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Purpose. The project report represents one method of exchanging ideas, perspectives and experiences between cooperating institutions.

Methodology. The project associated with the "Institute for Training Directors of Teacher Education Reform Programs" focused on selected realities of current efforts which provide alternate programs for teacher education. This report contains theoretical, analytical, and practical models, discussions, and case studies which should be valuable to any educational organization contemplating change.

Topics included in the report address seven critical areas of teacher education reform. These are:

1. Institutional cooperation between and among diverse universities.
2. The role of planning through selected planning techniques and strategies.
3. A model to evaluate and compare teacher education components and concepts.
4. An analysis of the role of human relations training in teacher education.
5. A model to assess personnel and their probability for change.
7. Case studies of program development and consortia efforts aimed at developing performance oriented certification in the state of Washington.
PREFACE

The project report contained herewith is, in one sense, the commencement of a series of activities which were made possible through the cooperation of the U.S.O.E., Bureau of Personnel Development, Dwight W. Allen, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts; and George B. Brain, Dean, College of Education at Washington State University. Other personal institutional participants and the many project activities are noted in Chapter I.

There are key individuals who must be recognized for their help in bringing this phase of the Seven Year Teacher Education Study to its fruition. Dr. Robert J. Harder, Associate Professor of Education, University of North Florida assisted in developing the project in its formative stages. Mrs. Jan Reinking is acknowledged for her persistent efforts in coordinating the many project details and in supervising the preparation of the final report. Mrs. Kris Keogh aided in the preparation of the manuscript and bibliographies. Robert Suzuki and Gilbert Lopez of the School of Education, University of Massachusetts aided in coordinating the details of the sub-contract. Finally, there are many individuals on the secretarial staff, Department of Education, at Washington State University who contributed their time and effort to the project and to whom special appreciation is extended.

This report is intended to analyze selected aspects of the phenomena of teacher education reform. Presented, possibly for the first time, is a detailed description of the prototype consortia models which are intended as competency based certification mechanisms for the state of Washington. The presentation of planning techniques and the conceptual levels matching model should prove invaluable to administrators and researchers. The microgrid evaluation tool may present a unique means to qualitatively judge teacher education programs or course components. The detailed presentation about human relations training is intended to aid curriculum and course developers. The case study of the transition from a traditional to a competency based course presents the challenges and efforts needed to produce such experiences. Perhaps the major contribution of this report is that it will aid other educators, state legislative bodies, leaders of state departments of education and other educational decision makers to avoid the mistake of others—especially the bandwagon jumpers.
ABSTRACTS

CHAPTER 1

THE TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM MOVEMENT

by

Donald C. Orlich
Department of Education
Washington State University

The "Teacher Education Reform Movement" is the introductory chapter to this report. A very brief review of selected social and educational trends, which have apparently lead to the "new reform" movement in teacher education, is presented. Included in the chapter is a summary of the development of the Seven Year Teacher Education Study and a list of the participating institutions. The objectives of the project are presented with mechanisms which have been identified to bring about institutional changes so that the teacher education reform may take place more systematically.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF SELECTED PLANNING PROCEDURES

by

Donald C. Orlich
Department of Education
Washington State University

A summary of planning procedures is presented in Chapter 2 which includes analyses of the processes of planning, program evaluation and review technique (PERT), planning-programming-budgeting-system (PPBS), Delphi technique, management by objectives (MBO), advocate teams and advocate-adversary teams. Case studies of selected techniques are presented to aid those who contemplate initiating an educational reform program.
A qualitative and quasi-quantitative teacher education evaluation model is presented in Chapter 3. The model allows for the collection of baseline and comparative data for educational products and processes. A series of teacher education program components and concepts are identified. Each of the latter is then described through a set of evaluative criteria for selected variables pertaining to the component or concept. An evaluation profile of components or concepts is then established. The profile allows for a comparison of program components or concepts with any other teacher education program or institution. The model provides any evaluator with data that indicates direction for program or course changes if desired.

AFFECTIVE CONSEQUENCES OF TEACHING

There appears to be a social trend in the United States of America toward increasing awareness of the importance of the affective domain. Human relations training (HRT) is one outgrowth of the apparent need. Consequently, it is now being included in the preparatory program of social agencies, more specifically, the school. Interpersonal sensitivity is found to correlate significantly with desirable teacher performance. Findings from selected research indicate that HRT can be valuable toward increasing interpersonal sensitivity, especially when it is administered shortly before student teaching. Very short term HRT programs have little effect in changing attitudes or behaviors. Trainers are perceived as being crucial to an effective HRT program. Several programs are described as prototypes for HRT in teacher education institutions. Based on available research, program guidelines for HRT in education preservice are suggested.
CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONCEPTUAL LEVELS MATCHING MODEL
FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

by
Terry R. Armstrong
Department of Education
University of Idaho

All individuals have the potential to evolve through developmental stages or levels of awareness that may offer some explanation for people's resistance to change. This paper describes four levels of awareness that parallel chronological stages of development for adolescents and adults. The levels presented follow a progression from the need for structure to the need for flexibility on the part of individuals.

Viewed in an educational context, the matching levels concept is used to describe today's learners with differing teaching methods. The failure of past educational reform is viewed as a failure of the reformers to consider the awareness levels of the people for whom the change was intended. Educational change is most likely to occur in a setting where the awareness levels of all the publics are in accord with that of the decision makers.

CHAPTER 6

THE SEMANTICS OF COMPETENCY BASED OR PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

by
Donald P. Kauchak
Department of Education
Washington State University

An analysis is made between the terms "competency based teacher education" and "performance based teacher education." Competency based teacher education is considered to be the most inclusive, connoting standards in addition to the execution of specified tasks. A distinction is made between possessing a competency and utilizing it in the classroom. Drives and incentives are suggested as additional variables affecting the use of a competency in a teaching context. germane to the paper is the apparent lack of understanding by professionals of the distinctions between the terms and their basic psychological and philosophical tenents.
An initial competency based program resulted in module development for Education 301, "Language Arts for Teachers," at Washington State University. Students utilizing the modules were allowed to proceed at their own pace using a variety of materials such as printed sources, audio and videotapes, and other media resources. Each module contains a pre-test to check entry competency, knowledge level objectives, simulation level objectives, and a post-test of module mastery. A laboratory (application-through-teaching level) which is supervised by a master teacher is scheduled in the local public schools so that a classroom is available for students to apply newly learned skills.

Faculty who are involved in the module development program continue to experiment and refine the modules and instructional procedures. Alternate means of instruction are currently being investigated. Evaluations have indicated that students are mastering language arts teaching skills and enjoy the self-paced, multi-media approach to learning. Problems identified include student insecurity with new instructional methods and a need for providing more strategies to meet a variety of learning styles. Feedback from faculty, public school supervising teachers, students, former students now teaching, and employing principals have all contributed to the program's growth. Recurring criticisms from faculty are the lack of time and resources to develop modules and instructional procedures. The module program was developed with a minimum of outside financial support. Faculty professionalism and enthusiasm have been the program's greatest strength.
In July 1971, the Board of Education of the state of Washington adopted guidelines and standards designed to give new direction to teacher certification in the state. The guidelines are based on the following principles: (1) preparation should be related to performance, and performance related to the objectives of the professional and his/her clients; (2) preparation should be individualized and give recognition to personal style; (3) preparation programs should be planned and developed in a participatory manner by those affected; and (4) preparation is a career-long, continuing process.

Three teacher preparation agencies which are to implement the principle via consortia are defined as professional association, school organization (i.e., any public or independent school system or district or group of such organizations), and colleges and universities. Programs must meet specific criteria relative to consortium arrangements and preparation opportunities and alternatives. All preparation programs are subject to approval by the State Board of Education. Two distinct types of consortia groups are (1) the single purpose which is designed to develop programs for specific areas such as physical education or counseling, and (2) the "umbrella" in which several institutions and organizations act as a coordinating agency for a variety of special interest task forces. As of 1973, 46 consortia groups were in existence in the state.

A case study of a language arts special area consortium group illustrates how the general concerns identified in the assessment applied to and affected the operation of a specific consortium group established to develop K-12 language arts teacher preparation programs.
CHAPTER 9

APPRAISING COMPETENCY BASED TEACHER CERTIFICATION

by

Donald P. Kauchak
Department of Education
Washington State University

The developing concept of competency based teacher certification is analyzed and compared with more traditional conceptualizations of certification. Basic but often unstated assumptions which undergrid competency based certification are also examined. Through a review of selected materials it is concluded that there is lack of a credible research base and the concomitant lack of valid and reliable certification instruments. A question is also raised as to the relative efficacy of states, individuals or institutions all conducting research to validate locally defined teacher competencies. Assuming that research programs for the validation of teacher competencies are nationally sponsored, the need for adoption to local needs is emphasized. The importance of an operationally defined teacher education program which provides competencies to teachers is considered to be a first priority in the development of competency based teacher certification.

CHAPTER 10

PERFORMANCE BASED CERTIFICATION WITH FOCUS UPON THE STATE OF WASHINGTON MODEL

by

William P. McDougall and James T. Shoemaker
Department of Education
Washington State University

The chapter discusses the background of certification in terms of its history, rationale, and current status, and describes two evaluation methodologies: the accreditation model and the Tylerian Model. The Washington certification model, an example of performance based certification now in process, is presented with a description of the Washington State Department of Education Guidelines. A case study of the Southeastern Washington Counselor Education Consortium is given along with a discussion of the many problems and issues in its development. The chapter includes observations and suggestions concerning the Washington model.
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As the decade of the 1960's closed, a mandate for change in teacher education programs was being anticipated and demanded by nearly all the affected segments of our society. A national urgency for significant changes in teacher preparation was the subject for comment by critics from both in and out of the educational profession. One source of criticism was the realization that public educational systems at all levels had been unresponsive to massive social and technological changes. Some critics claimed that stagnated teacher preparation programs were the major causes of the ills being demonstrated in the nation's schools. Moreover, the latter half of the 1960's was marked by violent student confrontations which had traumatic and potentially long-lasting consequences on the higher educational scene. Perhaps the sense of national urgency was the climax of nearly two decades of polemic statements both condemning and praising the nation's educational enterprise.

Teacher education had not been ignored, however, during those decades. Many massive national efforts had already focused on teacher improvement. This was so especially between the period 1958-1967.

During that period, the National Defense Educational Act (NDEA) supported a broad spectrum of educational activities. However, the activities were supported not so much to improve education as to bolster the nation's defense potential, of which brain power is so essential.

The enactment of the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) generated billions of federal dollars to be utilized by local, state, and regional educational agencies. ESEA was hailed as a federal policy which would allow the schools to implement the best possible educational and innovative practices for all children. However, reports began to show that the ESEA programs were short-lived, unincorporated into the ongoing programs, and in many cases simply not helping children to
learn better, especially those from the lower socio-economic classes. The warm reception which greeted the far flung federal programs gradually turned to cynicism.

Panaceas of all sorts were apparent during the sixties, or perhaps they might best be labeled "brief enthusiasms." It was the decade to experiment: try new ideas, gadgets, machines, technology, behavioral objectives, Program-Planning-Budgeting Systems, Foreign Language Elementary School, English as a foreign language, new science, new math, new everything -- if it was new it presumable had to be good.

A set of strategies. It became obvious that the various kinds of inservice and preservice programs funded by NDEA, ESSA and the National Science Foundation were not having an appreciable effect in changing the schools. Thus, in 1967 the United States Office of Education (USOE), Bureau of Research planned a national intervention strategy to accelerate teacher preparation reform at the institutional, preservice, and inservice levels. In that year the USOE announced a national competition to fund selected proposals. The proposals chosen would be the "cutting edge" for a total reform movement in elementary teacher education programs.

What emerged from these so called "Phase One" plans was not a multiplicity of competing alternative models, but a monolithic set of models that can be summarized as prototypes of the "Performance Based Teacher Education" (PBTE) system. To be sure, there were many different program components, designs and mechanisms; but, the nine funded "exemplars" all fit one kind of model that had its roots in behaviorism. Following the initial funding of the "Phase One" projects, the USOE requested proposals for "Phase Two." This was to be the pilot testing, analysis, and application aspect of the models from "Phase One," or even the pilot testing of models yet to be designed. In 1969 eight colleges and universities were funded by the USOE under "Phase Two." Analysis of all the "Phase Two" proposals yielded the conclusion that PBTE was the "in-thing" for the new teacher education reform movement -- at least as far as the USOE's Bureau of Research was concerned. Critics of PBTE were more or less rendered powerless in the national surge for "seed" money to federal, state, and nongovernmental sources to convert to PBTE.

Weber State College caught the eye of the Carnegie Corporation and received a grant of $195,400.00 in 1969 to support its entire education faculty for one year. The goal was to prepare a total PBTE type program which it would then adopt as its reform program. Weber State went on to be acclaimed as having the program of the year by the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, and was awarded the Distinguished Achievement Award in 1971.

A reform "environment," which has the potential for the creation of truly alternative teacher education programs, has become, (in this writer's opinion) an almost monolithic force undergirded by the tenets of behaviorism. The evaluation axiom of the PBTE movement was: "If it can't be observed it isn't performance, and that's not teaching."
literally taken hundreds of years to analyze (i.e., defining teaching competencies) has been cavalierly approached by the State of Florida so that between 1971 and 1974 they will supposedly have completed the task (Golden). Again, this writer interprets the reform movement and its current outcome as an attempt to bring relevance to teacher education programs. The movement, however, has been transformed into a system where ephemeral competencies and performances (all prescribed in behavioral objectives, of course) are the ends of teacher education. Ultimately such a position will inaugurate an age of anti-intellectualism in teacher education programs. And, the reform cycle will begin anew—just as all the reform movements of the past century. Yet, the programs developed under the tenets of PBTE are in a constant state of programmatic evolution. It may be more prudent to wait and observe if the final products actually emerge as better teachers, happier pupils, and more supportive school environments.

To say that the PBTE movement itself is totally monolithic would be a gross simplification. There are several institutions of higher education which have not jumped on the PBTE bandwagon, but have approached teacher education reform in more cautious manners. One such approach is the Seven Year Teacher Education Study.

The Seven Year Teacher Education Study

To develop a strategy for fostering the significant reformation of teacher education programs in a systematic way, the Commission of Education for the Teaching Profession of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) initiated and fiscally supported a project called "The Seven Year Teacher Education Study." Supported by the Executive Committee of NASULGC, and with the unanimous endorsement of the Association of Schools and Colleges of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the Study group became a coordinated effort on the part of interested state supported and land grant institutions to reform teacher education programs through a graduated reallocation of existing institutional resources. The Study group was commissioned to focus on program planning in some participating institutions and to initiate stages of implementation in others. The goal of the project is to share data, designs and plans so that a mutually supportive information system could be established.

As of 1973, the participating institutions are:

University of Georgia
University of Massachusetts
Miami University of Ohio
University of Minnesota
New Mexico State University
University of South Dakota
South Dakota State University
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and Washington State University.

These nine institutions collaborated to form an Institute for Training
Directors of Teacher Education Reform Programs, of which the Seven Year Teacher Study is a part. Initially the project was housed and administered by the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts. Dwight W. Allen, Dean of the School of Education, at that university became the initial Project Director; Allen was then followed by Kenneth A. Beattie as Staff Director to coordinate the project. During the 1972-73 year a decision was made to relocate the project within the College of Education at Washington State University. In 1973, with a renewal grant obtained from the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education Personnel Development, the project office was transferred to Washington State University under the directorship of this writer.

The project is attempting to fulfill a number of serious needs which must be met if large scale and significant changes in teacher education are to be made on a national level. Basic research is necessary in the universities with a research orientation such as Harvard, Chicago, Columbia and Stanford. But, it is imperative that the "mainline" teacher education institutions become the focus of serious efforts to reform teacher education. These are the state institutions who graduate the vast majority of the teachers. The Study attempts to foster reform efforts in a selected number of such institutions which have promise for exerting a strong, positive influence on peer institutions in their respective regions.

In addition to the need for making an impact on major teacher preparatory institutions, there is a need to demonstrate that significant program changes can be made on a large scale without heavy dependence upon outside funding (usually federal). As mentioned previously, the change strategy being adopted by the Seven Year Teacher Education Study is the gradual reallocation of existing institutional resources. A major goal of the Study is to demonstrate that significant changes can be made without a huge influx of new fiscal resources. At the completion of the Study, the participating institutions will represent regional resource institutions for others willing to embark on institutionally funded program reforms.

Project Objectives

Broadly defined, the objectives of this project are to:

1. Develop a knowledgeable cadre of leaders capable of directing teacher education reform efforts on their individual campuses.

2. Develop a group of respected teacher education institutions that can work together to initiate change on a national level.

3. Influence teacher education programs both on an individual basis and on the national level to become more responsive to the needs of our contemporary society.
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Supporting these very broad objectives are several more specific objectives sought by the Institute. They are to:

1. Expose participants to a wide range of teacher education program alternatives.

2. Impart systematic program planning and implementation skills to participants throughout the planning and implementation phases of their change efforts.

3. Help participants to improve their program designs by exposing them to constructive criticism by their peers at other institutions who are involved in similar change efforts and by others outside of their own institutions.

4. Help prepare participants to gather and utilize program evaluation data to guide the ongoing revision of their programs.

5. Encourage the exchange of ideas, materials, perspectives, personnel, and experiences between the cooperating institutions.

Conferences held by the representatives of the participating institutions and the papers contained in this report reflect the achievement of the project objectives. Those who attended the various project conferences in 1973 are listed below:

1. University of Georgia: Joe Williams, Dean, College of Education; Gilbert F. Sheárron, Chairman, Division of Elementary Education; and Horace C. Hawn, Director, Teacher Corps Project.

2. University of Massachusetts: Horace B. Reed, Director of School Services; Robert Suzuki, Assistant Dean for Administration, School of Education; Dwight W. Allen, Dean, School of Education.


4. New Mexico State University: Jack O. L. Saunders, Dean, College of Education.

5. University of South Dakota: Thomas E. Moriarity, Dean, School of Education.

6. South Dakota State University: Duane Everett, Chairman, Department of Education; and Robert D. Luchsinger, Department of Education.
Institutional Change

Each of the institutions participating in the Seven Year Teacher Education Study has committed itself to a gradual and planned reallocation of institutional resources from its traditional teacher education program to at least one alternative teacher education program.

In addition, the series of activities sponsored in the Institute set a framework and time schedule for anticipated completion of steps in the process of bringing about institutional change. Further indications of the commitment to institutional change is evidenced by the steps taken by the institutions towards the implementation of selected alternative teacher education programs during the initial years of this project.

The major effort of the Institute for Training Directors of Teacher Education Reform Programs will be the preparation of selected representatives from the individual institutions participating in the Seven Year Teacher Education Study. This preparation is intended to stress the identification of crucial problems in teacher education, the generation of new approaches, and program models for preparing teachers.

During the project's duration each institution in the Study formed a Seven Year Study Group on its campus. These groups are composed of faculty, administrators and students who are involved in the planning of that institution's alternative teacher education program. In most cases, the chairperson of this group is a member of the Institute and is responsible for stimulating teacher education change efforts. It is the members of these Seven Year Study Groups who were involved in the 1973 Institute activities.

The Institute activities have been organized around what is labeled a "development-evaluation strategy." The first phase of this two-phase strategy is concerned largely with program development, but will also establish the groundwork for the major emphasis of phase two which concerns itself with program evaluation. Although the first phase emphasizes development and the second phase evaluation, it should be stressed that a critical principle involved in the development-evaluation strategy is that the data gathered in the second phase will immediately be fed back into activities aimed at program revision. This will mean, in effect, that developmental activities will be conducted throughout the project. Evaluation data will be examined for their implications on program goals and operating principles. To this end the
chapter entitled "A Micro-Grid Evaluation Model" provides one alternative for the meaningful exchange of evaluation data.

The design and development of alternative teacher education programs will be subjected to continual review by others who are designing and developing programs. Accompanying the implementation phase will be a systematic evaluation of new programs. Preparation will be taking place as an integral and continuing component of program development and implementation.

The needs being addressed by the Institute itself are concerned with problems of program conceptualization, development, implementation, and evaluation. Too often, those given the responsibility for directing program reform have been so heavily involved in conducting the current teacher education programs that their horizons with regard to program alternatives are more limited than they should be. These individuals need intense exposure to the development and operation of a wide range of alternative approaches to teacher education.

Those struggling with the design and implementation of new programs often find themselves repeating the mistakes of others who have encountered problems similar to their own. Though they hear about the success of new programs, those directing teacher education programs rarely have the opportunity to examine the weaknesses and failures of other programs with an eye to avoiding such problems in their own change efforts. The mutual cooperation among institutions embarked on teacher education reform should help to alleviate these problems.

Moreover, once an institution has embarked on a program change, the personnel in that institution become so involved in the operation of the new program that they develop a "tunnel vision" that limits their ability to perceive aspects of the program needing serious revision. This attitude inhibits their exposure to promising approaches that might be integrated into their program to improve it. It is too often assumed that all preparation for program planning and design should take place before the change is actually begun; once begun it is also assumed that all that remains of the task is to put the design into operation. Quite to the contrary, there is a great need for continuous program revision and concomitant retraining for those involved in the program change. Exposure to the ideas and constructive criticisms of outsiders are as crucial throughout the implementation phases as they are during the planning phases.

All of these needs are being directly addressed by the design of the Seven Year Study Group. The sharing of ideas and designs allows them to broaden their conceptual horizons, examine critically the change efforts being undertaken by others, and provides a continuous exposure to both the ideas of others and to outside critical evaluations of their own programs. In addition, the Institute activities will help provide crucial inter-institutional support for the change efforts. Support resulting from the exchange of ideas, perspectives, experiences and
materials; and moral support resulting from the awareness that their peer institutions have also accepted the risk of experimenting with major program changes.

Through the Institute mechanism, a model set of diverse programs will emerge. The programs will all exhibit the unique aspects, potentials, and geographic contingencies which comprise the nine universities participating in the project. These models may ultimately be transported to other institutions with similar characteristics. Even more important than program dissemination may be the processes that are taking place to bring the Seven Year Study Project to its fruition.

Organization of this Report

This report is organized into nine additional chapters. Each chapter reflects a major discussion which addresses the Study objectives previously stated. The writers of the paper are all actively associated with the problems about which they write. In this sense personal and institutional experiences are being shared so that colleagues may benefit from our actions, conditions, errors and problems. More specifically we are presenting reactions, observations and analyses of selected events from the State of Washington since it is acknowledged as a pioneer state in early efforts toward performance based teacher education and certification.

Possibly the most significant implication of this report is that it raises questions and concerns about the apparent universal subscription to the PBTE movement. Is PBTE a logical, rational, competitive system for the preparation of more effective teachers, with its clearly stated role derived objectives, field-centered approach, individualization and personalization of instruction, prespecified performance mastery levels and modes of assessment, its capacity to permit a student to progress at his or her own rate, and its conduciveness to systematic development and evaluation . . . (AACTE, 1973)?
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CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF SELECTED PLANNING PROCEDURES

by

Donald C. Orlich
Department of Education
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

One hallmark of organized activity is the process called planning. If changes are to be made in any aspect of the educational enterprise, a substantial proportion of time and activity must be concentrated on scheduled planning sessions so that effected changes may take place in a more systematic fashion, not just by random activity. Researchers in all disciplines have long known that if a well-devised research plan has been prepared, then the results may be predicted. Only in occasional surprise cases are outcomes unanticipated. Program changes might also be anticipated in such a manner, i.e., predicted in advance. Educational planning is not always the development of unique or creative guidelines.

One aspect of educational program planning that seems to be generalizable is that the plans being developed relate to problems which tend to recur continually. To be sure the recurrence will be for different circumstances which require new sets of objectives and solutions; but the problems seem to be cyclical and predictable. The context by which planning for changes in teacher education programs should take place is that those who participate with the development and implementation of the plans help establish priorities and ultimately design mechanisms by which the priorities will be achieved. If one assumes the latter statement to be valid, then the accompanying corollary will also be valid: planning becomes futuristic policy making and is essentially a political mechanism for change. It must also be understood that all plans are simply probabilistic in that they are estimates of what ought to take place rather than what will take place. By preparing written plans, priorities which affect fiscal, material, and personnel decisions will be made known well in advance so that success may be maximized to further organizational goals.

-9-
Historically, planning has been listed as the first element of administration. For example, Henri Fayol (1949) defined administration as a means by which "to plan, to organize, to command, to co-ordinate, and to control." Fayol's elements were ultimately expanded by Luther Gulick (1937) who described the now famous "POSDCORB." "POSDCORB" became the framework for those who analyzed administration as being comprised of a series of discrete functions. Functions identified by Gulick were planning, organizing, staffing, directing, co-ordinating, reporting, and budgeting. More contemporary administrative theorists contend that there is, to borrow from Douglas McGregor (1960), a "human side to the enterprise." This means that the feelings of the involved individuals must be considered and that the human resources cannot be considered in the same value system as materials. Regardless of administrative theory or principles, systematic planning as a process plays the key role in organization, development and change.

Robert P. Hufner (1967) identified four basic concepts associated with planning. Hufner noted that planning is firstly a management tool which has the purposes of supporting democratic decision making processes by pooling the selection of goals and policies and guiding administrative action to implement the goals and policies. He secondly identified the planning process as a means by which to co-ordinate programs and program elements.

Hufner cautioned that the third function of planning was to provide and maintain current plans which would be flexible for changing conditions and goals. A plan would provide guidance for decision makers as well as implementers. The fourth element listed by Hufner was called "competent analysis." Each step in the decision-making process should be guided by the most up-to-date knowledge and information concerning those specific elements planned so that appropriate decisions could be made.

Another aspect of the planning process is that the effectiveness of a written plan may be judged by the manner in which it helps to affect anticipated changes. Thus, an analysis of alternatives is an important aspect of the planning function. This assumes that there will be organizational inputs from all personnel. When plans are being formulated which may change entire teacher education programs, it is most undesirable and unrealistic to expect the chairmen or the deans to prepare the comprehensive plan. A more appropriate method would be to utilize the expertise and knowledge attained by various faculties. In this sense, planning for teacher education changes may best be brought about through democratic procedures and methodologies.

A pattern for planning. Planning has at least six elements which tend to be uniformly agreed upon. These elements most logically are: (1) identification of the problem, (2) analysis of problem components, (3) statements of solutions and alternatives, (4) solution tests for reality, (5) establishment of the organization to accomplish the changes, and
(6) Implementation of change decisions. These six elements, it is noted, are similar to the so-called scientific method of inquiry. (Hansen).

One of the major problems in planning is to identify the procedures which may be used in programmed steps to initiate the previously identified desired changes. To this end there are several systematic planning methods that can be used. All program plans tend to require some type of "needs assessment." The exact determination of the kinds of needs and the assessment to take place is traditionally accomplished in an intuitive manner. However, if major changes are to be made in teacher education, the requirement mandates that planning procedures move from an intuitive method to a rather highly organized and systematic method. It must be cautioned that "needs assessments" must essentially be recognized as the interpretation of "wants." When persons are polled to obtain a list of "needs," the usual list will be those activities, ideals, competencies or concerns that are desired by the respective respondents. The "wants" list must then be translated to a "needs" list; that is, how do the desired ends (wants) become operationalized. For example, we want teachers who can perform with some preselected set of alternative teaching strategies. But, we need to develop curricular materials, attitudes of worth, and models that can help produce the desired end. All too frequently wants and needs are considered as synonyms. They are not. Wants are ends; needs are means.

Program Evaluation and Review Technique

One of the methods by which planning for changes may be implemented is through the Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT). PERT is a method for planning diverse program activities regardless of how they are coordinated, into manageable processes leading to the project's successful fruition. Note that the emphasis is on management. If a PERT network is established, there is an underlying assumption that there will be management concerns about planning, organizing, motivating, and controlling the fiscal, material and human resources so that their total interactions will attain a predetermined set of objectives.

The PERT system is an attempt to facilitate three common dimensions of managing the project—time, costs (or resources), and performance. Once a generally agreed upon set of goals have been identified, all goals and processes are sub-divided into very specific components and placed on a "work division structure." A work division structure identifies all components of every major unit. After the major units have been identified, a network would then be prepared. Each network is composed of events and activities. Events are defined as those items which represent the start or completion of an activity but do not consume time, personnel, or resources. Activities are those tasks or jobs which require the utilization of personnel and resources over a period of time. The PERT network, then, is developed so that a timeline, management check, cost analysis estimate, as well as output products, may be identified.
An outstanding source for PERT techniques is available from the United States Government Printing Office. That source is:


Desmond Cook's monograph presents in detail the application of PERT techniques to educational processes and would serve as an invaluable source and planning guide when using the PERT technique.

Figures 1, 2 and 3 follow and illustrate a sample of a PERT network as it would be constructed to aid in the implementation of a curriculum project.

Figure 1 shows the organization of the major elements which would be predetermined in the initial planning stage. Using Cook's method the highest numbered level (i.e., 4) is the initial step. Here all major elements and components are identified. Each succeeding level then requires a specific subset of elements. Figure 2 illustrates the activities and events in a logically arranged order. Figure 3 shows the actual PERT chart with added details for the major elements. Further, the PERT chart shows the interrelationship of each element.

For example, in Figure 3, it can be observed that activities 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 may all be initiated autonomously. None of these activities is totally dependent on any of the others. With such planning knowledge a project director might wish to assign specific responsibilities to various teams. The teams can develop reports which can be coordinated at event number 7. However, it would not be possible to begin event number 12, prior to completion of both events number 7 and 11.

By establishing a detailed PERT chart or network for each major element in which change is being planned, a visual schematic is made available of anticipated activities. PERT networks must always be considered as "best predictions." The interrelationships of all elements become known. Precision is then added to the project calendar for time and cost estimates can be noted on the chart. More importantly, critical areas are identified in advance of the event. Program managers can predict and prepare for anticipated outcomes. However, as a project progresses there will certainly be unanticipated events that require modification of the original network. Thus, there ought to be a continuous monitoring of project activities and personnel so that the PERT network resembles a reasonable and accurate blueprint for action. Finally, a more efficient use of material and human resources will be the outcome of using a PERT network to describe the project.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 0</th>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
<th>LEVEL 2</th>
<th>LEVEL 3</th>
<th>LEVEL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Unit</td>
<td>Material Preparation</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Philosophical Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determination Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audiovisual Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Material Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tryout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1
Tabular Work Breakdown Structure for Curriculum Project*

Figure 2
Pictorial Work Breakdown Structure for Curriculum Project*

*Cook, Ibid., p.54
Event Identification

1. Project Start
2. Objective Start
3. Start Philosophical Evaluation
4. Start Psychological Evaluation
5. Start Content Evaluation
7. Objectives Complete
8. Start Structure
9. Start Determination
10. Start Evaluation
11. Structure Complete
12. Start Instructional Materials
14. Start Student Material
15. Start Audiovisual Aids
16. Start Evaluation
17. Start Reference
18. Start Dissemination Procedure
19. Start School Sample
20. Start Material Distribution
21. Start Tryout
22. Start Evaluation
23. Start Final Materials
24. Complete Final Materials
25. Start Publications
26. Start Teacher Orientation
27. Start Administration Orientation
28. Start Lay Orientation
29. Project Complete

Figure 3
Summary Network for Curriculum Project

*Cook, Ibid., p. 55
The PERT technique has added at least three contributions to the concepts of scheduling and controlling: 1. PERT identifies lead time for all project activities. 2. PERT helps to identify critical items by establishing progress checkpoints and indicates the times when the specific points should be reached. By combining these checkpoints, the PERT system indicates which activities will take the longest time to complete, and therefore, needs the most attention. 3. PERT offers an instant evaluation procedure. Reports of the accomplished work may be integrated into a computer system which compares the planned progress of each activity with the actual progress. Changes in activity that delay the process are easily identified so that appropriate action can be taken. To provide a range of time required for critical activities, estimates are made for each activity on a three-way basis: optimistic, most likely, and pessimistic elapsed-time figures. These three time estimates serve as comparative measures of time probabilities and thus help to identify the critical path or that series of activities which require the longest time to perform. The graphic plotting of the activities, events and time estimates forms the PERT chart.

The PERT technique is simply a management tool. The decisions, needs, objectives, value judgments, and commitments must be all made in advance.

Planning-Programming-Budgeting-System

One of the newer planning methods is that commonly called "Planning-Programming-Budgeting-Systems" or "PPBS." Depending on the orientation that one holds, PPBS is synonymously called systems analysis or the systems approach, which may or may not be entirely accurate. These techniques are methods which force those who develop plans to use problem-solving models rather than management-type models, per se. This is not to construe that the management model does not require problem solving, but that PPBS assumes that all planning activities are associated with problems to be solved. PPBS tends to revolve about three basic components. These are: (1) the relationship of cost to output, (2) the ability to analyze (and typically quantify) the effects of existing programs, and (3) the development of future plans to represent requests for funding in a manner which is justifiable in terms of outputs rather than inputs.

The planning activities usually involve the development of a task force which identifies needs, problems and resources. From this definition, goals or objectives are usually specified and then prioritized. The priorities are further subdivided into responsibilities, benefits, and general objectives. Every major element or program component of the organization is analyzed in this manner.

The programming portion of PPBS emphasizes the preparation of specific objectives, decisions, and responsibilities through which goals are to be accomplished. Alternate program strategies and evaluative plans are devised, as well as an estimated allocation of resources to meet the objectives.
The budgeting component is rather unique in that the program (and/or alternate) is first developed and then a task force or manager attempts to fit the budget to the program rather than fitting the program to the budget. If one flaw is apparent in PPBS analysis, it is the budgeting assumption. All schools of education have a budget presented or approved for their activities as far as two or three years in advance. Their programs fit the budget. Therefore, anyone utilizing PPBS must realize this basic contingency.

There are many advantages to using PPBS techniques. These are: facilitation of decision making, provision for resource allocation, a more meaningfully written budget document, identification of specific program objectives and lastly, planned evaluation and provision for the development of short and long range plans. Disadvantages of the PPBS system might be summarized as: an inappropriate budget assumption, initial increases in costs, a reversion to scientific management, and a threat of centralization (allowing basic decisions to emanate from one source only).

A major source of subjectivity in using PPBS techniques is that input-output units or costs in teacher education programs may be very difficult to compute. The usual cost method is to use a unit such as student-credit-hour or full-time-equivalent unit as a basis for dollar comparison. But, as David R. Witmer (1972) candidly points out, these objective-appearing units can be treated by several different methods so that the unit may not be operationally defined or easily manipulated.

Further, there is great difficulty in measuring the qualitative aspects of a program. Legislatures which mandate that "X" number of contact hours or student-credit-hours be enforced for all faculty members cause a direct conflict with state boards of education or educational associations which mandate a competency approach to teacher education.

For example, in 1971 the Washington State Legislature mandated that faculty be required to teach each week 15 contact hours in community colleges, 12 contact hours in state colleges, and 10 contact hours in state universities. At the same time (1971) the Washington State Board of Education adopted a set of teacher education program guidelines which required colleges of education to prepare teachers through programs which were individualized and competency oriented, designed jointly between universities, school districts and professional organizations, and which would allow "alternate" means toward the obtaining of a teaching certificate.

An analysis of these goals shows that they tend to be mutually antagonistic. The appropriations for an individualized program did not materialize either in 1971 or 1973; neither group has established a meaningful dialogue with the other concerning teacher education. The state faces an excess of teacher candidates, and the colleges of education are called on to be "accountable" with "individualized" programs.

Such conflicts do not aid in systematic decision-making nor do they...
help to establish accurate bases for the comparison of inputs-outputs, quantity or quality. Yet, the overall concept of goal identification and the searching for alternative means by which to identify goals most efficiently and effectively is an important facet of the PPBS system.

There are two excellent sources concerning PPBS in education. The first is one of the early applications to education: Harry J. Hartley, *Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting: A Systems Approach*. Hartley's treatment of Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting provides the reader with an excellent overview of the general theory. For a more detailed and applied treatment of PPBS, the reader is referred to Orlando F. Furno, George J. Collins, and George B. Brain, *Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems: A Practical Approach* (1972, 336 pp.).

Management by Objectives

One extension of the systems approach is the concept called Management by Objectives (MBO). MBO is chiefly a business and profit-making technique predicated on the assumption that if any organization is to maximize its potential, growth or production it must first have clearly delineated, prescribed and measurable goals. Quite obviously in education, this is an adaptation of the behavioral objective described early by Ralph W. Tyler and later popularized by Robert F. Mager. The basic steps of MBO are listed below.

Key educational leaders and administrators review the school district or institution's overall goals, strengths, weaknesses, plans, budgets and other critical elements. This review leads to a set of written plans to improve the weak areas and to strengthen further those areas which are evaluated as "strong." These plans would also establish a clearly delineated set of school district or institutional objectives. Once these objectives have been specified all organizational, managerial or administrative efforts are focused to bring the stated objectives to their successful fruition.

The next element is to clarify and establish performance standards for all other administrative divisions. All achievements and activities must coincide with major organizational objectives. Results are the ends of MBO, not detailed role descriptions. That is, it matters little how a role is defined in the personnel manual. The objectives to be met take priority over all other functions.

The third element is the preparation of an improvement plan by each unit in the organization so that measurable contributions can be made for improved performance. Commitment to the goals and commitment to improve is prerequisite to MBO.

A performance review is the fourth basic step in the MBO system. This means that precise measures will be applied to each administrator and individual in the organization. The performance review is simply matching productivity with the stated goals.
The next step in MBO is a rewards system that recognizes those who achieve their goals and training programs to help those who do not achieve their goals.

The process is recycled so that after the evaluation data are available, the objectives may be modified. If an organization used only a summative evaluation technique, then the chances for goal modification are greatly reduced until a rather long period of time has transpired. Formative evaluations would be much more appropriate since they allow a constant evaluative monitoring. This requires that formative evaluation "check points" be built into the plans. Thus, if contingencies arise or planning assumptions prove to be invalid, a modified set of objectives can be substituted into the system.

Those anticipating the use of MBO must be aware of pitfalls that cause a loss in valuable "human potential" and loss of morale. For example, it must be observed that MBO can approach an unidimensional communication system, e.g., goals being decided at the "top" and applied "down." In this respect MBO has the power to get things done. But, applied in that manner MBO is authoritarian, doctrinaire and antihumanistic. Administrators must build a multiple communications system if they desire a more democratic organization--of which universities take noted pride. There are only ends in MBO, and these are usually quantitatively stressed. Persons in such an MBO system are treated as "givens."

MBO can be democratized so that goals are developed through group consensus. This allows persons at the operational level to affect and establish the productivity standards. Even then MBO may inhibit truly creative individuals since their ideas might be subsidiary to the organization's, once the goals have been established. Yet, the achievement of organizational goals leads to a rewards system that would ultimately reinforce personal behavior to achieve organizational goals in lieu of totally personal ones. There is always a place for personal goal achievement—when the organizational goals have been met.

An MBO system does have the advantage of being task-oriented, maximizing resources to achieve those tasks and of developing efficiency. In closed or fixed systems where the products are well defined, MBO techniques are easily installed and applied. Education, it must be cautioned, is an open system which is further comprised of multiple sets of sub-systems with few of these being controllable or totally manageable.

The acceptance of MBO as an operational model within educational departments would be consistent with Performance Based Teacher Education (PBTE). But, to implement a total MBO system would, in this writer's opinion, reduce the creative potential of that handful of prime movers who can be found in dynamic and prestigious universities. Also, education must surely heed the advice of Raymond C. Callahan (1962), who warned in his classic work that the goals of business and the goals of education are really quite different. And yet, can there be any disagreement with success?
Regardless of the type of program changes which are anticipated, the selection of goals and objectives becomes the single most important and critical element of the planning process. How can persons who hold diverse viewpoints present their positions in a rational method, but at the same time reduce the impact of personal power or status? This can be a perplexing problem in planning. Although universities tend to pride themselves as being the epitome of democratic institutions, it is rather apparent that the decision-making structure on university campuses follows a bureaucratic or hierarchial pattern. Although the faculty tend to consider themselves as being "equal" there are in fact, those who are "more equal." For example, in most institutions, the faculty only make "recommendations" to their administrators. It is the administrator who makes the decision. However, administrators have long known that it is to the benefit of the organization to have inputs and ideas from faculty which are congruent with organizational (administration) goals and objectives. Several planning techniques will be discussed below which may be of value to those organizations desirous of alternate planning strategies.

Delphi Technique

To accomplish the task of obtaining inputs, The Delphi Technique appears to be practical and can be employed in the planning processes to identify problem areas and to prioritize goals. As has been amply developed previously, decision making and planning must be systematic if they are to be effective, efficient and worthwhile. One of the problems in making decisions is to forecast or predict what the future might hold. Or, it may be prudent to establish priorities for goals which have already been identified through a needs assessment or opinionnaire. To this end the "Delphi Technique" allows a methodology for organizing and prioritizing the judgment of either experts or those who will be concerned with the planning and implementing of change.

The Delphi Technique was originally developed or at least popularized by the RAND Corporation, (Helmer). The Delphi Technique is justified primarily on the rationale that it allows for professional judgments to be made but without allowing status or high position persons from forcing judgments in the directions which they deem desirable. The Delphi method is an attempt to identify organizational consensus. The following is quoted from John Pfeiffer, New Look at Education.

