancement. Tenure and salary often depend primarily on years of experience. Teachers seeking such advancement often must leave the classroom in order to secure higher salary, status and recognition. Rewards available to those who remain in the classroom are quite limited.

The personal costs involved in implementing CBE-type programs, where they deviate significantly from prevailing instructional programs, are often high for all concerned. A great deal of time and energy are required to identify, plan, and assume the necessary new skills and roles. Unless implemen-

51

tation is carefully planned to include the provision of
incentives, resistance to CBE may be high.

Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards may be considered in an
implementation plan. House (1974) observes that:

> In examining high school reward structures, though
> not those directly related to innovation, Spock
> (1974) found that the "extrinsic" rewards varied.
> Intrinsic rewards -- pride of workmanship, positive
> social interaction with peers, and abiltiy to influ-
> ence school policy -- are relatively more important
> in the overall reward structure. Whether the greater
> importance of intrinsic work and peer-related rewards
> is because of the preferences of teachers or because
> of the absence of variation in extrinsic rewards
> could not be determined. It is clear, however, that
> intrinsic rewards are important and that the more
> material extrinsic rewards are scarce (p. 74).

Carpenter-Huffman et al. (1974), in discussing social
and behavioral barriers to and facilitators of change in
performance contracting programs, note that:

> On the school side, the real incentives for trying
> to make the programs work were the professional,
> advantage of being associated with a successful
> highly visible program and the professional
> dedication of educators trying to find new
> solutions to the problems they faced (p. 166).

Miles (1965) discusses the invisibility of teacher role
performance to peers or superiors, concluding that professionals
are relatively detached from peer estimates of performance.
He points out, however, that much satisfaction derives from
intrinsic properties of the role. CBE may provide an
opportunity for greater performance visibility via goal
definition and program evaluation, thus affording a sound
basis for providing extrinsic rewards for quality work.

Membership in an advocacy group provides an opportunity
for both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. For many, the

52

satisfaction of being a part of such an effort compensates for certain frustrations and for the time involved. In addition, group membership can provide more informal rewards, and can place members in an effective position to bargain for formal rewards. For example, gaining recognition for effective contributions in a CBE advocacy group can lead to "promotion" to positions of additional responsibility and financial rewards such as a unit leader or department chairperson, or to nomination to contract for work on summer or other extra-time, extra-pay projects.

Concrete rewards for group involvement have been described. Kapfer et al. (1970) discuss some:

> The strategy during the first year of the project was to utilize Title III funds for hiring substitute teachers for the purpose of freeing teachers for program development. The administrators worked closely with teachers who were freed for such activities. The plan...was to train the teachers in writing Individualized Learning Packages (p. 19).

When production was assessed, the process of using substitutes was determined to be inefficient. During the second year they chose to

> contract with teachers on a extra-time, extra-pay basis for program development. All teachers were informed of the opportunity that would be available during the summer to contract for specific program development (p. 20).

They also used the university:

> Teachers were also given the option of taking some or all of their pay in form of university credit through a workshop which the principal and project specialist conducted during the summer (p. 20).

53

In addition to individual rewards, it is worthwhile to consider the need for program-oriented, group rewards and incentives. It appears that schools seldom reward program-level or cooperative development. In this regard, Yarger et al. (1975) observe that:

> ...possessiveness of ideas of programmatic efforts as well as a sense of isolation are natural outgrowths. Educational respectability is typically associated with the product, and the recognition an individual garners for his/her professional effort. Rarely are groups of people rewarded for developing a superior program. In fact, when a superior program emerges, one or two individuals are usually singled out for reward and recognition, thus creating unpleasant responses from others who contributed to the effort (p. 13).

It is important to be aware of the relationship between the personal cost involved in implementing CBE (e.g., time and energy requred to develop new skills) and the amont of resistance that may result. Because a reward system can compensate for personal costs, resistance may decrease and progress toward effective implementation may increase. Therefore, a school's or district's capability to identify, provide and control adequate incentives should be of prime consideration in determining the scope and rate of an implementation plan.

FEEDBACK

The provision of mechanisms for communication and, feedback are also very important in preparing an implementation plan. This section presents a discussion of feedback related to the information needs of individuals affected by CBE-type programs.

54

61

Some goals of feedback systems often include --

o   Improving program implementation processes.

,o   Improving program implementation management.

b   Improving program outcomes, or program effectiveness.

Developing an information feedback system involves --

o   Identifying the information needs of potential partici-
    pants.

o   Identifying individuals who should provide and recieve
    the information.

o   Identifying methods of collecting and providing the
    information.

A very important guiding principle applicable to both
the planning and operation of an information feedback system
is emphasized by Hall and Jones (1976):

> Keep your plans open and on top of the table. Provide
> continuing opportunities for input and decisionmaking
> participation by staff...(p. 250).

It is appropriate to add the desirability of openness
with the feedback to participating community groups, parent
groups, professional groups, and funding agencies.   Colyer
(1976) describes a means of providing feedback to community
participants:

> When one includes members of the community...in a
> meeting and solicits their suggestions...on ways
> they might contribute to the program, it is helpful
> to have these items written down by the person
> making the suggestion (which gives them confidence
> that their contribution is not going to be lost)...
> (A written synthesis can then be) printed and
> distributed to those...involved....(p. 6).

Hall et al.(1976) describe a feedback technique used in
developing a competency based teacher education (CBTE) program:

> We know of a small staff cadre in one institution that
> is working on assumptions, competencies, and a prototype

management system for a new CBTE program. Two department chairmen and an associate dean are among the other participating staff. Each time a task is accomplished such as the identification of a set of assumptions, a written version of the action, in proposal form, is sent to the total faculty and to student and school representatives. The information is set on ditto sheets for feedback. (The ditto format connotes something less final than mineographed or other more polished printing). Those who wish to provide input to the committee do so. Those who don't, can't say they were never given the opportunity (p. 251).

Discussing organizational health and the need for adequate communication processes, Miles (1965) suggests that it is essential to have "relatively distortion-free communication 'vertically,' 'horizontally,' and across the boundary of the system to and from the surrounding environment" (p. 18). Communication feedback mechanisms must provide accurate and prompt information about tensions and difficulties within the school or program. And people must be able to secure and to provide information with minimal personal effort.

Appropriate use of feedback information in decision-making can increase CBE program effectiveness. Information can be collected on a wide variety of topics (e.g., learning outcome achievement, resource utilization, implementation strategy effectiveness, cost effectiveness). Seldom can a school or district collect, process, and disseminate all potentially useful information. Participants in the school system must, therefore, set priorities for information gathering. These priorities help define the system for collecting and disseminating information. As information gathering and processing systems are initiated and refined, they may be expanded to accommodate increasing categories of information.

Schools and districts may cooperate in planning complementary information-gathering strategies, and in sharing the results of subsequent information gathering, where appropriate.

Information-based Decisionmaking. CBE practitioners need continuous feedback to make effective program-related decisions. Information-based decisionmaking requires that information needs be defined and that information be gathered, analyzed and reported in a form that facilitates objectivity. Values naturally and appropriately influence the ways in which information needs are defined and information processing occurs. Decisionmakers can benefit from an effort to maintain awareness of potential values influences in the decisionmaking process. Hall and Jones (1976) speak to the combination of the relatively objective and the subjective in decisionmaking:

> As expert evaluators point out, the actual act.
> of decisionmaking includes a values-belief compo-
> nent as well as the summarized, relatively objective
> reporting of the evaluation data. It is at the
> point of making decisions that the most rational
> answer is not necessarily the best. However, the
> decisionmaker who has evaluation data will be able
> to make a more calculated decision and probably
> be more confident in his decisions than if the
> decision had been completed based on "gut feelings"
> (p. 273).

Hall et al. (1976) note that feedback can facilitate an actively adaptive implementation environment:

> Deciding on which variables are most in need of
> evaluations, who will make what decisions, what
> feedback mechanisms are needed, and who will handle
> evaluation activities should be settled before
> program development starts. Then, through
> successive approximations and adaptations to events
> and data, the evaluation (and implementation)

64

activities should be regularly adjusted (Hall et al., 1976, p. 273).

Definitions of competency based education type programs suggest the importance of an instructional management model that facilitates information based decisions regarding instruction. The same model may be applied to the management of the CBE implementation process itself.

A Framework of Information-Based Decisionmaking.
Hall et al. (1975) and Hall and Jones (1976) suggest two frameworks within which decisionmaking processes can be organized (see Appendices A and B). One framework (Hall and Jones, 1976) incorporates two basic dimensions. The first dimension addresses three levels of program implementation: planning, implementing and maintaining. The other dimension addresses four decision areas: outcomes, resources, strategies, and costs.

In Appendix B, sample questions are presented within each cell of the framework. The remainder of this section focuses on each of the four decision areas as it relates to identifying information needs, and collecting and dissmeminating information.

Feedback Related to Outcomes. Utz (1974) suggests that feedback related to outcomes "will be...most important in effecting change, because it furnishes data pertaining to the relevance of objectives and effectiveness of instructional strategies" (p. 8).

A major purpose of feedback should be to provide a basis for modifying outcomes-referenced strategies. In this context, it is appropriate to apply feedback both to instructional outcomes and to implementation outcomes.

Woditsch (1975) raises a caution:

> Very seldom are objectives set on grounds other than tradition or some first-approximation response to the market place. Once set, the goals appear no more amenable to change than those of traditional curricula. Rarely are conscious efforts made to adjust program objectives in accord with program experience (p. 13).

Implementation goals and student learning outcomes should be assessed regularly throughout the implementation process. If results and expectations are inconsistent, modification may be necessary. Decisionmakers must deal with three major phenomena that impinge on the decisionmaking process: availability of hard data, context values, and Woditsch's researched observation that there is no tendency to change outcomes statements as a result of experience.

When attempting to implement a competency based teacher education program, Dickson et al. (1972) observed that a major problem related to student feedback:

> While we believe that data should be supplied in abundance concerning their skill attainment, etc., feedback to our students has been delayed because of the cumbersome evaluation procedures we have been using. Inadequate feedback has [also resulted] because most professors tested only once or twice during a course (p. 6).

Sound decisions depend on reliable, timely outcome information. Inadequate feedback hinders decisionmaking by both students and professional staff.

Other feedback activities affecting CBE program imple-

mentation include the review of instructional scheduling and pacing information by supervisory personnel. Lasser and Elam (1974) observe that "regular monitoring of these aspects [scheduling and pacing] of program operation provides for increased teacher accountability, and help focus teacher attention on the attainment of specific program outcomes" (p. 8). They suggest that "the emphasis of such review activities (should be) on identifying and correcting any problems or potential problems that might impede pupil progress toward program goals" (p. 8).

Southwest Regional Laboratory staff studied the effects of monitoring and reporting the reading achievement of first-grade pupils on several levels. After studying fifteen schools, using four different levels of accountability and reporting, they offer the following comments:

> Reporting required that teachers submit to their principals a record of pupil achievement scores on each assessment exercise administered. A 45-item criterion test based on the major objectives of the reading program was individually administered at the end of the school year. A significant positive relationship (p. < .001) between level of teacher reporting and pupil reading achievement increased with each increase in level of teacher reporting. In addition, program completion ranged from 60 percent for the lowest level of reporting to 75 percent at the highest level (p. 9).

Progress toward desired outcomes should be continuously assessed and instruction modified accordingly. Thus, with each assessment the performance ideal may be more closely approximated.

<u>Feedback Related to Resources</u>. Major categories of resources may be conceptualized to include personnel, materials and incentives.

