ED 108 197   CS 001 997

AUTHOR   Hylton, John A.
TITLE   The Feasibility of a Combined Training System
                Compatible with LMS (Learning Mastery System) for
                Harper & Row 1, 2, and Bank Street 1.
INSTITUTION   Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational
                Research and Development, Los Alamitos, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO   SWRL-TN-5-71-66
PUB DATE   Aug 71
NOTE   8p.; See related documents CS001996,
                CS001998-002002

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS   Content Analysis; Educational Objectives;
                *Instructional Materials; Learning Activities;
                Primary Education; *Reading Instruction; *Reading
                Programs; Reading Skills; *Teaching Methods; Teaching
                Models
IDENTIFIERS   *Learning Mastery Systems

ABSTRACT
          Considerations pertinent to the development of a
combined training system for users of the Learning Mastery Systems
(LMSs) for the Harper & Row grade-one and grade-two and Bank Street
grade-one reading programs are presented in this document. An LMS is
a set of materials and procedures prepared by the Southwest Regional
Laboratory (SWRL) as an objectives-based framework to assist in
managing the learning activities of existing reading programs and
materials. The document contains (1) an analysis of LMS
characteristics and materials across the three LMS versions, (2) a
discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of developing a
combined training system, and (3) a recommended plan of attack.
(Author/RB)

SOUTHWEST REGIONAL LABORATORY
TECHNICAL NOTE

DATE   August 18, 1971

NO   TN 5-71-66

TITLE: THE FEASIBILITY OF A COMBINED TRAINING SYSTEM COMPATIBLE WITH
         LMS FOR HARPER & ROW 1, 2, AND BANK STREET 1

AUTHOR: John A. Hylton

ABSTRACT

This document presents considerations pertinent to the development of

a combined training system for users of Harper & Row 1, 2, and Bank

Street 1 versions of LMS. Contained within the document are: (1) an

analysis of LMS characteristics and materials across the three LMS

versions; (2) discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of devel-

oping a combined training system; and (3) recommended plan of attack.

THE FEASIBILITY OF A COMBINED TRAINING SYSTEM COMPATIBLE WITH LMS FOR HARPER & ROW 1, 2, AND BANK STREET .1

The Laboratory has developed a set of materials and procedures designed
to complete an instructional management system for teachers using the
Harper & Row grades 1 and 2, and the Bank Street grade 1 reading programs.
An instructional management system is defined by four characteristics:
1) explicit learning outcomes; 2) instruction to these outcomes; 3)
outcome-specific assessment, and, where necessary; and 4) outcome-specific
additional instruction or practice. Most commercially available instructional
packages do not include materials or procedures for specifying outcomes,
assessment, or supplemental practice.

LMS is not a new instructional program. When coupled with the Harper
& Row or Bank Street instructional materials, it makes several alternative
procedures available to the teacher. These alternatives result from the
outcomes-based assessment supplied by LMS, and the instructional consequences
of that assessment. The alternatives place the teacher in a position to
objectively and systematically monitor and control the rate at which
instruction proceeds for each child.

Separate training systems for the first- and second-grade
programs were developed to acquaint teachers with the available alternatives
and to instruct them in the purpose and use procedures of the materials
included in LMS. To avoid a plethora of training components as new
Learning Mastery Systems are developed, it appeared advisable to develop
a training system relating to the characteristics and procedures of LMS
independent of specific program content differences. In order to explore
this possibility, an analysis was made of the LMS versions for Harper &
Row 1 and 2, and Bank Street 1.

From the analysis, implicatio·s of a combined training system were
drawn and recommendations made.

Analysis of LMS Characteristics and Materials

In an attempt to determine the feasibility of developing a combined
LMS training system, an analysis of the similarities between the three LMS
supplements was made. This analysis is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN
THREE LEARNING MASTERY SYSTEMS

	Bank Street LMS-1	H & R LMS-1	H & R LMS-1	Format and Procedural Differences
LMS Characteristics				
Outcomes	X	X	X	X
Frequent Assessment (Pacing)	X	X	X	
Outcome Specific Remediation	X	X	X	
Unit Sequence	X	X	X	
Outcome Specific Instruction	X	X	X	
Assessment	X	X	X	
Outcome Specific Review	X	X	X	
LMS Materials				
Criterion Exercise Training Lesson	X	X		X
Placement Test	X		X	X
Review Exercise			X	
Criterion Exercise	X	X	X	X
Auxiliary Exercise	X	X	X	
Practice Exercise	X	X	X	
Class Record Sheet	X	X	X	X
Teacher's Manual	X	X	X	

As can be seen in Table 1, all three Learning Mastery Systems have
identical characteristics. With the exception of the Placement Test and

Review Exercises, all three systems have the same types of materials used for identical functions. Table 1 also reveals points of difference in materials format and specific use procedures across programs.