Research on the consensus problem was conducted in the early 1950's at the RAND Corporation. Olaf Helmer and his colleagues developed a special way of obtaining group opinions about certain urgent defense problems, and christened it the "Delphi" method in honor of the oracle of Apollo. An unclassified version of this method was published about five years ago, and has stimulated a good deal of research since then. It is
intended to avoid personality pressures and related complica-
tions and to get an expert opinion without bringing the experts
together face-to-face. They are consulted individually, as a
rule by questionnaire.

There are a number of variations on the Delphi theme,
but the general idea is to prepare successive rounds of
questions designed to elicit progressively more carefully
considered group opinions. The procedure, which involves some
rather sophisticated ways of arranging and presenting infor-
mation, may take a form such as the following:

1. The first questionnaire may call for a list of opinions
involving experienced judgment, say a list of predictions or
recommended activities.

2. On the second round each expert receives a copy of
the list, and is asked to rate or evaluate each item by some
such criterion as importance, probability of success, and so on.

3. The third questionnaire includes the list and the
ratings, indicates the consensus if any, and in effect asks the
experts either to revise their opinions or else to specify
their reasons for remaining outside the consensus.

4. The fourth questionnaire includes list, ratings, the
consensus, and minority opinions. It provides a final chance
for the revision of opinions.

The procedure generally succeeds in its objective of
encouraging convergence of opinion, or at least a majority
opinion and a clearly defended minority opinion (1968, pp.152-
153).

The use of the Delphi Technique is easily extended to include those
aspects of teacher education programs which are familiar to participants.
A series of events might be rated as to their desirability or probability
of occurring. In addition, all respondents are encouraged to provide
statements about what impact the events might bring if they do occur. For
example, the Delphi Technique could be utilized most effectively in first
identifying whether a faculty desires to move toward the competency-based
method of teacher education or not. One of the very difficult problems
is, of course, the formulation of educational policies and plans that will
allow for alternative future options in teacher education. A series of
preference statements could be identified by a team of writers or task
force and distributed to the faculty of education for their response. In
such a manner, consensus could easily be identified or could be identified
on those items which have higher and lower consensus or agreement. In
one sense, the Delphi Technique is not a scientific technique, but
rather an intuitive method by which all members of an organization have
an effect in shaping organizational goals and policies.
One example. The Delphi Technique was utilized in 1971 by the Washington State University, Department of Education, Advisory Committee to rank-order departmental priorities. After three rounds of printed questionnaires, the number one ranked item which emerged was a need to "re-examine the assumed priorities, goals and objectives of the Department of Education in light of current, economic and social trends of manpower needs." Interestingly enough, this particular item has been validated at least twice since the 1971 Delphi Technique through other departmental assessments.


It should also be noted that the "Suggested Goals for Washington Common Schools," published September, 1971, by the Washington State Board of Education were accomplished by use of the Delphi Technique. During the Spring of 1971, a wide geographic and occupational cross-section of Washington citizens was identified to participate in a three-phase Delphi survey. The sample survey was comprised of urban, suburban, and rural area persons and included teachers, administrators, students, business, labor and professionals, members of higher education and staff members of the Office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSSPI).

These respondents were first asked to prognosticate to the decade of the 1970's and to share their thinking and feelings about what students ought to know, feel and be able to do as a result of their K-12 school experiences. As responses were gathered, consensus opinions and dissenting opinions were studied carefully and ultimately used to develop Washington's "Ten Goals for The Common Schools!". Of interest, the minority opinions which were obtained in this manner numbered 67 with accompanying sub-groups and were published as a statement of the OSSPI entitled, "Delphi Survey Minority Opinion Report," July 10, 1971. Thus, the Delphi Technique has been utilized to identify both majority and minority consensus positions.

Problems with the Delphi technique. The Delphi technique can be used most effectively when there might be predictable but conflicting opinions or attitudes. It could be assumed that the Delphi technique would readily identify problem areas with great ease. However, in 1971 when Dr. Toshio Akamine of The Department of Education at Washington State University began to note the frequency distributions of faculty responses on 14 items which were distributed in a faculty questionnaire, the method by which the ranking was accomplished would in fact change some of the ranking orders. For example, if a ranking order of one equaled first place, two equaled second place, three equaled third place, four equaled fourth place, and so on, in descending order, then an average of the individual rankings per item would reveal the overall total average. In other words, the item that would be ranked the most important priority or whatever, ought to have the lowest numerical ranking. As it happened with the
Department of Education at Washington State University, the highest ranked item (establishment of department priorities) was obviously the number one response. Clearly, this meant that if one used a total weighted average, or a median ranking, or a frequency of rank as number one, or a frequency of a weighted or unweighted ranking of first and second, or the frequency of weighted or unweighted frequency as first, second or third place choice, the top ranked item remained the number one priority for the Department of Education. Further when the items were placed on histograms this particular item had the greatest frequency of number one responses. But, at that point all other items showed a gradual shift in rank order depending on the method used to calculate the weighted ranking. See Figure 4 for an example of the top ten items.

What this means is that there is a high probability that those items which have the highest priority and perhaps the lowest priority may be easily identified. In the 1971 Washington State University Delphi survey, it was discovered that the top rated item did not change its position even though seven different ranking methods were used. However, that was the only item that had such stability. All other items moved either upward or downward in priority depending on the type of statistical method being used. For example, if total weighted rankings were used, the top eight priorities would have been ranked as following (where the letter represents the item): B-G-D-E-H-C-A-F. If, however, the ranking was to have been accomplished by the frequency by which the item was ranked number one then the ranking was as follows from highest to lowest: B-E-D-G-H-C-A-F. Table I shows the movement of the various rankings, using letters to represent each of the priority items, to demonstrate a subjective characteristic of using the Delphi technique when attempting to quantify responses. This is not to be construed that the Delphi technique is not a powerful tool. This is merely to point out that there is a problem in ranking the items when one attempts to quantify them and reduce bias.

A second major concern and problem which appears when using the Delphi technique is that the manner in which the statements are written will affect their outcome priority ranking. Value-laden terms will cause a shifting in rank upward or downward. It becomes extremely crucial that statements be either value-free, or reflect precise points. This is not to state that value-laden items ought not be included. But if included, value-laden items may cause a biased set of responses.

Accompanying the problem noted above is that of stating or developing an initial set of items. To begin with, all faculty members have some "intuitive" or "felt" concerns. It may be well to begin with these concerns. Or it may be better to begin with an open-ended type of response item where all faculty members are asked to list or identify what that faculty member considers to be the two or three major problems associated with the teacher education program. These lists would then be sent to a task force or editing committee for compilation. However, if the lists are very lengthy then additional editing, classifying and
Figure 4
Histograms Showing Frequency Distributions of Faculty Responses to Top 10 of 14 Items in the Faculty Questionnaire, Department of Education, November 11, 1971
n=28 (68% return). Circled number indicates the median weight with number 1 being top priority.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking By</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total-Weighted Mean</td>
<td>B - G - D ← E - H - C - A - F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Ranking</td>
<td>B - E - G - D - F - H - C ← A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Rank No. 1</td>
<td>B - E - D - G ← H - C ← A ← F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of 1 + 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted b</td>
<td>B - G ← D ← C ← H ← A - E - F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted</td>
<td>B - D - G - E ← H ← C - A - F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of 1 + 2 + 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted</td>
<td>B - G - H - D - C - A - E ← F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted</td>
<td>B - G - D - H - A - C - E - F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(*\rightarrow\) Tie

*a* Each Letter, i.e., A ... H represents the item.

*b* Unweighted means were the simple adding of the place values for first and second place. The weighted computation means that first place was given a greater weighting factor than any other place.
grouping must take place so that a meaningful response pattern can be generated when the first questionnaire is distributed to the members of the faculty.

One last caution--the lists which may be generated by a group may be very biased from the inception. This means that what ought to "really" take place might not even be listed by the respondents. If a major policy determination is to be accomplished via the Delphi Technique, it may be prudent to retain an outside consultant to analyze each of the statements for their implied meanings, as well as to identify statements or priorities that were not explicitly identified. This would be an adaptation of Michael Scriven's (1972) "Goal Free Evaluation" technique. Too, a great deal of subjectivity enters into the editing of initial or added statements.

As minority opinions are appended to the basic questionnaire, the chances of their moving up to top priorities are highly improbable if only three distributions of the questionnaire are made. If one uses the Delphi technique, and does desire to have the minority opinions appended and have an opportunity for prioritizing, then a minimum of four questionnaires must be distributed. This assumes that the distribution of the first questionnaire would lead to the second questionnaire on which the minority items are included. The third questionnaire would allow respondents to rank the minority items and the fourth questionnaire would require further ranking and evaluating by respondents.

The Delphi technique will probably require at least one month or longer to accomplish depending on the size of the faculty and the complexity of questionnaire responses. The important consideration is that the faculty has an opportunity to identify those issues or problems which they perceive as important. Further, it allows administrators to add their input since they too are concerned with the problems which will occur as changes in programs take place. Administrators may desire to send out their own Delphi questionnaire to identify administrative priorities.

As a planning technique, the Delphi method should prove to be invaluable as institutions begin to probe the values of competency-based teacher education programs or any other changes toward which departments of education will move. A basic assumption of this writer is that there will be a pluralistic set of teacher-education programs developed in the departments of education in the United States of America--not a monolithic one. By using a planning technique such as the Delphi method, administrators, faculty members and others involved in professional teacher education may provide systematic inputs for decision making. Of course, it is the action that follows the plans that is important. Michaelangelo understood this when he created his "David." The essence of good planning is to act on that which is desired. The next sections describe some other techniques for planning the action.
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Advocate Teams

The use of Advocate Teams has been proposed by Diane L. Reinhard as a means of designing methodologies which concern input evaluation strategies (1972). Although Reinhard’s use of advocate teams is specifically designed to solve evaluation problems, there appears to be a high degree of applicability for advocate team use when serious planning processes are about to commence. The advocate team strategy is a means by which convergence of action is assured. The advocate team strategy could be used in planning when it is desirous to achieve a method which must be acceptable to an entire group: that is, the group would hold homogenous viewpoints. An advocate team would be selected with the objectives that team members would prepare a written statement expressing those views on planning means and ends. The advocate team might not initially evaluate the planning concepts but would propose and explain them in great detail.

The advocate team is selected from group members who have viewpoints known to the person who appoints the team. Typically an advocate team is comprised of from four to six persons. They will be asked to describe tasks, criteria and other essential information that will be used in planning procedures. In short, they will be given a set of specifications which describe what is expected of the team. Usually an advocate team will propose some selected strategy to accomplish the given set of objectives. In establishing advocate teams an appropriate procedure is to choose the team chairperson first. The team chairperson should then have veto power over the selection of other team members regardless of how they are selected. This allows for the team chairperson to identify those with similar viewpoints and who will remain on task.

The relevance to teacher education programs would be that in-house teams could be used for planning since these same individuals may have to implement the plans. However, it should be noted that if advocate teams are comprised totally of insiders it may allow for a rather homogenous or a "locked in" approach to the plan. This means that internal adversaries may emerge and limit the advocate team from accomplishing its stated objectives. This can be anticipated by the use of a second technique which is defined by Reinhard as the "advocate-adversary team," discussed below.

Advocate-Adversary Team Approach for Planning

It can be validly assumed that not all education department personnel or faculty will be committed to any specific change at any one time. All too frequently the advocates of a proposed change are as biased as those who oppose them. One method by which to examine data or proposed changes from two different viewpoints is to appoint an "advocate-adversary team." In this particular model all statements or objectives are prepared, written and examined by two specific teams: (1) the advocates, and (2) the adversaries. Viewpoints are prepared in writing so that the two groups may
apply different criteria as well as establishing their own biases and viewpoints when cross-examining the advocate position. This particular system would aid in the development of competing viewpoints and in identifying unanticipated problems which the adversaries observe. In essence this is a role playing technique which can develop into a very powerful method to identify weaknesses in any specific set of plans. Robert Stake used such an adversary statement in evaluating a gifted student project (1971). The adversary developed both favorable and unfavorable comments about the project.

The adversary statement may tend to allow for a type of epistemological weighting--that is, hard data presented by the advocates might receive more weighting than "soft data," such as intuition, feelings or opinions. The objectives that would be evaluated by both the advocate team and the adversary team would be prepared prior to organizing either team. Both the advocates and the adversaries must be allowed the opportunity to evaluate the polar positions in writing. In this sense, obstructionism can be countered by logic or empirically supported statements.

In most cases the technical adequacy of the planning must be evaluated; that is, do the planners have adequate knowledge of what they are attempting. By using "process" evaluation such as the advocate-adversary team, a systematic feedback takes place which reduces the risk of haphazardly establishing the plans. In short, use of the advocate-adversary team approach allows for strong minority statements which in the last analysis will aid an entire department of education as it seeks change.

An advocate-adversary mechanism could have saved the State of Washington much confusion in the apparently premature acceptance of its 1971 standards for teacher preparation. Between 1967 and 1971 the Washington State Office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction obtained statements from various individuals about changes in teacher certification programs. But in no case did advocates and adversaries ever openly analyze each other's statements. As a consequence, although the 1971 standards were formally adopted by the State Board of Education, there has not been the adequate funding by the Legislature which is required to implement the standards, nor have the respective boards of regents of the six state universities and colleges formally accepted the basic tenets of the 1971 standards. The State of Washington, may be praised as being on the cutting edge of teacher certification but finds itself embroiled in an internal struggle. Those who oppose the 1971 standards can now play the obstructionist role while those who support the standards are confronted with programs which are extremely costly and do not have financial resources to support them. Ultimately this dilemma will approach the crisis state in Washington and it might be predicted that an advocate-adversary conference will be commissioned to define a workable, fiscally responsible, and manageable system for the certification of teachers.
Team Planning

It can be also validly assumed that all teacher education programs are comprised of heterogeneous units, committees or departments. Thus, the planning processes for changes in teacher education programs must allow for team building within related sub-units or committees. For example, at Washington State University the Department of Education is sub-divided into five area committees: administration and higher education; curriculum and learning resources; educational psychology, counseling and evaluation; elementary education; and vocational-technical education. Faculty members from all five area committees share some responsibility for the undergraduate teacher education program. Any anticipated changes with the total program has concomitant effects on all area committees. To coordinate the individual committees, a series of Department of Education standing committees function to aid in intradepartmental communication.

To change the teacher education program in any significant manner, there must be provision made to promote team planning for specific components of the teacher education program. Such planning means that time allowances and commitments to change in some pre-planned and desired direction must be made.

Case Studies of Forward Planning

During the 1972-73 academic year, members of the College of Education at the University of Minnesota began a management systems study with an ultimate goal to develop a more flexible and responsive organization. It was apparent that the departmental and committee model did not allow faculty to work in "nontraditional structures and roles." Departments, for example, are traditionally oriented to their respective disciplinary considerations and roles. These, in turn, restrict creative or novel organizational patterns since faculty members identify themselves with the departmental "press."

To commence with planning for the reorganization models, two sets of planning groups were convened: one from the university, the second from outside the institution. From these planning groups emerged a tentative model which redistributed faculty resources from traditional departmental roles and identities toward more "programatic" ones. The finalized plans called for the conversion of nine departments to six different programs. Each program will have its own set of administrators, faculty, and students. Since budget should follow program, a simulated set of budget documents were prepared so some organizational autonomy could be maintained. Simulated budget planning was accomplished to determine the feasibility of significant program changes but still meeting obvious fiscal restraints. A field test of this organization plan is anticipated in 1973 or 1974.

In 1971 the University of Massachusetts undertook even a more dramatic approach to restructure the School of Education. Basically, all departments in the School of Education were collapsed. In their place emerged a series
of alternative and competing teacher preparation programs. A total of 24 different programs were offered to prospective teachers. These programs ranged from traditional approaches, urban and rural field centered programs, to international educational experiences.

Each program is administered by a director, who may be either a faculty member or a graduate student. It should be noted that all graduate students have the right to vote on educational concerns. This is more striking when one considers that the graduate student block has approximately a ten to one ratio over the faculty block.

No program can claim to be permanent, since the existence of all programs is contingent on recruiting a critical number of teacher trainees. In a sense, this method truly represents a "temporary systems approach" to teacher education.

Although Minnesota and Massachusetts represent two very diverse cases, they do point to the one key essential--planning. The former represents the concept of longitudinal planning for change, the latter a master plan which incorporates the concept of continual planning for change--perhaps a real case of a Future Shock oriented plan.

In Sum

The purpose of this paper was to identify selected components which seem essential for planning in institutions which are democratically administered. Since it is inconsistent with the philosophy of democratic institutions, an obvious omission of authoritarian-ordered change was made by the writer. Quite appropriately, MBO systems in such an environment must be greatly modified to meet at least three philosophic concepts which have been traditionally accepted in higher education. These are: (1) the notion of individual competence, (2) academic freedom, and (3) departmental autonomy. Also omitted is a discussion of group dynamic or behaviorally-oriented "T" group techniques for planning. This omission is done only to conserve space, not to ignore these powerful methods. The essence of planning is to guide future changes. Well developed plans are the first steps toward field testing, implementation or diffusion of meaningful innovations.

Teacher education is usually one function of a state university. It is not, in most cases, the most important one. Such a status for teacher preparation programs can be interpreted to mean that faculty in other disciplines will have to be convinced that they too must change their structure. This has almost always proven to be a most formidable challenge.

The writer wishes to acknowledge the aid of Dr. C. James Quann, Registrar at Washington State University, in preparing the section about PERT analysis.
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Evaluation of teacher education programs has traditionally relied on external evaluators such as accreditation teams or ad hoc visitation teams who are invited to examine the totality of a teacher education program. The reports of those teams are, by and large, meaningless as devices on which to focus for the improvement of teacher education programs. The reasons for making this sweeping indictment are: (1) the accreditation reports address themselves to generalities, (2) the criteria by which programs are judged tend to be very general, (3) the intermittent characteristic of such reports means that at least five or ten years will transpire before there is concerted preparation for the follow-up visitation, (4) meaningful baseline data are not accumulated nor are they maintained on a year-by-year basis, (5) the faculty seldom pays serious attention to a report unless it is so grossly negative that it would threaten accreditation, and (6) the feedback is seldom directed to specific components of the program.

To alleviate the shortcomings of non-systematic longitudinal evaluations an evaluation model has been designed which may reconcile the shortcomings listed above. More precisely, the model which we propose is more properly defined as a "context evaluation model." Both products and processes which are being utilized in specific components of the teacher education program are being judged against a set of predetermined criteria. Any concept or practice is first identified, e.g., "micro-teaching." The concept of micro-teaching can then be explicitly described with a set of variables which pertain directly to that general concept. A distinctive set of evaluative criteria can then be established along some continuum. Each set of evaluative criteria would be applicable to the concept in general, but would be specific to each separately identified variable. See Figure 5.
The general construction of the Micro-Grid is contingent on three components: (1) A concept or practice which is to be assessed, evaluated or judged; (2) A series of selected variables or key descriptions pertaining to the concept; and (3) A discrete series of evaluative criteria which form a logical gradation or continuum, one of which will be selected as the best fit for the current or anticipated condition within a particular teacher preparation institution.

For example, the variable $V_1$ would be judged by the row of evaluative criteria identified as $EC_1$, $EC_2$, $EC_3$, and $EC_4$. A person evaluating a particular institution would select the evaluative criterion that would best describe the variable as it appears within that institution's educational program.

After completing an entire Micro-Grid the selected criteria could be connected by a line, thus, providing a general profile for the particular concept. See Figure 6.

"Concept"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (V)</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$V_1$</td>
<td>$EC_1$, $EC_2$, $EC_3$, $EC_4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_2$</td>
<td>$EC_5$, $EC_6$, $EC_7$, $EC_8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_3$</td>
<td>$EC_9$, $EC_{10}$, $EC_{11}$, $EC_{12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_4$</td>
<td>$EC_{13}$, $EC_{14}$, $EC_{15}$, $EC_{16}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. General Model for Construction of Evaluative Micro-Grid

Figure 6. Construction of a Micro-Grid Profile
The placement of evaluative criteria should be accomplished with the most complex criterion to the far left and the least complex criterion to the far right. Using this construction there would be a uniform plotting technique. Who decides what is "complex" is subject to differing opinions. Yet, those items which tend to be intrinsically coincidental with the concept should be judged as most appropriate. For example, with the variable of Quality of Feedback Information under the concept of Individual Feedback, "feedback with suggestions for alternate routes to meet criterion performance" is considered more complex than either "feedback with errors identified" or "feedback with no suggestions or critique." Thus, placement on the grid would be subjective, yet, logically screened. See Figure 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Feedback</td>
<td>Feedback with Suggestions for Alternative Routes to Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Feedback with Errors Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback with No Suggestions or Critique (i.e., Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7. Placement of Evaluative Criteria**

By examining and identifying one evaluative item in each row with a check mark, the variable which is explicitly described can then be judged. By connecting each point on the micro-grid a total profile can be established for that particular concept. As a specific program is initially evaluated, baseline data would be available by which to compare any program changes. Specific program changes would be evidenced by observing a shift in the profile. The evaluative criteria can be altered or modified to accommodate any judgmental component that evaluators desire. The value of evaluative micro-grids is due in large part to this quality of adaptability to meet specific institutional needs. The use of such a grid allows easy analysis and comparison between and among courses or programs which are established within an institution. Further, the use of the evaluation grid model would allow for the assessment of a commonality of concepts among various programs and institutions.

Utilizing micro-grid analysis. Who would be responsible for preparing or using micro-grids within any department of education? This question could be answered with another question: "How much information is desired about the program?" If it appears that selected micro-grids are applicable for every course, module or program component within the teacher education program, then it would be advisable to have all instructors who coordinate the respective teaching-learning elements or components prepare a grid so that they too could establish their own sets of baseline data. It is the intent of the developers of the micro-grid to stimulate discussion between
and among faculty members concerning the goals of their programs, the means of evaluation, and the criteria by which to evaluate concepts.

It should be clarified that the evaluative criteria which are utilized have been synthesized from a review of literature concerning teacher education programs. The developers of the evaluative criteria tried to identify relevant, logical and appropriate variables from a review of the literature on teacher education. To be certain, not every novel, innovative or experimental practice has been included in the evaluative criteria. The choice of concepts for analysis was done on a selective basis with the hope of presenting a representative sampling. Researchers utilizing the micro-grid system for program evaluation are urged to formulate their own concepts and variables to coincide with their respective program priorities. The intent of this system is to provide more meaningful and specific data concerning the conduct of specified components of teacher education programs so that changes may be made with utilization of clearly defined objectives, and with a clear notion of the direction that change should take.

If specific instructors or those who are responsible for specific program components desire to make changes in programs, modules, or courses, then it is most desirous to identify in advance the direction toward which the concept is moving. Since directional "change" appears to be paramount in teacher education programs, rather than change per se, the use of a micro-grid evaluation system will help to identify where programs have been, where they are, and where they should be going.

Analysis of micro-grid systems. It should be apparent that the micro-grid system of evaluation is totally contingent on the identified variables and evaluative criteria. To be sure, both are arbitrarily identified and forced to fit an evaluation model. Yet, this argument is the crux of any evaluation system. The theoretical basis of evaluation is "a-experimental," a term described by Egon C. Guba, (1965). Guba has long advocated a shift away from experimental design to "a-experimental" when studying program dissemination and evaluation. Guba outlined the differences between experimental and a-experimental design as primarily differences of intent. The experimental investigator inquires into what might happen--into possibilities associated with intervening variables, while investigators using a-experimental design inquire into what has happened--into actualities. The latter is a major tenet of evaluation per se. The advantage of a-experimental method is that it is context-free, i.e., variables and data can be explored whenever and wherever they occur. The number of variables in a-experimental studies are unlimited, whereas in experimental design they must be strictly controlled. It is obvious that in changing educational programs control of variables is almost impossible if not impractical and absurd. However, this lack of control of variables does not in any way alter the importance of systematic data collection in relation to these variables.

The importance of descriptive data collection has been emphasized by Stake (1967). Evaluation of educational programs was described as being expository in nature, aimed at acquainting the audience with the characteristics of an educational program. Stake considered program evaluation to
be composed of two main kinds of data: objective descriptions and value-laden judgments. The importance of the first of these cannot be underestimated. The validity of the value judgment is dependent in large part on the accuracy of the information used to make these judgments. In addition, objective data collection also affords a basis for decision making, and a means to plan for implementation of value judgments.

John K. Hemphill (1969) established a series of characteristics which describe the process of evaluation. Hemphill listed six criteria which pertained to evaluation. (1) The problem is determined by the situation and because of its complexity may involve many definers. (2) The task of evaluation is to test generalizations rather than specific hypotheses. The absence of verifiable and empirical knowledge must often be filled by relying on judgment and experience. (3) Value judgments are appropriate at all stages of an evaluation study. (4) Each evaluation study is unique to a situation and can seldom be replicated. (5) Data collection is determined by feasibility and by value judgment. (6) Randomization is extremely difficult or impractical to accomplish and only superficial control of the multitude of variables is possible. Characteristics of these criteria is a pragmatic view of evaluation based upon consideration of specific situational goals and conditions.

It would appear that the evaluative criteria and the micro-grid system meet the criteria for evaluation described by Guba, Stake, and Hemphill. Further, the gathering of selected and prespecified information about the characteristics of educational programs will help to improve the decisions about the direction of change and the management of the desired programs. It appears that there is a strong theoretical position which may be developed to justify a rationale for the use of micro-grid systems evaluation.

Field Testing of the Micro-Grid Model

The micro-grids were field tested by utilizing them to describe existing programs at six cooperating universities of the Seven Year Study. These were: New Mexico State University, South Dakota State University, University of Georgia, University of Massachusetts and Washington State University. Representatives from these institutions, working with the developers of the micro-grid system, attempted to utilize the micro-grids to describe the teacher preparation program at their institutions. It was assumed that this procedure would yield not only a complete description of activities at the respective institutions, but would also serve as the first field test of the micro-grid systems. In the course of the field-test, the following observations were made.

1. The utility of the micro-grids in their present state as an international descriptive tool was questioned. Categories and variables appeared to focus on practice and content rather than form. Representatives from the above institutions recognized the usefulness of the micro-grid format but stressed the need for adaptation to each institution's program priorities.
2. Some difficulty was encountered in interpreting terms used in the micro-grids. The need for lengthier and more precise definitions was recognized. The possibility of operationalized definitions was raised. A glossary of terms was suggested as a possible useful addition to the micro-grids. The difficulties encountered in the process of accurately defining terms was viewed as potentially useful in the clarification of institutional goals and priorities.

3. It was suggested that the micro-grids be designed to describe specific parts of an institutional program rather than the total curriculum. Different goals and divergent paths to those goals appeared to negate the utility of prescribed variables and criteria.

4. The accuracy of describing the evaluative criteria continuum as proceeding from "least to most complex" was questioned. In some instances (cf., Table 9, Variable No. 1) a more accurate description of the evaluative criteria would be "simple to complex." It was pointed out that many of the continua had characteristics of a developmental sequence in which positions at the right were prerequisite to those at the left but not necessarily less complex. Using an example from Table 9, a sequence of activities in which the student teacher was gradually phased into a more active role in the instructional process was viewed as a desirable state of affairs. It was suggested that the variables be designed with complexity of the variable as a guide to placement rather than a value dichotomy such as good or bad.

5. A number of potential uses for the micro-grid system were discussed. A brief description of these uses follow.
   a. The micro-grids were observed as a useful conceptual tool in the planning process. Each table could be used to identify a major area for planning. Variables within the major areas could be used to focus on specific areas of concern. Areas to the right of the micro-grid continuum could represent the initial state of an institution which was planning program changes. Areas to the left of the micro-grid could represent goals or objectives to be reached. Progress toward the attainment of these goals could be indicated by the movement of the profile in the desired direction.
   b. In a similar respect the micro-grids could be used to describe and evaluate existing programs. The emphasis on descriptive detail and the hierarchical format of the evaluative continua both lend themselves to the goals of program evaluation.
   c. Representatives from the institutions involved in the field testing of the micro-grid system also viewed the micro-grids as a basis to accurately compare different programs. Specifically defined variables were noted as one method to standardize comparison processes.

6. Since the form was considered to have more utility than the specific content of the micro-grids, reactions from the field test of the micro-grid system lead to the following short description of the process utilized in selecting major areas of concern and variables within those areas.
Determination of the content for the micro-grids was accomplished by three processes. First, institutional goals were examined, and from these goals specific areas of concern were formulated. Areas of concern noted on the micro-grids then reflected the anticipated means of achieving these goals. To give an example, one of the areas of concern for the teacher education program at Washington State University was the need for in-depth school experiences integrated with the goals of preservice teacher preparation. Out of this identified need were generated several long range goals for the student teaching segment of the preservice program. One goal was to have the student teaching experiences articulate with the educational experiences within the institution (cf., Table 9, Variable No. 2). Identified were a realistic number of steps or points along the path toward the goal. These became the check points of the evaluative continuum. Progress toward achievement of program goals would then correspond to movement along the micro-grid continuum. A second method of determining the content of the micro-grids was an intensive review of the literature in the area of innovative and common practices in teacher education. This was done to supplement the areas identified in the first process and to insure against any "blind spots" in the area of identifying institutional goals. This second process also served to prevent a regional or local approach to teacher education processes. A third method used to determine content in the micro-grids was to examine current educational practices within the institution. This provided a basis from which to extrapolate to other related procedures. Examining current practices within an institution would, in some instances, suggest direction for change and areas of improvements.

None of these three processes alone were considered to be an adequate source to construct a micro-grid system. However, the collective utilization of the three methods appeared to provide a basis to insure a comprehensive micro-grid system. Further, as the grids were developed many discussions led to a lack of consensus about several variables. We suggest that institutions desirous of using or developing micro-grids establish a panel of judges to adjudicate all items. Where consensus is apparent the item could be considered as adequate or validated. In cases where there is no clear consensus, the item could be rewritten or defined operationally so that ultimately the judging panel could concur.

It is the intent of the developers of the micro-grid system to provide a methodology that will be continually revised but simultaneously be applicable to an ongoing program. Attached herewith are several tables which are called prototype micro-grids. The micro-grids will probably need great revision, modification and amendment. The concept of Micro-Grid evaluation is more properly defined as a "Formative" system of evaluation. The prime concern is to provide meaningful, systematic and accurate feedback while programs are being developed or field-tested. The Micro-Grid model seems to be compatible with any teacher education system currently in use or being planned and should provide the means by which to implement continuous evaluation with a minimum of effort, but with a maximization of feedback.
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### Table 5 (Continued)

**Micro-Grid for Inservice Preparation of Professors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Professional (Sabbatical) Leave Provision</strong></td>
<td>Institution has Professional Leave Provision for &quot;Renewal&quot; with Full Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Faculty Support</strong></td>
<td>Faculty Initiative in Instituting Inservice Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Criterion Reference</td>
<td>Evaluation Based on Percentage of Students Mastering Defined Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systematic Evaluation Not Based on Behavioral Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjective Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Process-Responsive</td>
<td>Periodic Evaluation from Students, Faculty and Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre and Post-test Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Attempt to Evaluate On-going Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Product</td>
<td>Evaluation Based on Behavior Change and Mastery of Cognitive Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Based on Behavior Change Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Based on Mastery of Cognitive Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subjects for Comparative</td>
<td>Pupil Gains in Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Students in College Teacher Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher or Professor Testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Type of Evaluation</td>
<td>Systematic Evaluation of Mastery of Competencies as Previously Defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systematic Evaluation Based on Behavioral Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjective Evaluation Based on Opinion Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Who Evaluates</td>
<td>Faculty, Staff, and Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students Only (Ad Hoc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7
**MICRO-GRID FOR PROGRAM INITIATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Sequence Starts with Entry (i.e., Freshmen Class)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Sequence Designed to Accommodate Different Past Experiences of Different Groups</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Faculty Systematically Integrated with New Programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty Randomly Integrated into New Programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Faculty Immersed in New Programs at One Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Program Evaluation Prior to Phase-in</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase-in Based on Success of Other Schools or Through Experimental Determination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase-in Based on Other Institution's Success with Similar Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase-in Based Only on Subjective Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Provision for Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design with Control and Experimental Components, Including Process and Product</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Inclusion Based on Product or Process Studies Only</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-systematic Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Planning of Phase-in</strong></td>
<td><strong>Includes Faculty, Students, and Administration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Includes Faculty and Administration Only</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Includes Administration Only</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Educational Opportunity</strong></td>
<td>Easy Accessability to Educationally Related Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Seminar Content</strong></td>
<td>Determined by Consortium of Student Teachers, Master Teachers and Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Human Relations Training</strong></td>
<td>Optional as Part of Student Teaching Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Community Resources Orientation (i.e., Special Education Facilities, Other Schools, Social Service Agencies, Juvenile Courts, Support Services, Community Action Committee)</strong></td>
<td>Student Teachers Visit Community Resources and Discuss the Facilities with Agency Representatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9
MICRO-GRID FOR INDIVIDUAL CLINICAL EXPERIENCE (STUDENT TEACHING)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Participation</td>
<td>Emphasis on Student Teacher Autonomy and Decision Making Skills</td>
<td>Teaching with Master Teacher's (M.T.) Lesson and M.T.'s Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Variety of Teaching Situation</td>
<td>Opportunity to Work with a Variety of Teaching Styles and within a Variety of Situations</td>
<td>Opportunity to Observe a Variety of Teaching Styles While Limited to Working with One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Domain(s) Included in Teaching</td>
<td>Integrates Affective and Cognitive Domains</td>
<td>Focuses on Affective or Higher Levels of Cognitive Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Competency Level</td>
<td>All Required Competencies to be Met Are Specified</td>
<td>Minimal Competencies Specified and Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Selection of M.T./S.</td>
<td>Selective Choice of M.T./S. Based upon Demonstrated Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of M.T./S. Based on Evaluative Rating Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited Criterion for Choice of M.T./S. (Years of Experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiscriminate Choice of M.T./S. (No Criteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Availability of University Supervision</td>
<td>Supervisor Available Most Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled and Systematic Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aperiodic Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crisis Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Length of Time</td>
<td>Full Time for School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time One Semester or Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-half Time for Semester or Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than One-half Time for a Semester or Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exploration Possibilities</td>
<td>Emphasis on Intern Autonomy and Decision Making Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines Provided but Limited Autonomy Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rigid Structure Not Allowing Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Articulation with Educational Program</td>
<td>Objectives of Teacher Preparation Program Formally Integrated into Intern Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial Attempts at Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Attempt Made to Integrate Goals and Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reinforcement of Education Program</td>
<td>Reinforcement of Teacher Preparation Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of Educational Learning Possible, Although Not Reinforced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to Integrate Educational Learning, Negatively Reinforced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Domains Included in Internship</td>
<td>Integrates Affective and Cognitive Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focuses on Affective or Higher Levels of Cognitive Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasizes Lower Levels of Cognitive Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Competency Level</td>
<td>Required Competencies to be Met Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected and Desirable Competencies Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Required Competencies Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Availability of Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision Available at All Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate Amounts of Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor Selection</td>
<td>Supervisor Selected Because of Demonstrated Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection Based on Evaluative Rating Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criterion for Selection Is Typically Years of Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Salary of Intern</td>
<td>Full Salary Commensurate with Duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial or Reduced Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Setting</td>
<td>School and Non-School Social Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table II
### Micro-Grid for Preservice Observation Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluable Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Locus</strong></td>
<td>Observation in Many Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Spectrum of Participation Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>Opportunity to Work within a Variety of Situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Observational Skills Emphasized (Competencies to be Met, e.g., Flanders Interaction Analysis, VJCS, Bayles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Articulation with University Preservice Program</strong></td>
<td>Objectives of Undergraduate Education Formally Integrated into Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Teaching (Learning) Being Observed</strong></td>
<td>Emphasis on Processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Observation Feedback</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated and Coordinated with Objectives of Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feedback</td>
<td><strong>Feedback Given</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extraneous to Main Thrust of Teacher Preparation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-Systematic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No Feedback on Observation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time Dimension</td>
<td><strong>Continuous with Preservice Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Limited and Discrete Observations for Each Course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Observations Tossed within Confines of Single Course, Optional Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unsystematic and Non-Sequential Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Participation</td>
<td><strong>Required Observations Associated with Projected Teaching Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>e.g., Systematic Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Required Observations Associated without Teaching Level Specified</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Optional Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Observations Not Required or Optional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participants</td>
<td>Representatives from Students, Schools, Universities, State Professional Organizations, State Department of Education, Parents, Community Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vicinity</td>
<td>Inter-State or Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Degree of Power</td>
<td>Weighted Parity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluation</td>
<td>Systematic-- Planned in Advance for Both Formative and Summative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Research</td>
<td>Appropriate Research Planned by Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Permanent Structure (Institutionalized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Funding of Participants</td>
<td>Permanent Staff Paid Through Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Opportunity for Articulating Educa-</td>
<td>Multiple Exit-Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tional Program</td>
<td>Limited Exit-Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opportunity for Individualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preparation Opportunities</td>
<td>Provision for Preparation K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for Preparation at Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levels K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Provision for Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervision</td>
<td>Provision for University Supervision K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for University Supervision at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected Levels K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No University Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competencies Required</td>
<td>Competencies Specified for Each Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Competencies Identified - Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used Years of Experience/Hours of Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Certification</td>
<td>Career Ladder Coordinated Toward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career Concept and Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomously Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progression Not Coordinated Toward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Salary Commitment</td>
<td>Salary Schedule with Increments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Salary Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary Not Well Defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Vertical Articulation</td>
<td>Skills and Competencies at Each Level Build Upon Previous Ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequencing of Program Based Upon Some Logical Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement of Learning Experiences Based Upon Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experiential Combination</td>
<td>Planned Horizontal Articulation of Learning Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coincidental Concomitant Learnings Utilized but Not Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Experience Randomly Organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Theory and Practice</td>
<td>Theory Utilized as Explanatory Basis for Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory and Competencies Stressed but No Attempt to Integrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Either Theory or Practice Lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competencies Integrated with Field Experience</td>
<td>Field Experiences Require Use of Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Experiences Allow Competency Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient Opportunity for Student Implementation of Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Internal Consistency</td>
<td>Consistent Theoretical Basis for Program Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Design Utilizes Logical Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design of Program Based Upon Pre-established Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Certification</td>
<td>Program Competencies Match State Certification Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial Overlap Between State Certification Requirements and Program Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Certification Guidelines Not Used as Basis for Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Performance Evaluation by Criterion Measures</td>
<td>Performance Evaluated by Teacher Overt Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Evaluated by Subjective Check List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intuitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Locus</td>
<td>Children in a School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children in a University Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Vitro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Feedback without Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from Peers without Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Audio Feedback Mechanism</td>
<td>Audio Feedback with Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio Feedback without Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from Peers without Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Source of Instructional Objectives</td>
<td>Clinical Professor-Student Determined Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomous Objectives Selected on Basis of Situational Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Professor Determined Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives Specified by Curriculum Guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality of Criterion Measures</td>
<td>Higher Affective and Higher Cognitive Criterion Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Affective, Higher Cognitive Criterion Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Affective and Lower Cognitive Criterion Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Cognitive Criterion Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Selection of Materials</td>
<td>Cooperative Selection of Materials Limited Only by Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials Pre-specified by Teacher and Clinical Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Selected Materials from list Pre-specified by Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials All Pre-specified by Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instructional Techniques</td>
<td>Situationally Oriented, If: Then Premise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tendency Toward Adaptive Selectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tendency Toward Fixed Sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Set of Behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluation</td>
<td>Performance Evaluated by Criterion Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Locale</td>
<td>Children in a School Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reteach</td>
<td>Automatic Reteach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Critique</td>
<td>Instructor/Student Critique Tape Immediately After Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Utilization</td>
<td>Required in Specified Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 16 (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Percentage of Students**</td>
<td>Two-thirds or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-third to Two-thirds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than One-third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percentage of Total Instructional Program</td>
<td>Two-thirds or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-third to Two-thirds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than One-third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Materials for Study</td>
<td>Individually Prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-group Prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Method of Studying Materials</td>
<td>Individually Prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-group Prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pace of Study</td>
<td>Individually Prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-group Prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Activities</td>
<td>Individually Prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-group Prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Decision Making</td>
<td>Student Centered, Emphasis on Acquisition of Decision Making Skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jointly Decided by Student and Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teaching Function</td>
<td>Instructor Guides When Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor Presents Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor Directs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching Focus</td>
<td>Processes and Problem-Solving Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Time Structure</td>
<td>Fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


** In individualized Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Population with Whom Simulation Is Used</td>
<td>Situations Oriented Toward a Specific Target Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situations Oriented Toward Grade Specific Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situations Generalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Skills Emphasized</td>
<td>Multiple Skills (Cuing in on Potential Problems, Sensitivity) which are Individually Student Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Action with Theory in Mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Skill Development Emphasized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced Choice Response Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opportunity for Observer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of Prepackaged Media</td>
<td>Variety--Audio, Video, Audio-Tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited Use of Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Production</td>
<td>Produced at Local Level Oriented to Specific Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerically Prepared Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Specific Means Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Integration in Program</td>
<td>Utilized in Systematic Manner in Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional Use of Simulations in the Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use Dependent on Decision of Individual Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training in Usage</td>
<td>Training Requires Skill Development and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Requires Reading About Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Role Playing</td>
<td>Students Participate in Establishing Directed Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students Directed Through Role Playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students Observe Others Role Playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Goals</td>
<td>Human Relations Applied to Teacher-task Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Relations with Emphasis on General Communication-interaction Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Relations Skills Developed for Increased General Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Integration into Curriculum</td>
<td>Optional, but Coordinated into University Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional Groups Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encounter Groups or Sensitivity Training Organized in Ad Hoc Manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Objectives</td>
<td>Objectives Stated in Measurable or Observable Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives Stated in Non-Measurable Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Objectives Stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Leader</td>
<td>Professionally Prepared Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para-professional Facilitator with Appropriate Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator has Participated but Has Not Conducted a Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Composition of Group</td>
<td>Unfamiliar Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-systematic Selection of Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Setting</td>
<td>Facilities Appropriate for Attainment of Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities and Locations Fixed but Adapted to Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Special Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Voluntary with Teacher Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required for a Limited Number of Activity-alternatives, One of Which is a Human Relations Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory for All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 19 (Continued)