Miles (1965) suggests that a healthy organization uses personnel effectively so that they are neither overworked nor idle. There must be a close relationship between each person's capacity to accomplish a task and the demands of that person's particular role. In this sense, capacity is very dependent on the skills, training, materials, and incentives related to CBE implementation.

Once planning decisions are made, it is necessary to obtain adequate feedback on the rate and effectiveness of resource utilization during both the implementation and maintenance phases of CBE. There is some evidence in the literature that additional resources are frequently required during the early stages of implementation. As time passes, schools gradually find ways to adapt extant resources to new processes. Initially, schools may maintain dual systems until more appropriate systems evolve to an efficient level.

<u>Feedback Related to Strategies</u>. New instructional materials and procedures are continually being developed. Each developer must identify the kinds of feedback that will effectively improve the product. Some useful types of information include the following:

o Students' reactions (appeal, relevance, utility, interest, etc.)

o Teachers' reactions (utility, manageability, relevance, etc.)

61

o   Amount of time required for students to complete a
    unit or sequence of instruction

o   Areas of confusion, errors, and information gaps

o   Student performance data

As mentioned earlier, teachers can develop material in
a workshop setting, use them with their students, secure
student feedback, and return to the next workshop session
to make appropriate modifications. Workshop facilitators
can develop simple checklists to help teachers ensure quality
control. Appendix C includes a checklist developed by staff
of the Seattle Public Schools. Teachers participating in an
individualized instruction workshop use that list to evaluate
learning packages before using them with students.

Publishers, regional educational laboratories, state
departments of education and school districts that prepare
materials for wide dissemination generally require comprehen-
sive quality control procedures. Materials are evaluated with
regard to usability, adaptability, cost effectiveness, and
effectiveness in meeting goals. Developers need to secure
the kind of feedback that leads to constructive modification:
often there are attempts to ensure that the final product will
be effective in a wide variety of settings.

Learning packages or instructional modules are frequently
developed by teachers and curriculum specialists. It is
important to collect information about these modules as
development progresses. Hall and Jones (1976) describe a
process used in some CBE programs:

Students are asked to make notes in the margins
and on the backs of pages as they proceed through
a module, highlighting points they believe should
be brought to the attention of the module developer.
To further systematize this process, a module feedback
form of the type developed by Englehardt, Gouge, and
Hall (1972) can be filled out by students after
completing a module (p. 279)..

A sample module feedback form is displayed in Appendix
D.

Hall describes another feedback form that has been used:
a computer card inserted within reusable instructional materials
such as films or tapes (See Appendix E for a sample form).
Information from this form provides feedback to learning
resource center staff about the perceived effectiveness and
appeal of the materials.

All new materials should be evaluated for their quality
and effectiveness. Students, parents, teachers, support
staff, and administrative staff can all provide information
when appropriate feedback systems are operable. That for-
mation provides a basis for improving the materials, as well
as annotating them for new users.

Feedback Related to Costs. Cost is a critical factor
having implications for the success or failure of changes
such as CBE frequently represents. Funding processes and
traditional accounting and budgeting procedures make
detailed cost difficult to monitor. Frequently, costs are
not itemized. In addition, a wide variety of costs must
be considered: e.g., costs relating to personnel, facili-
ties, materials, services, and equipment. These costs

may be usefully monitored within program, activity and implementation time frames. For each CBE program, adequate feedback systems should enable schools to report the costs of activities such as developing materials, training teachers or other program participants, pilot testing, planning, diagnosing, instructing and evaluating.

Little information is currently available on the cost of CBE-type programs. Initial indications are that CBE programs may be more expensive than non-CBE programs. Woditsch (1975) discusses costs related to learner-centered curricula:

> The costs of learner-centered curricula in terms of human resources is higher. This is a totally predictable outcome much ratified by research. Even in instances where learner-centered curricular costs roughly equal those of comparable traditional programs, faculty activity studies disclose a greater commitment of personnel time to the program. A not unattractive corollary frequently emerges in evidence that students, too, give themselves more intensively (p. 13).

There are some exceptions to the cost trends. One is cited by Olson (1971): "A competency based program in business education reported a net decrease of 16.7 percent in student-semester-hourly instructional costs." Olson explains that the program combined three typed of change: "CBE, individualized instruction and differentiated staffing." Although the two years of planning, developing, and training were expensive, the new program provided enough flexibility in student scheduling and staff use to permit additional subsequent modifications at no more than baseline cost.

Hall and Jones (1976) review efforts to develop CBTE

programs in five state-supported institutions in Washington
state:

> Hite (1973) reports that it was a consensus that
> the prototype programs were more costly than
> the traditional programs. Hite has clustered
> the increased dollar costs around three factors:
> (1) the resources, manpower, and money needed
> for program development, (2) the program require-
> ments for individualization of instruction, and
> (3) the involvement of added personnel, such as
> school faculty. Hite found that each of these
> cost factors accounted for over 50 percent of
> the estimated 150 percent increase in costs over
> the traditional programs for prototype Performance
> Based Teacher Education (p. 283).

Hall and Jones suggest, however, that costs will decrease

following the initial development and implementation phases.

They have drawn their information from CBTE program costs.

CBE programs' developed for K-12 schools may require quite

different expenditure levels. Although the evidence to

date is not extensive, it is fair to assume that CBE programs

will be more expensive than the traditional programs --

at least during their early development stages. There is

a need for carefully estimating, budgeting, monitoring, and

reporting development costs of clearly specified CBE programs

or program elements.

Hall and Jones (1976) describe one system that addresses

the need for a monitoring system:

> One particularly useful system that merits discussion
> is that of Wallace and Witzke (1972), who have attempted
> to develop a monitoring system for large-scale program-
> matic research and development efforts that can easily
> be adapted to the needs of CBE program managers. The
> composite system has been named the General Accounting
> System or GAS, and was developed to systematically
> monitor and estimate the time, resources, and dollar
> cost of future R&D efforts. Using the entire system
> requires adjusting the budget reporting and purchasing
> procedures as well as enlisting the cooperation of the
> personnel involved (p. 284).

In planning, developing and implementing CBE programs, costs to federal, state, and local educational agencies may be projected and analyzed. Cost information may be useful, in part, in answering questions or confirming answers to questions such as the following:

o What development efforts should be undertaken?

o What agency can best undertake a specific development effort?

o What agency can provide services that meet common needs most effectively?

The financial burden of developing CBE programs has fallen heavily on local education agencies. This trend is likely to continue unless development efforts can be appropriately shared by commercial agencies as well as by federal, state, and local agencies.

Feedback systems that reflect considerations such as those discussed in this subsection should facilitate informed decisions related to costs of planning, implementing, and maintaining CBE-type programs.

Scope of Program Implementation

CBE programs are being implemented in a wide range of settings. As with other educational innovations, some may be tempted to encourage CBE implementation systemwide -- the assumption being that if CBE or elements of CBE are "better" than elements of the present system, they should be adopted and implemented as soon as possible. In determining the scope of an implementation plan, school personnel should consider the complexity and extent of the required changes and the degree to which the CBE elements being considered are

transferrable from one situation to another. Determining the scope of program implementation requires addressing questions such as the following:

o What is the appropriate rate of implementation?

o How much of the instructional program or the total curriculum should be affected?

o How many and which schools or classes should be involved?

Rate of Implementation

Among the factors that Rogers (1968) suggests would affect rate of program implementation are: relative advantage, complexity, divisibility, and communicability. Rogers also suggests that an economist would say rate of implementation depends on the relative balance between costs and rewards.

Relative advantage is described as the degree to which people perceive a change or innovation -- in this case CBE, as an improvement over tradition. Legislators, school administrators, teachers, students, parents and community members may individually and collectively have very different perspectives regarding CBE's advantages. This has implications for training and orientation, as well as for the amount of time allotted to other implementation activities at any particular site.

Complexity is described as a measure of how difficult a change or innovation, in this case CBE, is to understand. Complexity is a function, in part, of an operational CBE model. Basic elements of competency based education are described in

an earlier section of this paper. These elements, and varying program emphases consistent with the elements, are discussed in the Oregon Competency Based Education Program paper, Alternative Models of Competency Based Education.

Divisibility is described as the degree to which a change or innovation can be implemented in separate, functional parts. CBE lends itself to divisibility. Schools can identify desired outcomes at the district, program and course levels at one. point in time, and identify or prepare related measures of outcome attainment at another time. Different schools can even take different approaches to CBE program development.

Communicability is described as the degree to which a change or innovation can be explained and demonstrated to others. The processes basic to competency based education may frequently be perceived as difficult to communicate succinctly and clearly. This may be a function, in part, of insufficient conceptual clarity or consensus regarding these basic elements at present.

Degree of Program Change

The characteristics of CBE make possible a wide range of implementation options. A number of variables that help determine whether CBE will be accepted involve the proposed rate and degree of change A few variables are cited by Gallaher (1965):

> For instance] what is the extant of the target
> system's felt need for change? Is the time
> factor right; that is, is the system already
> undergoing change, or is there a target
> system apathy induced by previous innovative

failures? There is also the matter of size in the system to be changed, and the associated organizational complexity that varies with size. The latter bears importantly on communications effectiveness, which is in turn related to the problem of determining the most viable unit for effecting change. It might be that even when the entire target system is scheduled for change, it can be done best by changing smaller, more manageable components one at a time (p. 44).

There are many ways in which to determine what portion of an instructional program should be initially affected by CBE implementation. One way is to identify only curricular programs or content areas whose staffs are eager to implement CBE. After sufficient "experimentation" and field testing, additional interested staff may join the project. Another approach is to begin with the largest component or curriculum area of the program, assuming that its activities will positively affect the activities of smaller program components or curriculum areas. A third approach is to begin with the program component that promises to be easiest. For example, it may be easier to implement CBE in mathematics classes than in social studies classes, because of the adaptability of mathematics content and skills to precise measurement. Initial success in implementing CBE is important because it offers administrators the opportunity to learn "process" skills, and provides staff the intrinsic reward of being associated with and being able to display a model for peers to observe.

It may be appropriate to intentionally and even openly ignore some problem area in CBE installation when developing an initial approach to implementation. Hersh (1976) refers to this strategy as 'selective negligence.'

How Many and Which Schools to Involve

A state or federal agency considering implementation strategies for CBE programs may be interested in House's (1976) observation that:

> Innovation in a region will be introduced through the largest city...and will follow a combination of two routes. One route leads from town to nearest town over the transportation network. The other leads from larger to smaller towns down the urban hierarchy (p. 337).

The findings cited by House bear on the selection of initial implementation sites. Special consideration may have to be given to very small or very remote districts.

In some schools and some districts change is valued, and people have learned to expect it. Such sites may provide excellent opportunities for success. Discussions among staff and community members may help clarify expectations prior to adoption and implementation decisions. Colyer (1976) suggests it is important to show teachers from the outset that they have a voice in whether, as well as in how far and how fast the implementation of CBE will proceed.

In discussing the League of Cooperating Schools, Goodlad (1965) acknowledges some school selection problems:

> Conditions surrounding entry of some schools into the League have hampered progress from the beginning. In retrospect, we think that we left to the districts too much of the initiative with respect to the process of school selection. As a consequence, the orientation of principals and teachers varied enormously. Some of the principals attending our first meeting scarcely knew why they were there, and many of them floundered when it came to explaining to their teachers what the League was designed to do (p. 8).

The knowledge of expectations combined with open dialogue about desired changes in plans may promote a feeling of security:

> I am suggesting that in formal organizations of a
> service variety, such as educational systems are...
> those who are secure can sustain the threat of
> examining alternatives, whereas, those whose
> margin of security is low will resist changing
> a system that has accommodated to them. In
> practical terms...I am posing the hypothesis
> that the better teachers in a given school system
> are more likely to accept innovations than are the
> poorer ones....(Gallaher, 1965, p. 43).