It is concluded that:

1. The system characteristics and material types and functions are essentially the same across the three Learning Mastery Systems.

2. The major differences which do exist are in materials format and specific use procedures (e.g., outcomes, Criterion Exercise and Class Record Sheet format, criterion levels, administration and scoring procedures).

3. Based on the information in Table 1 it seems feasible to develop a single training system for LMS users.

Consequences of a Combined Training System

Table 2 lists the advantages and disadvantages of a combined training system for Trainer and Teacher Training. The advantages required little explanation. From a development perspective the disadvantages may be 'viewed as constraints upon the resulting training system and are briefly discussed below.

If trainers maintain their function as a resource person to teachers (the LMS expert), the length of Trainer Training Sessions will consequently be increased as a function of the additional information the trainer will have to know (e.g., the differences across systems). It is possible, however, that with the development of an additional reference source for the trainer (perhaps in the form of a comparative listing of similarities and differences across programs) the increased trainer training time could be held to a minimum.

TABLE 2

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF COMBINED
TRAINING FOR TRAINERS AND TEACHERS

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Trainer Training	1. Fewer trainers and/or 2. Fewer training sessions	1. Longer training session or 2. Reduction in trainers' instructional responsibility (as a resource person)
Teacher Training	1. Fewer training sessions to plan, schedule, and conduct 2. All LMS teachers trained jointly 3. Make-up training sessions can be jointly conducted	1. Selection of training objectives constrained by similarities across systems, or 2. Introduction of branching point in present linear training model, or 3. Introduction of training information which negatively effects learning

The constraints imposed by combined Teacher Training Sessions are
not necessarily disadvantageous. For example, it is quite possible that
training objectives can be limited to areas of program similarity and
not effect the subsequent classroom use of LMS. An additional suggestion
which would facilitate any attempts at combined training is to standardize,
wherever possible, materials and procedures across LMS supplements.

If it is found that training in program specific use procedures is
required, then items 2 and 3 (under Teacher Training Disadvantages) would
add complexity to the training session, but not necessarily eliminate
the practicality.

Recommendations

The potential advantages of a combined LMS training system far outweigh the disadvantages. Therefore, the following recommendations are made:

1. Standardize materials and procedures across versions of LMS as follows:

   a. Manual - the LMS 1 Teacher's Manual is organized so that teaching procedures are found in the Unit Guide where they are first required. The LMS 2 Manual places these instructions in a separate section preceding the Unit Guides. This latter arrangement provides for quick reference for either the teacher or an aide or substitute. Should the LMS 1 Manual be organized this way, and the procedures presented in the same order, it would allow a more detailed discussion of the Manual while reducing the attendant confusion in a joint training session.

   b. Placement Test - LMS 2 includes a placement test based on high frequency first- and second-grade words and word elements. If any form of a placement, or entry skills test is projected for LMS 1, its purpose would be the same as that of LMS 2 and both should have the same name (e.g., Entry Skills Test).

   c. Review Exercises - if anything similar is projected for LMS 1, it would be more consistent to return to the original term, Readiness Exercises, as one which would accurately describe their function on any grade level.

d. Outcome Titles - a review of the outcomes for LMS 1 and 2 indicates that Structural Analysis (1) and Word Structure (2) are essentially the same. If their titles were adjusted to conform, it would leave only one outcome on each list, totally different. If there is no particular order to the way outcomes 4 through 7 are arranged, it would help if they followed the same order across grade levels.

e. Class Record Sheet - the title should uniformly be the Class Record Sheet to avoid confusion within and across programs. Also, the CRS format should be the same in both programs.

2. Develop a combined Training System emphasizing program similarities.

3. Augment the combined Training System, if necessary, with brief, low cost, printed training supplements of a grade level specific nature.