**MICRO-GRID FOR HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Type of Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Outcome Measured by Systematic Observations by Peers and Faculty (Concurrence of Student and Observer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Designer of Program</strong></td>
<td>Students and Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Referral to Program if Optional</strong></td>
<td>Performance Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Availability</td>
<td>Any Student May Contract for Equivalent Experiences in Lieu of Prescribed Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Few Students May Select or Contract for Equivalent Experiences in Lieu of Selected Aspects of Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Option Not Available to Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use</td>
<td>Students Select Self-Directed Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Select Students for Self-Directed Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honor Students on Self-Directed Program Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional</td>
<td>Means Are Now Available to Any Student to Initiate and Carry Out a Self-Directed Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>Means Are Now Being Planned (in Writing) to Allow Selected Students to Initiate and Carry Out a Self-Directed Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Feasible at This Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Course Options</td>
<td>All Courses or Modules Allow for Student Self-Directed Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Few Courses or Modules Allow for Student Self-Directed Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Self-Directed Options Not Available in Any Course or Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty Support</td>
<td>There is Recorded Faculty Support for Student Self-Directed Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Faculty Have Not Recorded Support for Student Self-Directed Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Faculty Have Recorded Opposition to Student Self-Directed Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 2**

**MICRO-GRID FOR COURSE OR MODULE COMPONENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Specification of Major Objectives</strong></td>
<td>All Courses or Modules Have Specified Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Sequencing</strong></td>
<td>All Courses, Modules or Competencies Are Sequenced According to Written Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Specifications of Learner Objectives</strong></td>
<td>All Courses, Modules or Competencies Are Specified by Learner Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Systematization</strong></td>
<td>Definite Hierarchy of Courses, Modules or Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Rationale</strong></td>
<td>All Courses, Modules or Competencies Have Written Rationales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Instructional Coordination Is Unit-wide, e.g., the Entire Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Model</td>
<td>Definite Model Followed for Construction of All Modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Modules Follow a Pre-selected Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Model Followed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use</td>
<td>All Components of Teacher Education Use Same Modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected Components in Courses Use Same Modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Few Modules Used in Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development Time</td>
<td>All Faculty Given Released Time to Develop Modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected Faculty Given Released Time to Develop Modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module Development Assigned As Part of Instructional Responsibility without Released Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Field-Testing</td>
<td>All Modules Field Tested Prior to Full Scale Use in Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected Modules Field Tested Prior to Full Scale Class Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules Developed and Used without Field Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Criterion Measures</td>
<td>All Modules Criterion Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected Modules Criterion Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Modules Criterion Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Format</td>
<td>All Modules Are Designed for Multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Modules Are Designed for Multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules Usually Print Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extent of Development</td>
<td>All Modules Self-contained with All Necessary Objectives and Learning Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Modules Are Self-contained, Others Contingent on Other Instructional Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules Present Learner Objectives and Assignment or Study List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Audio-Tutorial System</td>
<td>Used Extensively - Nearly Every Course or Module at Least More than Once Per Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Programmed Instruction</td>
<td>Materials Available and Used Commensurate with Module Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional TV</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Educational TV</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Computer Aided Instruction</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Learning Activity Packets</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Edax System</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Telecommunications</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Multi-Media Instructional Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pretests for All Modules or Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Simulation/ Games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Behavioral Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Individualization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Available and Used Commensurate with Module Objectives</td>
<td>Materials Available but Not Used Commensurate with Module Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Simulation/ Games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used for Every Module</td>
<td>Used in Selected Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used as Desirable for Objectives</td>
<td>Random Individualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Source of Input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parity Approach (Schools-Institutions, Professional Organizations, State Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parity (All Major Professional Parties Evaluate Objectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Objectives by Former Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluation Schedule</td>
<td>Continual Annual Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periodic, Non-Annual Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Validation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils Achieve Measurable Learning Superiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative Evaluation of Teachers in School Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sequencing of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequencing Through Systems Approach with Appropriate Feedback Loops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 25
**MICRO-GRID FOR EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Media Utilization</td>
<td>Students Taught and Encouraged to Utilize Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students Taught to Use Media but No Provision Made for Student Use in Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students Not Allowed to Use Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Micro-Teaching</td>
<td>Areas Flexibly Scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Scheduled Area for Micro-Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Areas for Micro-Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Work Areas (Media, Hardware)</td>
<td>Education Building Has Work Area Designated for Student Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Building Has Optional Work Areas on Call for Student Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Building Has No Space Available for Student Work Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rooms</td>
<td>Building Has Space Specifically Designated for Large Group, Small Group and Individual Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Has Space Specifically Designated for Moderate and Small Group Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Has Room of Approximate Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Telecommunication Capability</td>
<td>All Classrooms Are Instructional Areas Wired for Telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected Instructional Areas Wired for Telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Instructional Areas Wired for Telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media Center</td>
<td>Education Building Has Self-Contained Media Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University-wide Media Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Media Center on Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learning Resources Center (LRC)</td>
<td>Education Building Houses LRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several University Subdivisions Share One LRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No LRC for Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Office Space</td>
<td>All Faculty Have Private Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Faculty Have Private Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Faculty Have Private Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Graduate Space</td>
<td>All Full Time Graduate Students Have Offices or Carrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Full Time Graduate Students Have Offices or Carrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Offices or Carrels Provided for Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Individual Feedback</td>
<td>Constant Formative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative Evaluation Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time Lag</td>
<td>Immediate Feedback (Knowledge of Correct Results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of Feedback - Information</td>
<td>Feedback with Suggestions to Alternative Routes to Meet Criterion Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Availability of Instructor</td>
<td>Instructor Available at All Times for Feedback Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Frame of Reference</td>
<td>Criterion Referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Focus of Feedback</td>
<td>Non-Judgmental Task Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Responsive Evaluation</td>
<td>Two-way Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Formative Program Feedback</td>
<td>Schools, Student, Faculty Feedback (Parity Based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluation of Specific Program Competencies</td>
<td>Systematically Gathered from Experienced Teachers and Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 26

PROVISION FOR INDIVIDUAL FEEDBACK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identification</td>
<td>Desired Competencies identified by Consortium of National, State and Local Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Justification</td>
<td>Defined Competencies Include Supporting Empirical Rationale for Inclusion in Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Validation</td>
<td>Competencies Evaluated in Terms of Correlating Product Results to Desired Behaviors of Total Program (Pupil Gains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Universality of Competencies</td>
<td>Competencies Meaningfully Adaptable to National Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Modification</td>
<td>Based on Reality-testing of Achievability of Defined Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Method of Definition</td>
<td>Performance or Behaviorally Described in Evaluative Terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 28

MICRO-GRID FOR PRESERVICE CONTENT ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Empirical Review</td>
<td>Components Based on Empirically Substantiated Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Literature</td>
<td>Systematic Review of Educational Literature Planned and Conducted for All Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adaptability</td>
<td>Preservice Curriculum Demonstrates Basic Changes in Last Three Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Task Analysis</td>
<td>Teacher Education Program has Continuous Task Analysis Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Needs</td>
<td>Preservice Reflects Some Student Wants and Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Structure of Disciplines</td>
<td>Teacher Education Program Accommodates Structures of Various Disciplines by Systematic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Standards for Grading</td>
<td>Universal Standards Throughout a Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards Uniform within Specific Disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Specific Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor Specific Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Norms for Grading</td>
<td>Based on Defined Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determined by Cognitive Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal Curve Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Instructor Subjectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grades</td>
<td>Mastery Grading with Specified Performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-graded Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass/Fail Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative Grade Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Type of Grade Reported</td>
<td>Letter Grade Substantiated with Descriptive Set of Mastered Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of Competencies Mastered without Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter Grade Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Grade Reported, Pass/Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Grading Policies</td>
<td>Determined Through Consortium Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty-Student Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determined by Individual Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Progress Report to Student</td>
<td>Progress Reported by Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress Reported by Module Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress Reported by Course Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress Reported by Semesters Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. General Model of Evaluation</td>
<td>Pretest, Formative and Summative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative and Summative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest and Summative Evaluation Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative Evaluation Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Type of Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Performance and Cognitive Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance without Cognitive Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive Dimensions Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjective Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging Need for Human Relations Training

One issue which is receiving increased attention in teacher education, as well as by other educators, is that of affective education. Questions of the relevancy of traditional subject matter lead to the belief that the emphasis on the cognitive domain must be re-evaluated so that the affective domain will find an appropriate position in the education spectrum. The need for increasing emphasis on the affective domain may be shown by a recent survey (Branan, 1972) of 150 freshmen and sophomore students enrolled in psychology courses at a small private college. This survey revealed that when asked to describe in detail their two most negative experiences, students responded most often to categories involving interaction with teachers (84 responses). Of the 300 total responses, 257 involved interpersonal relations, three were religious, and 40 concerned accidents or illness. It was also found that more negative experiences with teachers occurred in high school (44 responses), whereas college accounted for 23 responses, elementary school included 12 and junior high totaled 5. A further breakdown of types of negative experience with teachers revealed that these experiences included humiliation in front of a class, unfairness in evaluation, destroying self-confidence, personality conflict, and embarrassment. These findings led Branan to conclude that human relations knowledge and skill should become a prerequisite for teaching credentials at any level.

Dinkmeyer, 1971b, a proponent of affective education, contends that children have been taught almost everything in school and that they should be taught how to live and accept themselves.
He further defends the idea that teachers must be involved in this type of instructional activity since guidance and education serve the same ends. Emphasizing that any valid learning experience has a guidance component, Dinkmeyer proposes that "only as a child understands himself, his needs, his purposes and his goals is he free to become involved and committed to the educational process" (1971b, p. 67). Another author, J. A. Robinson (Welser, 1970), agrees with Dinkmeyer that the new morality defines real teaching as based on a human relationship in which both the teacher and child are recognized as human beings. Teaching is further described as being a matter of human interaction, interpersonal communication, and of subjective and objective relationships.

Milne and Kosters (1970) define the role of the school to teach children rather than subjects. They explain this by writing, "Factors influencing the emotional or affective lives of the youth must be treated as being as important as the teaching of facts and skills" (p. 42). Milne and Kosters conducted a survey to assess educational needs in the affective domain in South Dakota. The survey questionnaire was received from 453 elementary school students, 514 eleventh graders, 65 teachers and administrators, 128 parents of students in school, and 102 lay persons. The need order was established by combining the extent to which the person thought the item should be taught to children and youth, and the extent to which the person believed society is meeting that teaching obligation. The objects of concern were identified in the following order: drugs and narcotics; law, order and decency; freedom and responsibility; mob violence; race equality; fair share of taxation; leadership morality; individual worth; cheating; sexual morality; individual responsibility; willingness to defend; equality of persons; respect for flag, leaders and traditions; and finally, alcoholic beverage use. This survey serves to point out specific areas within the affective domain which could be starting points in designing education programs.

Once the educational need for increased emphasis on the affective domain is accepted, the next step is to define the needed areas for teacher competencies in the area. For example, Amidon and Flanders (1963) identify nine desirable communication skills that teachers should possess:

1. The ability to accept, clarify and use ideas,
2. the ability to accept and clarify emotional expression,
3. the ability to relate emotional expression to ideas,
4. the ability to state objectively a point of view,
5. the ability to reflect accurately the ideas of others,
6. the ability to summarize ideas presented in group discussion,
7. the ability to communicate encouragement,
8. the ability to question others without causing defensive behavior, and
9. the ability to use criticism with the least possible harm to the status of the recipient.

Clearly, teacher education institutions would be responsible for requiring preservice teachers to attain these communication goals once the goals are accepted as necessary.
At the professional level, the emerging awareness of the need for affective education has been recorded through the adoption of "Human Relations: Philosophy, Purpose, and Goals for Education Associations in Illinois" by the Illinois Education Association. The statement of policy prescribed and declared the moral, ethical and professional responsibilities of education associations to establish action programs to improve human relations. It was noted that the human relations program should be an integral part of the professional and instructional improvement efforts of education associations. A further statement read as follows:

The objective of human relations is to bring about a productive harmony, based on respect, which provides optimal advantages and opportunity for participation for all groups (racial, sexual, economic, cultural, age, etc.) and individuals in our diverse, multi-cultural society. The primary focus of human relations programs must be to improve all interpersonal relationships which affect the learning of children (p. 113).

The Illinois example is cited since it is typical of the method selected by educators to alleviate the problems in education caused by the lack of affective education. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss and evaluate human relations training which is aimed at achieving self-understanding by the individual as well as improving human relations. This evaluation seems necessary since human relations training is being included in educational programs on the assumption that human relations training is a viable way of improving education.

What is "Human Relations Training?"

Human relations training (HRT) was founded primarily by Leland Bradford, who adapted ideas from social psychologist Kurt Levin, by forming the first training center in 1947 in Bethel, Maine (Birnbaum, 1969). Earlier the emphasis of human relations training performed by the National Training Labs was based on the sociological aspects of group dynamics as directed by its founders, Leland Bradford, Ronald Lippitt and Kenneth Benne.

Miles (1960) interpreted human relation training as applied social psychology, since human relations training labs focus on: (1) improving a person's sensitivity to social phenomena or increasing one's sophistication in diagnosing reasons for ineffective interpersonal and group situations; and (2) one's ability to act effectively and satisfyingly in accord with others. It further appeared to Miles that human relations training comes from interest in man as a social person and his transactions with social systems within which he moves.

Although human relations training was initially designed for organizational group development, the orientation has more recently shifted to psychological aspects (Edwards, 1970). Human relations training now requires a direct exposure of values, beliefs, and feelings, with the encouragement to limit group encounter to an affective level. In human relations training,
the focus is on social interaction, or how to interact with others. This implies a need for awareness of one's own feelings and of the feelings of others. Human relations training encompasses a responsibility to both interacting parties (Paiomares, 1970).

Weisbord (1970) described human relations training as essentially being an "agenda-less confrontation" in which people can express their fears, beliefs and suspicions to each other while a trainer focuses attention on the meaning of the interaction. Since human relations is a study of how people behave, skill in human relations results from knowing why people act the way they do, how they react to different situations, and what causes them to change their minds (Saputo and Gill, 1972). The directions a group takes can be any combination of the following: sensory awareness, expressive moment, environmental awareness, social-emotional expression, aesthetic appreciation, intelligent problem solving, creativity, ethical values, social sensitivity, social competence, endurance and mystical experience (Mann, 1970).

Amidon and Flanders (1963) interpreted human relations training as being helpful in obtaining three objectives:

1) The ability to accept, clarify and use the ideas of students in planning work and diagnosing difficulties,
2) knowledge of influential behaviors which restrict student reactions and those which expand student reaction, and
3) understanding of a theory of instruction that can be used to control teachers' behavior in facilitating classroom communication.

Much confusion in discussing human relations training arises from the distinctions in terminology which may disguise differences and similarities. To discuss the effect of human relations training on educational programs, the types of training must first be defined. Human relations training includes a wide range of lab training approaches in human relations, group dynamics, sensitivity awareness, organizational development, as well as a number of verbal and non-verbal experiences that seek to increase awareness and release human potential (Birnbaum). The milieu used to improve HRT has been called encounter groups, marathon labs, and confrontation sessions. The above variations account more for the types of methods and subjects used rather than for the theory to substantiate it. Below is a brief description of the variations.

Encounter group. The term "encounter group" comes from Carl Rogers' phrase "basic encounter group" meaning a new kind of experience from the traditional T-group. Encounter groups are relatively short (twenty-four hours to a week-end) in comparison to therapy groups which may run weeks, months, or even years. The emphasis is on direct exposure of beliefs, values, and feelings that are usually not put on public display by individuals (Birnbaum). As defined by Edwards, the encounter group is encouraged to operate almost exclusively on an affective basis. While
uninhibited exposure of emotions is acceptable, reserve and defensiveness are discouraged. Also complete honesty and openness are the established goals.

Marathon labs. Marathon labs are usually very intensive laboratories where the people function together without intervention. The purpose of marathon labs is to literally break through the normal defense patterns of participants as quickly as possible, thus moving immediately to new levels of open behavior. Marathon labs are often used with organizations to improve work efficiency (Reimer, 1971). Managers become consultants rather than bosses. The motivation level rises to go beyond the monetary reward (Bradford, 1970). One writer (Thomas, 1958) expresses extreme pessimism regarding marathon labs in schools. He experienced marathon labs as being entertaining, but contends that public funds should not be spent for entertainment.

Confrontation sessions. The purpose of confrontation sessions is to develop better inter-group relations. They are often used with a radical confrontation such as contrived racial encounters of Blacks with policemen. They are designed to develop interpersonal understanding (Birnbaum) and to vividly portray the nature of prejudice and the racial problems which exist. Hopefully, the confrontations provide the participants with a more realistic perception of the racial issues as well as new perspectives in solving them (Edwards).

An example of a confrontation type group is illustrated by an experiment designed by Carkhuff and Banks (1970). The purpose of the study was to improve relations between White teachers and Black parents and between White teachers and Black children. Fourteen teachers (six male, eight female) aged 22 to 50 with up to ten years teaching experience enrolled in a program in interpersonal skills, with ten Black female parent volunteers up to age 50 from the Black community adjacent to the college. The participants were divided into two confrontation groups of five parents and seven teachers each. A White and a Black trainer alternated between the groups. Results indicated that after three weeks of meeting daily for a total of 20 hours, both Blacks and Whites gained in interpersonal skills. The White teachers gained more in their communication with adults and on standard and racial indexes. Black parents were found to gain more in the ability to communicate with children. Uniformly, the race of the trainer was not found to be a significant source of the effect.

While there are three distinct types of groups used to focus on HRT, two methods can be employed within the group. Of the two methods applied, verbal and non-verbal, non-verbal is the most controversial. These range from minimum body contact to the physically intimate. The theory is that participants can reach deeper levels of consciousness more quickly through physical bodily expression and become uninhibited more quickly with non-verbal exercises than with verbal (Birnbaum). Non-verbal methods can be helpful when they are to the point, for example, inter-racial contact can lead to or confirm the idea that other races are indeed human and real too. Non-verbal methods attempt to return the body to man for communication purposes.
According to Edwards the supporting theories are of questionable validity.

These types of human relations training (encounter groups, marathon labs and confrontation sessions) help define different levels of human relations training. For purposes of this paper, human relations training shall be confined to that process of education which occurs in institutions of education and which attempts to increase sensitivity** on a continuous and pervasive emphasis, rather than being intensive and focal (Combs, 1970). Accordingly, the criteria to be followed in this report are: (1) to report frankly the feelings and thoughts the interactions provoke, (2) to report in the "here and now," (3) to discourage long explanations and references to personal biography, (4) to favor confrontation, and (5) to discourage politeness, evasiveness and sparring (Combs, 1970).

Goals of Human Relations Training

Schneider (1972) emphasizes that to begin affective education in the classroom one must begin with the teachers. He asserts that, "The teacher training institutions typically do little, if anything, in this area" (p. 104). The four goals of his teacher training workshop were:

1. To increase self-awareness.
2. To help increase interpersonal sensitivity.
3. To train teachers in group dynamics and group leadership processes.
4. To equip teachers with a repertoire of affective techniques for classroom use.

Marshall (1970) identifies additional goals of human relations training in education as: (1) learning to perceive others as resources for learning rather than as objects of conflict and irritation, (2) identify and cope with one's own defenses, (3) give and accept feedback, (4) identify the roles one currently uses, and (5) experiment with new roles and learn how to evaluate the degrees of effectiveness. The overall goal of human relations training, then, is to improve one's interpersonal relations; that is, the face to face and other direct communications between people. It is assumed that being sensitive to another person's values and beliefs, as well as one's own values and beliefs, will improve one's interpersonal relations (Gustafson, 1971).

**Several authors (Joyce, Dirr, and Hunt, 1969, p. 76) defined sensitivity as "The recognition of the learner's frame of reference and a subsequent adjustment of teacher behavior in an attempt to accommodate the learner's stance."
Further Assumptions of Human Relations Training

Often assumptions are implicit in the definitions of human relations education. Corey and Corey (1970) defined sensitivity education as helping people become more aware of and more sensitive to what happens as they react to each other, especially in face to face situations. They contend that human relations training helps people perceive what they do to one another and to themselves in confrontal communication. When the training has been successful, more of these interactions are taken into account. The most obvious assumption being made here is the benefit of sensitizing an individual to the real feelings, values and intents of others (Edwards). An assumption is generally inherent that the members of the group will share their feelings in an honest and straightforward manner (Reimer). Edwards cautions that widespread use of this skill by unsophisticated persons may be more damaging than helpful in that it may increase rather than decrease the defensiveness of associates. Further, defensive individuals may be encouraged to expose themselves to the "sensitized" person in expectation of receiving professional assistance.

Another assumption is that greater perceptual acuity and creative expression are made possible for the open individual. This breeds the assumption that all defenses are damaging and should be stripped away. Edwards points out that defenses serve a useful purpose. He asserts that usually defense development is necessary to maintain a balanced personality. The assumption that everyone will benefit from reduced defensiveness conflicts with Edwards' belief that a limited set of defenses is health-producing and is basically normal for the human organism. According to Edwards, many of the behaviors labeled as defenses by the group are rather self-integrating preferences which contribute to personal identity. He adds that these behaviors contribute to the uniqueness of the individual while promoting self-fulfillment and creative activity.

As used in the schools, human relations training legitimizes the current feelings, values, attitudes and concerns of learners. In so doing, human relations training is assumed to help learners develop methods for successful management of the affective domain as they develop (Wells, 1970). Stanford (1970b) contends that human relations training exercises can aid in student social development. When human relations training is integrated into the curriculum, Stanford maintained that it can increase the ability to work with other members of the class, and in some cases improve performance in subject matter.

A final assumption being made is that there is a relationship between some interpersonal variables and pupil performance (Berenson, 1971). This assumption has been the focus of several research attempts, as discussed in the research section. It is important to note that these assumptions are value based. Therefore, in evaluating human relations training for teacher education programs, one should try to maintain perspective in order to avoid the biases that value-laden assumptions might breed.
Criticisms

The importance and suitability of human relations training in the classroom is controversial. Critics of human relations training are not necessarily opposed to sensitivity training, but rather to some of its uses in school. Reimer notes that "there is no consensus of opinion or firm agreement on the value of sensitivity training" (p. 356). Reimer claims that sensitivity training tends to be irrational. He wrote that critical, reflective thinking and an intelligent analysis of problems and values are ignored or treated with hostility. According to Reimer, there is little intellectual involvement in the appeal to feelings. He observed that rational analyses of a problem were construed to be an evasion of the issue. Also, the focus on the "here and now" does not permit intellectual analysis of a problem, since the context of the past and future cannot be considered. Feeling, then, becomes the criterion for the evaluation and solution of a problem. Reimer concluded that "educators should become more sensitive to the needs of others . . . but the sensitizing process need not be divorced from intelligence and the use of man's rational powers" (p. 357).

Perhaps Reimer is confusing the goals of human relations training in this criticism. If the goals were to solve intellectual cognitive type problems, his criticism would be logical. However, the suggested goals of human relations training are to deal with the affective domain in terms of becoming aware of inter-and intrapersonal feelings. It seems that intellectualizing feelings through the cognitive process would further camouflage the issue in reaching this goal.

Edwards recognizes the danger in adopting human relations training as a panacea for solving various social and educational problems in our society. He contends that inappropriate identification of objectives and misapplication of techniques have inhibited successful application of human relations training in the school setting. Further, he noted that there are too many critical questions which remain unanswered regarding the general usefulness of human relations training. One of these drawbacks is that T-groups ordinarily do not attempt to determine whether the nature of the individual's environmental conditions makes intervention by sensitivity training appropriate. Nor do they attempt to ascertain the nature of personal problems of group members which may be beyond the group's power to deal with properly. Edwards further cautions against using sensitivity training with teenagers. He supports his view with the rationale that since adolescents are usually in the process of developing their value systems, they do not have carefully defined rationales which support their beliefs in order to defend their behavior patterns. Thus, the young person is left defenseless when confronted with conflict in group, especially if the attack is led by persons experienced in this kind of confrontation. Concurring with Edwards, Wells adds that any conscientious professional must be concerned that one does not psychologically damage children by placing them in situations where their defenses are lowered to the extent that they become vulnerable to an unwitting attack by another group member. Indeed, Edwards reports that if it seems advisable to reduce a person's defenses,
It is best done under the supervision of a trained professional rather than in a group since few groups are equipped with a highly competent trainer.

Edwards also observed that frequently persons experienced in confrontation training succeed in imposing their will upon the group. This results in evolving (imposing) common values, with the more influential group member supplying the direction. He interprets this peer-pressured conformity as being confining and restricting rather than socially enlarging. The new value structure may conflict with the family values, possibly resulting in the deterioration of the quality of the association with other family members. Edwards discussed problems the new values create in social interaction as:

Ironically, these new values have limited transferability to society at large. Communication skills so gained also have limited usefulness. Intensive training out of a normal social context trains one primarily for association within that group. Outside the group, the individual's style of communication is likely to be ineffective and in some instances even alienative. This is especially true of those groups where the strongest personalities have values divergent from acceptable proprieties or where strong attachments and dependencies are developed.

Here, Edwards raises a cogent point. It becomes apparent that if one is to use a human relations training program, the trainer must take the responsibility of assuring that the strong personality types do not overwhelm, dominate or inhibit other members of the groups.

In addition to identifying drawbacks of using human relations training in the classroom, Edwards presented impediments to using human relations training with faculty and staff members. He observes that school co-workers who are involved in the same sensitivity training group often reveal information which deteriorates any future working relationship between them. Also, polarization sometimes occurs when part of the staff undergoes training which changes their behavior sufficiently to alienate them from co-workers. This conflict of interest might be abridged by having staff members attend groups with strangers, although this solution might tend to take the training out of a normal social context.

Research

Methodological Flaws. To reach a meaningful understanding of the importance and consequences of affective education in teacher education programs, a review of current research or human relations training might be helpful. At this point, primary cautions are necessary to interpret the data, since affective evaluation and research often will include basic research methodological flaws. Researching human relations training programs poses several difficult problems. Wiggins (1970) noted these
problems because:

Research involving various human relation enterprises in education is relatively sparse, methodological questionable and inconclusive. Imprecise objectives and ineffective evaluation have created a paucity of research data which indicate any justifiable stance on the question of the viability of training experiences in schools. (p. 255)

Harrison (1971) stresses that being in a control group biases one's self-image and perception of him by others. Participating in training inclines one and others to look for changes in behavior. Also, Harrison points out that control groups are usually not random, since randomness would interfere with the voluntary aspect of human relations training groups. He suggests studying the process of training as well as the outcomes, and predicting training outcomes by scores or independent process variables as means to counteract the non-randomness of subjects.

A second weakness in human relations training studies is the lack of longitudinal data. Additionally, the number of dimensions used to measure change poses problems. If many dimensions are included, the assumption is inherent that all changes are equally important. If few are included, the goals of the training are narrowed. Another problem is that the writings are normative with respect to outcomes and it is difficult to specify the exact training experiences which subjects undergo (Harrison). Problems arise when one tries to explain the change, rather than merely describe it (Miles). This difficulty arises from the lack of theory about the effects of different elements of training design (Miles and Harrison). The variation of trainer style on participant learning and group composition effects are not clearly understood (Harrison). A further problem concerns the timing of data collection. The validity and reliability of the pre-test may be questionable due to high anxiety levels of subjects about to undergo a somewhat new and often threatening experience. Harrison indicates that the experimenter's relationship with the subjects affects the outcomes of the experiment. The final problem identified by Harrison is that of appropriate statistical analysis.

In working with human relations training, Miles observes that the amount of research on treatment processes and outcomes of human relations training is small in relation to the amount of treatment. Perhaps this is so since research on human relations training poses so many other methodological problems. Stanford (1972) and Wiggins join Miles' criticism that effectiveness in bringing about desired changes in psychological growth in students through human relations training in the classroom has been largely ignored. Stanford (1972) continues to list many projects of which no attempt was made to determine student outcomes. He further elaborates that those investigating psychological aspects of education have limited themselves to a general exploration of the area, formulating a rationale for integrating the cognitive and affective domains and devising activities to promote the new aims. There appears to be a void in research that measures the precise effects of activities on behaviors and attitudes of the participating.
It is claimed by Wells that there really are no data beyond the teacher-student "I like it" variety. In 1972, Schneider observed that controlled research in HRT has not yet been accomplished. He adds that many who have tried systematic emotional education in the classroom are enthusiastic about the results. He noted that in addition to enhancing psychological growth, it helps to remove emotional obstacles to the acquisition of cognitive skills. However, enthusiasm cannot be considered as empirical data.

Effectiveness of human relations training in attaining goals. The first question to be asked in evaluating assumptions of human relations training is, "How well does human relations training accomplish its goals?"

Data were compiled on over 7,000 teenagers who participated in YMCA human relation training experiences. The statistics confirm that most teenagers who are offered the YMCA human relation training approach respond dramatically to the experience. The teens were given a questionnaire immediately following their experience and the same questions were included on a questionnaire they filled out six months later. Their first responses to the question, "What are the most important things you got out of the experience" were listed in the following order: (1) better understanding of others, (2) increased self-identity, (3) making new friends, (4) better able to express self, and (5) increased trust. The girls tended to rate all the experiences more positively than did the boys. The high positive response to the first questionnaire was present in a substantial degree six months later. After six months, in response to the question, "Are you now behaving differently because of the Assembly experience?" the most frequent responses were: (1) better understanding of others, (2) increased self-identity, (3) more acceptant of others, (4) increased trust, (5) openness and availability, (6) increased ability to express self, and (7) greater autonomy. Some teens stated that the experience "changed my whole life" and "was the most valuable experience in my life" (Himber, 1970).

Lee's study (1970) of public elementary school teachers had three groups of subjects. Group One was subdivided into two groups of ten who had different trainers and who participated in 20 hours of intensive interpersonal sensitivity training aimed at increasing self-actualization and human relations skills. Group Two received the same amount of training as Group One (ten sessions of two hours per week) as well as the same reading materials. Group Two (N = 10) received instruction, demonstration and discussion on principles of human relations. Group Three contained 21 teachers and received no treatment. Results showed that sensitivity training had a significantly positive effect (p.<.01) on the areas of teacher attitudes toward children, toward personal relationships and toward teaching as a career as measured with a pre- and post-test of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Evaluation using a Q-sort instrument resulted in teachers in sensitivity training increasing significantly more (p.<.05) in self-esteem than those in the control group. Data from parent and administrator ratings favored sensitivity training, but not significantly so. There was no significant difference in teacher absenteeism between the control and sensitivity training groups, although students of teachers who
received sensitivity training were absent significantly less often (p<.05) than the students of the teachers in the control group and than the students of teachers in the conventional class in human relations.

Another study designed to measure HRT goal attainment included four treatments with 48 female students in a study by Berenson at a coed suburban state college. The subjects were selected randomly from senior elementary education majors. Twelve were assigned to each of the following groups:

1. Experimental group--Three weeks before student teaching, the experimental group received 25 hours of training in discrimination and communication of the interpersonal conditions of accurate empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness, immediacy, significant other references and confrontation.

2. Training control--Subjects received 25 hours of human relations training not utilizing quasi-therapeutic experience or Scales of Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning.

3. Hawthorne Effect control group--Students in this group were told they were participating in a study to determine the effects of the pre-student teaching workshop on their performance in their classroom and on their relationships with pupils.

4. Control group proper--There was no knowledge of participation by these subjects.

Pre-training scores showed no significant differences among the four groups. Post-training scores favored experimental Group One over all three control groups at the .001 level of significance. Differences between control groups were not significant. Berenson's conclusions support the human relations training program in a teacher education context. Training which focused on the conditions of the experimental group and which systematically employs the experiential, didactic and modeling sources of learning was shown to be significantly related to a wide variety of desirable outcomes for teacher trainees. Other conclusions were that classroom and college supervisors perceived student teachers who were functioning at higher levels in interpersonal skills to be more competent in their classroom performance than student teachers who were functioning at lower levels of these skills. Also, student teachers functioning at higher levels of interpersonal skills appeared more capable of solving teaching problems related to planning, management and teacher-pupil relationships than student teachers functioning at lower levels.

Moreover, Berenson found that those student teachers who functioned at higher levels of interpersonal skills appeared to utilize more positive reinforcing behaviors, less criticism of the pupils, and less emphasis on subject matter content. One implication drawn from the study was that since the student teacher's level of interpersonal functioning was highly correlated with desirable outcomes of teacher training, this index should
be considered as a selection method for teaching candidates. Also, rather than focusing upon the discrimination of desirable teaching behaviors in teacher education programs, emphasis should be upon the communication of desirable teaching behaviors, since one cannot assume the transfer from discrimination to communication. Therefore, if it is beneficial for teachers to offer high interpersonal skills, then the communication of the skills should be included in their professional preparation.

Another author (Ellis, as cited by Wiggins), who questions the ability of human relations training to achieve objectives, maintains that studies suggest there is no clear evidence resulting from research which points to human relations training as a better means of achieving explicit training objectives in preservice and inservice teacher and administrative programs. However, attempts are being made to examine the effectiveness of comparative approaches.

A study done by Hefele (1971) included 16 graduate students in the M.A. teacher preparation program at a school for the deaf in Buffalo, New York, 15 experienced teachers and 99 students in classes taught by them. The purpose of the study was to investigate the impact of a special interpersonal process training program on an experimental group of teacher-trainees. The process phase consisted of measuring the variables relevant to teacher and teacher-trainee interpersonal functioning. During the outcome phase, relationships between pupil achievement criteria and teacher interpersonal functioning predictor measures were studied. Through comparing the subjects in November to February, participants in the Interpersonal process training as opposed to the nonparticipants exhibited the following behaviors:

1. Communicated with their classes at significantly higher levels of facilitative interpersonal functioning (p<.0037);

2. Selected teacher-critics as practicum supervisors who were functioning at significantly higher levels (p<.0192) regarding empathy, genuineness, and having confidence in their own ability and that of their pupils;

3. Succeeded in elliciting higher levels of involvement from their students (p<.0501), and;

4. Chose to work in classes where there was a normally high level of process involvement by the students.

Hefele concluded that the Interpersonal process training was found to have had a significant impact on the ability of teacher trainees both to recognize and implement those aspects of good teaching which are defined by high levels of interpersonal variables (p.66).

He further concluded that reading achievement and other undifferentiated
achievement areas were definitely related in a positive fashion to the level of teacher interpersonal functioning. Implications from this study, then, would lean heavily toward interpersonal process training for teacher-trainees, since results suggested that the experimental group was able to begin their practicum experiences as more effective teachers.

A study (Kramer, 1969) which incorporated college students as subjects for HRT was conducted during the winter term of 1968-69. Seventy-six male subjects and 75 female subjects volunteered to participate in "An Experience in Interpersonal Communication." For this experience, groups were divided into eights, with approximately four of each sex, for a two-hour session. Self-reports were used as rating instruments on Likert type scales. Response changes suggest that both males and females became less tense and more relaxed during the session, reported it easier to initiate new activities, reported it easier to maintain eye contact with others, saw males as becoming more relaxed and reported nonverbal interaction as less threatening. The women subjects rated the discussion and interaction as stimulating and less threatening, and felt their partners were able to communicate more easily as the session progressed. Males found it easier to disclose information about themselves as the session continued and felt their partners became more relaxed. Neither sex reported significant changes in the difficulty of verbal interaction, development of greater confidence, frequency of question asking behavior, relative ease in meeting strangers, frequency of partner eye contact or reported awareness or recognition of present feelings or reactions.

These data do not support awareness of, or evidence for, substantial behavior change during the two-hour program. It might be valuable to emphasize here that the self-report response on the Likert type scale may have no parallel in actual behavior change.

Another study, reported by Wiggins was conducted in Tennessee with classroom teachers and administrators at elementary and secondary levels in public schools. The experimental group participated in a two-week human relations lab during the summer of 1968, and I4 weekly sessions the following year. Internal and external criteria were used to measure change. Findings were reported that both teachers and administrators exposed to human relations training became less authoritarian, developed greater self-insight, improved interpersonal relationships, and improved leadership skills.

An interesting follow up study was done by Haase, DiMattia and Guttman (1972) in which I3 returning trainees of a support personnel training program participated in a session which used the same rating of behavioral skills as used previously. The trainees were together for one week and the raters were two of the same trained raters used previously. In the original study, three basic human relations skills--attending behavior (eye contact, verbal following and posture), reflection of feeling, and expression of feeling--were taught to trainees. Results demonstrated that support personnel could be brought to significantly higher levels of incorporating these skills in a short period of time. However, since the reinforcement of the training period was removed, the researchers expected the frequency of
using the skills to decrease. In large part, this expectation was met. Results of the follow up showed that the trainees' eye contact skill remained at a consistent level with the previous year. Trainees demonstrated significant improvement in their ability to express accurately their feelings to another person; however, there was low reliability between raters for this variable. A final result was that the trainees decreased in verbal following, posture, reflection of feeling and a rating of counselor effectiveness. In this measure, subjects approximated their baseline operation of the preceding year.

This study could be of critical importance if its results are generalizable. In other words, if the significance found between human relations training groups and "control" groups (Lee, Berenson, Hefele, and Wiggins) diminishes one year following training, are the results truly significant? Clearly, reputable follow up studies need to be implemented to clarify the probability of HRT skills declining after training.

### Human Relations Methods vs. Discussion Approaches

Discussion methodologies oriented toward the improvement of communication skills might be less threatening since they minimize confrontation and avoid defense destroying exercises. Since professional trainers would not be required, the cost of a discussion oriented human relations training program would be reduced. The question then arises as to how effectively goals are attained with discussion approaches as opposed to human relations training approaches.

The purpose of one study (Larson and Gratz, 1970) was to determine the extent to which the problem solving discussion training approach compares with the human relations training approach in accomplishing the following educational objectives: reduction of dogmatism, improvement in critical thinking abilities and increased accuracy in problem solving. Five groups of 16 subjects each were composed from sophomore level college courses. The two groups comprising the problem solving discussion training approach were task oriented. Their course included discussions on the nature of small group problem solving, problem solving exercises and an introduction to small group processes. The second experimental approach, human relations training, included two groups as subjects with the T-group methods of focusing on the here and now, besides receiving eight lectures on interpersonal attraction, needs and characteristics of sub-groups and the nature of interpersonal influence. The control group was one section of an Oral Interpretation class, whereas the four experimental groups were four sections of the Principles of Discussion course at Bowling Green State University. The instructor of the experimental groups was formally trained in both areas. On the pre-test, no significant differences were revealed. However, on the post-test, one problem solving group and one T-group decreased significantly on dogmatism scores while the control group remained unchanged. All five groups increased significantly in critical thinking ability, although the four experimental groups increased significantly more than the control group. Also, one problem solving group produced greater increases
In critical thinking scores than did one T-group. Finally, the two T-groups increased significantly in small group problem solving accuracy, while one problem solving discussion group increased (not significantly), and the other problem solving discussion group and control group did not change in this area.

Rand and Carew (1970) describe another HRT versus discussion study with undergraduate resident assistants at Ohio University during the 1967-68 academic year. This study compared human relations training methods with a no-training and didactic lecture discussion approach. Ninety subjects were randomly selected for each group from the population of new resident assistants. A nested hierarchical design using covariance analysis was used for the study. The dependent variable was the post-test score, whereas the control variable was the pre-test score on the same measuring instruments. Results indicated that groups exposed to human relations training methods were rated superior by students as compared to the no-training and to groups trained with the lecture discussion method. Supervisor ratings showed no differences between treatment groups, while self evaluations gave inconsistent results with the didactic group appearing superior.

In another experiment, Stanford (1972) used English classes in three grades as subjects. They were grouped by tens into control or experimental groups with both groups having small discussion seminars. Meeting for two 55-minute periods each week, the groups had the same coursework. The treatments differed, with the students in the control group being able to determine their task or having the instructor tell them their task at the beginning of the group. Both groups were student directed. The experimental group devoted half of their class to psychological education activities. When the instructor determined it important, the experimental group could discuss their feelings. Outcomes of the study confirmed that giving deliberate attention to social and emotional development in the classroom can have an important positive effect on students. The experimental group made significantly greater gains from pre- to post-test at the .01 level. Although there was no significant difference between the groups in regard to how often they took responsibility to contribute, the experimental group was significantly superior in their ability to recognize the value of all of the members' contributions and respond to these affirmatively. Both groups increased in their willingness to disclose themselves with no significant difference between the groups. Significant changes occurred for the experimental groups in the areas of social sensitivity and leadership while the control groups did not change significantly. There was also a significantly greater percentage of students in the experimental groups than in the control groups that ranked themselves as feeling close in their relationship with the teacher and other students in the seminar.