In summary, several conditions appear desirable to smooth and effective implementation of changes in schooling such as those generally represented by CBE:

o Persons considering CBE implementation should
  clearly understand, and preferably even
  cooperate in defining or describing, the scope
  of the implementation task. Planned and moni-
  tored increase in scope may be a part of the
  implementation design.

o Involved staff should have planned assistance
  in attaining the necessary skills and knowledge
  to implement CBE.

o Involved staff should have resources and
  materials necessary to support operation of
  the CBE program they have designed.

o The organizational structure of the imple-
  menting site or agency should be compatible
  with CBE procedures.

Resources utilization strategies should, of course, be differentially designed, initiated and managed to create and sustain these CBE supporting conditions in different settings, with different program emphases.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS FOR FEDERAL,
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

This document has presented a range of considerations for implementing competency based education, with its major focus on the school district. Two areas of question remain: What implementation strategies at the federal and state levels can be employed to support the efforts of local agencies? And how can these three levels be made to interact with one another smoothly to support the implementation of competency based education programs?

Federal Agencies

In discussing incentives for implementing innovations in the public schools, Pincus (1974) identified a number of current conditions that might affect the capability of federal agencies to facilitate the implementation of changes in schooling such as competency based education. Following are excerpts from Pincus' discussion.

> "R&D organizations frequently do not provide sufficient implementation guidance in light of the variety of school situations where adoption is tried" (p. 125).

> A related difficulty is the tendency of federal and state agencies to view their contributions as seed money to be replaced by district funds if the program is a success.

> But school districts know that the typical cost of such programs ($100-500 or more per student per year) is beyond their ability to finance for the student body at large and to use up district funds for applying the innovation to only a small number of students raises serious ethical questions for a regulated public utility.

The school districts do not perceive the federal
government as demonstrating clear or consistent
policies toward innovation. There is no clear
long-term benefit or penalty to a district if
it adopts, or fails to adopt one set of innova-
tions in preference to another. This tends to
reduce the school's respect for federal policies
toward innovation, and to breed a certain cyni-
cism as to the merits of serious efforts at
innovation. Furthermore, since federal aid
fails to systematically support hard alterna-
tives and to scamp easy ones, it in fact en-
courages a strategy of Grantsmanship.

The schools interpret these peculiarities of
federal aid policies as meaning that federal
aid is unreliable soft-money that will disappear
as suddenly as it arrived. Therefore, school
districts characteristically refuse to use
federal money as the basis for any substantial
long-term changes in ways of doing business
(p. 127).

Many options nevertheless exist for meaningful federal

level support of CBE implementation. These options may

be grouped according to the following categories: Generat-

ing Support for CBE, Incentives, Scope of Implementation,

Research and Development, and Feedback.

Generating Support

Evidence of or commitment to long-term federal-level

support for CBE may be helpful in creating and sustaining

a climate favorable to adoption and implementation. Such

commitment may be demonstrated, in part, through legisla-

tive action. The federal sponsorship of programmatic

research and development activities can provide encourage-

ment and generate information and materials helpful to CBE

implementers. The support by national agencies of such acti-

vities as conferences, workshops, demonstration centers,

and training programs, can provide opportunities for the
sharing of CBE-related information and experiences.
Additional supports systematically provided or shared
at the national level may encourage the introduction,
study and refinement of CBE on a wide scale.

Resource Utilization

Resources made available through action at the national
level can be used to support the implementation of CBE. A
federal agency, professional organization or legislative
committee can serve as a CBE change agent. Federally sup-
ported demonstration sites may provide state and local
agencies an opportunity to observe CBE programs operating.
in a variety of formats and settings. Closely monitored
studies will provide additional information in such areas
as CBE implementation strategies, organizational changes
supportive of CBE, program effectiveness and cost effective-
ness. Such studies might illustrate alternative CBE program
emphases, and provide state and local personnel an opportun-
ity to participate in developing the necessary skills and
procedures for introducing and maintaining a CBE program.
The importance of practical program demonstration is high-
lighted in the following discussion by Scanlon (1973).

> For any innovation to have real impact, broad-
> scale implementation in a variety of student
> populations is a necessity. We have estab-
> lished a Nationwide Network of School Dis-
> tricts in order to demonstrate to the educa-
> tional community that individualization is a
> viable and practical strategy for teaching
> youngsters to be independent and self-directed

learners. The assumption behind the establishment of the Network is that demonstration is an effective way to diffuse new educational programs to the greatest number of schools -- and students -- in the shortest amount of time.

Thus far, 80 elementary schools in 43 states have joined the Network, and many state education departments have indicated significant interest in the project. The goal is to build a network of 100 school districts, at least 2 in each of the 50 states. Although we cannot financially support the Network schools, we are helping schools locate possible sources of funding so that they can participate in this effort to bring individualized learning into the classroom.

In addition to serving as demonstration sites for curriculum innovation and organization, Network schools also serve as training centers for teachers and administrators interested in bringing individualized learning programs to their school districts. Training materials and procedures have been devised and are available to Network schools. Also, a staff of developmental specialists regularly visits the schools and assists school staff in identifying and solving problems relative to the implementation of individualized programs (p. 11).

The opportunity to try out CBE programs on a short-term, low-risk basis may encourage participation by schools and personnel that generally resist innovations. Such "trial runs" might involve the use of validated, exportable instructional programs and/or local development projects funded via mini-grants.

Incentives

Traditional educational reward structures tend to be restrictive. Incentives provided at the national level may stimulate state and district level agencies to implement CBE.

Some have already been suggested. Two are identified by Rebell (1975):

> As an alternative implementation approach, consideration might be given to a voluntary inducement model which would provide special grants or other funding to schools which choose to adopt CBE approaches. Consumer-oriented legislation might also be enacted which would grant students attending or applying to colleges (or even secondary schools) a right to demand detailed information on institutional goals and approaches or to enter into contracts through which schools could be held accountable for providing specified processes and learning situations (pp. 8-9).

Scope of Implementation

When Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI) was disseminated nationally, the necessity of retraining school administrators was identified among the most apparent needs (Scanlon, 1973). Many administrator and teacher needs related to CBE may well be similar to those related to IPI. Practitioners at all levels will need not only the competencies required to plan, manage and implement CBE programs, but also skills relating to the following functions: outcome specification, assessment, needs identification, program development, program evaluation and information management (Hall, 1976).

Research and Development

Federally sponsored research and development efforts can strengthen the base for CBE implementation. For example, systematically developed resources and products can be used in effectively communicating program information and promoting

83

teacher skills related to CBE. Through such materials, local agencies seeking information on alternative approaches to CBE and their effectiveness may obtain the documentation they desire.

CBE relevant training materials and programs can be developed and validated by regional educational laboratories and centers. To the extent that exportable training materials are directed to the required state, district and school level personnel skills, the implementation process should be facilitated.

> Training school district personnel to adopt and institutionalize innovations requires systematic strategies and products. These strategies lie outside the typical publisher consultants, teacher guides, and the university settings. As an integral part of the dissemination strategy, the training (or more accurately, retraining) needs are often of three basic levels: school district central office personnel, school administrators, and teachers (Scanlon, 1973, p. 9).

Nationally sponsored development and dissemination of CBE resources and materials can be effective. Schools may find it useful to have well defined alternatives for --

o Identifying outcomes

o Measuring outcome achievement

o Structuring curriculum

o Providing instruction

o Linking strategies to outcomes

o Maintaining management systems consistent with the above

Resources available that address CBE-related needs are

described in the CBE Sourcebook developed by the OCBE

Program and available from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Feedback

When federal agencies become involved with research and development, product dissemination, program orientation and resource support for such innovations as CBE, they generally develop feedback systems to obtain information on feasibility, effectiveness and cost efficiency:

> This feedback which is continuous in nature,
> provides data on the efectiveness of product
> utilization, curriculum implementation, and
> school management problems. This assists in
> the redesign and revision of products and
> procedures (Scanlon, 1973, p. 14).

When large sums of money and effort are expended on the development of CBE materials and procedures, quality control procedures help to maintain the integrity of the products. Quality control procedures also help monitor the process of program implementation.

> In the past, many well-publicized educational
> innovations, after attracting widespread interest,
> failed when implemented outside their initial
> settings. A major cause of this poor record of
> implementation has been absence of detailed
> systematic specification for the control of
> the operation, coupled with a realistic method
> for monitoring and changing the implementation
> once it was operational in a given locale
> (Scanlon, 1973, p. 12).

Assessment instruments can provide information on the extent to which an innovation has been implemented. In discussing the implementation of IPI in schools, Scanlon (1973) describes two such instruments.

The Consultant Diagnostic Instrument (CDI) which
is the checklist for the consultant's use in
periodic observations and reports on Network
schools, was designed to provide basic descrip-
tive data concerning the degree of implementa-
tion for any particular subject to allow for
evaluation comparisons across schools and to
provide an index of degree of implementation
for each school.

The second instrument developed for use by the
local school principal is "Self Improvedment Guide-
lines for New Schools." SIGNS has been designed
to provide beginning schools with a means for
assessment of the degree to which recommended
processes and practices are used in an individual
school. The checklist and form provided enable
the administrator to make interpretable observa-
tions on various aspects of the innovation (p. 13).

Any effort to support CBE implementation nationwide

will likely involve state and local education agencies.

Therefore, state and local representatives would appropri-

ately be involved in the planning of any national CBE

support or implementation strategy. State departments

of education and legislatures have the legal authority

to implement change in educational policy, and can retain

a local perspective regarding the needs and potential for

CBE implementation.

The state agencies are interested in the state-
wide dissemination of new ideas and programs
of schools. Developments such as the 1967
amendments of ESEA, which strengthened the state
role in promoting inovation, and the President's
revenue sharing plan are evidence of increasing
need for greater state involvement in educational
change. Structurally, no agency is in a better
position to work for innovations than the State
Education Agency. This agency has power which
it must use prudently and with due recognizance
of the American autonomy in educational affairs.
But the fact remains that local school districts
derive their legal authority from the states
(Scanlon, 1973, p. 13).

To the extent that information, products and procedures that are consistent with basic program elements of CBE and are applicable in a variety of settings can be developed at the national level, federal agencies can facilitate the dissemination of CBE.

State Agencies

No specific combination of implementation efforts will assure success for all agencies. Certain elements of change strategies may be most effective at the state level. In describing attempts to implement planned change in New York state, Freeborne (1975) identified some problems that may be typical of other state environments.

> In New York state, all too often, research and development in education have been carried out in isolation from the real operation of schools in the local school districts. The R&D programs have not been planned with local problems and constraints in mind. In our current work, we try to have a 'hands-on" relationship with local school districts.
>
> Another factor has been the inadequate provision of implementation assistance. The traditional assumption has been that officials of local school districts are capable of defining their own problems and, given sufficient resources, taking appropriate action to solve them. Our experience has shown that many school districts do not have this capability. They need outside help. Our effort to develop a better instructional management support system arose out of our field experience which suggested that school districts could not make such an improvement on their own.
>
> Undue and misplaced categorical emphasis has also been important in affecting the success or failure of implementing change in local school districts. Not only did many programs, for example, under Title III, assume that local

school districts could define their problems precisely and conduct the necessary R&D to effect change, but also that they could fit them into an overall linked change plan or strategy. I question this assumption. Many categorical programs tend to lead to a 'parochial' rather than total systems view of schools. For example, the ESEA Title I program in the United States has led many school districts to develop separate educational programs for categorical projects. Districts do not often make the effort explicitly to link the categorical projects to their regular instructional programs. It is part of the state planner's role to point out the fragmented nature of the total effort and underline the price being paid by this emphasis on categorical projects undertaken in isolation.

