An Analysis of the teaching plans of adult educators in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and an examination of the relationship between the quality of the teaching plan for one lesson, the effectiveness of teaching performance as rated by supervisors, and personal experience factors of the educator were conducted. A 40% random sample was drawn for the study, and teaching plans were received for 96% of this sample. These were evaluated by an independent jury of adult educators. Each Extension Agent completed a personal experience questionnaire and a self-evaluation of his own teaching plan. Supervisors rated teaching performance by paired comparison of agents. The mean score of the total teaching plans evaluated by the independent jury was 2.44 on a scale ranging from 0-5. Mean scores for teaching plans were highest for home economics agents and lowest for agricultural agents. In addition, supervisors rated differently the teaching performance of county and area agents. Also, significant positive correlations existed between the self-evaluation and the independent jury evaluations of the teaching plans. (CK)
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AN ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHING PLAN OF THE ADULT EDUCATOR AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

This study was an analysis of the teaching plans of adult educators and an examination of the relationship between the quality of the teaching plan for one lesson, the effectiveness of teaching performance as rated by supervisors, and personal experience factors of the educator.

Research Design

The population for this study was the county and area faculty of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service with a tenure of six months or more. An instrument for the evaluation of teaching plans was developed in terms of educational objectives, learning experiences, teaching methods, and plans for evaluation of results.

A forty per cent random sample was drawn for the study and teaching plans were received for ninety-six per cent of this sample. These were evaluated by an independent jury of adult educators. Each Extension agent completed a personal experience questionnaire and a self evaluation of his own teaching plan. Supervisors rated teaching performance by paired comparison of agents.

Personal experience factors analyzed include: Extension position, tenure, undergraduate degree in education, public school teaching experience, graduate work in Adult or Extension Education, attitude regarding in-service education for Improved Quality of Instruction, quantity of teaching experiences during a designated month, and professional role preference and performance.
Summary of Findings

Personal Experience Factors

Thirty-five per cent of the Extension agents in this sample had public school teaching experiences and sixty per cent held an undergraduate degree in some field of education. Forty-three per cent held advanced degrees. Teaching methods and supervised student teaching were most frequently cited as the courses most helpful in preparing for a teaching role. The I.Q.T. Workshop was cited most frequently as the in-service training most helpful in preparing for a teaching role. Eighty-five per cent of this sample discussed their teaching performance regularly with their supervisor and large numbers discussed it with one or more co-workers. The mean number of lessons personally taught by each faculty member during March, 1970 was 7.48. Sixty-three per cent indicated they preferred to be recognized as educators, twenty-five per cent as subject matter specialists, and twelve per cent as administrators. Forty-five per cent indicated the major portion of their time was spent as an administrator while thirty per cent indicated the majority of their time was spent as a subject matter specialist and twenty-five per cent said educator.

Teaching Plan Scores

The mean score of the total teaching plans evaluated by the independent jury was 2.44 on a scale ranging from a low of zero to a high of five. The highest scores were for the items relating to teaching methods with a mean of 2.83, followed by teaching objectives with a mean of 2.77, learning experiences with a mean of 2.58, and evaluation of results with a mean of 1.82.
Jury Rating of Teaching Plans

A significant difference was found among the teaching plans of home economics, 4-H, and agricultural agents as rated by the independent jury. Mean scores were highest for home economics agents and lowest for agricultural agents. Teaching plans of agents who had undergraduate degrees in education were rated significantly higher by the jury than the plans of those without such preparation. There was a significant difference among the teaching plan scores which was related to the quantity of teaching experiences during the previous month. Higher mean scores were related to more teaching experiences.

Supervisor Ratings of Teaching Performance

There was significant difference as rated by their supervisors between the teaching performance of county and area agents with higher scores favoring area agents. There was a significant difference in teaching performance as rated by supervisors and analyzed by tenure, with the highest scores being associated with longer tenure. There were significant differences in teaching performance when analyzed according to role preference and role performance. Highest mean scores were given to those who preferred to be and performed primarily as educators, and lowest mean scores to those who preferred to be and performed primarily as administrators.

Relationship Between Ratings

Significant positive correlations existed between the self evaluation and the independent jury evaluation of the teaching plan, and between the self evaluation of the teaching plan and the rating by the supervisor of total teaching performance. The correlation between the rating of one teaching plan by the jury and the rating of total teaching performance by the supervisor was not significant.
Some Questions For Consideration By The Cooperative Extension Service

1) Forty per cent of this sample did not have a degree in education and twenty-nine per cent indicated no formal courses which were helpful to them in preparing for a teaching role. When, where, and how should these agents be prepared for teaching roles?

2) Eighty-five per cent of this sample had discussed their teaching performance with their supervisor during the past year; fifty-four per cent with a co-worker in the same office, forty-eight per cent with a co-worker in a similar position in another county or area, and thirty-nine per cent with a specialist. How consistent are the standards for this discussion? How effectively is Extension helping the agent who wants to improve his teaching performance?

3) Items dealing with evaluation of results had the lowest mean scores as rated by the independent jury. Is Extension giving less emphasis to evaluation of results than to teaching objectives and teaching methods? Have Extension agents been given sufficient assistance in identifying and collecting evidence of behavioral change?

4) Sixty-three per cent of this sample preferred a role as an educator while twenty-five per cent spent the majority of their time in this role. Twelve per cent preferred a role as an administrator and forty-five per cent spent the majority of their time in this role. What does this mean to Extension in terms of in-service education? In terms of effective performance? In terms of agent tenure?
5) Teaching plans of home economics agents, agents with undergraduate degrees in education, and more personal teaching experiences were rated superior by the jury. What does this mean? Are there intangible factors in teaching performance which do not show up on a written plan, but which might be measured some other way?

6) Supervisors' ratings of teaching performance were highest for area agents, agents with longer tenure, and agents who preferred roles as educators. What does this mean? Are supervisors able to isolate teaching performance from total performance? How much objectivity can they achieve and what tools would help them evaluate teaching performance?