The above study confirmed many of the results that Stanford (1970) found in a study with English classes at Horton Watkins High School in suburban St. Louis during the 1969-70 school year. The groups which received sensitivity education were paired with control groups meeting at
the same time and taught by the same teacher. Groups of ten to twelve students in grades 10-12 were expected to cover the same cognitive content, but the experimental groups, again, spent one half their time experiencing learning activities in the affective domain. These affective experiences ranged from giving first impressions to maintaining eye contact while talking to another person and when possible, they were linked to subject matter. The results differed slightly in that the experimental groups demonstrated more ability (at the .01 level) to take responsibility to contribute to discussion, as well as being more accepting of the value of all members' contributions and taking more responsibility in responding to other contributions. Members of the experimental group appeared to have felt significantly closer (.001 level) in relations with the teacher and other members of the class than did the students in control groups.

The results from these four studies indicate only small differences between the two approaches—discussion and human relations training. Inconclusive findings suggest superiority of HRT in small group problem-solving accuracy (Larson and Gratz), in affirmative responses and leadership, and, on the affective level, in social sensitivity in the ability to value other members' contributions (Stanford, 1972) and in "feeling closer" to the teacher and other group members (Stanford, 1970). However, both groups improved comparably in their willingness to disclose themselves, so that disclosure cannot be interpreted as a meaningful differentiating variable. Considering the cost, both monetary and possibly psychological, of conducting human relations training groups in their ideal form and the findings of Haase, et. al., about retention, perhaps one should weigh these findings as to the importance of these programs to teacher preparation.

Self-concept in relation to academic achievement. Dinkmeyer (1971b) found growing evidence that feelings of self-adequacy and the self-concept are significant in determining scholastic achievement. In citing several studies, he reported three studies by Walsh (1956), Coopersmith (1959), and Fink (1962); all substantiated that the child who had an adequate self-concept was more effective socially and academically. Combs and Soper (Dinkmeyer, 1971b) found a significant relationship between feelings of adequacy and educational achievement. They noted that the longer the child was in school, the lower his self-esteem. Another study reported by Dinkmeyer (1971b) was that of Lamy who found that the best single predictor of beginning reading achievement in first grade to be the child's self-perception in kindergarten. These findings would suggest a need to recognize the affective realms of child development in the classroom. However, Flanders and Amidon (Dinkmeyer, 1971b) observed that acceptance of feelings accounted for only .005% of the verbal interaction in the classroom.

Walsh, in her study, used two groups of "bright" boys. One group included low achievers (N = 20) who had demonstrated superior intelligence from the second, third, fourth, and fifth grades in a prosperous middleclass suburb. Twenty adequate achievers were individually matched with the low achievers in respect to sex, age, grade, intelligence, race, and socio-economic status. Projective techniques incorporating dolls were used and the results were then rated and analyzed. Consistently, the low achievers
differed from the adequate achievers in their portrayal of the boy doll as restricted in action; unable to express his feelings appropriately and adequately; being criticized, rejected or isolated; and acting defensively, through compliance, evasion or negativity. These differences were significant beyond the .01 level. There was no significant difference between the groups in ability to identify with the male role.

In another study (Solomon, Rosenberg and Bezdek, 1964), the learning of facts was significantly related to teacher clarity, expressiveness and lecturing while gains in comprehension related significantly to teacher energy and flamboyance, and a moderate position on a permissiveness continuum.

The effect of HRT on differing personality variables. One study was designed to measure differences between school counselor candidates who chose to continue T-group experiences and those who chose not to continue (Melchiskey, 1970). The subjects were involved in 18 weekly sessions of approximately 1½ hours each with the same trainer during a fall semester. Results showed that dogmatism was not a significant differential between the students who accepted and those who rejected further group experience. Achievement needs were possessed to a greater degree by members of the group which rejected further group experience while succorance was possessed more by the "accept" group. Differentials which were not significant between groups were: need dispositions, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality and aggression.

Dixon and Morse (1961) reported their findings that the teaching role tends to mediate differences in personality. Therefore, the crucial need is not to establish an ideal model of a teacher, but rather to help prospective teachers develop confidence in their teacher role. Also, the hypothesis that individuals who have a high empathic capacity as measured by pupil responses are seen as better teachers was verified.

Generalizations from other research show that laboratory training does induce change in participants, but there is conflicting evidence about the performance and application of new attitudes and behavioral styles. Involvement in the training process, more than personality factors, appears to be the critical determining factor which influences learning and change. A trainer can manipulate the group climate which produces differential trainee performance and learnings. An inverse relationship exists between the congruency of the trainee's behavior style with the lab milieu and his relative level of learning as judged by peers and trainers. People whose entry into training styles are at some variance with the culture that develops in a lab seem to attain a higher level of learning than those whose initial styles are relatively congruent with the culture (Golembiewski and Blumberg, 1970).

Conclusions. Although the research cited includes methodological flaws due to the variable needed to evaluate the affective domain, it can be useful as a starting point in creating human relations training programs.
Clearly, more research must be executed before concrete conclusions can be drawn. However, the data which are available can be useful since they provide inferences which are one step beyond intuition. If one uses the research data with the reservations required by methodological limitations, the information can be useful in adding a new, more scientific basis for the structuring and implementing of teacher education programs.

Human Relations Training Programs

Having reviewed selected research findings on human relations training, it seems appropriate to consider some of the educational programs which are built on a philosophy supportive of human relations training.

Project Insight. A report on "Project Insight" (Enterline, 1970) revealed that Cleveland's city wide elementary and secondary human relations program was designed to help young children know and talk about themselves and about relationships to other human beings. The Program for Action by Citizens In Education (PACE), a non-profit organization dedicated to improving the quality of education for all Cleveland children, suggested "Project Insight." In 1967, PACE gathered a group of teachers together and asked them to suggest a curriculum and methods of teaching human relations. The results of this collaboration was an informally structured curriculum centered on student discussion and participation, rather than on lectures by teachers. Neither grades nor tests were required. In 1969 the first elementary school teachers participated in a six-week summer training session. The training sessions consist of watching films and taking part in discussions, participating in classes in sensitivity training, learning more inductive teaching methods, and watching techniques for handling student response. Teachers also learn to ask questions and let children learn to seek their own answers for them.

A report on PACE (Doll, 1971) explained that PACE works closely with the Cleveland Board of Education and the county's other school systems to seek new and better ways to educate children. To get assistance, a school system's program must fulfill established requirements: Each teacher who will be involved must complete the six-week PACE summer training institute and each participating school must offer the course for one year after the teacher has been trained. The primary aims are to make students aware of basic social concepts, to encourage curiosity about themselves and others, and to lead them to question stereotypes. PACE programs are unique in method. They use games to stimulate thinking, encourage inductive thinking, concentrate on feelings and reactions rather than facts and promote the exchange of ideas between students. Rather than value judge, the teacher serves as a facilitator by asking questions to open discussion. The films provide an instant environment whereby students experience the feelings and desires of people in different socio-economic levels (Doll, 1971).

Solution to racial conflict. Emerging as a potential cure for racial problems was one high school human relations training program. Upon the emergence of two schools with the purpose of forming a model racial balance
school, school fights between Blacks and Whites broke out during the first week of school. Small group human relations training sessions of ten students plus a leader were instituted as a means to pacify the violence. Hansen and Wirgau (1970) reported that the only evaluations were highly subjective and even these suggest that the program is far from a panacea for resolving racial problems. While students liked the openness and honesty created in the groups as well as appearing to relate to each other more as individuals, there was no objective evidence that these groups helped reduce the human relations problems of the school, especially the racial ones. However, participating counselors considered the human relations training group among the most meaningful and satisfying experiences of the year. The groups seem to have helped the counselor image. Although they were not in the violent form of the original crisis, sporadic incidents involving Blacks and Whites continued. Perhaps the felt success of the program was best materialized in its continuance through the creation of the class, "Psychology of Human Relations and Interpersonal Relationships."

Another program which might serve as a partial solution to racial conflict, the Human Development Program (HDP) was developed for elementary school children by the Institute for Personal Effectiveness In Children (IPEC). The HDP was instituted in a bilingual setting at Coronado Elementary School in Albuquerque, New Mexico, during the 1969-70 school year. Grades kindergarten through third grade were included (N = 350). The project included teacher aids, a three-track curriculum for children speaking Spanish, English, or a little of both, in addition to the HDP.

The central technique of the program is the "magic circle" in which children and the teacher share what they are thinking and feeling for 20 minutes per day. In IPEC designed institutes, teachers were required to participate in small group experiences with the objective of helping them become more aware of their own feelings, thoughts, and behavior. It was hoped that stereotypes would be overcome. In addition to lectures and feedback sessions, IPEC teacher preparation included microlessons with children from local schools to model HDP techniques, including the "magic circle." The three focal areas were awareness of feelings, mastery to improve the self concept, and social interaction (Palomares, 1970).

For evaluative purposes, the participating subjects were compared with a traditional non-bilingual program in a school with a similar student population. Results showed Coronado's kindergarten children having an average gain of more than 10 points in IQ and over 17 points in mental age during the year. First graders gained almost 12 IQ points with a 19-point gain in mental age. Results also showed significantly higher scores at Coronado in performance, awareness, mastery, social interaction, self-esteem, peer relations, teacher relations, and enjoyment of school at all grade levels. The oral competency and Spanish performance averaged almost 50% higher in kindergarten and first grades (Palomares).

The director of Albuquerque's Bilingual Education Program, Carlos Savedra, gave principle credit for the project's success to the Human Development Program. According to Savedra, the freedom of expression
seemed the most important aspect of the HDP sessions. Thus, the HDP was perceived as an effective way of aiming at desegregation (Palomares). A follow up study of those subjects' ability now would seem most beneficial.

In another racial conflict study by Rubin (1967) in Andover, Massachusetts, participants "lived in" with a mixed racial group for two weeks. Subjects included 20 males and 30 females ranging from 23 to 59 years old (mean of 33 years), most of whom had at least a bachelor's degree. Eight Blacks participated so that each group had at least one Black member. The author concluded from this study that a minimal increase in self-acceptance (20% gain in this study) is necessary for any significant change in human-heartedness to be immediately observable. Human heartedness, it might be added, is difficult to operationalize or measure.

Human relations curriculum. Throughout Ohio's Cuyahoga County which includes Cleveland, a program entitled "The Human Relations Curriculum" was introduced in more than 60 elementary and secondary schools (Harding, 1971). The goal of the program was to produce tolerant individuals who are able to respect others whose racial, ethnic or religious backgrounds differed from their own without being threatened by them. One evaluator concluded that the course benefits appeared to be in areas where it is easier to make, but more difficult to reject, generalizations about whole classes of people. The human relations participants appeared more at ease about interracial contacts, more adaptive in rejecting stereotypes of Blacks and poor people, and were less nervous about Black power and militancy (Harding, 1971).

National programs. With the emergence of human relations training in schools, came the creation of the Center of Human Relations by the National Education Association. Capocy (1970) reported that 22 state education associations have had or have more recently established human relations committees. Also, the National Training Lab has numerous programs designed to assist teachers and other school personnel to become more effective in human relations programs.

Simulation packages. One author (Gustafson) interpreted simulation as a partial answer to the need for human relations training. He emphasized the importance of the simulation environment which is a low threat and provides an opportunity for the learner to scrutinize and identify his own concerns, attitudes and beliefs. An advantage to simulation of interpersonal relations is that it can offer a variety of settings.

Continuing to describe a technique developed at Michigan State University, Gustafson elaborates on the physical facility and the process undergone by the subject. The physical facility consists of a small room equipped with a television monitor, motion picture projector and screen, coffee table and two chairs. The floor was carpeted and the walls were draped. One wall had one-way glass and a microphone was partially concealed. In the adjacent rooms were two television cameras, a special effects generator, a video recorder and related amplifying equipment. A direct telephone line between the two rooms was available.
no significant change in the ratings of sensitivity but there was a large statistical change in rapport building (p<.01). The sensitivity program did not increase questioning or positive sanctioning by the subjects. An indirect conclusion reached by the authors was that consistent relations between teaching behavior in simulated conditions and in normal classrooms indicate that simulated settings are enough like real teaching conditions to enable their use as training environments.

Defending the method of using small group sessions for new teachers, Grossman and Clark (1967) emphasized that sharing classroom difficulties in a protected small group setting provides the opportunity to sharpen sensitivity to the children's as well as their own anxieties and concerns. In their program, first year New York City teachers meet weekly with a mental health consultant from the Educational Clinic of Hunter College in the Bronx. The program is structured with a set of guidelines for observation in the classroom. The teachers are then to play the role of the "other" person involved (visitor, parent, principal). The group also serves as a miniature classroom in which processes of interaction are illustrated similar to those occurring in the classroom. Attention is directed to prevention or repairs of teacher-student relationships deemed undesirable. Grossman and Clark suggested this type of group training as being appropriate to prepare teachers to handle the daily crises to which one is not exposed in teacher education programs.

Teacher education programs, Chancey and Passmore (1971) suggest that the trend of recognizing the need to humanize education by emphasizing the importance of the affective domain implies a need to equalize and integrate the "knowing, doing, and feeling" educational experiences. Further, they identified a model of experiences appropriate for inclusion in existing courses to integrate the affect. The five foci of affective training for teachers which they suggested are:

1. Personal growth and development directed toward feelings of competence.
2. Awareness of one's own affect.
3. Professional identity.
4. Awareness of the reciprocal impact of behaviors in interpersonal settings.
5. Knowledge of process features of group behavior (p. 214).

The model Chancey and Passmore suggest includes three phases for teacher education programs. Phase One incorporates open ended, educationally or diagnostic, social problem solving class meetings. The goal of these meetings is to provide future teachers with an opportunity to address themselves to personal issues of identity within the context of ongoing classes. Also included in Phase One would be "human potential labs" designed to help prospective teachers to value themselves as competent and adequate persons.
In Phase Two, T-groups and sensitivity training would supplement class discussions geared to help trainees face themselves, their anxieties, fears, hostilities, compassion and caring. The group experiences would focus on helping the trainee develop skills in self-disclosure, understand the reciprocal nature of human relations and perceive process features of groups. Finally, Phase Three would occur during the clinical experience (student teaching). This phase would include group counseling, as well as the C-group as initiated by Dinkmeyer, (1970), which is discussed later in this paper.

A pilot program using human relations training in a teacher education program during the 1968-69 year was sufficiently successful to encourage its continuation the following year. During the second year, most trainers were required to participate in a "Training for Trainers" program initiated by Malcolm Knowles (Marshall). For each teacher education student group, there was then one trainer and co-trainer who met with Knowles for one and a half hours after each group. The initial role of the trainers was first to identify and clarify for the students what sensitivity training was and was not. Then they were required to act as a model of an effective group member by accepting individual expressions of feelings and individual behaviors. They were also supposed to be protective and supportive. The trainer was required to be the responsible authority figure, although this role may in turn have created dependency on the trainer by the students. To avoid this dependency, the trainer was to withdraw gradually. The trainers were encouraged to not become members of the group, but rather to always remain trainers.

Results were limited to self-reports. It was reported that the group had developed interpersonal relationships among group members that continued beyond the time of the group meetings (Marshall). The group members appeared more open and trustful in relationships after sensitivity training than before. There were frequent references to improve communication, acceptance and understanding through openness, candor, and confrontation with feelings and behaviors.

Concurring with this belief that human relations training must be directed at preservice and inservice teachers, Gazda (1971) presented a three phase model for inservice teachers. Phase One would consist of training in empathy, respect, and warmth. This phase would require a minimum of 20 hours and would include about ten members per group. Following within a month, Phase Two would emphasize concreteness, genuineness, and appropriate self-disclosure, thus running 20 to 30 hours. Ideally, Phase Three would follow a few weeks after Phase Two with the goal being confrontation and immediacy. Phase Three would continue until trainees were functioning consistently above the minimally effective level of helping that had been established previously. Gazda further suggested that student teachers should be given a minimum of 20 hours systematic training in groups of approximately ten during their first year. This early training would enable their reaching the minimal effective level before being allowed to work with students.
Another proponent of using human relations training in the college curriculum (O'Banion, 1971) enthusiastically supported the program at Santa Fe Junior College in Gainesville, Florida in which Behavioral Science 100, "The Individual in a Changing Environment," is a required course. The objective of this course, which O'Banion identified as "the heart" of the general education program, had been stated to be "self-understanding." In this course, students develop their own personal objectives to fit within the broad course objectives, identify their method of reaching their objectives and develop evaluation procedures to assess whether or not they have reached their goals. Student planning thus forms individualized learning packages for behavior change patterns. A 5-point Likert type scale was developed to compare this course with other courses taken in college. Fifty-eight percent of the students rated the course above average or excellent. The highest ratings were given to the reaction papers, small group discussions, tape recordings, individual projects and readings. O'Banion concluded that although many students were not receptive, the course offered much personal growth to the majority of students.

At Weber State College in Ogden, Utah, another course dealing with human relations training is included for prospective teachers. The course "Education 300: Fundamental Skills for Teachers" was introduced for Fall quarter, 1970. The goal of this course was to activate the ability to relate to others and furnish students with skills necessary in solving interpersonal problems (Adamson, 1972). The course is sub-divided into two parts: the student's individualized learning activities based on the WILKIT (Weber Individualized Learning Kit), and group activities centering on the Interaction Lab for Teachers' Development. The group activities consist of a 40-hour program of 26 exercises for structured and controlled exposure to the most common interpersonal problems a teacher can expect to encounter. Communication skills, group interaction and interpersonal skills, and typical professional problems of teachers are dealt with during group activities. Methods used include simulation, role playing, group games, and analysis of response. Thus, the laboratory forms a packaged course which Adamson claims is easy to teach. Adamson found reactions to the course to be enthusiastic, especially on the part of the students.

Guidelines for HRT

With the above discussion in mind, some general guidelines to employ HRT most effectively in educational programs have been established. There appear to be many specific factors which affect human relations including fear, aggression, prejudice, rejection and sex (Gustafson). One author (Dinkmeyer, 1971a) emphasizes that effectiveness is a function of how the teacher combines his knowledge and understanding with his own way of using himself to be helpful to others. He continues that the information the teacher is taught is not as critical a factor as the way in which the knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and feelings are internalized. Combs' study (Dinkmeyer, 1971a) showed significant differences between effective and ineffective teachers. Effective teachers were cited as being concerned with internal rather than external frames of reference, people rather than
Another proponent of using human relations training in the college curriculum (O'Banion, 1971) enthusiastically supported the program at Santa Fe Junior College in Gainesville, Florida in which Behavioral Science 100, "The Individual in a Changing Environment," is a required course. The objective of this course, which O'Banion identified as "the heart" of the general education program, had been stated to be "self-understanding." In this course, students develop their own personal objectives to fit within the broad course objectives, identify their method of reaching their objectives and develop evaluation procedures to assess whether or not they have reached their goals. Student planning thus forms individualized learning packages for behavior change patterns. A 5-point Likert type scale was developed to compare this course with other courses taken in college. Fifty-eight percent of the students rated the course above average or excellent. The highest ratings were given to the reaction papers, small group discussions, tape recordings, individual projects and readings. O'Banion concluded that although many students were not receptive, the course offered much personal growth to the majority of students.

At Weber State College in Ogden, Utah, another course dealing with human relations training is included for prospective teachers. The course "Education 300: Fundamental Skills for Teachers" was introduced for fall quarter, 1970. The goal of this course was to activate the ability to relate to others and furnish students with skills necessary in solving interpersonal problems (Adamson, 1972). The course is sub-divided into two parts: the student's individualized learning activities based on the WILKIT (Weber Individualized Learning Kit), and group activities centering on the Interaction Lab for Teachers' Development. The group activities consist of a 40-hour program of 26 exercises for structured and controlled exposure to the most common interpersonal problems a teacher can expect to encounter. Communication skills, group interaction and interpersonal skills, and typical professional problems of teachers are dealt with during group activities. Methods used include simulation, role playing, group games, and analysis of response. Thus, the laboratory forms a packaged course which Adamson claims is easy to teach. Adamson found reactions to the course to be enthusiastic, especially on the part of the students.

Guidelines for HRT

With the above discussion in mind, some general guidelines to employ HRT most effectively in educational programs have been established. There appear to be many specific factors which affect human relations including fear, aggression, prejudice, rejection and sex (Gustafson). One author (Dinkmeyer, 1971a) emphasizes that effectiveness is a function of how the teacher combines his knowledge and understanding with his own way of using himself to be helpful to others. He continues that the information the teacher is taught is not as critical a factor as the way in which the knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and feelings are internalized. Combs' study (Dinkmeyer, 1971a) showed significant differences between effective and ineffective teachers. Effective teachers were cited as being concerned with internal rather than external frames of reference, people rather than
things, and perceptual meanings rather than facts. They were found sensitive to the feelings of students and perceived them as persons. Also, they were more concerned with persons and their reactions than with the materials they were presenting. Having feelings of adequacy, they saw others as friendly, well intentioned and capable of dealing with their problems successfully. They emphasized process-oriented experiences and saw the purpose of teaching as freeing.

Dinkmeyer (1971a) then suggests a new approach for teacher education, the C-group. The C-group is so named since many of its components begin with the letter "C":

1. Collaboration--the group works together on mutual concern.
2. Consultation--the interaction within the group helps the members develop new approaches to relationships with children.
3. Clarification--one goal is to clarify for each member his beliefs and help him see if his behavior is congruent to his beliefs.
4. Confidential--the discussions are not to be repeated outside the group.
5. Confrontation--the group expects each individual to see himself, his purposes and attitudes and be willing to confront other members.
6. Communication--an objective is to communicate ideas, meanings, and feelings.
7. Concern--the group is involved with other members and children.
8. Commitment--the members should be committed to change.

Ideally, the C-groups would have five to six members. They would be conducted for a minimum of one and a half hours each session and would have a circular seating arrangement. A readiness exercise would be used as a warm-up at the beginning of the session. Dinkmeyer concludes that preliminary feedback suggests the C-group model can be a useful tool in facilitating teacher development. It has been piloted in the student teaching department at Northeast College in Chicago.

In teacher education programs, Marshall found that it was better to conduct groups for a weekly three hour session for five weeks than to meet two hours per week for 12 weeks. He also reported that groups of ten to twelve worked better than large groups, i.e., 21.

Wiggins concluded that while human relations training may be a means to an end, it is unlikely that it is an end in itself. He suggests the
following requisites for human relations training: clearly defined goals and behaviorally defined objectives, empirical research and evaluation methods, and standards for professional performance on the part of the trainers.

It was claimed by Alschuler and Ivey (1972) that educators should be held accountable for creating instructional objectives that define relevant human competence. They suggested that otherwise, the 'effectiveness' of competency-based education means effectively coercing students, effectively exposing teachers' incorrect view of reality, effectively misleading children about what is necessary to survive and flourish in society (p. 53).

Once affective objectives have been written as clearly as possible, how does one evaluate them? Harbeck (1972) stresses that a continuous effort must be made to evaluate affective goals, if they are to remain a part of the curriculum. Evaluation data can be collected on a group basis by using instruments which can be gathered anonymously from students. Possibilities of instruments include interview schedules, checklist, open-ended questions, questionnaires with fixed alternatives and semantic differential techniques.

It appeared to Combs (1970) that in evaluating human relations training programs, one must know who is in the program, who is directing it (the training, experiences and philosophy of the trainer), the purpose of the group, and the circumstances of the group. This information would help define the group to avoid the ambiguity of an umbrella definition which might hide important characteristics.

General suggestions for human relations training in schools were made by Krafft (1971). He suggests that the first step be to diagnose the situation. Since change in one part of the school organization will produce adaptive changes in other parts, the gain in one area may be offset by a loss in another area. Krafft emphasizes the importance of limiting the objectives of a human relations training program. He cautioned that one should steer away from a panacetic approach to human relations training. Once the objectives and depth of intervention are set, one should stay within these constraints. A point of intervention with a supporting rationale should be specified. Another key element is to let the individual decide whether or not to participate (Krafft; Kimple, 1970). This choice should be based on adequate knowledge of what human relations training entails. According to Krafft, transfer of learning should be the primary concern. He further asserted that it is important to not allow human relations training to polarize the school. The school system must be paralleled and have complementary changes made with sensitivity for human problems. Incorporating the human relations training into the process of learning, teaching, and administering is more desirable than to institute it as a special incident in the life of a school. Krafft's final suggestion was to find and use competent human resources. From the emphasis given by
others, (Wiggins; Combs, 1970; Welsbord; Edwards), this point is an apparently crucial one.

Reaffirming the importance of the trainer, Thomas declares:

T-group experiences with a good trainer may not help an organization, but T-group experiences with a poor trainer can create severe personnel problems, can hinder communication and can be psychologically damaging to both individuals and institutions (p. 459).

Another variable found to be important in group accomplishment is that of trust. From his research, Friedlander (1970) concluded that workgroups in which members have high trust in each other prior to laboratory training reach greater degrees of group effectiveness and have more worthwhile meetings after laboratory training and that the converse seems to follow. Trust served as a catalyst in combination with laboratory training to foster group competence. Trust did not act similarly in groups which had not participated in training. Another significant finding was that trust does not seem to increase significantly as a result of training unless laboratory training was part of an ongoing, integrated development program. Birnbaum suggests conducting HRT away from the home and school so that the individual can remain anonymous. The distance might enhance the trust of the group to encourage personal growth.

Welsbord advocates having teams of consultants with diverse skills to work simultaneously with the groups in a total organization development effort. Welsbord continues to delineate happenings in a typical school workshop in human relations training. The first step is to bring conflict into the open through some form of encounter. The participants are then organized to speak "their own minds." At that point, the group considers how this conflict relates to the school's problems and identifies areas that many feel need attention. The next step is to design specific projects to help bring about the changes. Finally, the group evaluates which activities and conditions most favor change and decide how these results will be measured.

In suggesting that a plan for evaluation is essential prior to the implementation of a human relations training program, Wiggins seems to contradict the sequence of these events. Perhaps an evaluation scheme would be more meaningful in measuring behavior change if the subjects were assessed additionally at the beginning of the human relations training.

An interesting point made by Saputo and Gill (1972) was that part of the problem in implementing human relations training in schools is that many people are not aware that human relations is a "science" in which it is possible to build a skill. They further emphasize that young people especially have had little chance to become aware of the need for such skills. It appeared to Saputo and Gill that conflicts must be dealt with at the outset. Although it is feasible to effectively incorporate human relations training in a vocational course, little time would be left for
the teacher to spend on other tasks, especially with the ever increasing technical information that must be dealt with. The authors then advocate a separate discussion course in human relations which is structured around a student-designed course. Fundamental questions, e.g., the importance of human relations while at work, and case studies would be discussed. The course should demonstrate the importance of a good working environment in which employees feel free to discuss problems. The authors reported that studies have shown that quantity and quality of production increases in proportion to the morale of the workers.

Evaluation

A chief concern to educators is that emphatic statements of the urgent need for human relations education are being made without a research background. Stanford (1970a) suggested that human relations training was a potential cure for many social ills. Stanford contends that human relations training could eliminate racism, decrease teacher anxieties by preparing teachers psychologically for teaching, teach the psychological process of learning to be a woman, wife, and mother and teach the ability to get along with people. Further, Stanford wrote, "All teacher preparation programs should include group or individual counseling for teacher trainees to help them learn to handle and overcome harmful attitudes such as race and class prejudice or excessive aggression" (p. 7). Stanford seemed to imply that all beginning teachers should be provided with individual or group counseling. A continuing program of counseling and faculty discussions should likewise be available to all teachers when they or their supervisors feel they need it. Is this realistic in terms of manpower and finances available to schools?

Another writer (Patterson, 1969), who viewed human relations training as a potential umbrella to alleviate problems in education, stated ". . . we are going to have to be concerned about humanizing the education process to counteract the dehumanizing effects of the machine" (p. 104). Patterson forecast machines as being the teachers of subject matter while the major preparation of elementary level teachers would be in human relations. His conclusion was that, "since preventive activities will reduce the incidence of emotional disturbance among children, counseling or therapy will no longer be needed by most students" (p. 106). The curriculum assumptions might be challenged here.

One advocate of using human relations training as a potential partial cure to drug use among students suggested that, "the human relations discussion technique seems a pretty oblique approach to a serious problem, [the use of drugs by students] but we know that, so far, no other way works" (Dawson, 1971, p. 29). It might be noted at this point that Dawson had no evidence to suggest that human relations training would work as a method of drug control either.

Another example of the "I like it" type of evaluation can be observed in Buchanan's article on preparing teachers for the affective level (1971). In her article, Buchanan suggests a method for creating affective expertise,
i.e., the ability to reach a student as a fellow human being and to feed subject matter into that relationship. Without supporting research, she contends, "The success I have had in my efforts has been most rewarding" (p. 616). She further observed that without exception the students were affected by the non-verbal experiences in a positive way. Finally, she defended the position that since perceptions are interpreted primarily on the affective level, our next step in improving the classroom is to emphasize the affective rather than the cognitive processes.

The above examples are of weaknesses in evaluating human relations training programs and seem typical of advocates searching for a single method to cure the many problems encountered in the schools. Clearly, the first step in evaluating human relations training programs is to have measurable outcomes. Harbeck recognizes the problems with evaluating the affective domain when trying to find or prepare objectives and evaluation items. One of the problems is the difficulty in capturing in "action words" the internalized attitudes, feelings and values desired of the students. Words like "appreciate," "be interested in," and "be willing to" should be avoided since they are open to numerous interpretation. The difficulty in conducting thorough research is inherent in the type of activity encountered where each group is unique. The behavioral aspect leaves evaluation at a subjective level; for example, how does one measure the hypothesis that group members come to truly care for one another? The quality of the group is hard to verbalize to others. Also, constructing instructional objectives for accountability may have negative effects on students, as pointed out by Harbeck. The danger here is that in prescribing every step in a student's learning sequence, the development of the student's creative power may be inhibited.

A further problem in evaluating HRT programs which has received a minimal, if any, amount of attention is that of cost. Even if the need for change is in the area of affective education, is the change feasible? Cutbacks on available funds have often resulted in a decrease of professional school counselors, which also would affect the resources available to hire competent trainers and to conduct teacher human relations training workshops. Since human relations training cannot guarantee any specific outcomes, is it the most desirable method of improving interpersonal relationships, and is it appropriately included as a function of formal education? What is the value of HRT to school districts and to the goals of school districts?

Answers to these and similar questions would appear more definite if HRT had a solid theory as a base. However, HRT lacks a theory, and therefore it does not explain behavior in concrete terms which could be debated, substantiated or falsified. Clearly, adopting human relations training in teacher education programs is threatening in that, as with any change, many find security in maintaining the status quo. If approached with the idea that human relations training has the potential for increasing interpersonal relationships, and that this goal is desirable, perhaps there is a place for human relations training in teacher education programs. If viewed as a panacea for alleviating universal problems, however, human relations
training does not approach its goal. Certainly, cautions must be taken in instituting human relations training programs.

Summary

The studies of Dinkmeyer (1971b), Branan, Walsh, Solomon, Rosenberg and Bezdek, and Palomares indicate that there is an increasing need to include human relations training in teacher education programs. Other researchers indicate that HRT can improve teacher attitudes toward children, personal relationships and teaching as a career (Lee), can increase interpersonal relations which relate to desirable teacher outcomes (Berenson and Wiggins) and can increase communication of teachers with their students and elicit higher levels of involvement from students (Hefele).

By extending the implications of these research findings, incorporation of HRT in teacher education programs is suggested. The three objectives identified by Amidon and Flanders appear helpful as a basis for HRT programs in teacher education. They suggested that teachers should possess: (1) the ability to accept, clarify and use the ideas of students when planning and diagnosing difficulties; (2) the knowledge of behaviors which restrict and those which expand student reactions; and (3) understanding of a theory of instruction which can be used to control teachers' behavior in facilitating classroom communication. Additionally, HRT would be useful in preparing teachers for group dynamics and group leadership processes by increasing their interpersonal sensitivity and self-awareness (Schneider). Inherent in this objective is the assumption that sensitivity to values and beliefs will improve interpersonal relations (Gustafson).

Yet, in his criticism that HRT should be integrated with the intellectual analysis of a problem, Reimer apparently could not free himself from emphasizing the cognitive domain. If affective education is needed it need not be camouflaged by including it only as a better method of developing problem solving behavior. Perhaps his reflection is that of many others also: that is to assume that cognitive learning should be included in the goals when conducting HRT.

A questionable assumption seems to be made by Stanford (1970a). Reference was made to HRT as a means of teaching the psychological process of learning to be woman, wife, and mother. An inference from this assumption is that there is only a monolithic role of "woman, wife and mother." Such a role definition is not fashionable in current social thought. His statement appears to support the channeling of female roles into domestic duties. In the movement for equality between sexes, Stanford will surely meet opposition by describing women in such terms. The described roles do not allow for an extension of women's potential.

Overprojections of the importance of HRT to classroom teaching as identified by Patterson leads to the questioning of the curriculum assumptions. Predicting that subject matter will be taught by machines followed by human relations assignments is not a humanizing experience.
The many writers in the field of affective education, as well as those whose concern is to "humanize the curriculum," all reflect a desire to reorient the process of schooling to its clientele--the children. If this noble goal is to be met, then a systematic implementation of HRT is a mandate for both teachers in preservice and inservice.

General Guidelines for HRT Programs in Teacher Education

The suggestions for including HRT in teacher education programs which follow are a synthesis of the most appropriate suggestions surveyed from the literature previously cited. The following list is to be construed as a tentative set with modifications being necessary when empirical tests are made.

1. HRT training is useful when implemented in close time proximity to student teaching. Berenson's study indicated that a minimal amount of time (25 hours) spent in HRT lead student teachers to deal significantly with discrimination and communication of empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness, immediacy, and confrontation. This group also employed the experiential, didactic and modeling sources of learning. These traits are all desirable teacher outcomes.

2. Avoid the short-term, e.g., "crisis" two hour HRT programs, since participants did not reveal substantial behavior change (Kramer).

3. To be more effectual, HRT in teacher education programs might best be followed with a HRT program conducted during the first year of teaching. A continual HRT program seems imperative from the findings of Haase, et. al. After one year, and without further HRT Haase's subjects closely approached their earlier baseline behaviors.

4. If there is resistance to HRT in a program, similar effects might be obtained through small group discussion approaches. This technique is suggested by the research attempts of Larson and Gratz, Stanford (1970 and 1972), and Rand and Carew.

5. When establishing a HRT program in teacher education, responsible faculty members should first conduct a needs assessment, state the HRT objectives and identify evaluation strategies which will measure the attainment of these objectives. Further, it is necessary to identify trainer competencies, and to incorporate HRT into the processes of learning, teaching, and administrating.

6. Cautions must be exercised when using HRT to guard against reducing necessary personal defenses. Some "defenses" are needed to maintain a balanced personality (Edwards). If it seems advisable to reduce a person's defenses, then this might best be done under the supervision of a therapist rather than in a group where specific and highly individual needs have not been assessed.
7. Avoid having a group which is dominated by a limited number of personality types. Here, the trainer must impose regulations to prohibit the monopoly of the interaction so that other group members do not become inhibited (Edwards).

8. In planning research on HRT, several methodological flaws can be avoided by identifying precise training objectives, using appropriate evaluation techniques which measure the effects of activities on behaviors and attitudes of the students, and by studying the process of training as well as the intermediate and final outcomes. Include several control groups so that groups are identified as control groups and others as experimental. Also, it is essential to plan for follow up studies, and to specify the exact training experiences including outcomes which are not solely normative based. A description is needed of the theoretical structure on which the HRT program is designed. Finally, operationally defined measurement activities are needed to determine the effect of HRT activities.

9. In evaluating HRT programs, data must be collected concerning the relative cost effectiveness. Even if there is the need for change in affective education, the change must be fiscally feasible. Cutbacks on available funds may result in a decrease of professionally prepared school counselors. Such fiscal actions affect the resources available to hire competent trainers who can conduct teacher oriented HRT workshops. Since human relations training cannot usually guarantee a specific outcome, is it the most desirable method of improving interpersonal relationships, and is it appropriately included as a function of formal education? What is the value of HRT to school districts and to the goals of school districts?

Answers to the above and similar questions might be more definitive if HRT has a sound theoretical base. Usually, however, HRT lacks a consistent theory and therefore it does not explain behavior in precise terms which can be substantiated or negated by observation or empirical tests.

Adopting a human relations training program in teacher education is threatening in that as with any change many find security in maintaining the status quo. If approached with the idea that HRT has the potential for increasing interpersonal relationships, and that this goal is desirable, perhaps there is a legitimate place for it in teacher education programs. If viewed as a panacea for alleviating universal problems, HRT cannot approach attainable goals. Caution must be observed when instituting HRT programs. If the preceding set of criteria are used to establish such programs, they should yield a high probability of success.
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Contemporary educational literature presents ample evidence to indicate that the decade of the sixties witnessed more attempts at educational reform than any time in prior history. It would take pages to list the acronyms that frame these endeavors. To document the products of Title III and Title IV programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which attempted to affect change in education would alone fill several volumes.

As one reflects on those years and the efforts expended for educational alternatives, one must ask what has been the result? While the reform movement has produced some changes, the schools themselves are largely unchanged. Goodlad (1969) found that schools were much the same in 1969 as they had been in 1949, and in some respects not as good as they were forty years prior when the last great school reform movement was at its peak.

In 1962, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) published a yearbook entitled, Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A New Focus for Education, (Combs, 1962). Written during the technological revolution of the post-Sputnik era, the yearbook did not advocate the production of technological automatons. Quite the contrary, the results of the four year study indicated a need for the development of self-actualizing educators and foresaw a significant change in the teachers' views of their roles and relationships to children.

School experiences significantly affect the lives of students. If public education has failed, one reason is because it tends to be inhumane. This has been the caution of educational reformers for the past ten years—Postman and Weingartner (1969), Goodman (1964), Holt (1964, 1970), Herndon (1969), Dennison (1969), Friedenberg (1969), Kohl (1967), Kozol (1968)
School experiences, noted Carl Rogers, are irrelevant unless they affect

(1) the student's concept about oneself as an individual and as a member of the society (classroom, school, community, and so on) that impinges on oneself, (2) the style that the student develops to deal with the school experiences (notably teacher-student and student-student transactions), (3) the attitudes toward social institutions that students develop as a consequence of their first major experience with one such institution—in this case, the school system (1969).

What is the present school experience? One source refers to school as a sad game.

The game is called "Let's Pretend," and if its name were chiseled into the front of every school building in America we would at least have an honest announcement of what takes place there. The game is based on a series of pretenses which include: Let's pretend that you are not what you are and that this sort of work makes a difference to your lives; let's pretend that what bores you is important, and that the more you are bored, the more important it is; let's pretend that there are certain things everyone must know, and that both the questions and answers about them have been fixed for all time; let's pretend that your intellectual competence can be judged on the basis of how well you can play Let's Pretend (Postman and Weingartner, 1969).

The knowledge explosion is a fact. No one argues the point that scientific knowledge has doubled in the last decade. John Gardner observed that, "We think of the mind as a storehouse to be filled when we should be thinking of it as an instrument to be used (1965)." With human knowledge accelerating at a phenomenal rate, we need larger storehouses. Or we might consider Gardner's alternative that the mind is an instrument to be used. He suggests that the minds of young people should be used to "learn what and who they are, it helps them to think about what they wish to become—as individuals and as a people (1965)."

This is the challenge. As Combs suggested, a major goal of educators at all levels must be to prepare the student to become a person...

...who has a positive view of himself, who is open to experience, who is creative, who is trustworthy and responsible, who has values, who is well informed, and who is aware that he is in the process of becoming. This is the person most able to survive and deal with the future (1962).

It is also assumed that when teachers themselves engage in an educational experience in a way which gives it personal meaning, and when they themselves become independent and self-directed learners, they will be likely...
to create a similar kind of learning experience for the children they teach. Jersild stated that

If teachers accept the concept that education should help each child to develop his real or potential self, it will be essential for the teachers to seek the kind of self-understanding which they are trying to help their pupils achieve. If a person would help others to understand themselves he must strive to understand himself and he must be willing to accept help in the process (1969).

It is now two decades since the post-Sputnik revolution in education. As noted, for the most part, schools have not really changed. The text still remains the fundamental teacher aid despite the many alternatives available. One question is central: why have some individuals accepted change and successfully implemented the results of research and development while others in similar capacities strongly resist? For anyone who observes educational facilities and school programs it is always puzzling to find innovative programs in one district while in a neighboring situation little evidence of change can be found. Likewise, an individual teacher or administrator may evidence alternate methods within a school while most of the staff seem committed to conventional ways. What is it that causes the wide disparity in perceiving the benefits or faults of any new idea? Why, at a period in our history when the time between discovery and application is fast shrinking, should it take educational improvements so long to be accepted? Why have efforts to "humanize" our approaches to teaching only been accepted by a very few even when research data supports tested alternative methods?

A Taxonomy of Awareness

As Harvey states in the text Experience Structure and Adaptability:

Delineation and dissection of the factors surrounding the differential capacity of individuals and social systems to behave creatively, to withstand stress and to cope effectively and adaptively with diversity and change would be of significance to the theorist and practitioner alike ... (1966).

One area of study that offers some insight as to how people effectively and adaptably change attitudes or perceive the world around them centers around revised definitions of what a learner really is. While there continues to be debates about the merits of one curriculum over another, alternative teaching methods and the role of the teacher, there has been little attention given to the characteristics of learners. Learners, as defined here, include all people: public school and collegiate students, teachers, administrators, college teachers and school patrons. Evidence is now accumulating which suggests that all individuals have the potential to pass through several different levels or stages of awareness which affect their perception of the
world around them and alter the way in which they view educational choices.