Too often, the implementation of change has been impeded by excessively high expectations regarding results. It has been my experience that local incentives for implementing change are not great. The barrier of the current condition looms too high. The state planners must be content with small incremental gains in the direction of their goals. We are talking of an evolutionary process. It is important to note that one cannot challenge authority and power structures dramatically and at the same time solicit their cooperation in implementing change at the local level.

The availability of extra resources is important for success. There are certain start-up costs which must be funded. They generally have not been adequately provided.

The last factor influencing the successful implementation of change is dissemination. There has been an all too pervasive assumption that writing general articles about successful educational programs in one locality would convince other school districts to adopt the reforms. I think there are at least two reasons why this has not worked: 1. People like to feel that they are creating something that is different and that is a response to the problem that they understand best. 2. Such general articles really are not sufficiently detailed and prescriptive to show the local officials how to go about the task. Effective dissemination of educational change programs might well include visits of personnel to other school

districts; the training of core staff to work on
a continuous basis in districts; the adoption
of procedures in a cookbook format showing how
the program can be implemented step by step; and
certain money incentive systems (Freeborne, 1975,
pp. 20-21).

Implementation strategies applicable to state agencies

may be conceptualized in the same categories discussed in

regard to federal agencies: Generating Support for CBE,

Resource Utilization, Incentives, Feedback, Scope of Imple-

mentation; and Research and Development Activities.

Generating Support

State level agencies have four basic constituencies:

The state board of education, the Governor and the state

legislature, local and intermediate school districts, and

the general public (Freeborne, 1975).

In attempting to persuade these constituencies that

CBE should be considered, adopted, or implemented, a state

agency might consider a range of options including advocacy

for voluntary adoption and implementation or mandate backed

by existing incentive and accountability structures. What-

ever option or combination of options are chosen, it is

helpful to gain the support of top-level people in each

agency. This support may be partially obtained through

orientation activities (e.g., demonstrations, newsletters,

conferences, explanations of alternatives and cooperative

planning). Close consideration should be given to the

nature of the constituency being addresssed and the respec-

tive motivations and interests of its members (Guba, 1968;

82

Woditsch, 1976).

State agencies should be prepared to provide their constituencies as much information as possible about CBE and its implications. Basic CBE processes should be clearly and concisely defined, its desired outcomes identified, and information regarding its effectiveness presented. Constituents will need information about CBE's history, emphases characterizing CBE programs being implemented elsewhere, and resources needed for implementation. If needed information is not available, the state may wish to consider establishing research and development programs and short-term tryouts, demonstrations, or simulations.

Resource Utilization

State departments of education are often in an excellent position to help districts implement CBE. A state department may choose to act as a change agent and major advocacy group. State agencies often have control over or access to the necessary material, information and human resources, including personnel with the skills required to facilitate CBE implementation.

Strategies can be devised for implementing and maintaining CBE within a state's school system. Scanlon (1973) suggests the following five change strategies, each modified slightly here to make it CBE-specific:

o Establish criteria to ensure understanding about and commitment to CBE.

83

o Develop CBE training programs for school
   district central office personnel, adminis-
   trators and teachers.

o Establish CBE demonstration sites in a variety
   of settings.

o Develop an information network and feedback
   systems that permit the monitoring of CBE
   schools in terms of student progress and
   degree of implementation, and the collecting
   of research data on strategies, procedures
   and roles.

o Involve district-level central office adminis-
   trators in the development of a capacity for
   implementing and maintaining CBE.

By tracing the flow of personal contact and influence,
one can chart the likely course of innovation (House, 1974,
p. 6). CBE is likely to be diffused through a network of
personal contacts. A state agency can either use existing
networks or develop new ones at the state, local and school
levels. Because frequency of personal contact is partially
a function of distance, proximity is an important considera-
tion in designing a dissemination network.

Freeborne (1975) describes three activities that state
agencies should consider. The first is the development of
conceptual or practical models. The second is provision
of technical assistance to district level personnel.
(Freeborne suggests that "local school districts can most
easily overcome their problems if experts are brought in
from outside -- not necessarily personnel of the state
department of education," p. 24.) The third is provision
of financial assistance, especially during the early stages
of innovation when the risk and financial burden are

91

84

.greatest (Freeborne, 1975; House, 1974; Pincus, 1974).

The state legislature, local or state tax measures, federal agencies or private foundations may provide funds to help solve short-term, start-up funding problems.

It is desirable that state personnel advocating CBE-type change work closely with school staff during implementation. Pincus (1974) expresses the view that

...incentives to adopt and incentives to implement are largely different from each other. Innovation and implementation work through different agents in the institutional setting. The federal or state agencies propose; school superintendents or principals dispose; the teachers and students transform (p. 135).

Therefore, the efforts of the state department should not end at the school district offices. State agencies may want to consider training and recruiting people who work well with both R&D agencies and school personnel. Such collaborative effort may provide valuable support to CBE implementation.

District

The major focus of this paper is specific district level implementation strategies for CBE. A few general district level implementation strategy considerations are described in this section.

School district structures frequently allow only top administrators oportunity for extensive contact outside the organization. Principals generally have less and teachers generaly have even less. School districts in

the process of selecting new superintendents may want to
consider the following:

> The superintendent (and his top staff) play a
> key role in introducing innovations into their
> districts, since they have the most outside
> contact...The career-bound superintendents
> look forward to their next job and feel that
> they must innovate to build a reputation.
> They also have a freer hand inside the district,
> as opposed to the place-bound person, who has
> made many friends and enemies in his rise to
> the top. The place-bound man is more con-
> strained by the school structure, whereas the
> career-bound man does not mind stirring the
> waters, the man coming in from the outside
> does indeed introduce many more innovations
> than the man promoted from within. The out-
> side man also cultivates many more external
> sources of innovation. The superintendent
> acts as a carrier, a catalyst, and a gate-
> keeper for new ideas -- within the framework
> of advancing his career (House, 1976, p. 338).

House (1976) also described central office staffs as
playing a key role in promoting or inhibiting an innova-
tion. The superintendent acts as a carrier, a catalyst,
and a gatekeeper for new ideas -- within the framework of
advancing his career (House, 1976, p. 338).

House (1976) also described central office staffs as
playing a key role in promoting or inhibiting an innovation.
He suggests that because of their control over communication,
internal resources and policy, it is very important to have
the support or sponsorship of at least one central office
staff member.

Tarion (1975) suggests that a district's capability
to implement a major innovation depends on the following
factors:

86

o Long-range commitment of [the] school board
  and superintendent to...program planning and
  implementation.

o Willingness of the school board and superin-
  tendency team to devote substantial time to
  the process of planning for the program.

o Recognition by leadership of the normal human
  reaction to resist a new program and the con-
  sequent need to adopt a strategy designed to
  overcome negative reaction.

o Ability to achieve a balance within the admin-
  istrative team to ensure an orderly transition
  from traditional program orientation to an em-
  phasis on innovations in general, and CBE spe-
  cifically.

Ironically, teachers -- who have only limited access
to outside contacts and new ideas -- are often expected to
assume the major burden of implementing CBE. Although they
are influenced most by professional peers, teachers must
rely principally on district administrators, periodicals
and college courses for their new information (House, 1976).
(Even if a teacher should wish to try a new program or
procedure, the district central office may limit access
to needed information.)

Given the high cost involved in providing the needed
training, resources, materials, program support staff and
tangible incentives, it is likely that a school district
will initially implement a partial CBE program. Schalock
(1976) discusses one conceptualization of a partial CBE
program:

For this discussion a partial model or an
approximate program of competency based
education is defined as one that does not
incorporate all five of the defining

characteristics of CBE in clearly recognizable form. Since the development of alternative models of CBE is largely a paper exercise, it is unlikely that partial models will occur, unless of course, the model builder chooses to define competency based education on a different basis. The implementation of school programs, however, is a different matter: here it is likely that most implementation efforts, at least in the beginning, will be approximate programs. It is unlikely that school districts will be able to implement a full-fledged competency based education program all at one time. The magnitude of change is such that most districts will require at best a three- or five-year period to shift their programs to a competency based mode of operation, and then it is likely that they will be operating in a manner that is only a rough approximation to what is desired or what may exist at a later point in time.

It is important that this be understood, and not only as a matter of resource availability. Equally important is the matter of time, for the principles and practices of competency based education are so at odds with much of what goes on in contemporary schools that considerable time must be allowed for students and faculty to act habitually on the basis of CBE principles and practices. A clear understanding of time required for shifting from a traditional to a competency based mode of operation should elicit a great deal of tolerance for schools that only approximate a fully operational CBE program (Schalock, et al., 1976, pp. 25-26).

The specific implementation strategy alternatives discussed throughout the rest of this paper should be of use to districts in choosing, planning and managing the level and type of CBE implementation best suited to their needs.

POTENTIAL PROBLEMS OF CBE IMPLEMENTATION

> Many innovations...have been adopted but are
> often not successfully implemented... The
> impedimenta of these innovations -- in the
> form of equipment, or a new set of management
> structures, or the vestiges of "bold, new"
> curricula -- remain beached by the wake of
> ephemeral educational revolutions while the
> system continues to operate as before.
>
> The responses of schools to opportunities for
> innovation appear therefore to be complex, and
> between the adoption and the implementation,
> innovations reoutinely disappear or suffer sea-
> changes (Pincus, 1972, p. 117).

Some potential obstacles to CBE implementation have

been suggested in earlier sections of this paper. For ex-

ample, a specific technique for providing CBE information

may elicit negative responses, for reasons not related to

competency based education itself. Advocacy groups may

engender counter groups (House, 1974); cost reductions may

seem appealing to certain constituents and uncongenial to

others (Pincus, 1972); demonstration sites and experimental

classrooms may provide useful information, but may be per-

ceived as too unlike the home schools of visitors to be

taken seriously (Goodlad, 1967a).

Rather than cause for discouragement, however, infor-

mation regarding potential implementation problems may

be viewed as advantageous. That is, such information

permits the architect of change to prepare a CBE instal-

lation blueprint that reflects a sensitive analysis of

the terrain on which a specific installation will take

place. One cannot be sure that the analysis will sight

all the pitfalls in that terrain; however, to the extent
that pitfalls can be anticipated, progress may be facili-
tated.

The potential problems addressed in the remainder of
this section concern broad and basic implementation con-
siderations related to schools, to CBE, and to change
itself. To pursue the topographical metaphor, these pit-
falls are deep.

Schools as Noncompetitive Organizations

As an education agency becomes more open by introducing
change, it also becomes more vulnerable to elements against
which self-perpetuating systems routinely protect themselves.
Pincus (1972) proposes that the noncompetitive market struc-
ture of the public schools has a major effect on decisions
regarding innovation adoption, and that the schools's bureau-
cratic and incentive structures predictably shape the trans-
ition from innovation adoption to implementation!

Schools have little incentive, he notes, to adopt
innovations that are compelling in a market economy -- those
that contribute to economic efficiency. Carlson (1965) con-
curs:

> The significance of the relationship with clients
> is implied in the label of "domesticated organiza-
> tion" which is given to organizations like the
> school.... They are not compelled to attend to
> all of the ordinary and useful needs of an organi-
> zation. For example, they do not compete with
> other organizations for clients; in fact a steady
> flow of clients is assured. There is no struggle
> for survival for this type of organization --
> existence is guaranteed....

The consequence of domesticating organizations,
as far as organizational change is concerned,
is to restrict the need for, and interest in,
change because of the environment of the domes-
ticated organization in many important respects
is more stable than it is in other types of
organizations....

Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that
the domestication of public schools is a hin-
drance to change.... (pp. 6-7). —

The market economy of schools as defined by Pincus and
by Carlson is not supportive of the type of innovation typi-
cally congenial to competitive organizations. Pincus also
identifies three factors favorable to innovation in the
schools:

Bureaucratic Safety – When the innovation is per-
ceived as favorable with respect to the current
status and organization of the bureaucracy
(because in a self-perpetuating non-market system,
these bureaucratic values become socialized and
tend to dominate other criteria; or in other words,
the bureaucratic costs are the real costs of the
system).

Response to External Pressure – When external
pressures for innovation are perceived as irre-
stible (because school systems cannot be entirely
unresponsive to external pressures and financial
constraints).

Approval of Peer Elites – When key figures in the
bureaucracy and their colleagues in other educa-
tional bureaucracies can agree about the accepta-
bility of the innovation (because in the absence
of clearly defined output criteria, consensus
among the elite is often the primary decision-
making criterion p. 120).

From Pincus' view, schools would be unlikely to adopt

CBE if they perceived it as implying a radical change in the

organization of the school system. Such change confronts the

bureaucratic safety constraint.

Fear of external pressures could make school personnel reluctant to collaborate with other groups at the policy making level. To the degree that CBE seems to promote increased involvement of and collaboration with other groups regarding school policy and productivity, it may be perceived as contributing to increased extra-system pressures.

Pincus' discussion of the elite consensus constraint suggests that prevailing practice is likely to change only minimally. Local education agencies are, he feels, necessarily unclear regarding educational goals.

> [To the extent that] educational research and development has failed to enlighten them substantially about the relationship betweeen various educational technologies and any specified instructional aim...a rational bureaucratic elite would be unlikely to experiment voluntarily with major changes in structure or method (p. 122).

Demonstrated Effectiveness of CBE: "The Crowning Disincentive"?

Bureaucratic structure constraints such as those discussed by Pincus suggest that where the possible social and political consequences of an innovation loom large, and where the instructional benefits are uncertain, an innovation is likely to meet strong resistance from administration.

House (1976) considers the incentives to engage in innovation from the teacher's point of view.

> The personal costs of trying something new are greatly underestimated. The teacher has acquired...teaching skills laboriously over a long period of time.... These skills may not

92

be superb, but he knows how to operate with
them -- how to get by. Someone comes along
and says, "Try this." The new skills make
the old ones obsolete.... Furthermore --
the crowning disincentive -- there is seldom
any conclusive evidence that the innovation
is really worth much in the classroom.

Thus the teacher is faced with learning a
new mode of behavior at high costs with no
expectation of tangible reward and with no
assurance that the innovation will work any
better than what he has been doing. No
wonder teachers regard many new programs with
some cynicism; too many such programs are not
worth the personal investment. Few corpora-
tions would invest under similar circumstances
(p. 339).

Schutz (1969) observes the "elegant no significant
difference" of a comprehensive summary report of experi-
ments on instruction conducted over the last 50 years.
The report by J. M. Stephens demonstrates "the remark-
able constancy of educational results in the face of
widely differing deliberate approaches" (p. 2). In
Stephen's words,

Every so often we adopt new approaches or
new methodologies and place our reliance
on new panaceas. At the very least we
seem to chorus new slogans. Yet the
academic growth within the classroom
continues at about the same rate, stub-
bornly refusing to cooperate with the
bright new dicta emanating from the
conference room (Schutz, 1969, pp. 361-362).

With little empirical data to demonstrate the effec-
tiveness of a given innovation, the message is clear and
compelling: Why change?

What data exist to support CBE adoption? Indeed, what
data can be expected regarding the effectiveness of a

process that dictates neither outcomes nor interventions, but rather is designed to facilitate the systematic reduction of uncertainty regarding appropriate outcomes and means of instruction?

Huff (1976) observes that CBE provides a framework for "deducing a relevant education form what is to be done" (p. 5). She notes further, however, that

> no CBE program thus far has had a body of information derived from systematic empirical investigations to use as a basis of the deductions.... (p. 5).

Woditsch and his colleagues (1975) concur:

> Despite the mounting tide of commitment in all sectors of competency-based reform, first-generation performance and competency constructs remain largely untested. In some instances, the surrogate for a behaviorally specified competency has become the affirmative nod from a panel of faculty, and one questions how vast a divergence from tradition this really is. In addition, the question of which educational treatment best serves the development of a particular competency has barely been phrased (p. 5).

The need for further refinement and study of procedures and materials employed in competency based education is clear. Procedures considered essential to CBE -- procedures that should facilitate, in part, the development and formative evaluation of complete instructional programs -- are still in the formative stages of development themselves.

Some cards remain face down at this stage of the game. The value of CBE in facilitating more informed decision-making -- and ultimately improved student outcomes in

94

101

education -- is to some degree still a matter of faith.
Nevertheless, some institutions and individuals will be
bold and will bet on CBE now. Their efforts and experi-
ences with competency based education will provide one
basis for meaningful assessment of its value.

Change by Mandate: What Chance for Success?

> We are concerned about forcing people in any way
> with regard to CBE. Several states now mandate
> competency-based criteria for teacher certifica-
> tion, effectively requiring that all teacher
> education in those states install CBTE programs.
> There are many who go along willingly. Others
> cannot see anything of value in CBTE. For those
> who would try it and see, no trial is possible,
> at least no real trial with the option to reject
> the new system. Frankly, we think the mandate
> is one of the worst things that has befallen
> the CBTE movement. The movement has enough
> going for it to succeed without a mandate, so
> why stimulate the emergence of a whole army
> of organized opponents?
>
> If you want to sell CBE, prove its viability
> with a well managed pilot program. Let the
> enthusiasm of students, faculty and coopera-
> ting professionals have its effect on the rest
> of the institution and you will probably end
> up with a full-fledged, voluntary CBE operation
> (Hall and Jones, 1976, pp. 251-252),

The degree to which CBE by decree threatens serious
implementation efforts is conjectural. Mandated practices
and materials have an ancient and honorable history
education.

Competency based education-type programs are now
being considered in the public schools of at least 29 states,
and serious efforts to implement CBE are apparently
underway (Goor and Tomlinson, 1976). Competency based teacher

102

education programs are mandated in at least twenty states, and CBTE is reported alive and well in many institutions within those states.[3]

Sensitivity to practitioner needs is not precluded by mandated practice in education. Practices may be "required" while leaving comfortable leg room for ownership and personalization. Required practices, including competency based education, may necessitate little real change from existing practices -- depending on the adopting unit and the emphasis in definition or interpretation of CBE. Thus, as Woditsch (1976) has suggested, an

> organizational system with aspirations to spread CBE throughout a state must have a capacity to detect existing strengths within schools and districts that comport with CBE dynamics and priorities. These surely exist at the level of the individual instructor who...habitually churns guts with instructional outcomes and student skill development. It also exists, often not neatly labeled, in the occasional curricular planning team. Here and there the CBE spirit already dominates an entire school, and needs little more than sanction and a few expressive vehicles to become explicit (personal communication, 1976).

A problem area related to mandated change and requiring

---

[3] Because of the pressures of developing and refining new programs while teaching and conducting other customary activities, estimates regarding the robustness of the staffs at these institutions are more conservative. The staff time and energy required to develop, install, and refine comprehensive CBTE programs has been described as inordinate. Strategies for maintaining staff commitment and motivation to continue to expend such energy are just beginning to be explored (Hersh, personal communication, 1976).

96

103

sensitive attention during overall program design is
discussed by Pellegrin (1975) in regard to a differen-
tiated staffing effort.

> In the abstract, it is possible that innovation
> is best attained through concurrent attacks on
> multiple problems. For such an approach to
> succeed, however, it would have to be preceded
> and accompanied by systematic planning enormously
> comprehensive in scope. Furthermore, the imple-
> mentation of radical revisions in education
> programs requires impressive financial support,
> assistance by many administrators and specialists,
> acceptance by personnel, etc.

> The project planners gravely underestimated the
> complexity of the tasks undertaken and overesti-
> mated the resources available for achieving the
> objectives they had in mind. It is a curious
> fact that some educators believe that radical
> changes in education is easily accomplished even
> in a short period of time although it is univer-
> sally known that even minor changes in the schools
> are achieved with great difficulty (p. 96).

Gentry (1972), in reflecting on the ambitious goals
and the actual progress of a competency-based effort in
teacher education at the University of Toledo, acknowledges
the complexity of the task. In a memo to the College of
Education staff engaged in the CBTE effort he suggests
a realistic strategy for coping with the complexity and
controlling the change.

> In making the decision to systematically develop
> the instruction for students in our elementary
> and secondary program, the faculty of our college
> assumed a task of enormous proportion. In fact,
> if we were to stipulate that each of the modules
> or components of the model were to meet minimum
> requirements for effectiveness, the task becomes
> impossible, given the time and resources available
> to us....

> An alternative...permits us to operate the instruc-
> tional system almost at once with a minimum of

97

resources.   This...alternative is also systema-
tic in its development of instruction, but it
accepts approximations of the minimum require-
ments of the task.   That is, each component of
the system must still be dealt with, but the
criteria for each component are met to varying
degrees.   For example, behavioral objectives
may contain only the performance statement and
lack of condition or level statement.   We may
deal only with terminal objectives, ignoring
enabling objectives, for the moment.   Assessment
instruments may have insufficient or token items.
The means for accomplishing our objectives may,
intially, be chosen because they are possible
rather than for their pedagogical qualities.

As one faculty member pointed out, the above
conditions are not much different from those
that exist now.   There is one all-important
difference, however.   <u>Our systematically de-
veloped approximations will be subject to
continuous systematic revision...</u>

The point is, if we are to be successful in
developing meaningful, effective instruction,
and in maintaining an open academic community,
we must each consider these critical alterna-
tives carefully.   This does not mean that we
wait for perfect solutions for each problem,
there will obviously be many occasions for
compromise, but that we monitor all decisions
in light of their effect upon our students and
our professional lives.   We have selected a
strategy for accomplishing important goals.
If any part of that strategy is inefficient,
ineffective, or antithetical to those goals,
we must have the flexibility and control to
change the strategy as well as its products.

Summary

The preceding section covers three potential prob-

lems that may confront any major effort to implement CBE

in education.   The first concerns the noncompetetive nature

of schools.   As organizations with somewhat captive clien-

tele, schools are not compelled to opt for economic effici-

ency, and can therefore afford to be highly resistant to

to certain innovations.

The second problem concerns the fact that CBE's effectiveness has yet to be demonstrated. Educators may thoughtfully weigh the proposed advantages of CBE-type programs against the time and effort they must invest in planning, implementing, and continually refining such programs or program elements. As more CBE programs are implemented and the results made known, educators will acquire a more sound basis for making decisions regarding adoption and implementation.

The third problem concerns the fear that legislative mandates or other requirements regarding CBE may stimulate opposition to the innovation, rather than build support. It is suggested, however, that although CBE as a general practice may be mandated or strongly encouraged, schools and teachers should be assisted in personalizing their programs, designing and implementing continuously adaptive programs which reflect sensitivity to their particular needs, skills and preferences.

GENERAL SUMMARY

Definition of CBE

This paper begins with a general definition of CBE as

> ...a process that facilitates with a known degree of effectiveness the acquisition of desired outcomes in learners -- including the ability to perform tasks related to success in job and life roles -- documents the achievement of these outcomes and links graduation requirements to specific performance levels on a particular set of outcomes (Schalock, 1976).

The definition details three categories of characteristics: defining, enabling, and unique characteristics.