David E. Hunt (1970) and Lawrence Kohlberg (1971) researched positions that are most appropriate to educators. Their findings have been further analyzed and developed by Charles Jung (1971). Educators who are confronted with criticism from today's youth or who are unhappy with teaching outcomes or whose programs are in need of study, should reflect on the theory which follows.

Just as Jean Piaget theorized that stages of development exist for youngsters, Hunt and Kohlberg have proposed levels of moral and cognitive awareness that parallel chronological stages of development for adolescents and adults. Their disclosures may offer insight for educators. These levels or stages of awareness follow a progression from the need for structure to the need for flexibility on the part of individuals, including those responsible for public school and collegiate education. While it is never a safe procedure to classify or categorize people, readers should be able to recognize the four typical levels or phases.

While the discussion that follows is directly related to today's student population, it must be understood that adults too, can be located along the same continuum. The student facet is as follows.

Level one stereotypes. Level one students are most often encountered in high school and elementary school although a few occasionally find their way to college, especially introductory undergraduate classes. These individuals have responded to the adult world's promotion of role expectations that neatly fall into specific stereotyped occupations. Level one individuals lack the basis for forming individualized or personalized opinions regarding career choices. Course work for them is appealing if there is a direct and immediate relationship with what they perceive as relevant for an expected occupational role, often the parent's occupation or one designated for the learner by parents. Level one students lack an experiential or cognitive base for evaluating the importance of assignments. There may be a rejection of course assignments which often leads to academic failure. These students may do an adequate job in classes if direct occupational relevance is demonstrated. However, most need considerable direction and guidance from the instructor. Thus, programmed materials, workbooks, worksheets, readings relegated to the text, and structured laboratory experiences offer the best methods for these students. Jung (1971) calls these individuals the "stereotypic" learners.

Level two opinionates. Level two learners may be termed the "opinionates". These individuals may compose about one-half of most high school and college classes. The opinionate learners are happiest in the world of low level cognitive information. The curriculum is viewed as a collection of non-redundant absolutes. Right-wrong, black-white, and yes-no specifics are learned with enthusiasm. These learners rarely question assignments, learn cognitive information willingly and are most comfortable if the information is in the text or carefully explained in a lecture. There is little pleasure found in real-world learning experiences. An opinionate
botany student, for example, would easily learn that there are four cell layers in the cross-section of a leaf. The learner would draw and label such a cross-section in earnest, feeling comfortable that all leaves hold that anatomical configuration. Opinionate learners like instruction from lectures, handouts, teacher directed discussions, workbooks, structured labs, reports, teacher generated library assignments, films and materials that do not present grey area inconsistencies.

Opinionate learners are the pivotal type in the hierarchy of awareness levels. In time, and with appropriate awareness increasing stimuli, the opinionates begin to exhibit behavioral change. Two forms of stimuli are of interest today: one is documentary television (which is of significance to high school aged individuals) and the other appears to be debate and discussion with peers who may be classified as being on levels three and four. The outcomes of debate and additional input of information often focus upon the realization that there are not as many black-white concrete answers to today's complexities as imagined. Television is not directly responsible for changing many opinions about basic facts or concepts. Rather, television forces young people to question values once held as sacred. A concomitant of this situation is the realization that there is too much to learn; a feeling of despair and frustration is often noted after realizing that it is impossible to learn everything. The individual who learned about four cell layers in the leaf cross-section is dismayed upon discovering that all leaves do not exhibit this pattern.

A result of this new awareness is that formerly opinionated individuals begin to painfully question or reject statements and assertions that adults in education or in positions of authority make. At the same time there may be concomitant changes in dress, appearance, and behavior. These signal the beginning of level three awareness.

Level three existentialists. Jung terms level three individuals as "existential" learners. As the existential term implies, time awareness is worth noting. While level one and level two learners tend to live for the future and speak often of the past, level three types are not concerned with the past and reject most information which alludes to historical positions or opinions. Neither are they concerned with what is to come. These students live mainly in the here and now. Today this type often exhibit dress patterns considered bizarre by opinionates. Some characteristics of this type of individual may include alternate life style, drug use, varied religious expression, and (of importance to the educator) questions about what is worth studying, learning and knowing. Members of prior generations have arrived at level three awareness without manifesting such overt characteristics; however, they usually can relate some "deviant" behavior common to their era.

It has been argued that not all individuals who reach level three awareness must evidence the alternate life style replete with drugs, deviant behavior or changed dress. However, if one has passed through this stage it is possible to document some "deviant" change in behavior. In school, it may be noted that once eager students (by level two standards)
often withdraw and direct their energies in personal endeavors that may not necessarily be self-damaging. Such activities often include social service, creative diversions (such as music, art, literature), or withdrawing for a new look at the world. The level three period is the phase that gives teachers and administrators some of their most difficult moments. The protests of the late 1960's were the product of level three types for the most part.

Level three students prefer teaching methods and educational experiences that allow for options and independent learning such as teaching-learning contracts, open-ended problems, open experimentation and student led discussions. Traditional teaching methods are most often rejected. Many of these students espouse the notion that they are able to structure their own courses and methods for evaluating progress. Many teachers are dismayed at the thought of allowing students to take part in formulating decisions about course content, procedure and evaluation methods. Teachers who are not supportive of the demand to affect course structure are often victims of poor student ratings, student dissen.tion, and poor cooperation.

There is no set length of time for an individual to stay at awareness level three, nor is there a specific age at which people enter this period; it depends on the individual's experience and immediate surroundings. Often people will vacillate in and out of the preceding and following levels, a point that is of interest to those studying learning theory.

The level three period terminates when the learners reach an awareness about the finiteness of life and the realization that the individual is responsible for making choices and decisions that affect the outcomes of life.

Level four self-actualizers. The final level of awareness may be termed the "creative" stage. At this point in development, learners have the realization that life might be purposeful and that they are free to make choices which will affect their lives. This differs from the blind acceptance of purposefulness found in levels one and two. Level four learners take charge of life. Many educators will note that the once recalcitrant, level three learners will seek out those professors who they deem as relevant and begin to study with them with a zealousness that is startling. Having entered the creative phase, the learners accept that all behavior represents the possibility of choice for exposing or not exposing oneself to change. There is an accepting of responsibility for an active part in creating "self" from that point on.

The freedom wanted by level four learners generate a great deal of independence; work is genuine, creative and unencumbered. In Maslow's terms, these individuals would be considered "self-actualizing." Maslow (1970), a psychologist, devoted much of his later life to the formulation of the self-actualization theory. He searched for the conditions under which people developed to the full stature of which they are capable. Crucial to this idea is the concept of basic needs. That is, Maslow believed that self-actualization can only result after a series of basic
physiological and psychological needs are satisfied. These needs are listed in sequence from lower to higher, in what Maslow terms the "hierarchy of relative pre-potency." This concept is important to the present discussion as it offers additional evidence supporting the notion of levels of awareness.

Maslow's classification of basic needs, beginning with the lowest level, are as follows.

1. The physiological needs are the needs which work for our biological self-maintenance.
2. The safety needs include the need for order, routing, the family, the known, and the need for security.
3. The needs for belongingness and love are reflected in the need for a place in a group and for affectionate relationships with other people.
4. The esteem needs are the needs for importance, self-respect, self-esteem, independence, and the respect and esteem of others.
5. The need for self-actualization is the desire to realize one's maximum potential.

Using the Hunt and Kohlberg concept as a framework, it would appear that level one and level two individuals have satisfied Maslow's first three needs, while level three people are searching for Maslow's fourth need, esteem. Maslow's final level is reached during the creative stage or the self-actualized state.

The results of Maslow's studies yielded the following characteristics of people who are in the process of actualizing themselves.

1. A more adequate perception of reality and more comfortable relations with reality than occur in average people. Maslow's cases seem to detect the spurious, the fake, and the dishonesty in interpersonal relations and to be attuned to the truth and to reality in all spheres of life. They eschewed the illusory and preferred to cope with even unpleasant reality rather than retreat to pleasant fantasies.
2. A high degree of acceptance of themselves, of others, and of the realities of human nature. They were not ashamed of being what they were, and they were not shocked or dismayed to find foibles and shortcomings in themselves or in others.
3. Spontaneity. Self-actualizing people displayed spontaneity in their thinking, emotions, and behavior to a greater extent than average people.
4. Problem-centeredness. Maslow's subjects all seemed to be focused on problems outside themselves. They were not overly self-conscious; they were not problems to themselves, and could hence devote their attention to a task, duty, or mission that seemed peculiarly cut out for them.
5. A need for privacy. Self-actualizing people could enjoy solitude; indeed, they would even seek it out on occasion, needing it for periods of intense concentration on subjects of interest to them.

6. A high degree of autonomy. Self-actualizing people seem able to remain true to themselves in the face of rejection or unpopularity; they were able to pursue their interests and projects and maintain their integrity even when it hurt to do so.

7. A continued freshness of appreciation. Self-actualizing people showed the capacity to "appreciate again and again, freshly and naively, the basic goods of life... a sunset, a flower, a baby, a person"; it was as if they avoided merely lumping experiences into categories and then dismissing them. Rather, they could see the unique in many apparently commonplace experiences.

8. Frequent "mystic experiences". Self-actualizing people seemed subject to periodic experiences that are often called "mystic" or "oceanic"—feelings that one's boundaries as a person have suddenly evaporated and one has truly become a part of all mankind and even of all nature.

9. Gemeinschaftsgefühl. The German word Gemeinschaftsgefühl means "brotherly feeling," the feeling of belongingness to all mankind (related to the mystic experiences above); the attitude was found to be characteristic of self-actualizing people. They felt a sense of identification with mankind as a whole, such that they could become concerned not only with the lot of members of their immediate family, but also with the situation of persons from different cultures.

10. Close relationships with a few friends or loved ones. Maslow found that his self-actualizing subjects, while not necessarily very popular, did have the capacity to establish truly close, loving relationships with at least one or two people.

11. Democratic character structure. Self-actualizing people tended to judge people and to be friendly with them, not on the basis of race, status, religion, or other group membership traits; rather they related to others as individuals.

12. A strong ethical sense. Self-actualizing subjects were found to have a highly developed sense of ethics. Though their notions of right and wrong were not always wholly conventional, their behavior was always chosen with reference to its ethical meaning.

13. Unhostile senses of humor. Self-actualizing people had senses of humor which made common human foibles, pretensions, and foolishness the subject of laughter, rather than sadism, smut, or rebellion against authority.

14. Creativeness. Self-actualizing people were creative and Inventive in some areas of their existence, not followers
of the usual way of doing or thinking.

15. Resistance to enculturation. Self-actualizing subjects could detach themselves somewhat from complete absorption, or "brainwashing" or imprinting by their cultures. This would permit them to adopt critical attitudes toward cultural inconsistencies or unfairness within their own society (Jourard, 1970).

Other social psychologists have written descriptions of the adequate, self-actualizing person. The statements of Arthur W. Combs (1962), Carl Rogers (1969), and Gordon Allport (1955), all indicate the uniqueness of the level four, autonomous or self-actualizing person.

Implications for Inservice Teachers/Administrators

Although the description or classification of students into the four levels is subject to debate and criticism, it is helpful to speculate on the characteristics of school personnel when categorized by the present scheme.

Educators at level one or two are characterized by extremely fixed patterns of response. They tend to perceive things evaluatively, that is, in terms of stereotyped dogma. Teachers at this stage prefer unilateral social relationships or relationships that are hierarchal. Thus, the administrator's role is viewed as unchallengable by teachers at this level. Likewise, administrators at this level take comfort from the direction of board of education or immediate superiors. Their behavior would be characterized as "other-directed" and it would be unlikely that these types would ever question decisions or offer suggestions to those immediately above them.

If level two types are asked for suggestions, responses are often constructed in such a way that the superior is given what the teacher feels the inquirer wishes to hear. Educators at this level also tend to reject information which does not fit in with their present belief system or to distort the information in order to store it in their own existing categories (Hunt, 1970).

The advent of more level three teachers, particularly younger educators, concerns level two administrators. At level three, individuals break away from the rigid rules and beliefs which characterized the former stage. The teachers are now in a state of active resistance to authority and tend to resist control from all sources. They may still tend to dichotomize the environment and many are adamant in the rightness of their positions. Thus, this type often has difficulty perceiving the points of view of others. They are, however, beginning to balance alternatives and to build concepts which bridge differing points of view and ideas which apparently contradict each other.

The level four educators are able to maintain a balanced perspective
and are able to build new constructs and beliefs or belief systems as are necessary in order to accommodate changing situations and new information. In addition, they are able to negotiate with others about the rules or conventions that will govern behavior. They can also work openly with others to establish programs of action and to approach abstract problems creatively and spontaneously.

The following figure summarizes the learning environment most often created by teachers at level one and two as compared with the environments created by those at level three and four.

**Levels 1 - 2**

- Low I/D ratio (as measured by an interaction analysis scheme)
- Directive
- Low tolerance for ambiguity
- Competitive environment
- Requirements uniformly prescribed
- Emphasis on objective tests over cognitive material
- Emphasis on teacher evaluation
- Reliance on extrinsic rewards
- View that all learners are the same
- View that there is a right way to teach
- View that all children learn as "I" learned
- View school rules and policies as fixed and unalterable

**Levels 3 - 4**

- High I/D ratio (as measured by an interaction analysis scheme)
- Non-direct
- High tolerance for ambiguity
- Non-competitive environment
- Learner centered requirements
- Emphasis on process evaluation
- Emphasis on self-evaluation
- Reliance on intrinsic rewards
- View that all learners are more different than alike
- View that there are many alternative methods
- View that each person learns in a way that is unique
- View school policies as amenable to discussion and change

**Figure 8. Comparative Learning Environments By Level**

Hunt (1970) describes the necessity of coordinating teaching methods with levels of student awareness. He states that the optimal procedure for inducing individuals to progress toward higher levels (those of flexibility and complexity) is to tailor the training environment to the characteristics of their present stage, but in such a way as to pull the individual towards the next stage of development. The system may be viewed as one ranging from a high degree of teacher structure in the optimal
environment for level one to independence at levels three and four. If this model is based on fact, the teachers must themselves be able to demonstrate acceptance of a wide spectrum of behaviors and produce the proper environment for each learner. If teachers are not themselves at level four, problems arise.

Some methods that appeal to both students and teachers who may be classified at the various levels are described in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels 1 - 2</th>
<th>Levels 3 - 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>Problem formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbooks</td>
<td>Open-ended problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films/filmstrips</td>
<td>Discrepant events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed learning</td>
<td>Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Simulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured laboratory activities</td>
<td>Unstructured laboratory activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher directed discussion</td>
<td>Student led discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single text orientation</td>
<td>Student originated projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning activities packages</td>
<td>Multiple text/readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher directed projects</td>
<td>Activity orientated methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notebooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Teaching Methods and Awareness Levels

Most learning of the stereotypic and opinionated individuals occurs as a reinforcement via grades and adult acclaim. This type of learning is rapidly forgotten and is generally applied under those conditions for which it was learned. By contrast, learning at levels three and four which involves insight is easily retained, needs little or no reinforcement, and is broadly generalized in behavioral applications. Thus, inductive teaching procedures are best for levels three and four individuals.

There have been several sets of interacting research studies which have explored the effectiveness of the teaching strategy derived from Hunt's developmental theory. Hunt (1967) has used the structure to analyze the effectiveness of the Upward Bound programs. While the sample of Upward Bound youngsters did not run the gamut of the developmental stages, Hunt demonstrated that the interactions between training environment and personality were significant in terms of the kinds of growth that the Upward Bound programs were trying to achieve.

Hunt (1966) has also taught the strategy to teachers of the inner city, who attempted to match environments to the kinds of culturally-deprived children they were teaching, and Joyce (1964) has used it in teacher education programs. The model is interesting precisely because it provides a framework for analyzing learners and adjusting the school to their personality needs.
At present, there are a number of attempts to build differential (individualized) teaching strategies from developmental theories that pertain to cognitive development. For example, see the work of Edmund Sullivan (1970) of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. The essence of these attempts is that one takes the descriptions of intellectual development which are described by Piaget, and then attempts to produce teaching strategies which are calculated to induce the learner to engage in the intellectual operations which are appropriate to a stage slightly ahead of his present level of development.

Problems of learners are compounded by differences in awareness exhibited by educators. As expected, adults too have evolved to specific levels of awareness. Conflicts arise when adults at level two attempt to teach or relate to individuals at levels three and four. Many level two adults not only cannot teach levels three and four students, but even fear and often fight them while misinterpreting their behavior. Kohlberg (1971) reports that, while increasing numbers of youth are moving to advanced stages of awareness, most teachers are only at level two, with only ten percent reaching the final stage. He further reports that an individual who stays fixed in a stage for too many years loses the capability of moving to the next stage.

Program Implementation

An extension of the conceptual awareness theory developed by Hunt, when projected to describe the success or failure of implementing educational reform, seems appropriate. It would appear that the problems rest in trying to impose changes in programs created by levels three or four individuals on levels one or two educators. The most serious problems arise when administrators at different levels impose their programs on communities and faculties that are not in a position to accept either the rigidity or flexibility of the proposition.

Thus, any projected change when viewed on a "structure to flexibility" continuum may be viewed by people on opposing ends with disdain and rejection. If one examines the behavioral-humanist debate along this continuum it may serve as an additional focus for the levels concept. It appears that the behaviorist position supports and promotes programs most appealing to levels one and two educators, while the humanist movement seems to be promoting alternatives suitable for levels three and four types.

It is possible to review almost any curricular area and intuitively place a given program on the "structure-flexibility" scale. Structured curricular offerings would support the accountability, behavioral objective, cognitive growth, learning hierarchies, behavior modification, and programmed learning concepts. Flexible curricular offerings would support a humane, student centered, activities centered, open creative atmosphere. Thus, to truly meet today's needs of all youngsters, schools must offer programs that deal with the levels of awareness of staff, students, and the district patrons. Provision must be made for all levels and in a way that
honestly attempts to meet the awareness level of all the publics served. It is really futile and counter-productive to impose change on a system that is not ready for it. Clearly, however, level four people seem to be in most demand in educational circles since their experiences should have allowed them to progress through the prior three levels and left them with a non-judgmental attitude toward people at lower levels. Thus, they are in a better position to prescribe learning plans for youngsters at all levels.

Teacher Education Programs

Those promoting changes in all areas of education, especially in curriculum, must continually assess the types of student enrolled in teacher education programs. As new curricula emphasize more activity centered approaches, preferred by level four types, it is appropriate to identify preservice teachers with attributes and attitudes supportive of a more flexible role. Colleges and universities need to more accurately predict the role of their teacher education candidates as to the probability of their becoming activity centered teachers.

The solution to the problem of developing a test to differentiate levels one and two teachers (teacher centered) from levels three and four (student centered) may have been provided by the work of Berger (1971) in his work with teachers utilizing the materials produced by the Science Curriculum Improvement Study. Using the Predicted Role Measure (PRM), Berger was able to identify a significant difference in responses of activity versus textbook centered teachers. Berger's work was expanded by Taylor (1972) who found he could differentiate types of preservice teachers into those promoting more flexible methods from the more traditional text centered teacher. The implications of Maslow's self-actualization theory on the personal characteristics of preservice teachers have been studied by Smith (1968) and Murray (1969). Likewise, Holt (1971) further applied Maslow's theory to preservice teacher education when he determined criteria of a self-actualizing teacher. Holt, utilizing the "Personal Orientation Inventory" which purports to measure facets of the self-actualizing person, determined that there is a relationship between the overall level of self-actualization of student teachers and their teaching effectiveness when measured by their pupils. In addition to the student teachers' autonomous, self-supportive orientation, he determined that the successful student teacher appears flexible in the application of various value systems. The degree to which the student teachers' value system was flexible appears related to effective teaching. Student teachers who are able to be more accepting of the behavior and value systems of the pupils may well create a classroom environment which encourages pupil participation and learning. On the other hand, student teachers who can only accept their own value system, and make no attempt to accept any pupil value systems, may create an environment in which learning is stifled.
Hunt concludes his report on conceptual level matching by stating:

Assuming that the matching principle is sufficiently well established, it seems probable that one of the major determinants of its acceptability will be the degree to which it is congruent with the 'implicit matching principles' that teachers have in their heads... If one accepts this formulation, then the task of implementing a matching model should begin with an investigation of what 'theory of matching' the educational decision-maker is now using, because from what we know of attitude change and adoption of new procedures, the suggested matching prescriptions should not be too far out of line with those held by the person who will be implementing the prescription. Such problems of implementation will require concepts and strategies at least as comprehensive as those set forth in this paper on matching. Although this is not the place to begin this large task, it seems important at least to point out this rather neglected area of understanding.

One final complicating feature in the possible adoption of matching principles into the schools comes from the increasing tendency for student-determined options and courses. How does a matching model operate in a situation where the students themselves decide the 'prescriptions'? It would seem that work will be necessary in exploring ways in which matching information can be provided to students in constructive, nonthreatening ways so that it can serve as a guide in helping students arrive at effective decisions (1970).

Kubie (1965) and Kohlberg (1971) indicated that in the past, preoccupation with academic achievement has contributed primarily to human worth, while inadvertently maintaining many conditions that inhibit self-evolution. With a hierarchy of awareness or "Matching Levels" concept, educators will be able to provide a better combination of conditions which maintain high academic achievement for human worth along with experiences of decision-making and other forms of self-awareness which provide for human dignity and freedom. The increased creative and destructive capabilities of recent cultural and technological advances in society make such improvement not only possible, but extremely important to the welfare of mankind.

Seekers of change in institutions of higher education and more specifically teacher preparation institutions might use the four stage "Conceptual Levels Matching Model" herein described as a reference continuum. To be sure, it may be an unsafe procedure to classify all mankind into four levels of awareness. Yet, if changes in teacher education curricula are to be
efficacious, some congruency must take place between those who administer program changes and those being changed or allegedly being changed by the program. This model implies that internal conflicts will probably be predictable where the institutional "press" is at odds with the innovative direction.

If teacher education changes are being guided under the Performance Based Teacher Education (PBTE) tenets, which are highly behavioristic in learning principles and philosophy, then there will ultimately be confrontations of great magnitude, especially from professors of the liberal arts who tend to perceive themselves as more humanistically oriented than the espousers of PBTE.

This paper does not propose a guideline for action. Rather, it proposes a serious model which may explain and predict the personality and learning types who are attracted to various programs and curricula. The test of this model will ultimately come through empirical studies. If the model is used as an analytic tool for the planning of change, then it will have served the purposes of the Seven Year Teacher Education Study group.
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Chapter 6

The Semantics of Competency Based or Performance Based Teacher Education

by

Donald P. Kauchak
Department of Education
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

An idea has arrived on the educational scene which is in need of a name. The idea is that the education and certification of teachers should be based upon the future teacher's capability to teach rather than on class hours taken. Two terms have been used interchangeably to describe this new conception of teacher preparation: "performance based teacher education," and "competency based teacher education." Little attempt has been made to differentiate between these two terms. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Committee on Performance Based Teacher Education, while choosing to utilize the term "performance," wrote that "... the adjective itself is relatively unimportant if there is consensus on what elements are essential to distinguish performance or competency based programs from other programs" (Elam, 1971, p. 6). Such a pragmatic stance on semantics, while useful in the initial stages of conceptualization to bring diverse groups together under a common banner, ultimately obscures valid differences between the concepts. The choice of terms to designate an idea, especially in the initial stages may have important effects later. This chapter is a brief attempt to differentiate between "competency" and "performance," and in so doing, analyze some of the denotations and connotations associated with each term.

The major distinction between the two terms to date has been made by Burns. Burns noted that both performance based and competency based teacher education are predicated on outcomes defined in behavioral terms. In distinguishing between the terms, Burns stated, "Objectives describing a behavior, but without additional criteria, lead to performance based education; while behavioral objectives with performance criteria lead to competency based education" (1972, p. 39). Performance based education emphasizes that students be able to execute predetermined activities upon completion of their training as teachers. Competency based education also emphasizes the execution of predetermined activities, but in addition is concerned with...
the establishment of criterion standards for the execution, and with the level of proficiency at which the activities are executed. As defined by Burns, competency based education appears to be the more professionally oriented, the level of proficiency being determined by the demands of on-the-job performance standards. The use of the term "competency based" accentuates the need for close consultation with both professional organizations and teachers in the field to determine competency levels. Burn's distinction also underlines the importance of criterion standards when considering teacher qualification.

Useful distinctions can be made between competency and performance by using the framework learning psychologists employ to distinguish between "learning" and "performance." Disparities between what researchers thought subjects learned and their actual performance on tests convinced researchers that these two terms were not synonymous. Learning was considered to be a hypothetical construct, "... an entity or process that is inferred as actually existing (though not at present fully observable) and as giving rise to measurable phenomena" (English and English, 1958, p. 116). Learning cannot be directly observed but only inferred to exist by observing a person's performance on certain tests or tasks. Poor performance on a task, however, may not necessarily be due to a lack of learning, but may be caused by a number of factors related to the performance situation. Anxiety or fatigue may affect a person's performance in a test situation, thus giving an unrealistic picture of how much the person learned. The particular task or tasks being performed may inaccurately measure what a person has learned. Unclear directions, faulty wording, or inadequate sampling can act to distort the relationship between learning and performance.

In a similar manner, competencies are not always directly observable; they may be best defined as hypothetical constructs. Competencies must be inferred from overt behaviors or performances in different situations. The performance in an evaluation situation becomes the means by which to verify the existence of competencies. The difficulties involved in arranging for a valid evaluation situation place a tremendous burden on the teacher candidate. The burden would be diminished were evaluative feedback both easier to attain and more constant with opportunities for correction. Fairness to the teacher candidate demands a considerable amount of planning and research to insure a close correspondence between the teacher candidate's competencies and performance in an evaluation situation.

The significance of such a distinction between performance and competency is the emphasis placed on the importance of valid evaluation situations. Educators involved in teacher preparation have a responsibility to develop an adequate evaluation instrument capable of validly measuring given competencies. This responsibility would become crucially important in teacher education programs advocated by Schalock.

Schalock (Rosner, 1972) suggests a teacher preparation program in which entrance into the profession would be determined by the ability of the teacher candidate to bring about student learning in a classroom situation. The utilization of such criterion for teacher certification demands
evaluation instruments that are not only valid but highly reliable. The possibility of excluding teacher candidates with the necessary competencies or of admitting into the profession teacher candidates who lack the necessary professional skills emphasizes the importance of good evaluation instruments. Proponents of the competency based approach to teacher education generally assume that a major problem with traditional teacher education programs is that teaching skills are either ill taught or not taught at all. The solution to the problem of poor teaching becomes then, in large part, one of increased teacher training efficiency and more precise quality controls at the entrance to the profession. It could be concluded that a current major problem is lack of initial entry skills.

Advocates of competency based teacher education and certification seem reticent to extend the concept of competency standards through the span of a teacher's career. Such a stance on the role of competencies, in terms of assessing entry and continuing skill, points to an implicit assumption made by advocates of competency based teacher education: that to possess competencies is to use them in the classroom. The comparison of the competency/performance relationship in the field of education, as with the learning/performance relationship in psychology, affords a basis to examine this assumption.

As mentioned previously, psychologists note a disparity between what a person was known to have "learned" and their subsequent "performance" on a test. One variable introduced to explain the difference between the two terms was drive. Drive was considered to be a condition of the organism, such as hunger or thirst, which effects the response of the organism. This physiological interpretation of drive has been broadened to include other learned motivational conditions, such as the need for achievement or attitudes toward the task. The implication of the concept of drive for competency based teacher education is that acquisition of competencies may not automatically guarantee their use in the classroom. Competencies forced upon teacher candidates, or competencies not organized into their total conceptual framework of good teaching are not likely to be used as frequently as competencies accepted and integrated into the candidate's cognitive framework. Thus the ability of competencies to satisfy teachers' cognitive needs is an important determinant in their rate of use. In short, acquisition of a competency may not insure its use years later, unless use of the skill is in some way made rewarding to the individual. Advocates of competency based teacher education programs have given inadequate consideration to the problem of candidates' acceptance of competencies. The planning of such programs has evidenced little attention to this problem at either the instructional or the evaluation stage.

An additional variable affecting the relationship between learning and performance is incentive. Psychologists found that subjects would perform faster and longer for more or better incentives. In a similar manner, incentives (or the reward conditions of a teaching situation) effect the use of learned competencies. Using competencies acquired in teacher education programs which run counter to norms prevalent in schools could elicit either negative reinforcement or no reinforcement. In either case, the use of such
competencies could decrease in time as a result of receiving no incentives for their use. Contrariwise, incentives could potentially be used in a positive manner to reward and encourage desired teacher behavior, and thus strengthen the relationship between acquired competencies and performance in the classroom. Competency based teacher education literature has given inadequate treatment to the problem of on-the-job influences affecting the use of learned competencies. Notably lacking are viable, field tested methods for encouraging use of acquired competencies and attainment of further competencies.

The disciplines and education. Finally, there is the connotation in the use of the term competency based teacher education to subtly imply that all other forms of teacher education create "Incompetents." The semantics of performance or competency based teacher education programs is alone adequate to sway lay boards of education. For example, there is no published evidence that the Washington State Board of Education, or the Florida or Arizona legislatures examined any empirical evidence before they prescribed the performance based certification and/or teacher evaluation system. Lack of such evidence in the literature suggests they did not. Basically it is this writer's opinion that the processes associated with the acceptance of performance and competency based teacher certification was more expedient politically than sound educationally.

It must also be noted that the concept of performance or competency based teacher education is a misnomer of the highest order. In nearly all institutions which describe their programs with these terms, the liberal arts or the academic disciplines have not been converted. To be sure, the departments of education are in various stages of performance or competency based teacher education. But, in the vast, vast majority of institutions, the academic stuff of teaching, the disciplines, are traditional. To the writer's knowledge, no competency based teacher education program has solved this problem of a part time competency based curriculum. As of 1973, no published paper reviewed by the writer has acknowledged this most apparent discrepancy. Further, this writer will predict that the disciplines will not be receptive to the semantics associated with the competency movement. Such an assumption, if valid, may in the last analysis cause the demise of the highly publicized competency based programs. Without the total support from an institution the teacher education programs can only emerge as a partial response to the rather glorious ideals connoted by the term "competency based."

The foregoing discussion is an attempt to illustrate how "competency based teacher education" and "performance based teacher education," commonly used synonymously in the literature, carry many differing connotations. The differences of meaning, when examined analytically, reveal questions about ideas subsumed under the terms themselves. Moreover, the differences of meaning subtly affect the implementation of the concepts which the terms represent into diverse teacher education programs. It would be prudent of educators to distinguish more precisely between terms commonly used to describe a new concept or approach to teacher education.
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CHAPTER 7

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED COMPETENCY MODULE PROGRAM

AT WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

by

Michael A. Balasa and Frank B. May

Department of Education
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

During the academic year 1970-71 the Elementary Education Committee of the Department of Education at Washington State University developed a proposal to create a "Competency Oriented Personalized Education" program for elementary preservice teachers. This proposal was an outcome of a previously planned program proposal submitted to the U.S. Office of Education but was not funded by that agency. The enthusiasm among those who participated in generating the proposal was great enough to continue the development and implementation of basic ideas without federal financial support. Part of this program focused on the development of individualized competency modules which could be substituted for the traditional teaching methods courses.

To demonstrate these individualized competency modules, this chapter will draw upon module development for one exemplary course involved in this program, Education 304 (a six-hour, junior level methods course in reading, children's literature, and the language arts). The Education 304 course serves as the focus for discussion in the sections below entitled "Module Utilization," "Instructor Innovations," "Program Evaluation," and "Experimental Evaluation of the Individualized Competency Module Program."

Assumptions Used in Program Development

The assumptions underlying the desire to create competency modules follow.

1. Individuals vary in their learning rates and learning styles.
2. Teacher trainees should develop and demonstrate teaching competencies rather than just test taking abilities.
3. Learning-for-mastery is a reasonable goal for teachers-in-training.

4. Observable behavior should be the basis for evaluating the progress of teachers-in-training.

5. Positive transfer between learning experiences on campus and teaching experiences in elementary school classrooms can be attained.

The first assumption, that individuals vary in their learning styles and rates, is based on studies and observations long reported in educational literature. This assumption has become an educational axiom.

To meet the first assumption, several modules were developed in the area of reading instruction, which could be used by the preservice trainee on an independent study basis. These modules specify the behavioral objectives which the trainee must meet at the knowledge, simulation, and application-through-teaching levels. The student is then provided either with written information necessary for meeting the objectives or with a list of annotated sources. Thus, the trainee can proceed at his/her own rate by either reading the material or by selecting the materials desired from a given list of resources.

To provide for a variety of learning styles the original plan was to make available to the trainee several different types of learning media: reading, programmed materials, listening to lectures or audio-taped lectures, viewing of video-taped classroom teaching, case studies or tapes of actual children, and actual classroom experiences. In practice some experimentation took place with all of these media with the exception of audio-taped lectures. The latter have yet to be developed.

The second assumption, that teacher trainees should demonstrate teaching competence rather than just test taking abilities seems to be an obvious and valid assumption for those involved in training teachers. However, it is only since the Conant Report on teacher preparation (Conant, 1963) that more serious attention has been given to this assumption by the majority of teacher educators. Studies showing low correlations between academic performance and field success (Barr, 1948; Barr, 1961; Walberg, 1967) convinced many educators that the product of a teacher education program should not be a person who has done little more than pass paper and pencil tests, please instructors, and gather credit hours; rather this person should be one who has continually demonstrated specified competencies in a number of simulated and actual teaching situations.

To meet the second assumption, trainees were engaged in both simulated and actual classroom situations. One of the best examples of this is the simulated reading assessment. This simulation requires the trainee to listen to several tapes of different children reading and to assess the children's instructional, independent, and frustration levels. The trainees are then asked to make a similar type of assessment with an actual child in a nearby public school. They are also asked to administer an informal word analysis inventory to this child. Evaluations of the trainee's competence are made.
both by the university instructors and the public school cooperating teachers.

The third assumption, learning-for-mastery, is similar to that held by Benjamin Bloom. "Most students," Bloom claims, "(perhaps about ninety percent) can master what we have to teach them, and it is the task of instruction to find the means which will enable our students to master the subject under consideration" (1971). Bloom and others have cited ample evidence for such a claim. The assumption that students should master what they are expected to learn is based on another assumption—one that has been supported in pedagogical circles for decades but has seldom been applied in practice: "Whatever is worth learning is worth learning well." Too often in the past students of education have been asked to learn too little about too much.

To meet the third assumption, that learning-for-mastery is a reasonable goal for teachers-in-training, the developers attempted to limit the number of modules to a necessary minimum for effective teacher training, thereby reducing the amount of information which the trainee must learn and also reducing the amount of negative transfer which often coincides with an information overload. Within each module an attempt has been made to keep the information to be learned to such a minimum. To arrive at the minimum, a definition was attempted for classroom roles which teachers typically carry out in their position as elementary classroom teachers. These roles serve as screens through which is selected the information that trainees should receive. The resulting information is subjected to further analysis by deciding whether or not the obtaining of this information can be demonstrated—at all three levels: the knowledge level, the simulation level, and the application-through-teaching level. Theoretically, information that cannot result in demonstrable behavior is either discarded or given to the students on an optional basis.

Mastery of information (rather than coverage) is further encouraged by stipulating a rather high level of performance acceptance. For example, on a test given at the knowledge level for each module, 80% accuracy has been established as the minimum level of competency. Trainees who do not meet this minimum criterion level must carry out further study or receive tutoring, as well as retake the test (or a parallel form) before continuing to the simulation level of the module.

The fourth assumption, that evaluation should be based on observable behavior, is based on the premise by Mager (1962) that teachers simply cannot tell whether learning is taking place unless there is some observable change in behavior. Frequently teachers have assumed that learning was taking place simply because of the "knowledge expressions" on students' faces.

The method of meeting the fourth assumption has been somewhat described above. The basic theoretical position is that information that cannot result in demonstrable behavior should be either discarded or given to the students on an optional basis. Information that can result in observable
Behavior is to be tested at three levels: first at the knowledge level (multiple-choice and short answer tests), then at the simulation level (reading assessments on taped children, development of questions for a basal reader story), and finally at the application-through-teaching level (during their junior year pre-student teacher experience). The testing at the application-through-teaching level has been limited by the amount of time available to the cooperating teachers for evaluating the trainees' performance. It is anticipated that this situation will improve in the future and will be supplemented by evaluation of cooperating teachers during the senior year student teaching (clinical) experiences.

The last assumption, concerning positive transfer between on campus experiences and actual teaching experiences, is premised on a principle of learning that has been verified through research: transfer can best take place if the initial learning situations are similar to the final behavior desired.

To meet the fifth assumption, an attempt was made to guide the trainees into completing each module in a sequential manner. The trainee is expected to first complete a module (at the specified mastery level) at the knowledge level, then to complete it at the simulation level, and finally to transfer the information and skill gained into classroom teaching within a short time after completing the simulation level. This sequential pattern is made possible by the arrangement between the Pullman Public Schools and Washington State University.

Development of Program

The elementary staff was actively involved in developing instructional modules based upon the five assumptions discussed above. Assisting the staff were numerous graduate students interested in teacher education, many of whom were involved in teaching the elementary methods courses. Also assisting the staff were three media technicians and a librarian, all being employed full time by the Department primarily for carrying out the ongoing traditional program but also for assisting in module development and utilization.

As a form of institutional reward for faculty members engaged in module development, completed modules were considered equivalent to publications or research proposals. In the beginning, this type of "bait" was not taken readily by the faculty. There seemed to be a reluctance to equate module development with traditional professional activities. But gradually an increasing number of faculty members overcame their reluctance (over a period of about two years) and began to become involved in module development. Incentives for graduate students included course grades, additional credits, thesis topics, and simply the experience in module development which could be acquired. (The latter it should be noted also helped these same graduate students obtain employment.)
The time spent on the development of modules can be enormous, particularly when one accounts for the countless hours of communication that must go on among and between university and public school personnel concerning essential teaching behaviors in the classroom, the type of model teaching behavior which should be demonstrated on video-tapes, and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the modules. Whereas the actual writing of a single module may take little more than an afternoon or two, the concomitant, prior, and succeeding tasks for the university professor takes many, many additional hours.

In addition to the problems of time consumption in the actual production of modules, there is the further problem of the time lag between enthusiasm for module development and actual creation of modules. Many faculty members may be enthused about the development of modules, but do not know how to go about it. Therefore, inservice education is necessary—an another time consuming factor. At Washington State University an attempt was made to provide inservice education through brief two-hour long workshops and through duplicated position papers. This approach has not been highly effective as faculty members often consider themselves too busy to either attend workshops or read the papers. It is anticipated that some type of release time will be made available to faculty in the future.

Perhaps one of the most time consuming aspects of module development was that of creating video-tapes to provide the prototype models of teacher behavior which the module was attempting to demonstrate. For example, if the module were attempting to provide information on a selected method of teaching a particular type of phonic signal, a video-tape would be made of a classroom teacher successfully demonstrating this teaching method. This involved a great deal of planning, articulating, and communicating between university personnel and classroom teachers on how the lesson might best be taught, on which children to use in the demonstration lesson, and on numerous mechanical details related to high quality video-taping. During the development of these tapes it was necessary to free one faculty member for one semester full time to work with teachers and technicians. But even this was not adequate to produce consistently high quality educational tapes. In the future much more time will be necessary for communication and coordination between classroom demonstration teachers and university personnel. Furthermore, additional incentives such as university credit may have to be provided to classroom teachers who participate in the videotaping program. The incentive used to date has simply been that of providing teachers with a chance to observe themselves on tape.

Numerous purchases were necessary to add the video-tape dimension to the list of resources available to trainees in each module. These included a number of video-tape recorders (both for producing the tapes and for playing them back to students on an individual basis), a number of television cameras, and of course all of the supplementary materials necessary for recording and playback. Effective video-taping requires, for example, at least two cameras, one to record the teacher's behavior and one to record the children's behavior. Effective recording with two cameras in turn requires a portable console that allows for split screen recording.
as well as the type of recording that shifts from teacher to pupil. Although the time and effort spent on the development of video-tapes has not yet been justified in terms of student use of demonstrable behavior, it has provided stimulation for future investigations. Probably the slow and gradual development of truly effective tapes is the most promising modus operandi.

One of the courses involved in the development of individualized competency modules in the program for elementary preservice teachers is Education 304. Attention will be focused on that course as an example of module development in this program. Again, Education 304 is a six-hour, junior level methods course in reading, children's literature and the language arts.

Module Utilization

In actual use, the Education 304 modules are flexible enough for each instructor to modify instructional strategies as well as module content to fit an instructor's competencies, idiosyncrasies and philosophies. Within the basic framework of the module's format of pre-test/knowledge acquisition/simulation/ and post-test, instructors have experimented with variations. For example, an application-through-teaching component is a part of several modules. Experiments have led to further improvements in the program and development of additional modules and learning resources. Another important factor resulting from continuous experimentation is the continuous enthusiasm which accompanies innovations. An inflexible, static program is not conducive to stimulate instructor enthusiasm—which is necessary for a successful program. Because of the built-in flexibility of the Education 304 modules, it is difficult to generalize accurately on all aspects of the program. The following description of the basic utilization of the modules will be a basis for further discussion of instructor experimentation and innovation.

Students purchase the complete set of locally prepared modules from the University Book Store at the beginning of the semester. Having all the modules at one time has the advantage of allowing students to preview the entire course and the sequence of development. The course consists of fourteen modules. Nine modules related to reading are based on the book, To Help Children Read by Frank B. May (Charles E. Merrill, 1973). There are three additional modules prepared by the Department of Education dealing with the teaching of oral language, listening skills, spelling, handwriting and creative composition. An additional two modules are also used which deal with children's literature and poetry. The fourteen modules are presented to the students in a sequential order requiring them to successfully complete each before proceeding to the next.

To introduce each module there is a rationale, explaining why the module is important to teacher preparation. The specific goals, stated in behavioral terms, for that module are listed next.
The introductory module, although being self-contained and self-instructional, tends to confuse students about the implementation of the study and activities and the expectations of the instructor. To alleviate student anxiety, instructors usually lead the students through the first instructional module, explaining where the resources are located, how to obtain resources, how to organize time and activities, the standards of study and product expected from the students, and time limits for completion of each module. Because of the unorthodox learning procedure inherent in the modules, students are understandably anxious about a method of learning different from the standard lecture method. Once they master the module routine, anxieties tend to disappear for most students. Those who appear compulsive or lack organization still tend to feel anxious and do seek instructor reassurance.

The first implementation of each module is the pre-test. The test covers the goals of the module, and students can determine from the tests which resources need to be studied to pass the final post-test. Goals which were successfully met on the pre-test need not be studied. Usually students will study all the goals on the module regardless of indications of mastery on the pre-test. Perhaps they feel their own knowledge might be lacking in part and they wish to pursue all listed objectives for the module.

Goals of each module are stated in such a way as to direct students to appropriate resources. Goals are written on two levels: knowledge level and performance or simulation level. An example of a knowledge goal would be as follows:

On a closed book examination you will be given several terms to identify. For each term there will be five examples. You will be asked to select the one example which truly illustrates the term. Terms you will need to understand are these: Phonogram, phoneme, grapheme, consonant letter, vowel letter, consonant digraph, vowel digraph, consonant blend, digraph, VC pattern, VCE pattern, CV pattern, and VV pattern.

The student will refer to a list of resources in the appendix to determine how to meet that goal. Choices might include material on audio-tape, videotape, programmed materials, computer assisted instruction courses, or specially prepared folders. Students might prefer to follow one type of medium, such as programmed materials, to master the objectives. Most, however, prefer to meet objectives through two or more sources or methods.

Many of the available resources are placed in the education area library. Resources heavily used by the students are placed on three-hour or one-day reserve. Having a library which is truly service oriented, it is necessary to control the outflow of materials as well as maintain the condition of the materials, especially hardware which is easily damaged if misused. Also within the education building and easily accessible from the library is a media resource center where students can check out audio playback units, cassette recorders, video-tape recorders and receivers, and
various visual projectors. A resource room is being developed where students will be able to utilize audio-visual equipment under supervision of a media specialist. The resource room now contains a computer terminal, typewriters, carrels equipped with audio plug ins for a master recording console, and study desks. The Department of Education provides a part-time teaching assistant to manage the resource room. In future semesters, this room will play a greater role in providing students with assistance to utilize the resources recommended in the modules.

Simulation level objectives direct a student to try out the newly learned knowledge. An example of a simulation level objective is as follows:

When given a closed book examination, you will observe a sample (about 10 to 15 minutes) of a teacher providing reading instruction. Teacher behavior will either be dramatized or presented on film, video-tape or audio-tape. (Instructor will select a sample, or ask a committee of students to dramatize a sample of teacher behavior.) You will be asked to write a critique in which you tell what learning principles the teacher utilized and what ones were violated, and to cite an example in each case.

This individual activity gives each student a chance to demonstrate an understanding of knowledge learned independently through study of the knowledge objectives of the module. Simulation activities are varied because the tasks are so differentiated. The task may include teaching in small groups or in entire classes, evaluation of pupils' performance, motivating pupils, or other appropriate activities. As with the knowledge level objectives, mastery criteria are specified in detail.

The final process in completing each module is the demonstration of mastery. Students studying independently of the class group take the post-test, which is an alternate form of the pre-test, when they believe they are ready. The student taking the test and failing to achieve a predetermined mastery is allowed to restudy the knowledge and simulation objectives so that the test may be retaken. Students must demonstrate mastery of the objectives for one module before being allowed to proceed to the next module.

An important aspect of this program at Washington State University is the laboratory experience (application-through-teaching level) in the public schools of Pullman. Students spend one-half day per week in a public school classroom under the supervision of a master teacher. While participating in this laboratory experience, they are encouraged to participate, not just observe the teacher. Students are asked to handle as many teaching activities as possible with the goal being to experience what it is like to be a classroom teacher. Hopefully, students will actually appreciate the pressures and responsibilities related to the teaching situation.

Participating teachers in the Pullman Public Schools vary greatly in their perception about the role of the student participant. Some teachers
allot more responsibility to the participant. Some just request the housekeeping tasks such as grading papers or caring for the room. Other teachers require participants to work with individual children as tutors. All teachers, however, are required to allow their student participants to teach three directed lessons. The three lessons include one lesson from the reading area, one lesson from language arts other than reading, and one lesson in the area of children's literature or poetry.

The study modules all include lists of lesson suggestions to be attempted in the laboratory. Students write an accepted lesson plan, have it approved by the instructor and laboratory teacher, teach the lesson, write a self-evaluation of how the lesson succeeded, and prepare a personal reaction to their own endeavors. Since 1973, the Pullman school laboratory experiences have been extended to the Education 305 class which is concerned with elementary social studies, science and mathematics. In that course too, the students are expected to teach three directed lessons in the classroom. Students are encouraged to take Education 304 and 305 successively, thus allowing them to remain in the same Pullman classroom to observe the development of a class of pupils over an entire school year. Those wishing to change classes are allowed to do so before beginning their second semester.

Students participating in the Pullman Public Schools are required to keep a log of their daily activities. The log is signed by the participating teacher and examined by the university instructor at the end of each semester. The student then knows that the activities and experiences gained in the public school are recognized by the instructor. An example of items listed in the log would include administering of tests, correcting workbook pages, tutoring pupils, constructing tests, helping art and music teachers, finding resources in library and media rooms, conducting reading and math groups, helping children practice and present dramas, and doing many other activities that are realistically part of the typical classroom scene.

Instructor Innovations

Originally the Education 304 modules were designed with the expectation that one faculty member would coordinate the efforts of teaching assistants. The teaching assistants would then introduce modules, administer tests, supervise simulations, and counsel students with questions and problems. Funding did not allow for teaching assistant utilization and faculty members were assigned to conduct the Education 304 classes. While this has resulted in a greater expense for personnel, the expertise of the faculty of professorial rank has resulted in a more dynamic program. Experimentation is under way concerning module format, utilization of resources and coordination of laboratory and classroom experiences.

One experimental modification is being tried to consider the pre-test as a practice test. All students take the test to obtain an indication of test content and format for the final evaluation. This procedure precludes
the degree of selection a student might make of the objectives to be studied. There is still freedom in the amount of study necessary for each student to meet objectives.

Several instructors have modified the individualization of the modules to include more small group participation and interaction. An early criticism of the program was that individualization isolated students from each other and resulted in overlap in individual conferences with instructors as well as too little sharing of laboratory experiences between students. Assuming that students learn from each other, instructors arranged for small group meetings to discuss selected aspects of the modules. At the knowledge objective level of the module, instructors can bring the class together to provide background information on the module in terms of the implications of the knowledge to the entire sequence of knowledge within the course. Instructors found that not every student was able to relate previously learned modules to the content of newly introduced modules; therefore, group discussion was used to clarify the logical sequence of information. At the simulation and application-through-teaching level of the modules, students could meet after performing simulations at the university or teaching lessons in the laboratory schools to compare notes. For the simulations performed at the college, students were encouraged to work together which allowed them to compare their interpretation of the materials with others. Laboratory skill experiences were unique for each individual and sharing these experiences expanded the laboratory experiences for all students. Sharing problems in this manner will hopefully lead to a better understanding of teaching and to the solving of problems.

Allowing for more group participation resulted in less individualization and thus less self-pacing of module utilization. This problem has been partially overcome by allowing those who work faster to complete their work sooner and to spend more time attempting additional laboratory and simulation experiences. Further experimentation is continuing to solve the problem of maintaining a degree of individualization and self-pacing along with the advantages of group participation and interaction.

Resource materials are constantly being updated, deleted and new materials added. Department of Education personnel participated in a workshop in techniques of Instructional design. From this workshop, renewed interest was generated in developing mini-courses in specific teaching skills. These courses used media hardware such as audio cassettes and video-tape recorders. Within the Department of Education, the media center has available a complete television studio with video-tape recording equipment to develop simulation materials. Washington State University allocated funds to the Department under Washington State House Bill 151 to make innovations in instructional technology. Computer assisted instruction mini-courses, the most recent innovation, were developed with these funds. However, there is a continuing need to develop more effective audio and visual instructional materials. Thus, the state's fiscal resources have played the role in program development.

Module content has undergone several changes since initial development.
Instructors modify modules as new educational information becomes current and as a result of student feedback. While field testing of modules will be discussed below, an example of such change, as mentioned earlier, is the development of Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) mini-courses. Reports from first year teachers indicated that the content of reading, i.e., word attack and comprehension skills, were not adequately covered. The CAI courses are primarily concerned with reading content and will be available to students during the Education 304 semester and after student teaching for remediation.

It is the consensus of the elementary faculty that each professor has a duty to generate innovations from semester or semester. Instructors share their innovations formally and informally to improve the program continuously from day to day rather than from year to year. Observers of the program would find a multitude of ongoing modifications at any one time. The course instructors consider this to be an indication of their enthusiasm and concern for the program.

Program Evaluation

Both subjective and objective evaluations are an integral part of the Education 304 program. Program evaluations result in the modifications and experiments described above. Program evaluation stems from three basic sources; each of these sources of evaluation has a direct impact on program development. First, most input is generated from the students themselves, both as preservice teachers and as inservice teachers after the first year of teaching. Second, evaluation input is also gathered from Pullman Public School teachers participating in the Education 304 laboratory. Third, Education 304 instructors provide continuous input based on post-test results and subjective evaluations based on direct experiences.

Student evaluations are formally derived through two instruments: mid-term and final evaluations. Instructors have a choice of several mid-term evaluations developed by the Student Personnel Committee within the Department of Education. The mid-term evaluation is usually an open ended questionnaire which seeks anonymous evaluations dealing with course content, instructor effectiveness, and resource efficacy. Mid-term evaluations have been most effective in improving instructor teaching methods and requirements. The final course evaluation is a questionnaire developed by the University. Instructors have a choice of either an objective or subjective form of the evaluation. Results of the final evaluation have implications for total curriculum development as well as instructor competence. In addition to the formal evaluation, informal evaluations as a result of instructor-student interaction provide continuous feedback on the efficacy of classroom and laboratory experiences.

Students also evaluate their laboratory experience on an instrument developed within the Department. Students are given an opportunity to evaluate their public school experience in terms of their opportunities to interact with children, the laboratory teacher, and become familiar with
instructional facilities. Students also comment on the relevancy of their observations to college courses. Evaluation data from students results in feedback to laboratory teachers on how they might improve their supervision of student participants.

Meetings with the participating public school teachers and principals throughout the school year at the Pullman schools provide informal evaluations that can result in remediation of problems as they appear. Often informal meetings between University instructors and Pullman teachers resolve personal problems dealing with individual students. Formal meetings usually deal with total program implications; for example, teachers were concerned about the number of participants assigned to them and requested they be assigned no more than four participants per semester.

Instructor evaluation is concerned with student achievement and module efficiency. Based on results of post-tests, instructors can make decisions about efficacy of resources and student ability to learn from resources. Instructors can make library checks to determine which resources are being used. Materials which are not being used are either modified or taken off reserve status in the library. Materials which cause difficulty can be evaluated in terms of pedagogical effectiveness and clarity of content. On the basis of the evaluation, new methods of presenting materials may be developed or certain material may be declared irrelevant to the scope of the module. Students might need further orientation to materials to impress them with content relevancy to teaching.

An important aspect of instructor evaluations is the consideration of time utilization. Inefficiently constructed modules result in more time spent in personal interaction to clarify student confusion. Resource development requires a substantial amount of instructor time, and the lack of available time is a limiting factor in the development of new materials and revision of old materials. The bookkeeping problem of the modules, and accounting for a student's work and grades has proven to be time consuming. As time factors are considered, it is possible to plan for course development more realistically.

Experimental Evaluation of the Individualized Competency Module Program

In the spring semester of 1971 an attempt was made to compare the modularized, independent study program with the more "traditional" program. The course selected for this study was Education 304. As mentioned above, the teacher trainees spent one morning or afternoon a week teaching and observing in the Pullman Public Schools. In the spring semester of 1971, 140 trainees enrolled in the course. Students were randomly assigned to five sections with 25 to 30 in each section. Two of the sections were designated as the "independent study treatment" and assigned to work with the self-instructional modules. The other three sections were designated as the "group study treatment" and instructed largely in groups through lecture and discussion.
As nearly as possible the course content and objectives were kept constant for all five sections. Each instructor for the five sections used the same set of performance objectives as a guide for instruction. However, because of the nature of self-instructional modules, the achievement of the performance objectives for each of the twelve modules was more rigorously tested in the "self study" sections. In the independent study sections, trainees were expected to pass a knowledge test at the 80% level of competency for each module. Testing in the group study sections, on the other hand, was more informal and relied more on class discussion techniques for most of the modules. The achievement of the same simulation level objectives, though, was rigorously tested for all five sections.

The independent study modules which were initially developed were primitive, both in content and format. Pre-tests had not been prepared, and thus trainees had to rely on their understanding of the written performance objectives in preparing for the knowledge test that had been developed for each module. The lack of pre-tests, of course, also made it necessary for every student to complete every module. Consequently, only the rate of completion and the sources used for completing the modules varied. In many cases the trainees were forced to use the exact same sources, such as a particular reading in the library, in order to score well on the knowledge tests. To some extent, this problem has since been remedied, but it is still a factor which interferes with a more complete individualization of the module program.

None of the modules used during the duration of this study were self-contained. All of them required considerable time in the library. The trainees had to check out many of the sources through the library's reserve section and often wasted valuable time hunting for the "correct" answers for the test to be taken, as well as time waiting for the exact reserve book to use. This was understandably frustrating to the trainees and a cause of inefficient learning.

To assure that the five sections were derived from a homogeneous population, a comparison was made of the GPA of the students in the two treatment groups, both the self study and group study. A t-test of significance indicated no significant difference in GPA. A further test of homogeneity was made by using an F-test among the five sections. There was no significant difference in GPA at either the five percent or ten percent level. This same lack of significance was demonstrated later when an F-test was again made on the five sections after ten of the students had dropped from the course.

Because each of the sections was taught by a different instructor, an attempt was made to determine the equality of instructor effectiveness. To do this, two different inventories were administered to the trainees enrolled in Education 304 at the end of the fall semester of 1970-71. No significant differences (at the .05 level) were found to exist among the five instructors as measured by the students' attitudes "toward Professor X" and "toward Education 304." On the average the attitudes expressed by the trainees were
equally positive for all five instructors. These data should not be inter-
preted as pre-test information because the trainees to whom the attitude
inventories were administered at the end of the fall semester were not the
same trainees as those involved in the experimental study in the spring
semester of 1971. Therefore, these data should only be interpreted as a
method of attempting to equalize the five sections and the two treatment
groups.

Course evaluation for students enrolled in Education 304 during the
spring semester 1971 in both treatment groups was on the basis of a point
system contract. The contracts were essentially the same for all five
sections. Teaching and observation experiences in the public schools were
evaluated on the same basis for both treatment groups at the end of the
semester. Each trainee was rated on the same form for attendance, teaching
performance, written plans, additional work with children, helpfulness on
tasks not directly involving children, and on professional attitude and
behavior.

At the end of the spring semester all students were administered an
achievement test in the form of a final examination and were also rated by
their supervisory teachers in the public schools. Moreover, they were
administered a series of inventories: one achievement, five attitudinal
scales and one rating scale. The mean scores on the inventory instruments
were used as dependent variables in this study. The instruments are briefly
described below.

1. Cognitive achievement test. This test was an 80 item multiple-
choice final examination, with most items requiring application of infor-
mation supposedly gained in both the group study and independent study
treatments. Content validity of the test was obtained by requiring agree-
ment by five out of five instructors for each of 123 items submitted to
them for independent judgement. Items that were not considered acceptable
for inclusion in the final exam by all five instructors were not included.
As an estimate of reliability a Kuder-Richardson coefficient was computed
after the test was administered. This coefficient, measuring the internal
consistency of the test, was .71.

2. Attitude toward professor "X." This inventory was a 30 item at-
titude inventory developed from an original pool of 120 items submitted to
scale discrimination analysis. The final 30 items were low on Q values
and high on item discrimination. Administrations to various university
classes yielded Spearman-Brown coefficients of reliability ranging from
.80 to .89.

3. Attitude toward education 304. This inventory was a 24 item at-
titude inventory developed from an original pool of 119 items submitted to
scale discrimination analysis. The final 24 items were low on Q values and
high on item discrimination. When administered to a group of Education 304
students a Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient of .92 was computed.

4. Personalized education for teachers creative attitude test. This
was designed to measure the degree to which a teacher trainee appears to value creativity as a mode of thinking and behaving in himself and others. This 40 item inventory was developed from an original pool of 135 items submitted to scale discrimination analysis. The final items were low on Q values and high on item discrimination. A Spearman-Brown coefficient of reliability was computed after the inventory was administered. The coefficient was .75.

5. Rokeach dogmatism scale. This scale was selected as a measure of openmindedness. This frequently used scale was checked for reliability after administration to the Education 304 students. A Spearman-Brown coefficient of .80 was computed.

6. Semantic differential technique. This well-known technique was used for five different concepts: attitude toward myself as an education scholar, toward myself as a prospective reading teacher, toward my instructor in Education 304, toward the point system of grading in the course, and toward independent study. Coefficients of reliability ranged from .83 to .93 for this particular population.

7. Teaching performance ratings. These ratings were obtained from the supervisory teachers who worked with the junior student teachers in the participant-observer program.

The results of analysis of variance for the various dependent variables yielded significant differences only on the achievement test. The independent study trainees achieved a mean score that was significantly higher than that of the group study trainees. However, there were no significant differences on any of the other variables. This might be encouraging with respect to the attitude variables such as "Attitude toward Education 304" and "Attitude toward my instructor." However, it should be noted that there was no difference between the two groups on teaching performance ratings, which theoretically is the most important variable. Moreover, the correlation between the achievement test scores and the teaching performance ratings for the total population was only .08. (In fact, there was a correlation of only .10 between teaching performance and grade point average, whereas a correlation of .48 was computed between achievement test scores and grade point average.) This suggests several possibilities: that the teaching performance ratings were too unrelated to the performance objectives for Education 304, or that the achievement test was not tapping potential teaching performance, or that Education 304 was not preparing trainees for the job of teaching. It is likely that all three of these possibilities were in operation to some extent.

Since the independent study modules emphasized cognitive achievement, it is encouraging that this emphasis showed up in a higher mean score for the independent study group. It is equally encouraging that trainees from both groups were rated quite high on their teaching performance, since both the group study and independent study trainees were given a competency based program. It may be that more emphasis on performance evaluations in the participant-observer program and more definite attempts to relate
cognitive achievement to the actual teaching performance in this program may yield the kind of transfer between teacher training and teacher performance that we have been seeking.

Considerations for Future Development

Education 304 has been discussed in detail as an example of the development of individualized competency modules within the total program for elementary preservice teachers. The experiences of all courses involved in the program can serve as a basis for consideration of future development.

The Elementary Education Committee realizes the need for continuous revision of all modules. Numerous problems of revision have arisen in incorporating feedback from the students and the public schools: finding sufficient faculty time; increasing participation in the program by faculty, graduate students and public school teachers; keeping up with current literature pertaining to elementary curriculum; developing a more efficient method of managing materials involved in the program; and most important, encouraging the further individualization of the competency modules.

Student evaluations and evaluations from teachers in the public schools point to the need for changes in knowledge and simulation type activities. For example, phonics approaches and terminology used in the new basal reader series in the Pullman Public Schools have been somewhat at variance with information provided to the trainees through the knowledge type and simulation type activities provided on campus.

The updating and revising will take faculty time: time for communicating with school teachers and administrators, time for keeping up to date on reported research, and time for sharing ideas with colleagues. This will in turn necessitate some type of reward system which encourages faculty involvement and commitment. As in any effort to maximize involvement, the necessary factor is an adequate reward system. Professional responsibility, recognition from peers and supervisors, and experience are the only practical motivations available. Ideally financial compensation and released time would insure enthusiastic and continuous participation.

For continuous development of modules every possible source of input and participation needs to be cultivated. In addition to the elementary education faculty, other faculty members have contributions to make towards module development. Content such as classroom management and lesson planning overlap with curriculum and educational psychology areas. Faculty with competencies in these areas must coordinate their efforts with elementary education faculty to reduce duplication of efforts. Involving faculty in module development to be used in courses other than their own, however, has not proven realistic. Department efforts at course coordination have proven successful but further efforts are needed to involve departmental personnel in an advisory capacity.
Involving public school teachers who participate in the module program has also proven difficult. Public school teachers are in the best position to evaluate knowledge and simulation efficacy in preparing students to face classroom responsibilities. To make maximum use of public school personnel, information and communications need to be improved to handle the large amount of input. The main problem deals with teachers' time and energy needed for the communication effort.

Another source of participation that may prove to be practical and desirable is the use of graduate students. Graduates profit professionally from involvement in module evaluation and development. Their experience from working with the module program gives them exposure to competency based programs, audio-visual materials construction, elementary curriculum, and evaluation methods. Thus far, involvement by graduate students in the total program has been limited and needs to be expanded.

Research studies reported in the literature have made it necessary, and will continue to make it necessary, to update the information provided to the trainees. This updating, however, sometimes runs counter to the "real classroom" which the trainees experience in the Pullman schools. Thus, some method must be found for updating teaching practices in the Pullman schools. Perhaps cooperating teachers could attend seminars and receive academic credit for their inservice training.

Managing materials, recording grades, and evaluating projects are very time consuming for individual faculty members. Materials need maximum exposure to students, and therefore require efficient delivery and accounting systems. Students should be able to locate materials when they want them. Problems arise when materials are not available in sufficient quantity, when materials are kept out too long, or when materials are not immediately reshelved.

Maintaining student grades is a great problem due to the large amount of materials evaluated. More efficiency is needed on test scoring, recording and maintaining feedback to students. Lack of funds prohibit use of test scoring machines, secretarial help or computerization. As with grades, accounting for student projects, such as simulations and laboratory lessons, has not been efficient. Management of the program will probably continue to be the responsibility of individual instructors. Continuing experimentation will be necessary to determine optimal means of accounting for student efforts, but simultaneously reducing the bookkeeping efforts.

Probably the most important consideration for further development is that of further individualization of the competency modules. It is the faculty's judgement that a selected continuum of individual and group instruction needs to be provided to all trainees. Some trainees desire to complete most or all of the modules on their own as rapidly as possible. Therefore, all of the modules, or nearly all of them, need to be refined as easily understood independent study modules. Students should be given a choice of completing either all or some of the modules on an independent
Some trainees prefer to meet in small or large groups for most of the modules; they feel uncomfortable working independently. Therefore, they should have the option of learning required information through regular class meetings. Because of the importance of independent study in the field of education today, some of the modules should probably be completed by all of the trainees on an independent study basis. This will probably require a preparatory module which eases students into the independent mode.

Another means of individualizing the modules should be that of providing a much greater variety of sources from which the trainees select information. Some trainees seem to prefer getting most of their information from books and articles. Some prefer getting the information by watching teachers in action, either live or on video-tape. Others prefer an auditory approach, listening either to audio-taped, live, or video-taped lectures which cover the required information. To date, the primary information sources to students have been written materials and live lectures or discussions. More variety needs to be offered.

It has been observed that some of the modular activities seem to lend themselves to independent study and others to group study. The learning of phonics terminology, for example, is better handled through independent study or by pairs of trainees, rather than through class discussion or lecture. The learning of phonics techniques of instruction, however, is better conducted through group study in which trainees experiment with different techniques on their peers and receive critical evaluation on their understanding of the techniques.

It can be observed, then, that several factors influence the degree and type of independent study and group study activities: student desire for independence, sources of information available, the nature of the modular activities and, of course, the teaching style of the instructors. The last factor is probably the most problematic, as some instructors are quite flexible in suiting their methodology to the student and others are inclined toward a more standardized approach.

In conclusion, it is the desire of the Elementary Education Committee at Washington State University to maintain the modular development as a continuing and creative process—one that allows for individual faculty contributions and for individual student needs. Although this program has taken a great deal of time to develop, it has been successfully implemented as an ongoing program, not abruptly supplanted as a program replacement. The essence of careful planning, reviewing, evaluating and pilot testing is now paying high dividends in teacher preparation.
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Washington State's Certification Guidelines and Standards

In July 1971, the Board of Education of the state of Washington adopted guidelines and standards designed to provide an alternate direction to teacher certification in the state. The guidelines represent a distinct departure from the traditional approach to certification for teachers, administrators, and staff associates as specified in previous guidelines issued in 1956, 1961, and 1968 respectively. The 1971 guidelines are described as "... a new approach in which processes and procedures to be employed in determining and developing components of preparation programs and approving such programs are set forth as standards." They are further characterized as providing "... a process, a rational and open system... for constant recognition of new knowledge, for an appropriate use of technology, and orderly agreed upon response to the changing education needs of society and individuals" (State of Washington, Department of Public Instruction, 1971).

Implicit in the content of the guidelines and standards is the expectation that program development will focus on the needs of the children and youth served in the public and private schools of the state. In addition, it is anticipated that the implementation of the guidelines will provide "... opportunities for those being prepared to have more personally fulfilling activities and experiences so that as professionals they may provide a better school life for learners at all levels."

Five years of effort involving hundreds of persons concerned with the improvement of the quality of education in the state's public and private schools preceded the adoption of the guidelines. Draft copies were circulated for study and reaction. Deliberations took the form of discussion sessions, study groups, and conferences with concerned individuals and agencies throughout the state. A number of trial competency based programs were
conducted. After several revisions, a final document was approved by the state board with an effective date of September 1971. It was not specified, however, when the new guidelines would officially become the standard of certification for the state, since previous regulations were also allowed to remain in force—a prudent decision as one shall appreciate after reading this report and Chapter 10. Agencies involved in teacher education (colleges and universities, school organizations, and professional associations) were requested to submit within one year reports concerning their plans to implement the standards. Thus, in Washington there are dual certification programs: program approval and competency based.

Basic assumptions and principles. The 1971 Guidelines for teacher preparation and certification are based on the following selected assumptions about learning and teaching.

1. The main purpose of the school is to help each child achieve self direction and self reliance in a dynamic and changing society.
2. The adults in a school, by the way they work and live, establish the intellectual and emotional climate for the school.
3. Adults moving into schools as professionals need to experience preparation in a manner consistent with the way children ought to be helped to learn in school.
4. Learning and growth is a continuing and dynamic process.
5. All learners become what they will by the choices they make, the actions they take, and the consequences they undergo.
6. Learning and growth occur best under circumstances where persons are respected and loved and free to be themselves and to become whomever they have the will to become.

The principles derived from these assumptions were that:

1. Preparation should be related to performance and performance related to the objectives of the professional and his clients.
2. Preparation should be individualized and give recognition to personal style.
3. Preparation programs should be planned and developed in a participatory manner by those affected.
4. Preparation is a career-long, continuing process.

Teacher preparation agencies. The 1971 guidelines and standards were designed to provide a framework which would encourage broad participation with an emphasis on decentralization of responsibility and accountability for the preparation and the outcomes of preparation. To achieve these goals, provision was made for the formation of consortia of colleges and universities, professional associations, and school organizations to plan and implement preparation programs. Each of these three agencies is to have an equal voice (parity) in overall planning, policy formation, assignment of responsibility, evaluation of programs, and the hearing of appeals. The three agencies are defined below.
1. **Professional association.** A professional association is that body which is determined by the total faculty of certificated employees in a school organization in accordance with election procedures as defined by state law. This agency is charged with the responsibility of providing opportunity for input from all specialized and subject matter associations.

2. **School organization.** A school organization is defined as any public, independent school system, district, or cooperative group of organizations. This agency is to represent the interests of parents, children and youth, other interested citizens, the local school board and the school administration. Representatives from the school organizations are designed by the chief administrator or administrators of school organizations, and are charged with the responsibility of providing opportunity for input from the above groups.

3. **Colleges and universities.** Any institution of higher learning which has, or develops professional teacher education programs is defined as a college or university. The chief administrator for professional preparation and development shall have responsibility for providing opportunity for the various departments and groups within the college and university to fulfill their role for the institution in the development and implementation of programs.

**Consortium Programs and Procedures**

The state guidelines specify that preparation programs are subject to approval by the State Board of Education. Programs must meet specific criteria relative to consortium arrangements and preparation opportunities and alternatives. In addition to filing with the Superintendent of Public Instruction (S.P.I.), a letter of intent to form a consortium, arrangements and processes must be specified relative to the formulation of policy, development of program objectives, input from students and citizens, program implementation, administration, review and evaluation. Provision must also be made for comprehensive outside evaluation and evidence must be given that resources are available for program evaluation.

With respect to preparation opportunities and alternatives, the consortium must describe:

1. The role or roles which are to be assumed by the grantee of a specific certificate with a particular endorsement.
2. The rationale for the competencies required for specific roles.
3. Examples of experiences provided for candidate to demonstrate required levels of competencies.
4. Procedures which ensure that candidate participates in the design of his own program and in determining his rate of progress.
5. Examples of evidence what will be used to determine entry and exit levels of competency.
6. Examples of feedback procedures.
7. Examples of experiences and resources available to staff development personnel.
8. Evidence of high professional quality of program.
9. Procedures and arrangements which ensure continuing career development opportunities for persons holding initial and continuing certificates.

Responsibilities of the State Board of Education relative to review and approval are outlined in the guidelines as well as those of the Superintendent of Public Instruction with respect to functions for approval-accreditation, certification, and improvement-leadership.

Consortium Development Activities, 1971-72

During the school year 1971-72, approximately 46 consortia groups were organized and preliminary planning was initiated for implementing the new guidelines for teacher certification. Two distinct types of consortia groups have emerged. One is the single purpose type, designed to develop programs for specific areas such as special education teachers, physical education teachers, and educational staff associates in areas such as counseling and nursing. The second type is of a more general nature and has become known as "the umbrella" consortium formed cooperatively by several institutions and other appropriate organizations.

The single purpose consortium appears to have made more rapid progress in organization and implementation as of this writing. The predominant pattern is that of the educational staff associate certification, i.e., the preparation of specialists. The umbrella consortium views itself as a general type of organization which takes a broad view of the standards, and acts as a coordinating agency with a variety of special interest "task forces" operating as subgroups in the various areas of certification programming. As a geographical expediency, umbrella consortia have developed around the Intermediate School Districts (ISD's). Typically, several colleges and universities and more than one school organization and professional organization are involved. The major agenda item for 1971-72 was the development and adoption of a set of bylaws under which the consortium would operate. Bylaws typically involved a statement of philosophy consistent with the 1971 guidelines and a definition of authorization, purpose, membership and operating procedures. An example of a typical set of bylaws developed by the Intermediate School District #101 in eastern Washington is contained in Addendum A, pages 176-151.

Emerging Concerns

Early in 1971 it became evident that concerns were developing over the implementation of the guidelines and the formation of consortia groups. Major problems centered around (1) the management system that was needed to insure that consortium development would proceed in an efficient and methodical fashion, and (2) the time and cost factors. The latter was important since personnel from the various agencies were involved with a
large number of consortia groups and had to commit time and money to meet. To coordinate and articulate the concerns, a group of deans and directors of teacher education from public and private four year institutions developed a position paper to address specific areas. The position statement endorsed the concept that educators are engaged in a partnership approach to teacher preparation and certification. The rationale for the statement was articulated in the introduction to the position paper:

The partnership concept inherent in the Fourth Draft¹ has the potential for opening doors to the increased participation of individuals and groups in ongoing decision making. There is little doubt that a coalition comprising the professional associations, the school organizations, the college or university, and the state agency will create an environment where cooperative planning and joint utilization of material and human resources becomes a reality.

It seems reasonable to assume a multilateral decision making body must operate according to a clearly defined management system. A coalition is inoperable in the absence of a protocol that designates primary and cooperative responsibilities to its various components.

**Assumptions Basic To Teacher Education and Certification**

Part Two of the previously mentioned position paper identified the following assumptions judged basic to teacher preparation and certification:

1. That development of teacher preparation programs shall involve the professional associations, school organizations, colleges and universities and the state agency.
2. That primary responsibility and accountability for each phase in the teacher preparation and certification process shall be assigned.
3. That the agency with primary responsibility is accountable for the active meaningful involvement of other agencies.
4. That programs of preparation shall provide for maximum individualization.
5. That teacher education shall include an academic component and a professional educational component that shall be field oriented and performance based.
6. That the education of a teacher shall be continuous throughout his career.

¹The "Fourth Draft" was the predecessor to the 1971 Guidelines ultimately adopted by the State Board of Education. Between 1966 and 1971 a total of five guideline drafts were prepared by the State Superintendent's Office and circulated for review.
7. That for persons from out of state, approved for Initial certification shall have met standards at or above current levels of preparation.

8. That in formula funding teacher education shall be awarded status comparable to other professional programs.

9. That colleges and universities participating in teacher education shall be accredited by appropriate state, regional and national accrediting agencies.

10. That the cooperative responsibility for the development of state level patterns for certification requires the establishment of a committee including the colleges and universities as well as other components of the coalition. The committee would have a critical role in the development of new patterns based on a continuous monitoring of existing programs. Inputs from the various components should provide a comprehensive assessment. The state agency has primary responsibility for this activity.

Responsibilities of Agencies

Management concerns were addressed by identifying major responsibilities of each agency involved in the development of teacher preparation programs.

1. Responsibilities of professional associations were that they shall:
   a. participate in the development of programs leading to certification.
   b. encourage the involvement of all teachers in the improvement of professional preparation and teaching.
   c. assume primary responsibility for development and administration of programs for Continuing certification.
   d. assume primary responsibilities for professional development following Continuing certification.

2. The responsibilities of school organizations were that they shall:
   a. be involved in the development of frameworks for certification.
   b. participate in the development and administration of programs for Preparatory and Initial certification.
   c. provide opportunities for field experiences.
   d. participate in the development and administration of continuing education for teachers.
   e. facilitate the bringing together of preservice and inservice education.
3. Responsibilities delegated to the college or university are that they shall:

a. assume primary responsibility for the development and administration of programs of admission and for those experiences basic to the Preparatory and Initial certification logically residing in the domain of the colleges and universities, since these programs are largely interwoven with academic degree requirements. It is also reasonable to assume that for some time to come, the college and university will continue to be the prime source for developing conceptual designs for programs since the research and the analysis of research data are done by faculty trained in these activities. Although the leadership role shall reside in the four-year institutions, the sharing of ideas and the encouragement of inputs from other members of the coalition shall be a required, essential ingredient.

b. be involved in the development of frameworks for certification.

c. assume primary responsibility for developing and administering programs of admission, Preparatory certification and Initial certification in cooperation with other agencies.

d. cooperate with school organizations and the professional associations in the development and administration of programs for Continuing certification.

e. provide opportunities for involvement of students in the development and conduct of teacher education programs.

4. Responsibilities delegated to the state agency were that it shall:

a. assume primary responsibility for development and administration of frameworks for certification.

b. provide funding and establish a procedure for approving and monitoring programs consistent with the principles of the partnership approach to the development of programs.

c. give final approval to all certification programs.

d. grant certificates for all levels.

Assessment Instrument and Procedures

After approximately one year's experience of working with consortia groups to implement the 1971 Guidelines, the participating colleges and universities made an assessment of experiences to date to gain direction for future development. It appears that no other agencies involved in
consortium development have conducted any studies of this nature. The purposes of the study were to:

1. Identify the strengths, weaknesses and major concerns which have resulted from the experiences of the colleges and universities to date.
2. Collate the experiences of all colleges and universities into general statements, thus focusing on the guidelines and their implementation rather than on the idiosyncrasies of the institutions.
3. Report the results in a format usable by other agencies as well as colleges (Giles, 1973).

Each college and university completed an open-ended questionnaire dealing with specific aspects of consortium development. The responses, which encompassed approximately 60 consortia experiences, were compiled and edited into representative statements covering institutional assessment of strengths, weaknesses, and concerns. Edited statements were sent to all participating institutions for approval or suggested changes.

SUMMARY OF INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

The following statements are based on the experiences of Washington colleges and universities in their efforts to implement the 1971 Guidelines. In each category, perceived strengths and weaknesses have been identified and areas of concern worthy of serious consideration for change have been noted.

Consortium Development Concept: Strengths

1. The concept provides for a broad participation of individuals involved in teacher preparation.
2. The concept provides an open system approach which allows for inputs from diverse groups at various stages of development.
3. The concept, based on the parity principle, insures an equal voice among agencies.
4. The concept requires that responsibilities for program development be spread across a broad base of participants.
5. Planning is more diverse than was the case when it was done by the colleges in isolation. Key people from each agency permit implementation to occur more quickly.
6. Performance objectives are good. However, most departments were working with those under the old program, as well as getting inputs from outside.
7. Definition of objectives and evaluation by performance are good aspects of the consortium concept.
Consortium Development Concepts: Weaknesses

1. The concept is extremely complex. It requires the establishment of a base of knowledge before developmental activities can begin.
2. The concept, as it is currently defined, cannot become fully operational until further definition is given to provide a linkage between the development group (policy board) and the established policies and procedures for the three agencies.
3. The concept does not clearly define the responsibilities of each of the participating agencies. There is no management system included for the assignment of accountability to any one of the participants.
4. The concept does not clarify the number of persons who should represent each agency.
5. The concept provides little or no provision for the coordination of each agency. It does not provide directions for resolving the question of reciprocity among consortia, out of state applicants, etc.
6. The concept encourages duplication of effort since many consortia are developing programs in the same area.
7. The concept is extremely demanding in time and effort. Even when released time can be arranged, many teachers are reluctant to leave their students with substitutes.
8. Teacher education will have to become the central business of the institution. This will be difficult to achieve.
9. Hundreds of hours seem necessary for anything to happen.
10. New guidelines seem to have been based on the prediction that greater numbers of teachers are needed. No revision has been made in light of present employment conditions.
11. There is a tendency to perpetuate status-quo, since outside agencies are not demonstrating, in most cases, leadership in improving teaching.
12. No provisions have been made for someone to be held accountable for the quality of the experience. This needs to be spelled out more clearly.
13. The concept is costly. Colleges and universities will require additional funding to operate it.
14. The concept is not equally applicable to rural and urban settings.
15. The concept provides a quasi-legal description of consortium members. This tends to move planning from a programmatic concern over to a political or power base.
16. The concept does not provide a definition of roles for the school and college personnel in Initial and Continuing certification programs.
Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

1. Guidelines are too vague. Too much is left for interpretation by each group.
2. Provisions should be made for longer periods of planning time than are now available through afternoon or evening sessions.
3. The roles of the various consortium agencies should be defined according to responsibilities each should have for the different levels of certification. This idea implies a change in the concept with respect to the parity principle as now defined.
4. Implied costs are beyond the resources of the institution.
5. The most appropriate course of action would be to redirect current efforts toward a pilot model approach.
6. No evidence exists that the new guidelines will produce better teachers. It is a higher cost program, both in time and money, that does not guarantee better results than are possible in the 1961 Guidelines.
7. Proliferation of programs should be controlled.
8. The policy board has no fiscal support or legal status. This needs changing.
9. Funds should be made available for small pilot projects to develop tools for performance criteria.
10. The specialized professional organizations and learned groups from the academic discipline should have a stronger role in the process.

Implementation of the Concept Through Program Development: Strengths

1. Input and review by all participating agencies should provide a more relevant program.
2. Priorities are reordered to put highest value on the success of the candidate.
3. A competency based approach to certification is a real strength. It is possible that it can be directed to the improvement of education for elementary and secondary students.
4. A strong emphasis is placed on evaluation of the competence of the individual candidate.
5. Preparation occurs where the learning is most relevant.
6. Those who have roles in developing a program are more likely to use it than they would if it were forced on them.
7. A strong potential for innovation exists.
8. Clarification of means versus ends must be considered in teacher education.
Implementation of the Concept Through Program Development: Weaknesses

1. Agencies do not have clearly defined responsibility for program development. Evidence to date suggests that teachers do not have the time and there is some question as to the degree of interest required for the intensive effort required in planning the pre-service and inservice components.

2. Competency based teacher education is threatening to many colleges and school personnel. They do not feel that they themselves are competent in the standards expected of the candidates.

3. Competency based teacher education is extremely demanding of time, energies, and resources. Communication is critical to the success of the concept and this requires extensive provisions of resources.

4. The state of the art is not sufficient to prepare the tools, techniques, and personnel required for the evaluation of criterion-referenced performance.