Installation Strategies

Strategies presented in this paper are intended as suggestions for consideration by schools and districts intending to implement CBE. It is expected users will exercise imagination and flexibility in considering and adopting or adapting these strategies.

CBE installation may be viewed as a continuum which begins with user orientation, proceeds through intitial adoption and adaption, and culminates with the integration of CBE into the existing school structure. The point at which installation is complete may be conceptualized/as institutionalization.

In the following paragraphs, some considerations of importance in facilitating a smooth transition to CBE are briefly summarized.

100

Generating Support

It is impotant that members of an agency suport CBE and the CBE implementation process. The extent to which they do so may depend partially on whether the change is imposed externally or initiated internally. Internal, flexible changes -- those perceived as most adaptable to users' needs -- generally stand a better chance of acceptance and support. Users need some assurance that they have a voice in whether and to what extent an innovation is adopted and in subsequent adaption activities.

Orientation

It is critical that potential users be provided a thorough orientation to CBE. Information on CBE can be provided in several ways, including workshops, printed materials, one-to-one consultation sessions, and classroom observations. Through orientation, users not only gain information about CBE, but may also become involved in the CBE adoption decisionmaking process. Support for CBE tends to increase in proportion to users' understanding of and involvement in the CBE change process.

Evidence of Support

Administrative support appears very important. Administrators may express open approval of the innovation, initiate actual implementation activities and encourage participation by others. Peer approval tends to enhance

the credibility of a proposed change because of the rapport and trust common within peer groups. External authority approval may also facilitate CBE implementation; many users value the opinions of recognized experts in the field.

Staff Involvement in Planning

In order to be part of the planning process, staff require a clear understanding of the innovation. All information provided should be precise, addressing specific program characteristics. Community members and educators on many levels will need information on CBE; therefore, the different informational needs of a wide range of audiences will require careful consideration.

Planning also involves evaluation of program effectiveness. Such evaluation depends in part on the gathering and processing of reliable data regarding past and present student performance. Anecdotal data and participant reactions are also important in assessing program effectiveness.

Training

To complement initial orientation efforts, training may be provided to help users develop the necessary knowledge and skills to design, implement and maintain a CBE program. Such training may be provided at the university level, as well as through ongoing staff development in the district implementing CBE.

102

Observation of External Programs

There are several advantages in giving potential users an opportunity to observe an operational CBE program in an external setting. For example, the experience may provide far more information regarding CBE procedures and implications than could readily be communicated through other means. In addition, external sites may serve as experimental environments which foster the development of generalizable implementation procedures.

Simulations

To supplement other training, users may be exposed to simulations of CBE-relevant procedures. Participants learn through instructional activities in an experimental setting, and have an opportunity to discuss concerns with colleagues.

Short-Term or Small-Scale Tryouts

Small-scale tryouts are often effective because they enable users to build confidence in CBE before feeling committed to full-scale implementation. A chance to try out particular components of CBE on an experimental basis allows users to become acquainted with the concept in a relatively risk-free context.

Using Strategies

Personalization is the key to effective use of any implementation stragegy. Users must weigh the relative value and appropriateness of any strategy, adopting what seems suited to

1iü

a school's or district's needs, and modifying or creating.
new strategies as needs dictate.

Resource Utilization

In implementing CBE, it is especially important that
resources be used effectively. Following are some suggested
techniques for helping to ensure efficient resource utiliz-
ation.

Appointing a Social Organizer

The social organizer may best be thought of as a
program manager: one responsible for implementing a major
change. Such an individual should be selected with utmost
care, since the position demands indepth understanding of
CBE, an ability to conceptualize an operational CBE program
within a specific context, skill in locating and organizing
resources, and ability to motivate and unify personnel. In
some cases, it may be advisable to enlist the specialized
skills of someone outside the organization to fill this
role.

Forming an Advocacy Group

An advocacy group, which often rallies spontaneously,
in suport of an innovation, serves several important func-
tions. Frequently its members provide much of the work
energy which keeps an innovation flourishing. Advocacy
group members can also do much to enlist public support and
obtain resources. In addition, the existence of an advocacy

group may help minimize internal opposition to an innovation by providing open support and serving as a source of reliable information regarding the innovation.

Using Support Services

Many types of suport services facilitate CBE implementation. They include training, maintenance of resource centers, effective and possibly innovative program support staff, and establishment of some means of personal communication to facilitate and maintain understanding of the innovation as implementation progresses.

Incentives

It is widely recognized that the reward structures operating within school systems are sometimes quite restrictive. At the same time, acquiring the necessary knowledge and skills to implement CBE often demands that teachers and administrators make great personal sacrifices in terms of time and energy. School systems may consider offering certain incentives to encourage this expenditure of time and energy.

Membership in an advocacy group may provide both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards to some users. Such membership may increase the chance to obtain needed resources, provide a sense of accomplishment if the innovation is successful, and may frequently generate peer approval. Training offers participants a chance to interact with peers and to enhance their knowledge of CBE; release time for participation

can make a training option even more attractive. The
opportunity to learn more about CBE can be a very strong
incentive, depending on what value users place upon the
innovation.

Feedback

Appropriate use of feedback from students, teachers,
administrators, community representatives and others can
improve implementation and management processes and help
increase overall program effectiveness. In addition,
feedback may help pinpoint areas of confusion and highlight
needs for additional information. Feedback may be gathered
on virtually any CBE-relevant topic. It is important that
an effective system be developed for obtaining, processing,
and disseminating feedback information. Data processing
methods should promote objectivity in analyzing program
effectiveness; and methods for obtaining and disseminating
feedback data should be sensitive to audience needs.

Scope of Program Implementation

Potential users need to consider and to determine the
rate at which CBE should be implemented within their district
or school, the extent to which any existing program will be
affected, and the number of schools, classes, and pupils
that will be involved. These factors together help deter-
mine the scope of CBE implementation.

106

Implementation Considerations for
Federal, State and Local Agencies

Agencies at federal, state and local levels can do much to support various CBE implementation efforts.

Federal Agencies

Federal agencies can generate support through federally funded training and program implementation, support of new legislation, and sponsorship of analyses of the existing knowledge regarding CBE, followed by systematic research and development efforts. In addition, federal agencies can help ensure availability of CBE-related resources at state and local levels.

State Agencies

Implementation of CBE benefits from the support of the state board of education, the governor, the state legislature, local and intermediate school districts and the general public. Each of these constituencies needs current, relevant information on CBE.

State agencies can furnish information, provide training, and provide human and material resources. They can develop CBE models for consideration by local districts, offer technical assistance in planning and implementing a CBE program, and also furnish financial assistance -- especially during the early stages of implementation.

107

114

Districts

Local districts can support the implementation effort through a long-range commitment. In addition, it is helpful if the superintendent's office and the school board become fully active in all phases of planning. The transition to CBE can also be aided by districts' facilitating access to available resources and initiating and supporting a personalized communication system.

Potential Problems of CBE Implementation

Many problems can arise in the course of CBE implementation. For example, advocacy groups may engender counter groups. Demonstration sites and experimental models may seem too unlike observers' own school settings to be regarded as useful sources of generalizable information.

Many problems which arise are related in some way to one of the following factors. First, schools are basically noncompetitive organizations. Because their clientele is assured, economic efficiency may not be a high priority. Therefore, schools can afford to be highly resistant to an innovation, regardless of how attractively it may be presented.

Second, the potential of CBE has yet to be fully demonstrated. As more schools implement CBE, greater amounts of feedback data will become available. Although it is possibly unrealistic to expect that evaluation of change in education will yield unequivocal evidence of

7

program effects, outcomes-based data collection in CBE programs will provide users with increased information for making sound decisions regarding CBE adoption and implementation.

Third, there is some concern that if CBE is introduced to districts externally, as through legislative mandate, rather than internally, through voluntary adoption and design, users may oppose it without due consideration of its potential benefits. It is suggested, however, that even when CBE is mandated as a general concept, districts should be encouraged to retain and exercise control concerning the nature, degree, and sequencing of implementation. This will provide users a sense of choice regarding the implementation process and will help ensure program responsiveness to particular needs of an adopting unit. Long after initial implementation, a CBE program should be treated as flexible, with the expectation that it will be continuously modified based on changing needs, expectations, and capabilities.

110

REFERENCES

Allen, Jack, Chairman and others. Selected Minimum Standards and Statewide Dissemination, Oregon Department of Education. May 1975. pp. 1-59.

Ansaldo, Mary. In a personal communication to the author, 1976.

Baird, Hugh and Belt, Dwayne. Some Organizational Problems Encountered in Implementing Competency-Based Education. New Orleans, Louisiana. A paper presented at annual meeting, American Educational Research Association, March 1973. 10 p.

Baskin, Samuel Ed. Organizing Nontraditional Study. New Directions for Institutional Research. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers. 1974 San Francisco, California pp. 1-89.

Bassi, Juanita, and Watson, D. Gene. A Study to Identify Variables Perceived to Influence the Institutionalization of Innovations. A paper presented to the AERA Annual meeting, Chicago, Illihois 1974. 11 p.

Bhola, Harbans S.; Jwaideh, Alice; Knowlton, James. Training the Change Makers in Education. Audiovisual Instruction. Vol. 18, No. 1. Bloomington, Indiana. Jan. 1973. 3p.

Burns, Richard. Suggestions for Involving Teachers in Innovation. Educational Technology Magazine. Vol. 9, No. 1. 2p. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Carlson, Richard O. Change Processes in the Public Schools. The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. 1965 Eugene, Oregon. 92 p.

Carpenter-Huffman, P.; Hall, G. R.; Sumner; G. C. Change in Education: Insights from Performance Contracting. Ballinger Publishing Company. Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1974.

Charters, W. W. and Pellegrin, R. "Barriers to the Innovative Process: Four Case Studies of Diffentiated Staffing." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1973: p. 3-14.

Colyer, Phyllis. Informal remarks prepared during OCBE program seminar on Strategies for Implementing CBE, January 26-28, 1976.

Crowther, F. "Factors Affecting the Rate of Adoption of the 1971 Alberta Social Studies Curriculum for Elementary Schools, Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1972.

Dickson, George; Gentry, Castelle; Hersh, Richard; Moir, Hughes. Planning for a Performance-Based Teacher Education Program: A Final Report. American Associaiton of State Colleges and Unviersities. Washington, C.C. August 1972. pp. 1-242.

Edling, Jack V. Individualized Instruction: A Manual for Administrators. DCE Publications. Corvallis, Oregon. 1969.

Edwards, Roger and Wright, William J. Variables Affecting the Successful Introduction of an Innovative Program in Aesthetics. A paper presented for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, D.C. 1975. 31 p.

Elementary-Secondary Guide. 1975. Oregon Department of Education,

Fraser, David. Effective Selection of Learning Strategies. Seattle, Washington. Seattle Public Schools. 1974

Freeborne, Gerald L. The Politics of Implementing Educational Change, As seen from the State Level. Educational Planning. Vol. 1, No. 3. January 1975. New York. 8 p.

Fullan, Michael and Pomfret, Allen. Review of Research on Curriculum Implementation Prepared for U. S. National Institute of Education, 1975.

Gardner, Herb. A Thousand Clowns. A Random House Play. New York City, New York. April 1962 py. 1-126.

Gallaher, Art. Change Processes in the Public Schools. The Center for the Advance Study of Educational Administration. Eugene, Oregon 1965. 92 p.

Goodlad, John I. The League of Cooperating Schools. California Journal for Instructional Improvement. 1967 4 p.

Goodlad, John I. Educational Change, A Strategy for Study and Action. National Elementary Principal. December 1968. p. 7

Goodlad, John I. Lag On Making Ideas Work. New York Times. 1970. 2p.