5. One of the greatest potential weaknesses of the 1971 Guidelines lies in the guidelines represent what it has taken 150 years of effort to get away from in teacher training (domination by facts, prescriptions, and narrow specializations).

6. There is no provision for program development since the whole package must be complete before anything can happen.

7. Greater number of people or groups involved in making decisions tends to slow the process.

8. There was a lack of adequate longitudinal studies prior to embarking on this approach.

9. There seems to be serious confusion relative to roles and responsibilities in the "umbrella consortium" approach.

10. There are no provisions for funding faculty or clerical staff for time required.

11. There is already an inability of professional people to develop and manage behaviorally stated criteria in teacher training.

12. The management system required for successful operation requires time and personnel not available in present budgets.

13. There is a great potential for maintaining the status quo as a result of programs that are geared to current practices in the field.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

1. Responsibilities for each participating agency must be clearly defined.
2. The manner in which professional subject matter organizations are to be involved must be determined.
3. The section on the standards dealing with program approval should be strengthened to insure that there is some expertise involved in the review of definitions of competency strategies, and criteria for judging performance.
4. The absence of emphasis on content achievement and no degree requirement should be corrected.
5. Definite responsibilities should be assigned to each agency for the development, implementation, and evaluation of programs.
6. The college degree is not required and thus, there is a real danger that it may become a thing of the past. Narrow preparation at the expense of a liberal education may well result unless this omission is corrected.

Program Approval Procedures: Strengths

1. Program approval by the State Office and State Board of Education should provide some assurance of program quality.
2. Procedures provide for continuing evaluation of programs.
3. Procedures emphasize a positive approach. Emphasis is on improvement of programs rather than on minimum program standards.
4. Each agency to be involved participates in program approval procedures.
5. The approval process has the potential to implement the participatory spirit of the 1971 Guidelines and Standards.

Program Approval Procedures: Weaknesses

1. The tremendous variety of programs will be extremely difficult, if not impossible for application of uniform criteria in evaluating programs.
2. The vast variety of programs to be approved will require much time and costly effort.
3. Procedures by which program approval will be granted or denied have not been developed.
4. The bylaws developed by a local umbrella consortium suggest that the group will exercise program evaluation separate from the state. How will this be coordinated?
5. There seem to be instances where parity seems to be impossible to attain. Where does one go from there?
6. Criteria for program approval lack specificity.
7. There is no assurance that program approval committees will have the expertise to do a competent job.
8. Competency based programs will require greater expenditures of time by visiting committees than do the 1961 Standards. There are no funds available for this.

9. Program approval procedures are designed to evaluate programs as submitted by each consortium. The 1961 Standards evaluated programs on an institutional basis. This means that the 1971 procedures will require approval of far more programs. This will incur greater costs.

10. A more definitive procedure for program approval must be worked out.

11. This approach makes the S.P.I. the complete dictator of teacher education. The funding required for state level monitoring is not available.

12. Minimum standards for program approval should be provided.

Provisions for Program Management: Strengths

1. Provisions operationalize a partnership process that draws on the strengths of three as opposed to one agency in the management of teacher education.

2. Management can develop in terms of needs.

3. The provisions allow the strong to come forward and manage.

Provisions for Program Management: Weaknesses

1. Planning for program management requires some experience with a coalition or partnership model.

2. The 1971 Guidelines and Standards provide no directions or provisions for program management.

3. There is no locale identified for program management.

4. Smaller institutions are jeopardized because of sheer numbers of persons required to provide management. These are not available.

5. Since each consortium may vary its system, those with vested interests may take over, even though not qualified to do the task.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

1. Where the great strength of the guidelines seems to be in the provision of a partnership approach to teacher education, the great weakness lies in the absence of any provisions for a management system necessary for the operation of the partnership concept. This contradiction must be corrected if the guidelines are to operate successfully.
2. The Guidelines need to incorporate provisions for a management system. The "examples" now contained in the appendix relegate the importance of management to the lowest priority possible.

3. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction will have to provide the leadership necessary for the development and inclusion of a management system within the 1971 Guidelines and Standards.

4. The level of funding necessary for management (once this is defined) must be provided by the state.

5. Consideration should be given to the channeling of funds for management (once established) through colleges and universities for the sake of systematization.

Roles Assumed by Various Preparation Agencies: Strengths

1. While stressing parity in the influence structure, the Guidelines encourage each agency to assess its strengths and weaknesses and base its role on the results of such assessment.

2. Role definitions for each agency are the outgrowth of shared planning and agreement among the three agencies.

3. Roles of colleges, universities and school organizations are outlined in the definitions of the agencies.

Roles Assumed by Various Preparation Agencies: Weaknesses

1. Successful participation by the agency in consortia activity requires the participant to thoroughly understand the parameters of his agency's legal role and function.

2. Agency role responsibilities impose a problem on consortium planning procedures since the policy board frequently must refer decisions back to a given agency for decision due to legal constraints under which that agency operates.

3. Agency role statements do not delineate the responsibilities for each role.

4. Considerable responsibility has already shifted to the professional associations who are neither staffed nor can provide qualified staff without necessary funding to participate in the development of teacher education programs.

5. Roles may be assumed by default due to failure of any one agency to fund its operation sufficiently.

6. Subject matter professional organizations are overlooked in role assignment by agencies.

7. The definition of "professional association" is poorly defined. Subject matter professional organizations are not included in the definition.
8. Specific role responsibilities for agencies are not provided.
9. With consortium funding coming from the S.P.I., there will be more centralization of control in the 1971 Standards than was true in the 1961 Standards.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

1. A matrix for assignment of agency role responsibilities should be provided within the 1971 Guidelines. To provide examples in the appendix is not enough.
2. A matrix of agency role responsibilities such as the one in Appendix "A" should be made available in the consortium planning stage. Very few people have a perspective of role that cuts across and includes three agencies.
3. A clearer statement on initiating programs is needed.
4. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should move quickly to modify the 1971 Guidelines to include provisions that clarify agency roles and responsibilities.

Role and Relationship of Office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction: Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

1. The specific responsibilities of the State Superintendent and the manner in which funds are to be allocated for implementation of the Guidelines need to be designated.
2. The S.P.I. role needs to be clearly defined in its "partnership" relationship in the development, implementation, evaluation and enforcement of the 1971 Guidelines.
3. An increased S.P.I. leadership role is needed.
4. A few selected pilot programs should be funded throughout the development, implementation and evaluation stages to determine the viability of the consortium as a vehicle for preparation and certification of teachers on a statewide basis.

Application of Guidelines to Administrators and/or ESA Personnel (e.g., administrators, counselors, school nurses): Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

1. Failure to provide extension of 1961 Guidelines for ESA personnel places these in a discriminatory position.
2. Lack of commitment of W.E.A. and school districts to ESA preparatory programs (developed by consortia) is serious.
3. Arbitrary 1973 deadline for ESA certification is bad when it has been impossible to get consortia moving.
4. Power struggles of the negotiating professional association (W.E.A.) and its lack of genuine concern for professional preparation of ESA staff is serious.

5. Increased staff is needed to coordinate, evaluate, and individualize programs.

6. Competency based guidelines do not account for the critical behavior of decision making. The degree to which effective decision making takes place is not demonstrated by an easily defined behavior.

7. Consideration should be given to the possibility of statewide institutional and agency cooperative arrangements for program development.

8. Specialized professional organizations should be included in the decision making process for consortia.

It can be observed from the above that implementation of the 1971 Standards will be no easy task. Since these issues were not addressed by the Washington State Board of Education, full implementation may well be postponed for several years.

Application of the Consortium Model: A Case Study

Early in 1971 plans were undertaken in eastern Washington to utilize the consortium model in the development of programs for the preparation of language arts teachers for grades k-12. Initially, five colleges and three school districts within reasonable proximity of each other participated in the planning along with representatives from educational associations and professional organizations. After several months of deliberation, two school districts indicated that they were unable to continue active participation. Thus, membership in the group consisted of five colleges, one school district, and the education organization. This group became known as West Valley Language Arts Consortium (WVLAC). It was hoped that representation would ultimately include all school districts and education associations in the geographic area.

A rationale and some background on this consortium effort was presented in the letter of intent prepared for submission to the Department of Public Instruction, as follows:

The five colleges, the education association and West Valley School District have worked for two years prior to the attempt to form a consortium in the area of language arts. The consortium was a logical outgrowth of the prior work which concerned itself with identified needs in the area of language arts. An incomplete list of the needs identified includes the following:

A. Needs, local educational:
One of the most remarkable and urgent demands of life in a technologically sophisticated society is to use language in more powerful and sensitive ways. In our own State, the
1969 Assessment of Educational Needs for Students identified what it found to be ten critical needs. Of these ten stated needs, eight are implicitly contained in the subsequent text of this Letter of Intent: (1) Provision for Individual Instruction, (2) Teaching Equipment and Materials, (3) Vocational-Technical Programs, (4) Changes in Curriculum Organization and Content, (5) Teaching Methods, (6) Changes in School Atmosphere and Attitudes of Administrators, (7) Changes in Student-Teacher Relationships, and (8) Opportunity for Students to Develop Their Own Ideas. In the local context of the Spokane Valley, our own teachers have identified two additional language needs to be served by this project: (1) to increase students' knowledge about language, and (2) to refine the ways students use language for both social and personal ends. The existence of these student needs, both nationally and locally, is predicated on currently accepted linguistic theories that are rarely or ineffectually applied to school settings. For example, these theories insist that teachers and students need to understand the distinction between language knowledge and language use; to operate on the notion that the act of language may be the same as the act of thought; to learn how to assimilate one's experience through language; and to shape and control one's actions and destiny through the power of language. These and other similar needs have been clearly identified and thoroughly documented by leading linguists, psychologists and scholars throughout the world. The reality of these needs is based on the idea that people are less than human unless they successfully use language as the basic tool by which they assimilate and shape their experience.

B. Needs, language:
1. To be an active user of language more frequently than be a passive receiver of knowledge about language.
2. To use language in settings where he must formulate Ideas in tentative ways, showing receipt of immediate and specific response.
3. To make appropriate linguistic response to events, Ideas, or feelings.
4. To make increasingly fine distinctions among varied and specialized uses of language.
5. To create order out of his surrounds through language.
6. To shape his personal, occupational, and social environment through language.

C. Needs, teacher preparation:
Study of the current scene and appraisal of trends suggest that Washington can marshal its resources and knowledge to stimulate preparation which is more appropriate to the services which professional personnel should provide to today's children and youth, and that preparation programs
should reflect and encourage an open-system concept. The open-system allows input from a variety of sources, does not lock all persons into the same mold, and encourages difference, variety, and change. The state is concerned that preparation experiences be relevant to competence on-the-job, the actual world of the elementary and secondary school student and to the changing needs of society.

The WVLAC effort was justified further on the grounds that the school district involved could be considered typical of the majority of school districts in the state. Thus, programs and procedures developed for West Valley might be replicated in many other places in the state. It was acknowledged however, that districts with substantially different racial, economic, and political characteristics might have different needs with respect to preparation of language arts teachers.

Major consortium activities for the 1971-72 academic year focused on procedural matters, including the drafting of bylaws. By May 1972, the fourth draft of bylaws had been accepted by the participating agencies. In addition, the following subcommittee groups had been identified:

1. Student language needs.
2. School program development.
3. Teacher competencies.
4. Teacher preparation programs.
5. Assessment and evaluation.

The Student Language Needs Subcommittee consisted of college personnel from the fields of English, speech, and elementary language arts, and primary intermediate, junior and senior high school teachers. In addition, a representative from the Board of Education served as a member. Membership encompassed representation from professional organizations such as the state and local Councils of Teachers of English and speech associations as well as representation from the education association. From time to time, college students enrolled in teacher preparation programs participated. Every effort was made to solicit input from students in the public schools as well. Committee meetings were held during the spring, summer, and fall of 1972, culminating in the development of a student language needs model from which language programs on a continuum from grades K-12 might be developed. Chairpersons for the remaining subcommittees were appointed in the fall of 1972.

The following consortium objectives were identified for the 1972-73 school year:

1. Continue present work of the student needs sub-committee in identifying language needs and objectives.
2. Begin development of school language programs and materials.
3. Continue to develop role definitions, competencies and rationale from which language teacher preparation program components will emerge.
4. Make suggestions about and/or design learning experiences and context which will assist the candidate to develop competence in an individualized manner.

5. Determine resources needed to accomplish program objectives and insure they are/will be available.

A number of the concerns noted earlier in this paper became apparent during the establishment of the WVLAC. Major concerns and problems are summarized below.

1. There was some feeling, especially in the early planning stages, that greater provision ought to have been made in the guidelines for meaningful involvement of the professional organizations. Although the question of professional organization input was resolved satisfactorily in the WVLAC group, there remained some uneasiness over the fact that the guidelines do not explicitly provide for such participation. Concern was expressed that it might be possible to finalize consortium arrangements with minimal participation by the group with most expertise in a particular area.

2. Teachers became increasingly reluctant to absent themselves from their classes on a regular basis even though a substitute was provided. This was particularly true for elementary teachers who felt that frequent interruptions in the ongoing program would be detrimental to the children. In addition, they were quite aware of the large amount of planning involved in preparing for a substitute. This time and effort was not included in their compensation.

3. As subcommittee tasks are identified, the amount of study and preparation of materials required outside the regular meeting time mounted. Teachers who found the meetings stimulating and rewarding were less enthusiastic about committing time and effort which was not directly related to their contract obligations.

4. Although all agencies were located within reasonable geographical proximity, travel time nonetheless became a source of concern. For three representatives a round trip to the district meeting site involved the better part of four hours. For a time a compromise location halfway between the district office and the most distant institution was utilized for subcommittee meetings. Classroom teachers, however, felt burdened at traveling out of town for evening committee meetings. Teachers, who were reluctant to meet during the day because they did not wish to leave their classes to substitutes, were equally reluctant to commit themselves to evening and weekend meetings. After school meetings were feasible only when held within the district, and even then the blocks of time were too small to be fruitful.

5. It seemed desirable to have five to seven teachers on each subcommittee to provide adequate input as well as to avoid an excessive workload for members of any one group. However, from the school district point of view, a critical problem emerged when 25-30 teachers were needed on a released time basis to have adequate representation on the five subcommittees. This possibility affected not only the instructional program, but the district's financial resources as well.

6. The lack of financial resources was a general source of frustration. Members of the initial planning group had envisioned a language learning
center as a physical entity where preservice and inservice teachers could work with pupils in flexible time frames to experiment with or implement innovative programs. Various sources of funds had been proposed, with very limited success.

7. The time and money drain with respect to personnel was exacerbated as additional consortium involvements emerged within the district. The heavy load on personnel representing all three agencies, district, education association, and college, became obvious as multiple consortia involvements became imminent.

In addition to the above considerations, the participating district was faced with resolving the conflicts generated by its being a member of the umbrella consortium (Intermediate School District (ISD)) as well as of a special interest consortium. The intent of the umbrella consortium was that special groups would operate as task forces under the umbrella rather than as separate consortia. Early in 1973 it became clear that many of the problems which had been identified might be alleviated if not resolved if the language arts consortium elected to become a task force under what was known as the ISD #101 umbrella consortium. This decision was reached after much deliberation. As of 1973, plans are being prepared to draw participation in the language arts task force from the broader base represented in the umbrella consortium. Thus, it is anticipated that some of the strain on the resources of one district will be removed.

Summary

Although the philosophy underlying the 1971 guidelines and standards for teacher certification in the state of Washington is laudable, it is evident that a tremendous set of tasks remains to be done before workable consortia programs can be developed. Many of the concerns which have been identified have not been resolved. While most existing consortia have been awarded small planning grants to continue their work for the coming year, it is apparent that carefully designed pilot projects are needed to provide viable models that can preserve the strengths inherent in the 1971 guidelines.
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ADDENDUM A


S T A T E M E N T O F P H I L O S O P H Y

The approval by the State Board of Education of the 1971 Guidelines and Standards comes at a most appropriate time in terms of the public's reaction to both teaching in the schools and the professional development programs.

Never before have parents, students, and the public in general been so ready to hold the school accountable for the success of the school product. It is, therefore, quite reasonable that those who are responsible for professional development programs should also be accountable for the product of their programs.

The emphasis on product has naturally raised questions about competence, relevance, participation, sharing, inservice growth, and the viability of programs which tend to require the same courses and experience for all students within a program. Students come to programs for the preparation of professional school personnel with wide ranges of skills and background experiences and, therefore, may desire and expect the programs to emphasize uniqueness and individuality. The new Guidelines and Standards requires the colleges, school organizations, and the professional associations to cooperate in the development of competency oriented professional development programs. It also emphasizes the need to arrange situations so the candidate can demonstrate desired competencies.

If the new Guidelines and Standards is to achieve its highest potential, there must be a new order of faith, confidence, and trust between agencies involved. Decisions must be on the basis of consensus. Real acceptance of parity between the three groups must be evident.

As the consortium develops, it must be open to change, allow for new memberships, encourage the development of special programs to meet the needs of various groups of professional school personnel, and maintain an attitude of encouragement to experimental programs.
BYLAWS OF INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT 101 CONSORTIUM FOR THE PREPARATION LEADING TO THE CERTIFICATION OF SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

April 6, 1972

ARTICLE I - AUTHORIZATION

Section 1. This consortium is authorized under the 1971 Guidelines and Standards for the Development and Approval of Programs of Preparation Leading to the Certification of School Professional Personnel which states, "Under these standards preparation programs are to be developed and implemented by a consortium of agencies." These agencies are defined as "colleges and universities, school organizations and professional associations." (Guidelines and Standards . . ., Sec. B., p. 3)

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE

Section 1. It is the intent of these bylaws to establish roles and procedures under which the consortium will engage in program development leading to implementation of the 1971 Guidelines And Standards for the Development and Approval of Programs of Preparation Leading to the Certification of School Professional Personnel. Specifically, these bylaws are concerned with (1) consortium structure, (2) formulation of policy, (3) the consortium's function in developing certification program objectives and characteristics, (4) implementation and administration of programs, (5) appeal procedures, and (6) review, evaluation and modification of programs established by the consortium.

Section 2. The purpose of this consortium is to draw together the optimum human and material resources for the preparation of school professional personnel; to improve communications between colleges and universities, professional associations and school organizations responsible for preparation programs; to review proposals in order that preparation programs may be planned and implemented in the most effective manner. This consortium shall strive to provide a constructive interchange of assistance and communication between all segments of the profession as it proceeds to carry out the intent of the 1971 Guidelines and Standards.

Section 3. The consortium shall be the agency for recommending to the State Board of Education all professional preparation programs prepared by members of the consortium. Members of the consortium may participate in other consortia whose boundaries are not exclusively within the boundaries of ISD 101.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Membership in the Intermediate School District 101 Consortium shall be open to all school districts, independent school systems, professional education associations and colleges and universities serving
the students and the general public within the above Intermediate School District area.

ARTICLE IV - COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Section 1. (a) From the membership above, a Coordinating Committee shall be created composed of six school district representatives elected by the school district organizations within each county, plus one representative elected by School District 81, plus one elected by the independent school systems, eight general professional association representatives elected in the same manner; and five members from colleges and universities (Washington State University, Eastern Washington State College, Gonzaga University, Fort Wright College, and Whitworth College).

(b) Representatives to the Coordinating Committee shall be elected to three year terms with the exception of the first year of operation. In the first year of operation the participating preparation agencies as defined in the 1971 Standards shall provide for continuity by electing representatives to the Coordinating Committee as follows:

1. School districts shall elect three representatives for three year terms, three for two year terms, and two for one year terms.
2. General professional associations shall elect three representatives for three year terms, three for two year terms, and two for one year terms.
3. Colleges and universities shall elect two for three year terms, two for two year terms, and one for a one year term.

(c) Alternates shall be selected in the same manner as representatives and shall have the same responsibilities and privileges as the representatives when serving in their behalf.

Section 2. (a) The Coordinating Committee shall be the policy-making board and shall serve to expedite the responsibilities of the consortium.

(b) The Coordinating Committee shall assure the formation of appropriate task forces when it is apparent that specific preparation programs should be initiated to serve the profession.

(c) The Coordinating Committee shall have the authority to approve appropriate task forces when it is apparent that specific preparation programs have been or are to be initiated to serve the profession.

(d) The Coordinating Committee shall give assistance and counsel to the officers of the consortium.

(e) The Coordinating Committee shall instruct each Program Review Committee as to its responsibilities.

(f) The Coordinating Committee shall see that there is representation on each Program Review Committee from the three preparation agencies as defined in the 1971 Standards with invitations extended to appropriate specialized and/or subject-matter associations to serve as consultative assistants.

(g) It shall be the intent of the Coordinating Committee to facilitate program development. The coordinating Committee shall approve, recommend modifications, or withhold approval on all preparation programs.

(h) The Coordinating Committee shall have the obligation of informing all members of Intermediate School District 101 Consortium of action taken relative to all proposals submitted to it.
The Coordinating Committee shall also have the responsibility of transmitting all recommended programs to the Division of Teacher Education and Certification in the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for review and approval by the State Board of Education. The Coordinating Committee shall recommend candidates for certification as one of its major responsibilities.

ARTICLE V - OFFICERS

Section 1. On or before the last meeting of the Coordinating Committee each fiscal school year (July 1-June 30) the Coordinating Committee shall elect a chairman and two co-chairmen to serve as coordinating officers of the consortium and the Coordinating Committee for the next fiscal year. The chairman and the co-chairmen shall represent the three different types of agencies as defined in the 1971 Guidelines and Standards. The chairman in cooperation with the co-chairmen shall plan agendas for the meetings, be responsible for the distribution of meeting notices and other communications and shall call meetings when sufficient business dictates or when requested by a petition of seven members of the Coordinating Committee.

Section 2. One of the two co-chairmen will serve as recorder.

Section 3. Officers of this consortium shall compile a list of all school organizations, all professional associations and all colleges and universities in Intermediate School District 101 (as defined by the 1971 Standards) who become signatories to this consortium.

Section 4. The officers shall compile a list of all members of the Coordinating Committee.

Section 5. The officers shall compile and maintain an up-to-date list of task forces and corresponding Program Review Committees that are developing preparation proposals.

Section 6. The officers shall insure that selection of representatives and alternates takes place in each of the three preparation agencies.

ARTICLE VI - PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Section 1. The Program Review Committee shall be elected by the members of the Coordinating Committee.

Section 2. Each Program Review Committee, from its inception, shall provide on-going communication with all interested parties in the consortium. Specifically, it shall review those professional preparation programs for certification assigned to it and shall make recommendations to the appropriate task force to strengthen and improve the quality of programs.
Section 3. Each Program Review Committee, after reviewing the proposed preparation programs assigned to it, shall make recommendations to the Coordinating Committee.

ARTICLE VII - TASK FORCES

Section 1. Task forces shall be composed of representatives of the three preparation agencies as defined in the 1971 Guidelines and Standards and shall provide opportunities for consultative assistance from appropriate specialized and/or subject-matter associations.

Section 2. Each task force shall be responsible for specific program development which shall include procedures for implementation and program evaluation.

ARTICLE VIII - RECIPROCITY IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Section 1. Intermediate School District 101 Consortium for the Preparation and Certification of School Professional Personnel shall develop reciprocal arrangements with other consortia within the State of Washington.

Section 2. The Intermediate School District 101 Consortium shall provide information for individuals from out-of-state who wish to pursue Washington Certification requirements within the ISD 101 area.

ARTICLE IX - APPEAL PROCEDURE

Section 1. Individuals seeking certification through programs implemented under the Intermediate School District 101 Consortium or representatives of preparation agencies, or members of task forces, who have been aggrieved by any action of the consortium, or agents of the consortium, may seek adjustment of the grievance. Adjustments of the grievance shall be sought through a sequence of steps.

   Step 1. Presentation of the grievance to the level of the consortium or agent of the consortium, where the grievance has occurred.

   Step 2. Appeal of the adjustment, or lack of adjustment, may be carried to a higher level.

Section 2. For purposes of appeal, levels of recourse in the consortium shall be:

a. A preparation agency or task force
b. The Program Review Committee
c. The Coordinating Committee
d. The Division of Teacher Education and Certification of the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction
e. The State Board of Education
f. Appeal to the Courts
ARTICLE X - REVIEW OF CONSORTIUM OPERATION

Section 1. The total operational pattern of Intermediate School District 101 Consortium, including these bylaws, shall be evaluated in accordance with the 1971 Guidelines and Standards.

ARTICLE XI - PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

Section 1. Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (Second edition) shall be the authority governing the conduct of meetings. (Exception: see Section 3 below)

Section 2. A quorum for the conduct of any meetings of the Coordinating Committee shall be at least fifty percent of the representatives or alternates of each agency as provided in Article IV above.

Section 3. Decisions made within each of the three preparation agencies as defined by the 1971 Standards shall be made by a majority of the representatives of the agency. Decisions of the Coordinating Committee shall result from consensus of the three agencies.

ARTICLE XII - FINANCE

Section 1. The consortium shall request funds from the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. No financial commitments on the part of any members of the consortium are implied by this document. Any budgetary commitments of the participating professional associations, school organizations, and colleges and universities can be made only by the appropriate policy making bodies of the respective organizations.

ARTICLE XIII - DEPOSITORY

Section 1. Intermediate School District 101 shall serve as a service office and the official depository for any records or other possessions of the consortium created herein.

ARTICLE XIV - AMENDMENTS

Section 1. Bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds affirmative vote of the representatives of each agency of the Coordinating Committee after a thirty day notice of the proposed amendment(s) has/have been sent to all members and representatives of the consortium.
Innovative crusades usually occur in evolutionary stages with each stage relying upon previous stages for its adequate development (Miles, 1964). Typically the first stage in such an evolution is the design stage when an innovation is discovered or invented. The design stage is followed by the awareness-interest stage when potential consumers of the idea become aware or interested in the idea and seek information about its characteristics. The third stage can be described as the evaluation stage. Transition to this stage often proves to be the most difficult since it often requires a change in the mode or direction of thinking. Previous to this stage, thinking processes may be primarily positive with little critical thought being devoted to the practical problems of implementation. A necessary condition for this stage is the existence of a dialogue which focuses upon not only the pros but the cons of any particular innovation and with the practical problems of implementation. In this stage, potential users often engage in "search behavior" to assess the likely net consequences of adopting the innovation. Barton and Wilder (Miles, 1964) report that inadequate communicating of characteristics, vested interests, and lack of rationality can operate to hamper adequate consideration at this stage. The fourth stage involves the initial trial when the innovation is attempted on an experimental basis. If the trial basis is successful, the final evolutionary stage of the innovation proceeds to that of full implementation. The innovation is actually put into use and integrated into the regular operating procedures.

Where is CBC in 1973? Applying this schema to the concept of competency based teacher certification (CBC), evidence can be observed in the literature that CBC has proceeded through the design stage and is well into the awareness-interest stage. The planning being conducted in the states of Washington, Florida, and New York may be construed as evidence of evolution through the evaluation stage and into the trial stage. However, one of the defining conditions of the evaluation stage is the existence of a dialogue concerning the strengths and weaknesses of a particular innovation. A review of the CBC literature does not reveal such a dialogue.
CDC has been accepted not only as a good idea, but one which should be implemented immediately and without hesitation. Daly (1970) jokingly (or perhaps not so jokingly) referred to the atmosphere at one state CDC conference as similar to an "old fashioned revival meeting."

The purpose of this paper is to critically examine the state of the art in the field of CDC and raise some questions which have not been given adequate consideration. This task is undertaken with the realization that it may be an unpopular one, for critics of ideas "whose time has come" often appear reactionary. This is not the intent of the present report. Rather, the writer hopes to raise questions at this stage of the evolutionary process which would help avoid later difficulties and thus facilitate movement to and through the implementation stage if an institution or state so desires.

Some advantages of CDC. The appeal of competency based certification can be observed in a comparison with traditional conceptions of the role of certification in teacher education.

The traditional concept of certification has been primarily reactionary and defensive, that is, aimed more at keeping unqualified people out than identifying qualified people for entrance into the profession. Lierheimer (1970) referred to certification as "gate keeping." Stiles (1969) called teachers' certificates "permits to practice," a guarantee of performance above defined minimum levels for particular kinds of professional responsibilities. In the past, little mention had been made of distinctions above the minimal level, or, if made, were based upon time or credit measures such as course hours taken or years of experience.

In contrast with this relatively minimal and non-qualitative role of certification in the teacher education process, CDC is assumed by its advocates to be a more dynamic and functional process. Rosner (1972, pp. 98-109) viewed CDC as a lever for reform. Certification based upon observable performance, by making performance criteria more visible, would force not only teacher preparation institutions but teachers themselves to keep pace with the latest in educational thinking. Schalock (Rosner) proclaimed CDC to be a method of providing standards by which to control the quality of teacher training institutions' products. Stringent certification standards would act as final quality control checks for the graduates of the colleges. Young (1970) considered CDC to be a way toward moving certification criteria closer to pupil learning outcomes. In this respect certification by criteria, either of student learning or trainee performance, was perceived to more accurately gauge teacher potential than hours of course work completed. Andrews (Houston and Howsam, 1972) viewed CDC as a means of delineating responsibility for the quality of prospective teacher candidates. Andrews also observed that CDC could be a means of focusing emphasis on student successes rather than time spent in schooling.

Other advantages associated with CDC are those pertaining to continuing career long certification. CBC offers a potential means toward bridging the often mentioned gap between "theory and practice."

Certification
requirements based upon classroom performance could act to help focus teacher education curriculum on the classroom, thus making the transition from college to classroom easier. Also, if CBC were organized to correspond to a career ladder, it could serve as a means to ensure continuity not only between preservice and inservice education, but also throughout the inservice curriculum for a teacher's entire career. CBC could also provide a more logical and technologically efficient basis for pay raises and salary increments. A final advantage for CBC is that it would afford an opportunity to realign present but somewhat archaic patterns of certification authority. Consortia, as described by Schalock (1970), Drummond (1971) and Rosner, would redistribute input sources to include a more representative sampling of all those influenced by certification. This would mean that the practitioner would have a vital role in defining the needed competencies.

Valid or invalid assumptions. Many of these advantages may be valid and powerful, and accordingly have contributed to the impetus currently evidenced by the CBC movement. However, most of these advantages are based upon assumptions which have not always been exposed to close scrutiny. Further, some of the possible problems which could result from implementation may arise from lack of validity of the assumptions made by advocates.

One assumption, as noted by Andrews (1972) is that objective systems of measuring performance are now available, or will be soon. The presence of evaluation instruments has also been noted as the sine qua non of CBC by the Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education (Rosner). At the present time, however, such instruments are nonexistent, or present in such a state of refinement as to offer little more discrimination than the present system of certification based upon college credit hours completed.

Part of the problem in developing such instruments is lack of agreement on the exact level of performance on which to base certification. Schalock advocates an output referenced system in which teacher certification is based upon student performance. In other words, teacher efficacy would be judged in terms of student performance changes. Certification in this manner is based upon the assumption that student learning is determined almost wholly by the teacher, and that it depends very little on the variables within the situation. Measurement problems of control of extraneous variables would be an essential consideration.

The Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education (CNPPTE) (Rosner) advocated the use of teacher performance in the classroom setting as the basis for both entry and permanent certification. Certification at these levels are based upon the assumption of probable cause and effect relationships between teacher competencies and desired pupil outcomes. Turner (Rosner), taking an intermediate position between the previous two, advocated the use of teacher classroom performance as the basis for temporary certification but called for the use of student learning outcomes for permanent certification. All of the above writers noted the increased difficulty in attempts to utilize student learning outcomes as the basis for certification, but nevertheless advocate the position without operationally defining the competencies. It would seem that the kind of competency is immaterial (just show some competency).
Another problem encountered in attempts at implementation of CBC concerns the assumption that enough is known about the relationship between teacher behavior and pupil learning to devise valid certification criteria. Without sufficient knowledge of such relationships, the validity of the whole process of certification is highly questionable. Writers in the area of CBC have for the most part underestimated the magnitude of the task for researchers attempting to document teacher behavior/student learning relationships. Some of the problems involved in studies attempting to link teacher behaviors and pupil achievement have been reviewed by Fattu (1963). These problems included: (1) lack of adequate control of extraneous variables, (2) time factors and the need for long term follow up, and (3) confounding of the effects of other teachers over time. Justiz, in a review of the literature involved with teacher effectiveness, concluded that:

The absence of reliable pupil performance criterion measure of teacher effectiveness is a well-known fact in the state of the art. In the past 60 years, teacher effectiveness has been so clouded with arguments as to why pupil performance criterion measures are supposedly unworkable that at times it is difficult to see beyond this position (1969, p. 49).

In a review of studies linking teaching processes to student outcomes, Rosenshine and Furst concluded that "Because of this lack of research, we have little knowledge of the relationship between teacher behavior and student growth" (Smith, 1971, p. 66). Others (e.g., McDonald in Houston and Howsam, 1972; and Cooper and Weber in Cooper et al., 1972) have reached similar conclusions about the state of the research in teacher performance.

Rosenshine and Furst listed five process variables which correlated strongly with student achievement. These were clarity of presentation, use of variety or variability during a lesson, teacher enthusiasm, task-oriented and/or business-like teacher behaviors, and student opportunity to learn criterion material. Despite these "strong" correlations it would be difficult to design either a valid performance based teacher education curriculum or credible certification instruments from these data. The correlations themselves reported by Rosenshine and Furst may not be strong enough yet. For example, correlations ranged from .37 to .71 for studies included under "clarity," which had the highest correlations. For studies listed under "student opportunity to learn," the correlations ranged from .16 to .40, which were the weakest sets of correlations. In short, proponents of CBC may be attempting to construct a test before they know what it is they are trying to measure or why they are trying to measure it.

Treating assumptions as facts. The need for a solid empirically researched base to guide formulation of competency based certification criteria is urgent. However, present patterns of research strategies may turn out to be unfeasible or unrealistic. Research thrusts by individual states, while admirable in their intent, lack the capability for needed comprehensiveness. Objectives formulated by the Board of Governors for the Florida Education Research and Development Program were stated in 1971 in their Prospectus as follows:
By the end of 1971, competencies expected of teaching personnel in elementary and secondary schools will be clearly identified. Evidence will be available showing relationships between teacher competencies and pupil learning. Teacher training techniques will be available for use in preservice and inservice teacher education programs which are aimed at the specified competencies. Evidence will be available to state policy makers which shows the extent to which teacher effects on pupil learning support various credentialing requirements (1971, p. 15).

That a single state could accomplish in three years what has eluded educational researchers nationally for the better part of this century is doubtful. Federal aid both in terms of financial assistance and coordination of state research efforts seems necessary. What is more alarming to this writer is that other state leaders will assume such glowing statements to be empirically derived and add a quasi-legitimitization to the entire process. Such practices will surely take place since opponents to CBC have not been widely published nor encouraged to appear at CRC conferences.

Are costs reasonable? Related to the problem of the lack of a credible research base are other practical problems related to in the field evaluation. Development and implementation costs may act as inhibitors in the movement toward an empirically developed CBC model. At the present time the Federal government seems willing to help defray some developmental costs, as evidenced by funding for the Elementary Models and Trainers of Teacher Trainees Program. Ultimately, however, the major brunt of implementation and long term development costs must be borne by the states. The question then becomes one of whether state legislatures, who in the past have demanded accountability, are willing to pay the increased bill for valid evaluation mechanisms without any assurance that the "product" will be cheaper, more efficient or better.

Estimates of costs of CBC have primarily been at the national level. The CNPTE (Rosner) envisioned a cost outlay of 5.5 million dollars over a five year period for initial instrument development. This figure only included the development of instruments to assess observable teacher skills in the classroom. The Committee estimated that it would cost an additional 10 million dollars to develop instruments to measure knowledge and skills prerequisite to the classroom skills. Both of these estimates were made for development at the national level. The problems of adapting evaluation instruments from the national level to local program thrusts may be considerable, unless one assumes a single national standard. The need for adapting these instruments to local needs results from the power that evaluation instruments have in affecting the direction of the programs they evaluate. This influence extends not only to include the content but the form of teacher training programs. Rosner, in noting this effect stated that "The form of legal and extra-legal certification manipulates the form of training. If certification is based on profiles of specific competencies, teacher education programs will provide training addressed to those competencies" (p. 101). Thus, teacher preparation curricula would be effected largely
by the form of evaluation. The unwillingness of educators to accept carte
blanche changes which will affect teachers' manner of instruction has been
noted by Jones (Houston and Howsam, 1977). The need for provision for
adaptation costs definitely appears to be an obstacle to CBC.

An additional cost problem in developing valid evaluation instruments
for CBC is the need for a continual revision of such instruments as
empirical, research or field trials provide new bases for instrument construc-
tion. Few advocates of CBC have either acknowledged or incorporated into
implementation plans provision for long term continual periodic revision.
The connotation seems to be that problems will be solved when they appear,
a stance not congruent with present day conceptions of adequate planning.

Whose ox will be nored? A final issue concerning problems of imple-
menting CBC is that of continued certification. It appears somewhat inconsis-
tent to demand a test of competency at the entrance level, but require
few or no competency checks at later dates. Such thinking would seem to
be based upon one of two assumptions: (1) little changes would occur in
the definition of good teaching within a teacher's career, and (2) teachers
would hold themselves responsible for updating competencies. Past expe-
riences in education negate the validity of either assumption. Some writers
have advocated the use of the "carrot approach" to updating competencies,
suggesting the use of incentives to encourage continued teacher education.
However, such procedures do not provide truly adequate means of insuring
competency updating. The same malingerers which CBC advocates claim to be
eliminating would remain unaffected. Remember that contracts, tenure and
teacher rights are negotiated by teacher bargaining. The teachers will not
give up any previously won power just to placate educational theorists!

A major impediment to career long CBC seems to be union and professional
association resistance to the spectre of competency based evaluation being
used as a basis for promotion and tenure decisions. Competency based
teacher education and competency based initial certification are seen as
valid innovations, but any use of competencies to determine retention or
pay increases is summarily rejected by the unions. The seemingly para-
doxical position taken by union leaders can be seen in a quote by Daly, a
national vice-president of the American Federation of Teachers.

The use of "micro-teaching" techniques by an individual teacher
to sharpen his teaching skills, for example, is a development in
technology and methodology that we can enthusiastically support.
It is apparent, however, that such technique will have great
appeal for administrators who wish to make teachers conform to
certain standards of behavior that are pleasing to the administra-
tion but which contribute little or nothing to the education of

The union's position seems to be so firmly entrenched that it led the
CNPPTE to conclude that "It is doubtful whether additional certification
requirements can be introduced for senior educational personnel..." (Rosner,
p. 12). It is the writer's opinion that a CBC policy which does not
extend beyond the minimal entry requirements would be toothless at best, a
return to the time honored tradition of gate keeping.
Many of these anticipated problems with CBC are not encountered at the institutional level when dealing with competency based teacher education. A number of factors such as size, agreement on directionality by the faculty within an institution, and lack of codified regulations and procedures, allow teacher training institutions greater opportunity to adaptively utilize research findings and/or successful practices to restructure program components. In addition, the problems of developing evaluation instruments would not be as great because of the decreased emphasis on standardization and need for reliability. These factors would suggest the advisability of focusing increased efforts at competency based teacher education programs that produce competencies which consequently result in subsequent student achievement.

Yet to be determined is the question of whether teacher preparatory institutions can produce "competent" teachers and whether the cost of such products is within the limits of present day cost limits. The answer to both questions is probably "yes," but the matter of when such programs can be operationalized on a large scale basis is still open to speculation. The importance of such operating competency based teacher education programs for the concept of competency based certification is paramount, for ultimately CBC must be based upon teacher preparation programs that can produce the needed competencies. K. Fred Daniel, Associate for Planning and Director of Education Research and Development in the Florida Department of Education reported such recognition by the State of Florida. Daniel wrote that "The State of Florida has decided that performance based teacher certification cannot be implemented satisfactorily until the needed teacher training technology is available" (1971). Proponents of CBC may profit by examining the state of the art of competency based teacher education in their own state or institutions. Hardnosed realistic appraisals of developmental projections for the next five or ten years could possibly prevent horse-cart problems from occurring.

The rush to CBC is premature because it is based on inadequate research and overemphases, a technological base which may not be existent. Some states may choose, and in fact some are choosing, to experiment with statewide certification by competencies. Other states will surely profit by the experiences and knowledge gained by the experimenting states. However, at this stage of development of the concept of CBC, it does not seem advisable from a practical standpoint for fifty states to initiate plans for full-scale programs. Many potential pitfalls and blind alleys will be exposed by the efforts of these initial states which will afford opportunity for others who follow to profit by their mistakes. In this instances, there may be some advantage to no "being the first kid on the block to..."
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PERFORMANCE BASED CERTIFICATION WITH FOCUS
UPON THE STATE OF WASHINGTON MODEL

by
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History, Rationale, and Status of Certification

From early times in one form or another, certification, credentialing and accreditation of trade and professional workers have played a prominent role in human history, and they have been by no means limited to education. The very first credentialing examinations were often crude, simple and lacking in validity. Julian Stanley (1954) cites a reference to an early type of credential examination which occurred in the Bible (King James Version, 12:5-6) taken from the book of Judges.