Goodlad, John I. The Dynamics of Educational Change. McGraw-Hill Book Company. New York, New York. 1975.

Gross, Neal; Giacquinta, Joseph B.; Bernstein, Marilyn. Implementing Organizational Innovations. Basic Book Inc. Publishers. New York. 1971.

Guba, Egon G., Diffusion of Innovations, Educational Leadership. Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Champaign, Illinois. January 1968. pp. 292-295.

Hall, Gene E. and Jones, Howard L. Competency-Based Education: A Process for the Improvement of Education. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 1976

Hall, Mary. Selected Minimum Standards and Statewide Dissemination. Division of Program Management Support. Salem, Oregon. May 1975. pp. 1-59.

Hall, Mary. Competencies Needed By School Districts To Implement Instruc-
     tional Portions of Oregon's New Minimum School Standards. Oregon
     Department of Education. January 1976. pp. 1-29.

House, Ernest R. The Micro Politics of Innovation: Nine Propositions.
     A paper at the Superintendent's Round Table. College of Education.
     University of S. Florida. Tampa, Florida. (McCutchan 1974)
     January 1976. 4 p.

House, Ernest R. The Politics of Educational Innovation. McCrutchan
     Publishing Corp. Berkeley, California. 1974. pp. 1-307.

Howes, Virgil M. A Strategy for Research and Change. The League of
     Cooperating Schools; Childhood Education. September 1967.

Howey, Kenneth R. Preconditions for Education Renewal and Reform.
     Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. 26. No. 1 American Association
     of Colleges for Teacher Education. Wash. D.C. 1975. pp. 8-12.

Huff, Sheila. Problems in Implementing Competency-Based Programs.
     Educational Policy Research Center. Syracuse, New York. June 1975.
     pp. 1-20.

Kapfer, Philip G. Toward the Life-Intership Curriculum. State of Nevada
     Department of Education. Carson City, Nevada. 1970. p. 68.

Keil, Ellsworth C. A Structure for Innovation in Education. Educational
     Technology. Denver, Colorado. October 1969.

Knapp, Jack. taken from Report of a Summer Institute. Baker Intermediate
     Education District. Baker, Oregon. 1975, p. 93.

Lasser, Barbara L. and Elam, Robert J. The Challenge of Installation:
     Maintaining Instructional Program Effectiveness During General School
     Use. A paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational
     Research. April 1974.

Lawrence, Sister Mary. Gearing Up for Curriculum Change. A Chance for
     Every Child: 'Assessing Needs Through Specific Goals. A paper
     presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges
     for Teacher Education. Chicago, Illinois. February 1975. 13 p.

Matula, Franklin V. Factors Contributing to the Willingness of Elementary
     Teachers to Try Selected Classroom Innovations. Education Service
     Center. Region 12. Waco, Texas. 1972. 13 p.

McLaughlin, Milbrey. Implementation as Mutual Adaptation: Change in
     Classroom Organization. The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica,
     California. 1975.

Miles, Matthew B. Change Processes in the Public Schools. The Center for
     the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. Eugene, Oregon.
     1965: 92 p.

11𝓈

Miles, Matthew B. Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground. Paper for work in the Project on Organization Development in Schools. Horace-Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation. Teachers College Columbia University. 23 p.

Moore, Mary T. Local School Program Planning Organizational Implications. A paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting. Washington. D.C. April 1975. 21 p.

Niedermeyer, Fred C. and Moncrief, Michael H. Considerations in Selecting Instructional Programs. SWRL Educational Research and Development. Los Alamitos, California. 1974. 8 p.

O'Hare, Robert W.; Lasser, Barbara R.; Bossing, Lewis. Providing for Visitors During Installation of an Educational Product: The SWRL Kindergarten Program Information Resource Centers. Report 42. Los Almitos, California. August 1972. pp. 1-35.

Oliver, Gordon. School Graduation Requirements in Oregon. Urban Studies Center. Portland State University. Portland, Oregon. September 1974. pp. 1-82.

Olson, Allan L. Can We Individualize Inservice Training. Educational Technology. Volume 14, No. 11. November 1974. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. pp. 41-43.

Pellegrin, Roland J. Administrative Assumptions Underlying Major Innovation: A Case Study in the Introduction of Differential Staffing. The Process of Planned Change in the School's Instructional Organization. The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. Eugene, Oregon. 1973. pp. 13-34.

Pellegrin, Roland J. Change Processes in the Public Schools. The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. Eugene, Oregon. 1965. 92 p.

Pellegrin, Roland J. Problems and Assumptions in the Implementation of Innovations. Journal of Research and Development in Education. Volume 9, No. 1. 1965

Pincus, John. Incentives for Innovation in the Public Schools. Prepared for NIE Symposium on Educational Research and Development. December 1972. pp. 1-33.

Pincus, John. Review of Educational Research. American Educational Research Association. Washington, D.C. 1974.

Planning for a Performance-Based Teacher Education Program: A Final Report. Submitted by University of Toledo to Urban Affairs Committee American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C. August 1972. pp. 1-242.

Rebell, Michael A. Esq. Legal and Legislative Implications of
    Competency Based Education. Educational Policy Research Center.
    Syracuse, New York. 1975. pp. 1-19.

Rogers, Carl R. Freedom to Learn. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co. 1969
    Edited by Carl R. Rogers and William R. Coulson. Columbus, Ohio.

Rogers, Everett M. Change Processes in the Public Schools. The Center
    for the Advanced Study of Educational Activities. Eugene, Oregon
    1965. p. 61.

Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovations. The Free Press of Glencoe.
    Toronto, Ontario, Canada 1962.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change.
    Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Boston, Massachusetts 1971.

Scanlon, Robert G. Building Relationships for the Dissemination of Innovations.
    Communications Group Workshop. Denver, Colorado. August 1973 18 p.

Schalock, H.D.; Spady, W.G. and Hathaway, W.E. Alternative Models of
    Competency Based Education. Working draft of a paper produced under
    National Institute of Education Contract No. 400-76-002. 1976. pp. 1-96.

Schalock, H.D.; Kersh, D.Y. and Garrison, J.H. From Commitment to
    Practice. Oregon College of Education Elementary Teacher Preparation
    Program. Monograph Published in AACTE. Monograph series on Performance
    Based Teacher Education No. 20. January 1976. p. 132.

Schutz, Richard E. Methodological Issues in Curriculum Research. Review of
    Educational Research. Vol. 39. No. 3., June 1969. pp. 359-366.

Smith, Ronald. Turnabout: A Model for Specialty Schools. Continuation
    Proposal for 1975-76 Funded by Title III. ESEA - 1974-75. Portland,
    Oregon.

Tarion, Charles A. The Facilitation of Change: An Administrator's Dilemma.
    Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research
    Association. Washington, D.C. April 1975. 11 p.

Taylor, Richard L. Personal communication to Oregon Competency Based
    Education staff. Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, Washington.
    February 1976.

Utz, Robert T. and others. A Comparative Analysis of Two Models of
    Implementing Competency Based Instructional Systems. A paper
    presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual
    Meeting. Chicago, Illinois April 1974. 10 p.

Vogel, Francis X. and Bowers, Norman D. The Impact of the Nongraded School.
    Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational
    Research Association. Chicago, Illinois. April 1974. 11 p.

Wacaster; Thomas C. The Life and Death of Differential Staffing at Columbia High School. The Process of Planned Change in the School's Instructional Organization. pp. 35-52.

Weikart, David P. and Banet, Bernard A. Planned Variation from the Perspective of a Model Sponsor. In Social Program Implementation, edited by Walters, William and Richard F. Elmore. Academic Press, Inc. New York, 1976.

Wilson, James Q. — Summary of Group C. discussion in Change Processes in the Public Schools. Eugene, Oregon. University of Oregon. 1965. p. 82.

Woditsch, Gary and others. Assaying the Great Cargo Cult: Recent Research on Learner-Centered Curricula. Paper presented at the National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the American Association of Higher Education. Chicago, Illinois. March 1975. 18 p.

Woditsch, Gary. Informal remarks prepared during Oregon Competency Based Education program seminar on Strategies for Implementing CBE. January 26-28, 1976.

Woods, Thomas E. The Administration of Educational Innovation. Reprint of earlier publication 1967. Bureau of Educational Research and Service. Eugene, Oregon. 1971. 53 p.

Yarger, Sam J. and Mallen, John J. Articulating the Bits and Pieces for Productive Change. Journal of Teacher Education. Volume 26, No. 1. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C. 1975.

124

APPENDIX A

Level-of-use Framework

Figure 2
LEVEL OF USE FRAMEWORK

LEVELS OF USE

SCALE POINT DEFINITIONS OF THE LEVELS OF USE OF THE INNOVATION

LoU CHART

CATEGORIES

	KNOWLEDGE	ACQUIRING INFORMATION	SHARING	ASSESSING	PLANNING	STATUS REPORTING	PERFORMING
LEVEL 0 NON USE							
DECISION POINT A	Takes action to learn more detailed information about the innovation.						
LEVEL I ORIENTATION							
DECISION POINT B	Makes a decision to use the innovation by establishing a time to begin.						
LEVEL II PREPARATION							
DECISION POINT C	Begins first use of the innovation.						
LEVEL III MECHANICAL USE							
DECISION POINT D-1	A routine pattern of use is established						
LEVEL IV A ROUTINE							
DECISION POINT D-2	Changes use of the innovation based on formal or informal evaluation in order to increase client outcomes						
LEVEL IV B REFINEMENT							
DECISION POINT E	Initiates changes in use of innovation based on input of and in coordination with what colleagues are doing						
LEVEL V INTEGRATION							
DECISION POINT F	Begins exploring alternatives to or major modifications of the innovation presently in use						
LEVEL VI RENEWAL							

Procedures for Adopting Educational Innovations Project, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin, 1975, N.I.E. Contract No. NIE C-74-0087

LoU: A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING INNOVATION ADOPTION

APPENDIX B

Program Development and Adoption Stages

Decision Areas	I. Planning for	II. Implementing	III. Maintaining
A. Outcomes Desired Occur Student Faculty ✓ Institution	Why are we not getting what we want? What are the desired outcomes?	Does it look as if we are going to get the outcomes we want? What unexpected outcomes are we getting?	What outcomes are we regularly getting? ✓ What unexpected outcomes are we getting? What new needed outcomes have been identified?
B. Resources Have Need Materials Facilities Skills	What resources do we want? What resources do we need?	Exactly what resources are needed? Will our resources support CBE on a regular basis?	What resources are now freed up? What unexpected resources are being consumed?
C. Strategies Instructional Installation	Which instructional strategy do we want to use? How should we implement? (Which adoption strategy? What training?)	Are the instructional strategies working? What changes msut be made in the strategies? Is further faculty training needed? Will everyone be able to do his part?	How effective are the instructional strategies? How effective were the implementing strategies?
D. Costs (Personnel and Resources) Dollars Time Resources One Time Ongoing	How much is it costing to plan? How much will it cost to implement? Once implemented, what will maintenance cost be? How long will materials last? How much staff time to implement?	What is it costing to implement? What do the maintenance costs now look like?	How much is it costing to maintain? How much did it cost to plan for and implement this innovation?

APPENDIX C

Specific Evaluation of Learning Package

SPECIFIC EVALUATION OF LEARNING PACKAGE

Use the following list of criteria to evaluate the consistency and organization of the learning package that you have just developed.

Major and Component Ideas (Concept and Sub-concepts)

1. Are the concept and sub-concepts stated simply and completely?

2. Are the concept and sub-concepts written at the language level of the proposed learner?

3. Are the sub-concepts logical and relevant segments of the concept?

4. Are the sub-concepts manageable within a single learning package?

Learning Objectives

1. Are the learning objectives stated simply and completely?

2. Are the learning objectives written at the language level of the proposed learner?

3. Are actions described that can reasonably be expected to result only if the desired conceptualizations have occurred?

4. Are intended outcomes described specifically enough so that evaluation is possible, but not so specifically as to result in segmented, non-functional behaviors?

5. Are the conditions specified under which evaluation will occur?

6. Are the qualitative and/or quantitative expectations clearly stated or implied?

Learning Materials and Activities

1. Will the learning materials and activities help the student realize the performances specified in the learning objectives?

2. Do the learning materials and activities provide direct perceptual experiences with the properties of objects, processes, and/or consequences? If not, do they elicit vivid recall of prior experiences with those properties?

3. Do the materials and activities employed operate through sense channels that match the properties about which the student is learning?

130

4. Do the materials and activities employed operate through verbal channels when necessary and effective?

5. Do student responses required by the materials and activities utilize the following two processes, either separately or in combination: (a) verbal or pictorial responses, and (b) overt non-verbal executions?

6. Have materials and activities been provided for the student who learns best by visual means? by oral-aural means? by physical means?

7. Has a variety of materials and activities been provided each of several specific performance levels?

8. Is there sufficient range of difficulty in the materials and activities listed?

Evaluation

1. Do the test items call for behaviors identical to the action terms in the learning objectives?

2. Does pre-testing diagnose what should be learned in the learning package (in other words, which objectives have already been met and which have not)?

3. Does self-testing help the student decide whether he needs to re-cycle himself for additional learning activities before taking the post-test?

4. Does the difference in response between pre- and post-testing provide a measure of learning growth?

5. Does self-testing help the student set his own specifications for achieving the learning objectives?

6. Does self-testing take the student's focus off the teacher and place it on the learning task?

7. Do testing procedures focus on achievement rather than on failure?

8. Do test results help the student determine his next steps in learning?

9. Does testing provide feedback for continued curriculum development?

Organizations

1. Are your learning packages organized according to a format? Can the modification or omission or any of the elements in your format be justified?

122

2. Will students be able to understand what they see and read? In other
   words, will they know what they are expected to do in an individualized
   program that incorporates your learning packages?

3. Are the learning packages attractively designed?

APPENDIX D

Student Module Feedback Form

Student Module Feedback Form

Instructions: In the items below, fill in the blank; circle "yes" or "no"; or place an "X" on the continuum in the appropriate blank.

1. How much time did you spend on the module? _____ hours.

2. How relevant was the topic of the module to you? (Indicate this by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.)

Irrelevant _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Relevant
                            Somewhat

3. To what extent do you feel the pre- and posttests actually tested the material presented in the module?

Not at all _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Completely
                            Somewhat

4. How helpful was the information presented in the module toward acquiring the competencies described by the objectives?

Confusing _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Very helpful
                            No Help

5. How useful were the "objectives" in learning what the module was trying to teach?

Detrimental _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Useful
                            No Help

6. How appealing was the overall structural arrangement?

Distracting _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Appealing
                            No effect

7. How helpful were the pictorial illustrations?

Confusing _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Facilitation
                            No help

Please identify confusing or unhelpful illustrations and point out where additional ones are needed.

8. What is the overall level of vocabulary in this module?

Too general _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Too technical
                            Just right

9. What amount of information was provided in this module?

Too little _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Too much
                            Just right

134

125

10. In doing this module, how did you feel you were treated?

As a robot _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Humanly

11. How much worthwhile information do you believe you learned from having had this modular experience?

None _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ A great deal
                                      Some

12. How enjoyable did you find this approach to instruction?

Distasteful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Very enjoyable
                                  Indifferent

13. If you had your choice, what percent of your future instruction in this course would you like to have based on a similar module format?

_____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____
  0%   20%   40%   60%   80%   100%

14. Did you have the background the module seemed to require?   Yes   No

15. Were you able to skip any sections of the module due to the results of the pretest?   Yes   No
    If yes, did you do it?

16. Did the objectives describe the most important things you could do after experiencing this module?   Yes   No

17. Does the module really teach the objective it purports to?   Yes   No

18. Were there activity instructions or explanations that were unclear or misleading so that you were unable to proceed and required help?   Yes   No

19. Were there any statements that were inaccurate or inconsistent with respect to your previous knowledge?   Yes   No

20. In the "discussion of responses," were you satisfied with the answers given?   Yes   No

21. Were additional materials needed that were not provided?   Yes   No

22. Except for the pretesting, did the module provide for you as an individual?   Yes   No

135

23. In doing this module, did you feel a need for   Yes   No
    alternate routes?

24. How do you feel about filling out questionnaires?

Yuk (#*?@) _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Yea
                        Take it
                          or
                        Leave it

25. In the space below, please list any suggestions as to how this
    module might be changed or improved.

                                    Thank you for your help!

_____

APPENDIX E

Computer Card

Resource Evaluation and Utilization

RESOURCE EVALUATION AND UTILIZATION

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION   **LEARNING RESOURCES CENTER**

We rely on each individual using this resource to advise us of its usage and condition
The evaluation is concerned with the quality of the sound and visuals, not with the
content. All problems are checked and corrected

THE NEXT STUDENT AND THE LRC APPRECIATE YOUR COOPERATION

1. Sound quality of resource?   ( ) adequate   ( ) a problem exists
2. Visual quality of resource?   ( ) adequate   ( ) a problem exists
3. Is anything missing?   ( ) no   ( ) yes (explain)

PROBLEMS: (use other side if necessary)

138

APPENDIX F

Strategy Considerations Related to the
Elements of Competency Based Education

APPENDIX F

Introduction

This appendix presents a two-dimensional matrix designed to assist the reader in pinpointing specific strategy issues relating to CBE implementation. Along one dimension of the matrix the defining, enabling and unique characteristics of CBE are listed. Along the other dimension, the major CBE implementation considerations are specified within three categories: generating support, resources utilization, and scope of implementation. At each intersection of the matrix--for example, Means for Evaluation of Outcomes vs. Orientation to Program--a number of questions may be raised relating to implementation strategies. These questions will typically vary in nature and scope for state, district and local agencies. Even among agencies at the same level, questions will differ, reflecting the unique implementation needs and concerns of each agency.

To illustrate the sorts of strategy issues that might arise at the state and district levels, sample questions are posed for one intersection of the matrix: Continuous Adaptation of Programs vs. Rate of Implementation. The reader is asked to keep in mind that these sample questions are intended only as an illustration. Any given agency is expected to have different or additional questions.

131

Table 3

		DEFINING CHARACTERISTICS					ENABLING CHARACTERISTICS				UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS		
	Possible Strategy Questions Relating to the Implementation of Each Element of CBE / STATED OUTCOMES	Means for Evaluation of Outcomes	Means for Evaluation of Negotiable Outcomes	Instructional Programs	Personalized Learning Programs	Continuous Adaptation of Program	Establish Goals Based on Social Conditions	Involvement of Students Educators and Community	Use of Settings, Persons and Resources	Decision Network	Life Role Competencies	Competencies Demonstrated by Students	Certification of Performance
SCOPE OF IMPLEMENTATION	Components of CBE Involved												
	Site Selection												
	Proportion of Program Affected												
	Rate of Implementation												
RESOURCES UTILIZATION	Feedback												
	Incentives												
	Support Services												
	Advocacy Groups												
	Social Organizer												
GENERATING SUPPORT	Adoption												
	Small-Scale Tryouts												
	Program Information												
	Observation of External Programs												
	Orientation to Program												

CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPETENCY BASED EDUCATION	QUESTIONS THAT MAY BE ASKED BY STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE) PERSONNEL RELATED TO THE RATE OF IMPLEMENTATION
A set of publicly declared rules and procedures for assuring the continuous adaptation and improvement of ongoing educational programs through the use of --.	
● Formative and summative program evaluation data on program costs.	● How soon should districts be able to demonstrate decision making based cost and utility information? ● Can the state demonstrate alternative cost-feedback decision making models appropriate for CBE? ● Can the SDE provide technical support (computer technology) to districts with similar (or different) program characteristics? ● Can the SDE provide the technical assistance necessary to design cost analysis systems?
● Formative and summative program evaluation data on the appropriateness of outcomes desired.	● Can the SDE provide districts with resource collections of outcome statements? ● What types of technical assistance do districts need to determine the appropriateness of outcomes? ● What materials and products do districts need for initial implementation of decision making processes related to program improvement? ● How should the rate of implementation be adjusted based on available technology, technical assistance, and materials and products?

142

	• How should the rate of implementation be adjusted based on districts' capability to assimilate the changes?
	• Can implementation be facilitated by prior SDE development activities: e.g., goal bank, goal retrieval systems, training materials, pilot test sites?
• Student performance data	• What student-performance information systems exist?
	• How soon can alternative approaches be piloted?
	• How soon can needed systems be developed?
	• What technical assistance will be required by districts?
	• How soon can the resulting information be effectively used in program improvement decisions?
	• How will the rate of implementation affect other elements of CBE?
	• At what rate can practitioners develop the required evaluation and reporting skills?
	• Who should be involved in decisions about rate of implementation?
• Staff performance data, including data on the effectiveness of staff development programs.	• At what rate can districts be expected to initiate procedures that reflect needed changes?
	• To what degree do district administrators perceive this element as an improvement?
	• To what degree is the required change complex and difficult to understand?
	• To what degree is the change divisible and implementable in separate parts?

143

- To what degree can the required changes be communicated and demonstrated?

- Do existing state laws impinge on this element?

- To what degree can/should state teacher organizations be involved with decisions relating to rate?

- How are school districts to be involved in decisions about rate of implementation?

- Is legislative action desirable to provide external pressure?

144

CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPETENCY BASED EDUCATION	QUESTIONS THAT MAY BE ASKED BY SCHOOL DISTRICT PERSONNEL RELATED TO THE RATE OF IMPLEMENTATION
A set of publicly declared rules and procedures for assuring the continuous adaptation and improvement of ongoing educational programs through the use of —	
● Formative and summative program evaluation data on program costs.	● To what degree does rate of implementation affect costs? ● At what rate can CBE activities replace traditional expense items? ● What technology is available to assess cost effectiveness? ● Does the district have the skills to assess cost effectiveness? ● How frequently are programs modified based on cost effectiveness feedback? ● Is it possible to implement programs with built-in cost monitoring systems? ● How soon is cost effective information needed for informed decision making? ● Should cost effective analysis be piloted in one or more sites prior to implementation district wide?
● Formative and summative program evaluation data on the appropriateness of outcomes desired.	● How frequently should outcomes be modified? ● Is it possible to select outcomes with documented evidence of appropriateness? ● In what sequence should outcomes be evaluated for utility? ● What portion of the program should be assessed for utility?

145

● Student performance data.	● To what degree can schools provide student performance data?
	● What support is available from other agencies?
	● Does the district have the expertise to develop or implement the necessary support systems?
	● How long will it take for teachers to develop new skills?
	● To what degree will teachers and administrators perceive the collection of student performance data as threatening their current status? —
	● Who should be involved in making decisions about rate of implementation?
● Staff performance data, including data on the effectiveness of staff development programs.	● To what degree do staff members perceive the collection of staff performance data as an improvement?
	● To what degree is the required change complex and difficult to understand?
	● To what degree is the change divisible and implementable in separate parts?
	● To what degree can the required change be communicated and demonstrated?
	● How are staff involved in decisions about rate of implementation?
	● What implications does this have for negotiated agreements?
	● To what degree are staff development programs replicable and demonstrated to change staff performance?
	● To what degree will the collection of staff performance data be perceived to threaten the current status of administrators and teachers?