And the Gileadites took the passages of Jordan before the Ephraimites: and it was so, that when those Ephraimites which were escaped said, Let me go over; that the men of Gilead said unto him, Art thou an Ephraimite? If he said, Nay, then said they unto him, Say now Shibboleth: and he said Sibboleth: for he could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took him, and slew him at the passages of Jordan: and there fell at that time of the Ephraimites forty and two thousand.

It may be noted that the foregoing examination is simple and crude, but it did require that the examinee display the "critical performance."

More elaborate systems of examination can be found later in history. Civil Service examinations were in vogue in China as early as 29 B.C., and it has been suggested that such examination systems have had a substantial effect on the stability of the culture and preservation of its language.

The development of Civil Service examinations in our own culture has
helped to assure that practitioners display appropriate competencies/performances so that the members of society may be protected from incompetents and charlatans. In nearly all professions, highly specialized examinations, certification and/or licensing procedures have been developed. The form and structure of evaluation varies both in content and title among the various trades and professions but has essentially the same goals—that of giving society some estimate of competence to perform in trade and professional roles.

In the field of education, certification of school personnel has long been a critical concern to help ensure competent teachers and other educational practitioners. At the present time, every state in the United States has some form of certification (Wells and Short, 1971-72). The patterns of requirements are in all cases linked to college preparation and in most cases require specific courses and experiences relating to the teaching process or educational specialties. The number of courses required in the latter category varies greatly from state to state and within educational specialties.

Since the 1960s, many states have been re-examining their certification procedures. At least a dozen are involved with some type of strenuous revision and some have been "nudged" or even mandated by their State Boards or Legislatures to effect revisions. The traditional patterns of certification have been challenged as being inadequate and often invalid. One critic, Carl Rogers (1972) has severely challenged those in the counseling profession suggesting that certification of counselors and psychologists in the present form should be drastically changed or even eliminated. Rogers explained that:

As soon as we set up criteria for certification—whether for clinical psychologists, for NTL group trainers, for marriage counselors, for psychiatrists, psychoanalysts, or, as I heard the other day, for psychic healers—the first and greatest effect is to freeze the profession in a past image.

This is an inevitable result. What can you use for examinations? Obviously, the questions and tests which have been used in the past decade or two. Who is wise enough to be an examiner? Obviously, the person who has 10 or 20 years of experience and who therefore started his training 15 to 25 years previously. I know how hard such groups try to update their criteria. But they are always several laps behind. So the certification procedure is always rooted in the rather distant past, and defines the profession in those terms.

Rogers rejects the argument that traditional certification offers a reasonable guarantee that the professional is competent by replying that

---

1 The states of Texas and Arizona have edicts from their Legislatures to revise certification procedures requiring performance based criteria.
"there are as many certified charlatans and exploiters of people as there are uncertified." Rogers speaks out strongly against the highly institutionalized and standardized mode of certification challenging educators to be more creative in meeting the demands of human beings particularly in the area of human relations.

Though most critics are not as severe as Carl Rogers, it has become apparent to many that new models and approaches to the certification of educational specialists are needed. A cursory examination of the present efforts suggests that the overriding theme of evolving plans is the performance/competency based focus. Numerous plans also give emphasis to various kinds of cooperating consortia or at least greater involvement of the many pertinent agencies involved in preparation of educational specialists including those in the field. A recap of the goals and underlying convictions of the new performance based, field centered plan in the state of New York would serve to highlight the emerging emphasis:

Goal for Teacher Preparation and Certification

Certain underlying convictions exist about teacher preparation; they illuminate objectives of plans later outlined.

1. Pupil performance should be the underlying basis for judging teacher competence. (Such a basis is not now fully obtainable because of the limited knowledge about measurement itself.)

2. The basis for certification itself should be teacher competence, not merely the completion of college courses. Possession of a State certificate should represent an acceptable level of teacher competence in the performance of teaching duties.

3. The preparation of teachers should involve a number of pertinent agencies and individuals including schools, higher institutions, professional staffs, and relevant agencies.

4. Like other professions, teaching requires that professional personnel undergo continuous training; consequently, teachers should be expected to demonstrate competency periodically to maintain certification.

The Regent's goal for the preparation and practice of professional personnel in the schools is:

To establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the schools possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn (PBTE, 1972).

Numerous other states including most of those involved in the Multi-State Consortium on Performance Based Teacher Education (PBTE, 1972) are
actively involved in implementing change hopefully resulting in greater emphasis on the ability to perform competently in the real life setting.\textsuperscript{2}

The state of Washington made one of the first moves to digress the traditional "building block" concept of certification and to base it on performance standards. This model, together with an illustrative case study example, will be provided and critiqued later in this paper.

**Evaluation Methodology**

Since the growth of evaluation methodology in the educational community would seem to have considerable influence and transfer to the evolving methodology of certification, a brief mention and analysis of two widely used evaluation models may be helpful in gaining perspective and suggesting important variables relating to further discussion of performance based certification models.

The accreditation model. Accreditation is perhaps the oldest type of evaluation activity. This approach or model has typically magnified the role of the "expert observer" and has given emphasis to the processes or means of education as opposed to consequences of educational activities on the learner. Procedures have been developed (by such organizations as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools) to identify deficiencies in the education of students and their teachers and to withhold accreditation of programs or place embargoes on graduates if deficiencies are discovered and are not corrected. The variables examined in evaluating the programs typically include such criteria as those emphasized by the North Central Association in use in 1945:

1. The "general intellectual and moral tone" of the school.
2. The school plant.
3. Instructional equipment and supplies.
4. The library and its services.
5. Financial data and personnel records.
7. Organization and administration of the school.
8. Teacher qualifications (degrees, subject matter preparation).
10. Whether the curriculum meets pupils' needs and interests.
11. Guidance services.
12. The school as educational and recreational center for the entire community.

Implicit in this approach is the assumption that the quality of the

\textsuperscript{2} Included are the states of Washington, Oregon, Utah, Arizona, Texas, Minnesota, Vermont, New York, and Florida.
facilities, the number of course units in the curriculum, and the number and kind of courses taken by the teachers would have a significant effect on the quality of pupil learning.

High degrees of standardization have evolved in the development of inspection procedures and the definition of systems to define such variables as training requirements, course units, plant facilities and finance. Little attention is paid to direct evidence of learner behavior. It has been observed by Glass (1969) that instructional outcomes are wedded to the faculty theory of psychology in vogue in the early 1900's, "... that those studies which are best adapted to develop the faculties of the pupils should have a prominent place in several curricula." Such psychology persists in large part to this day as far as the traditional approach to accreditation is concerned, an assumption which is not now universally accepted in current educational thought but one which has gone unexamined in many accreditation practices. The methodology has borrowed little from the behavioral and social sciences.

Overtones of this model can quickly be recognized as having direct parallels in our traditional patterns of teacher certification. An NCATE accreditation visit embraces almost precisely the variables which are reflected in most standard certification patterns including the number of course units teachers have fulfilled, extent and reputation of the training institution, degrees of faculty, and size of library. Little attention has been given to the direct assessment of learner behavior except as it is incorporated in standard course patterns.

A major weakness of this accreditation model is that standardization and wide acceptance of a process does not guarantee its effectiveness. Processes must be continually validated through research as reflected in learner behavior. Counting and tabulating institutional artifacts may indeed be an exercise in futility if a direct link to learner outcomes is not present. Standards against which teacher education programs are evaluated cannot be totally arrived at through deliberation of experts on education but rather must depend in part on direct assessment of the performance of the learner.

The tylerian model. Though the Tylerian Model was originally devised as a curriculum evaluation model during the 1930's for the Eight year Study, the basic methodology as presented by Ralph W. Tyler and his associates (Smith and Tyler, 1942; Tyler, 1951) has had broad application and influence in all areas of education.

Tyler's Model places almost exclusive priority on learner behaviors. It is the ends of instruction and not the means or processes which are important. The steps in the Tylerian Evaluation Model are:

1. Formulate objectives. Determine the broad goals of the program.
2. Classify objectives. Develop a typology of objectives so an economy of thought and action may be achieved.
3. Define objectives in behavioral terms. This feature has become
the cornerstone of the Tyler Model. "Modern" methodologies of evaluation which rest heavily upon the specific, behavioral statement of objectives have not moved beyond Tyler's thoughts on evaluation in the Eight Year Study.

4. Suggest situations in which achievement of objectives will be shown.

5. Develop or select appraisal techniques (standardized tests, ad hoc tests, questionnaires).

6. Gather and interpret performance data. The final step in the evaluation process involved the measurement of student performance and the comparison of performance data with behaviorally stated objectives.

The Tylerian Model has had pervasive influence on educational thought in the past few years. It has served to help shift the focus of our thinking from process to product and to make explicit the need for clear definition of goals in terms of learner behavior. Though the direct influence is difficult to assess, it is probably the Tylerian Model which has encouraged educators to incorporate more current research from the social and behavioral sciences into the methodology of education. It has been the key model utilized in packaged learning approaches, accountability by objective plans as well as many federal program evaluation efforts. The key emphasis as it relates to the processes of certification which heretofore has been carelessly underemphasized is the direct definition and assessment of learner behaviors.

Though the Tylerian point of view is refreshing, it does not appear at this point in time to be totally adequate. After years of experience with this model, there are recurrently unsolved problems which continue to reoccur. These are listed below.

1. For a significantly large portion of teacher education curricula the actual behaviors that are desired cannot be observed directly. Training and instructing must be evaluated by "proxy" or "stand in for" behaviors. One may view and evaluate the learner's behavior through classroom tests, by observation in role playing situations or simulated exercises, and through the learner's written or spoken reactions. Nonetheless, the behavior does not fully represent real performance. Even when entering the classroom or video-taping a live classroom experience the situation becomes, to a certain extent, unreal and may not be representative behavior. An example of a more adequate test would be how a teacher reacts to a problem or crisis which occurs spontaneously in the classroom at some future time.

2. Behavior models and instrument development and validation are still at primitive stages. Definition and measurement of creativity, attitudes, and most affective behaviors constitute major stumbling blocks. Higher levels of cognitive learning have yet to be clearly defined and thoroughly researched.

3. Research to establish desired behavior for various purposes is incomplete and indeed must be a continuous and evolving process. What are
the most desirable patterns of behavior for teachers, counselors, and administrators? The many variables which influence the effectiveness of these specialists including the uniqueness of students and teachers themselves makes it most difficult to provide a standard body of research which would represent desirable sets of behavior in all teachers of varying educational specialities.

The Tyler Model has "had its day in court" for nearly one half a century and despite the fact that it still has ardent defenders it alone is inadequate as a model for evaluating outcomes of instruction and training. It is ill suited for evaluating problems of organizational planning, facilities, and equipment, logic or program rationale, or financing. It has and does make a significant contribution to educational thought in that it emphasizes the central importance of learner behavior/performance.

It should be stressed that most specialists in the field of evaluation accept neither of these traditional models, the accreditation or Tylerian Model, as totally acceptable at this time. Adequate evaluation, which of course should be associated with teacher and educational specialist certification, involves far more comprehensive and complex methodology than either of the foregoing models incorporate. Stake (1967) and Glass (1969) provide excellent discussions of this topic.

In addition to clarification of the philosophical base and the clear definition of goals for any certification or evaluation plan, careful attention must be given to important student, institutional, and process variables and the context and manner in which they interact to produce the desired goals. One such certification model which is an attempt to incorporate many of these variables is the Certification Model in the Washington Plan (Guidelines, 1971). It is herein discussed with a case study example of the plan provided and critiqued.

Description of Washington State Department of Education Guidelines

On July 9, 1971, the Washington State Board of Education adopted the guidelines and standards for the development and approval of programs of preparation leading to the certification of school professional personnel.

The following principles underlie the new standards given in the 1971 Guidelines:

1. Preparation should be related to performance and performance related to the objectives of the professional and his clients.
2. Preparation should be individualized and give recognition to personal style.
3. Preparation programs should be planned and developed in a participatory manner by those affected.
4. Preparation is a career-long, continuing process.

Provisions are made for three types of certificates in the Washington
plan as follows:

1. The teacher certificate authorizes service in the primary role of teaching.
2. The administrator certificate authorizes service in the primary role of general school administration, program administration and/or supervision.
3. The educational staff associate certificate authorizes service in roles of specialized assistance to the learner, the teacher, the administrator and/or the educational program.

Within each type are three levels of certification:

1. The preparatory certificate authorizes experiences in school or school related settings designed to develop competence at the 'initial' level of certification. This certificate is valid for one year and is renewable.
2. The initial certificate authorizes school service in a particular role and allows the holder to assume independent responsibility for working with children, youth and adults. This certificate is valid for three years and is renewable once.
3. The continuing certificate authorizes school service on a career basis and assumes continued professional development. The continuing certificate is valid as long as the holder continues inservice. It is subject to renewal only if the holder leaves educational service for a period in excess of four years.

The Guidelines were developed under the supervision of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in the state of Washington to ensure quality control of school services. Certified teachers and professional personnel are required if a school is to be accredited in the state of Washington. It is crucial, therefore, that state guidelines and standards for certification encourage and promote the highest quality of preparation. The Guidelines, a result of discussion, study, and trial programs from 1966 to 1971, provide a framework within which trends and changes in society and education, which should influence preparation, can be incorporated into preparation programs. To ensure a broad base in developing programs, consortia are composed of universities, professional associations, and school organizations, each having an equal voice (parity) in overall planning, policy formation, assignment of responsibilities, evaluation of program, and the hearing of appeals. The Guidelines specify that it is essential that preparation programs include and address competencies in subject matter knowledge as well as in the art and science of teaching and in such human dimensions as interpersonal communication. The assumptions underlying the principles of the 1971 Guidelines are as follows:

1. The main purpose of the school is to help each child
achieve self-direction and self-reliance in a dynamic and changing society.

2. The adults in a school, by the way they work and live, establish the intellectual and emotional climate for the school.

3. Adults moving into schools as professionals need to experience preparation in a manner consistent with the way children ought to be helped to learn in school.

4. Learning and growth is a continuing and dynamic process.

5. All learners become what they will by the choices they make, the actions they take and the consequences they undergo.

6. Learning and growth best occur under circumstances where a person's respected and loved and free to be themselves and become whomever they have the will to become (Guidelines, 1971).

Southeastern Washington Counselor Education Consortium

The Southeastern Washington Counselor Education Consortium is, at the time of this writing, in the process of developing a counselor certification plan in accordance with the 1971 Guidelines. During 1971-73 a project for training counselors at the preparatory level has received an initial review by the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSSPI) and it is assumed that a fully acceptable plan will be endorsed by the State Board of Education in the early fall of 1973. The following is a case study of the activities of the Consortium and the development of this program thus far.

During the transitional period from the traditional to the 1971 Guidelines, the OSSPI prescribed that interim procedures were to be established. Numerous interim counseling consortia were formed throughout the state. Near the completion of the interim period, OSSPI officials invited interested members of the various consortia to Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington, for discussion in planning of permanent certification. At this meeting, various members of the Southeastern Washington groups and others formed a consortium that is now called the Southeastern Washington Counselor Education Consortium.

Membership of the Southeastern Washington Counselor Education Consortium includes:

1. Three professors in counselor education from Washington State University.
2. School district representatives from Clarkston, Kennewick, Pasco, Pullman, Richland and Walla Walla.
3. Representatives of professional associations from Clarkston, Kennewick, Pasco, Pullman, Richland, and Walla Walla Education Association.

These members have met regularly to develop policies and procedures of the
Consortium and to develop a plan for performance based counselor education in Southeastern Washington.

During the first six meetings Consortium members discussed philosophical positions which affected counselor competencies. These discussions provided a frame of reference from which to write a philosophical position. This task did not result, however, in specifying behavioral objectives. In the latter meetings, it was necessary to divide the larger group into three subgroups, each with a specific assignment to complete. One group had the responsibility for developing administrative procedural policies. The second group developed and operationally defined those behavioral competencies needed to be a "successful" counselor. The third group developed evaluation techniques and criterion measures for the various competencies.

The following are the policies and procedures which were prepared for the administration of the preparatory counselor certification program.

The Southeastern Washington Counselor Education Consortium, as a group will define general policies, criteria and procedures for certification of counselors.

A specific person at the training institution will be appointed by the University to carry out the coordination and implementation of the process as defined by the Consortium for preparatory training and evaluation.

These responsibilities will include:

1. Implementing the application and selection procedures.
2. Assembling appropriate selection and review committees.
3. Reporting to the Consortium all activities relating to preparatory certification program.
4. Coordinating the counselor evaluation process and recommending candidates to the Consortium for certification.

SELECTION COMMITTEE
(For entry into Preparatory Program)

A. Composition

The Selection Committee will include:

1. Two representatives from the WSU counselor-education program. One of these will serve as chairman.
2. A representative mutually agreed upon by the school districts involved.
3. A representative of the Washington School Counselor's Association, approved by the Southeastern Washington Counselor's Association certification committee, who is a member of the local counselors' professional organization.
4. A representative who is mutually agreed upon by the local professional negotiation association.

B. **Meeting Times**

The Selection Committee will meet near the middle of each college semester. Special meetings may be called if deemed necessary by the consortium.

C. **Responsibilities**

1. The Selection Committee is responsible for establishing an operating philosophy and agreement on the role of the counselor in light of the Consortium's officially adopted statements.
2. The Selection Committee is responsible for carrying on a communicative relationship with the applicant, including:
   a. review of personal data.
   b. interview of candidate.
   c. evaluation of personal data and performance evidence.
   d. recommendation concerning preparatory certification.
   e. advisement of appeal procedure.

---

EVALUATION COMMITTEE
(For evaluation at completion of Preparatory Program)

A. **Composition**

The Evaluation Committee will include:

1. Two representatives from WSU's counselor-education program. One of these will serve as chairman of the Evaluation Committee.
2. A representative mutually agreed upon by the school districts involved.
3. A representative of the Washington School Counselors Association, approved by the WSCA certification committee, who is a member of the local counselors' professional organization.
4. A representative who is mutually agreed upon by the local professional negotiation association.

B. **Meeting Times**

The Evaluation Committee will meet at or near the end of each semester.
C. Responsibilities

1. The Evaluation Committee is responsible for establishing an operating philosophy and agreement on the role of the counselor in the light of the Consortium's officially adopted statements on the role of the counselor.

2. The Evaluation Committee is responsible for carrying on a communicative relationship with the applicant, including:
   a. review of personal data.
   b. interview of the candidate.
   c. evaluation of personal data and performance evidence.
   d. recommendation concerning initial certification.
   e. advisement of appeal procedure.

The competencies needed to enter at the preparatory level for counselors are broadly stated and basically deal with personality characteristics and academic aptitude. Evaluation is mainly nonquantitative, relying on letters of reference, peer ratings, graduate record examinations, and impressions and information obtained by an interview with the Consortium's Selection Committee. The general competencies require an applicant to: (1) demonstrate potential to communicate and relate effectively with others; (2) demonstrate sincerity, honesty, openness and responsiveness in expression and behavior; (3) demonstrate objectivity, flexibility, broadmindedness, and an acceptance of and respect for others values and needs; and (4) demonstrate patience and tolerance for ambiguity.

An applicant who demonstrates the competencies needed to enter the preparatory level is then issued the preparatory certificate. Upon receiving this certificate, the applicant is expected to continue preparation for the initial level certificate.

The competencies to be acquired during the initial level are stated in greater detail than are those for the preparatory level. Specific behaviors were selected which are relevant to counseling success and which are eclectic with major counseling theories. For example, attending behavior was considered an important competency whether one uses a Rogerian or a behavioral approach. A modified systems approach was used to describe the specific competencies, the activities and the methods of evaluation. Firstly, general competencies or broad goals were selected. These were then redefined in specific behavioral terms. Activities were suggested that might help an applicant acquire the competencies. Evaluation methods were developed which were congruent to all components.

The following are the competencies to be acquired during the preparatory level which when accomplished would lead to the initial certificate. These competencies are those developed by the Southeastern Washington Counselor Education Consortium while other consortia may have differing lists of competencies.
Competencies To Be Acquired During Preparatory Level

1.0 DESIRABLE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES OF THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR

1.1 Demonstrates sensitivity to others and to their concerns and ability to maintain empathetic rather than sympathetic involvement with others.

Behavioral Competencies

1.11 Attending behavior
1.12 Acceptance
1.13 Paraphrasing of content
1.14 Reflection of feeling
1.15 Summarization of content
1.16 Summarization of feeling
1.17 Good posture and eye contact
1.18 Emotional stability

Activities

1.1A Practicum
1.1B Human relations groups
1.1C Work experiences
1.1D Individual counseling

Evaluation Method

A. Interview
B. Demonstration of counseling session
C. Completion of appropriate courses

1.2 Demonstrate self-insight and self-understanding.

Behavioral Competencies

1.21 Can evaluate oneself realistically
1.22 Can accept criticism
1.23 Ability to identify one's characteristics

Activities

1.2A Course in individual appraisal
1.2B Testing
1.2C Counseling
1.2D Human relations groups
1.2E Peer evaluation
1.2F Practicum
Evaluation Method

A. Rating sheets
B. Letters of recommendation
C. Interview

2.0 COUNSELING

2.1 Demonstrates ability to develop an atmosphere and relationship which stimulates open communications.

Behavioral Competencies

2.11 Non-judgmental orientation
2.12 Able to use minimal encouragement to talk
2.13 Ability to tolerate silence
2.14 Ability to use open-ended questions
2.15 Ability to focus on counselee content (do not introduce irrelevant data)

2.2 Demonstrates ability to listen to, verbalize and clarify counselee's verbal and non-verbal/cognitive and affective communications when appropriate.

Behavioral Competencies

2.21 Paraphrasing content (verbal)
2.22 Reflection of feeling (verbal and non-verbal)
2.23 Summarization of content
2.24 Summarization of feeling

2.3 Demonstrate ability to allow and expect counselee to accept responsibility for decision making.

Behavioral Competencies

2.31 Respect for counselee
2.32 Ability to be natural with cultural differences in individuals
2.33 Flexibility in relating to counselee goals
2.34 Ability not to impose one's own values

2.4 Help counselee relate, analyze, synthesize and integrate his own characteristics, goals and values to the real world so that he is better able to function in a way that will promote his making of responsible decisions.

Behavioral Competencies

2.41 Demonstrate knowledge of decision making
2.42 Demonstrate ability to explore actions and reaction of immediate and larger society
2.5 Keep personal and social needs, values and reactions from interfering with objectivity toward counselee's communications.

Behavioral Competencies

2.51 Non-judgmental orientation
2.52 Ability to focus on counselee content (do not introduce irrelevant data)

Activities for 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5

2.1A Practicum
2.2B Internship
2.3C Course in counseling methods and techniques
2.4D Course in developmental psychology
2.5E Course in where to obtain information

Evaluation Method

A. Interview
B. Successful completion of appropriate courses
C. Demonstration of counseling via a taped session

2.6 Demonstrates ability to provide a theoretical rationale and explain various counseling theories.

Behavioral Competencies

2.61 Demonstrate an understanding of psychological basis for theoretical rationale
2.62 Knowledge of learning theory approaches to counseling
2.63 Knowledge of rational approaches to counseling
2.64 Knowledge of perceptual-phenomenological approaches to counseling
2.65 Knowledge of career development approaches to counseling

Activities

2.6A Theoretical foundation course in counseling
2.6B Knowledge of career theories

Evaluation Method

A. Interview
B. Successful completion of relevant course
C. Paper and pencil test
2.7 Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of state statutes, and state and typical local board policies, in terms of their legal implications, accreditation standards, attendance regulations, graduation requirements, discipline practices, etc.

Behavioral Competencies

2.7.1 Ability to understand legal implications in case studies
2.7.2 Knowledge of state policies
2.7.3 Knowledge of state statutes
2.7.4 Knowledge of local board policies
2.7.5 Knowledge of accreditation standards
2.7.6 Knowledge of attendance regulations
2.7.7 Knowledge of graduation requirements
2.7.8 Knowledge of discipline practices
2.7.9 Ability to intervene and work within teacher's framework when appropriate
2.7.10 Ability to explain rationale to teachers

Activities
2.7A Internship (in school)
2.7B Program instruction
2.7C Course: Professions, Problems (legal and ethical implications; introduction to counseling)
2.7D Teaching experience

Evaluation Method

A. Interview
B. Supervisor's rating
C. Successful completion of appropriate courses

2.8 Demonstrates that primary responsibility is to the counselee.

Behavioral Competencies

2.8.1 Allows counselee to bring up relevant material
2.8.2 Helps client to establish realistic goals and behaviors.

Activities
2.8A Course in methods of counseling
2.8B Course in practicum
Evaluation Method

A. Interview
B. Demonstration of counseling session
C. Successful completion of appropriate courses

2.9 Maintains professional ethical standards in relation to counselee, while providing adequate communication to parents, teachers and others making referrals, without violating confidentiality.

Behavioral Competencies

2.91 Knowledge of case studies
2.92 Knowledge of professional standards
2.93 Ability to interpret test scores
2.94 Knowledge of meaning of test scores
2.95 Working knowledge of privileged and qualified privileged communication
2.96 Knowledge of appropriate responses to referral sources

Activities

2.9A Read APGA Ethical Standards
2.9B Course in professional problems
2.9C Course in using measurement scores
2.9D Practicum

Evaluation Method

A. Interview
B. Paper and pencil tests

2.10 Demonstrates awareness of personal and professional limitations.

Behavioral Competencies

2.101 Case conferences
2.102 Proper referral
2.103 Ability to discuss personal limitations
2.104 Knowledge of standards for professional competencies in dealing with continuum of presented problems
2.105 Knowledge of why a counselor makes a referral
Activities

2.10A Practicum  
2.10B Supervised internship  
2.10C Course in professional problems

Evaluation Method

A. Interview  
B. Supervisor's rating  
C. Completion of successful internship

2.11 Has the ability and knowledge to make appropriate referrals.

Behavioral Competencies

2.111 Know contact person in agency  
2.112 Knowledge of when to make referral  
2.113 Ability to know where to make referral  
2.114 Ability to know how to make referral

Activities

2.11A Internship (knowledge of appropriate agencies in community)  
2.11B Professional problems  
2.11C Independent study

Evaluation Method

A. Interview  
B. Completion of successful internship

3.0 INFORMATION SERVICE

3.1 Demonstrates familiarity with sources of educational, vocational, social and environmental information and referral.

Behavioral Competencies

3.11 Knowledge with Dictionary of Occupational Title (DOT)  
3.12 Knowledge with Occupational Outlook Handbook  
3.13 Career awareness kits  
3.14 Manpower Report  
3.15 Knowledge of impact of technological and social change  
3.16 Knowledge of world of work  
3.17 Knowledge of state and local publications
3.18 Knowledge of tests and testing services
3.19 Knowledge of study skill techniques
3.110 Awareness of contemporary societal problems

Activities

3.1A Career information course
3.1B Tests and measurement
3.1C Seminar in professional problems

Evaluation Method

A. Paper and pencil test
B. Completion of appropriate courses
C. Interview

4.0 INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT/INVENTORY

4.1 Demonstrates considerations relevant to confidentiality and ethical standards of the profession in using testing and non-testing data.

Behavioral Competencies

4.11 Case studies
4.12 Knowledge of appropriate use of test scores with teachers, parents and administrators
4.13 Local testing policies and use
4.14 Ability to interpret test scores

Activities

4.1A Knowledge of APGA Ethical Standards
4.1B Course in tests and measurements
4.1C Course in individual appraisal
4.1D Supervised internship
4.1E Practicum

Evaluation Method

A. Completion of appropriate courses
B. Supervisor's rating
C. Paper and pencil test
D. Interview

4.2 Demonstrates an awareness of the role and limitations of appraisal techniques.

Behavioral Competencies

4.21 Demonstrate knowledge of percentiles
4.22 Demonstrate knowledge of normal curve
4.23 Demonstrate knowledge of standard scores
4.24 Demonstrate knowledge of standard error of measurement
4.25 Other

Activities
4.2A Course in statistics
4.2B Course in tests and measurement
4.2C Course in individual appraisal

Evaluation Method
A. Completion of appropriate courses
B. Paper and pencil tests

4.3 Demonstrates ability to refer and use other professionals when appropriate for additional appraisal.

Behavioral Competencies
4.31 Knowledge of available professionals
4.32 Knowledge of when to refer
4.33 Knowledge of where and how to refer
4.34 Knowledge of how to use consultant reports

Activities
4.3A Internship
4.3B Course in tests and measurement
4.3C Course in individual appraisal
4.3D Course in professional problems (units on referral and availability of agencies).

Evaluation Method
A. Completion of appropriate courses
B. Paper and pencil tests

5.0 PLACEMENT

5.1 Demonstrates ability to interact, cooperate and communicate with parents, staff and students regarding placement of students.

Behavioral Competencies
5.11 Knowledge of classwork
5.12 Knowledge of work continuity
5.13 Familiarity with employment service
5.14 College placement services
5.15 Familiarity with world of work

Activities
5.1A Internship
5.1B Observe college placement services
5.1C Observed local agencies, i.e., employment, social and health, public assistance, etc.

Evaluation Method
A. Supervisor's rating
B. Interview

6.0 RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

6.1 Demonstrates knowledge, understanding and the ability to use and interpret statistical concepts of such data as applied to counseling and realizes the limitation of such data.

Behavioral Competencies
6.11 Be able to distinguish between different types of tests and the appropriate use of such
6.12 Be able to interpret individual and group data
6.13 Design a simple research project

Activities
6.1A Course in statistics in education and psychology
6.1B Course in tests and measurement

Evaluation Methods
A. Completion of appropriate courses
B. Paper and pencil tests

Applying for Counselor Certification in the Southeastern Washington Counselor Consortium

To be certified as a counselor, a person must contact a member of the Consortium and make application for counselor certification. The application form requests background data, education, awarded degrees, and reasons for entering the field. Applicants must also list references, work experiences, describe briefly their philosophy of life, and list their personal characteristics that they feel will qualify them as a potential counselor.
The applicant then obtains information about preparatory certification procedures and a list of competencies which are required for certification at the level for which the person applies. All applicants are given a list of needed learning experiences or activities, and the methods that will be used for evaluating competencies. The applicant's folder must then be completed by showing evidence of background experiences, records of course work and practicum. Self-ratings, peer ratings, and supervisors' appraisals are also required. Student or counselee ratings are optional.

The next step in the process is the selection of a review committee by the Consortium for evaluation. If the review committee recommends the preparatory certificate, the applicant must apply to the OSSPI within 60 days. In consultation with an advisor, usually a member of the selection committee, the applicant then develops a program of experiences designed to attain counselor competencies at the initial level of certification. An attempt is made to individualize the program as much as possible by considering the individual's background, experience and special abilities.

If the review board denies the applicant the preparatory certificate, a specific list of deficiencies is prepared as well as a list of needed learning experiences which will remove the deficiencies. The applicant may then reapply for a preparatory certificate when in the applicant's judgment, and the advisor's, all noted deficiencies have been removed. When the candidate and the advisor have decided that the applicant has attained the level of competence for initial certification, another application is submitted to the evaluation committee for approval and recommendation for the initial level of certification. If the evaluation committee recommends the initial certificate, the applicant must again apply to the OSSPI Certification Division within 60 days for the initial certificate.

Suggestions are made by the evaluation committee for further professional growth which would lead to the continuing level certificate. If, however, the applicant is denied initial certification, a list of deficiencies will be provided and also a set of specific suggestions for their removal. Reapplication for initial certification may be made when deficiencies are removed. The candidate may also request a new evaluation of performance by another evaluation committee. (The latter provision will surely lead to inter-consortia politicking, it must be noted.)

Problems and Issues in the Development of the Southeastern Washington Consortium Model

The problems discussed herewith include those which occurred during the interim procedures as well as those encountered in the development of the Southeastern Washington Plan. The difficulties encountered seem to be similar with regard to evaluation committees, financial arrangements, sharing of responsibility and delegating of authority. At least ten problems are now apparent and are discussed below.

I. Members of evaluation committees consist of two university repre-
sentatives, a professional association representative, a school district representative, and a representative from the counselors in the area. Since school administrators must have their counselors certified to be an accredited school, the school representative has at times attempted to obtain certification for an applicant to meet state requirements without regard for the necessary and specified behavioral competencies. This situation, while not isolated, must be balanced by other members of the board if the standards are to be credible.

Another major complicating factor is the variance of knowledge brought to the review committees by members. School administrators may be somewhat unaware of the specific behavioral competencies required for the various levels of counselor certification. Experiences with interim procedures suggest that the school district and professional association representatives usually rely on university representatives for recognition and appraisal of counselor behaviors. This places the university representative in the role of a control agent which weakens the concept of shared responsibility.

2. The evaluation procedures and standards which are established by the different consortia throughout the state are not equitable. Some interim consortia experienced problems when applicants felt that certification should have been granted because they had been "counseling." Evidently, in some interim consortia a "grandfathering" procedure was used even though this was not recommended or approved by the state and is totally contradictory to the tenets of the Guidelines. Negative feelings have been generated when applicants learned that they were being evaluated more stringently than those in another consortium. This problem seems to require an evaluation of the standards used throughout the state by the various consortia.

3. Applicants are often not familiar with the certification procedure or the behavioral competencies which they will be required to demonstrate. Many applicants who have been reviewed under the interim procedures do not have sufficient knowledge of what is to be required on a demonstration tape or other performance evidence which they bring to the evaluation interview. Some applicants believed that the review committee would merely "rubber stamp" approval of their performance and that the certification process had no real meaning. Since these attitudes were widely prevalent, most of the applicants applied for a continuing level certificate, even though they had little or no academic training in the guidance and counseling area! These applicants were quite obviously rejected and were presented with deficiency lists and other additional needed experiences. More often than not, these applicants became dissatisfied with the procedure and projected very negative feelings towards review committee members and the whole concept of the 1971 Guidelines.

4. The lack of audio and visual equipment on the various sites where the evaluation committees have met has created problems. Applicants have been requested to bring their own audio-visual equipment. The committee prefers audio-visual presentation since more evaluative data can be provided, allowing the review board to observe non-verbal behaviors.
5. Many of the competencies require an internship program or an academic program where counseling practicum and other courses are offered. This creates a problem in the southeastern region because there are very few identified or prepared supervisors for internship programs. Future internship programs will hopefully be developed with qualified supervisors—an extremely critical component of field based programs.

6. Selecting specific criteria for the evaluation is difficult. It is not difficult to select behaviors, e.g., attending behavior. Most guidance and counseling evaluators agree that it is important to communicate attending behavior. But to establish quantitative standards may approach sheer arbitrariness. For example, the amount of eye contact needed for optimal success in counseling is unresolved. Until an optimum or minimum statement of eye required contact can be stated, specific criterion evaluations cannot be established. Therefore, evaluation of the interview is overly subjective.

7. With all the excitement for change, there seems to be a growing tendency to overlook current counselor education programs. There are many behavioral competencies which can best be learned in an academic environment. Theoretical approaches in counseling, for example, can be most economically learned in the academic setting. Practicum requires role playing, micro-counseling and observation of clients under close supervision. These experiences are best obtained in institutions of higher education. Further, a more thorough and longitudinal evaluation by a consortium committee can be made when an applicant is on a university campus.

8. The state requires that a consensus be reached among the various factions represented on the consortium when developing the various behavioral competencies, administrative and evaluative procedures. In the Southeastern Washington Counselor Education Consortium, the University representatives have been mainly responsible for specifying the behavioral competencies, establishing performance criteria and developing the evaluation techniques. Usually, whatever the university representatives develop is easily approved by the consortia members. Experience in writing and analyzing critical skills is usually lacking among non-university consortium members.

9. State Board of Education approval must be obtained for the consortium program to be valid and for certification to be acceptable. The OSSPI has mandated that all requirements be stated in operational terms with specific performance criteria established for evaluation. In the guidance and counseling field, as in all other educational specialties, there are areas where such specification is impossible at this point in time. When the profession reaches a point of sophistication where this can be accomplished, the consortium will include more specific criteria into their procedures. Perhaps equally important is that the criteria will be so specific that their writing will be considered a reductio ad absurdum.

10. Funding is totally inadequate for the development of the Washington program. The OSSPI has developed an overdependence on an abundance of good will from the professionals involved. Meetings have been limited due to a
lack of travel funds. No money was available for development of research concerning competencies or for development of appropriate evaluation methods. In developing the procedures for the Southeastern Washington Counselor Education Consortium, approximately 12 meetings have been held consisting of at least 1200 man hours of "free" professional time. This does not include the administrative time needed to organize, contact members, and distribute proceedings. Such high expenditures of time requires far more fiscal and other support services if the consortium plan is to be practical.

Observations About the Performance Based Washington Model

1. It would be helpful if more specific responsibilities for each agency in the Consortium were delineated by the 1971 Guidelines. For example, if the university representatives were responsible for the development of competencies and evaluation methods, then other consortium members could react and/or approve, discuss and revise them. This feature would facilitate a division of responsibility. In the Southeastern Consortium the responsibility for developing behavioral competencies and evaluation methods ultimately fell on the University representatives.

2. Additional funding must be assured by the OSSPI to pay persons who contribute to consortium activities. The amount of time required to accomplish the enabling procedures, to specify behavioral competencies, to attend consortium meetings, and the like, are extremely costly. The time usually extends into weekends and evenings without any compensation. A long lasting consortium cannot be built on the premise that each agency will voluntarily contribute needed funds and thus compensate their respective contributors.

   The convening review board for evaluation may serve as an example of this costly procedure. It requires the time of an administrator, a local counselor, a member of the professional organization, and a university professor. Careful reviewing of candidates is a very lengthy procedure. For example, an examination of one to two hours per candidate means approximately eight professional man hours per individual candidate. In cases where the review board's decision has been appealed a new board has to be appointed and the entire process repeated. It is difficult for a review board to evaluate more than three or four candidates in a given day. Alternate means must be explored to evaluate applicants. If funds are not made available, the review boards will surely take short cuts and then will not effectively deal with the evaluation processes. It requires time, and a great deal of it, to evaluate an individual's performance based on behavioral objectives and to develop an individualized program that will help the person overcome noted deficiencies so that he/she may become "adequate" as a professional counselor.

3. Funding must also be provided for the development of more appropriate evaluative methods and for research concerning those specific competencies which lead to success in counseling. If no renumeration is forthcoming, it seems probable that competencies will not be further developed nor will evaluative methods be further developed, but will wait until
each professional specialty, at the national level, resolves a specific issue.

4. The state must establish standards so that all consortia will meet minimum criteria and thus make reciprocity more equitable throughout the state. This can be done without destroying the uniqueness of the 1971 Guidelines.

5. The guidance and counseling profession, as are most educational specialties, is in a transition period between the traditional, accreditation model type of certification and certification by performance based criteria. Even though our Consortium has reached a stage in which the members are somewhat expert in listing behavioral competencies, it is fool hearty to assume that all members are able to evaluate these competencies. Specific behavioral competencies, specific criterion measures, and use of quantitative test scores in evaluative methods have not yet been validated. Present procedures are highly clinical and subjective. Compounding this problem is the turnover among consortium committee members.

6. Actually, the Guidelines are one step removed in dealing with counselor competencies. The Superintendent of Public Instruction wrote in the preface to the 1971 Guidelines that "the teacher is only secondary to the learner (Guidelines, 1971)." To interpret this in counseling terms, it suggests that the counselor is only secondary to the client. This implies that the process of developing behavioral competencies for counselors should actually begin with the needs of the client. Once the needs of the client can be determined, it will be possible to teach those techniques which are necessary for counseling success. It is logical that the techniques which will help the client meet his needs are the behavioral competencies which the counselor should possess.

In the future, specific techniques, proven to be successful in counseling will be the required ones. Until such research and validation of technique are accomplished, those in the guidance and counseling profession will find it impossible to specify an objective which develops behavioral competencies written in operational terms.

7. Several advantages can be identified from the counselor consortium. The consortium offers an excellent opportunity for professionals in the field and the university to pool ideas and understand the problems of each unique situation. At the University, it has been found that the defining of behavioral objectives helps professors to understand what should be implemented into ongoing programs and course content. It is also easier to define new courses and trends in the development of more adequate counseling education programs. Professionals in the field seem to have become more aware of the problems associated with the education of counselors, and seem to be more sensitive to the functions that are defined as "counselor functions" by professional counselor educators. It has also been evident in most cases that a spirit of cooperation has prevailed in the implementation of the consortium processes.
Conclusion

In conclusion it would seem wise to remind ourselves that the concepts of performance or competency based, field centered, and shared responsibility in decision making, are not completely new to the field of education. One must not be caught up in a state of euphoria by assuming that the Washington model or any other model will be the ultimate answer to credentialing problems. The Washington model has dealt with recurring problems in a new context although it has not solved them.

Some questions still need resolution. "Is this new approach any more performance based in terms of the constituencies it serves (the students and parents) than the traditional model?" "Is it generating the type of credible research needed to answer critical questions relating to needs assessment and goal validation?" "Does it attend to the ends as well as the means of the educational process as is so strongly emphasized in the Tyler Model, or is it just another approach to gathering secondary type evidence in evaluating effectiveness of professional educators?" "Are the ends being treated as means?"

The concepts of the Washington state model are indeed exciting. It is hoped that the experiences recorded in this heretofore unreported case study about the development of the consortium model will be analyzed so that the model may indeed become a more complete and adequate approach to the certification of educational specialists. At the present time, however, problems of finance, logistics, research, and a clear definition of resources seem to be paramount restraints to the success of the consortium method of certifying counselors in Washington state.
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