The purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs vary between master teachers, university teacher education department chairmen, and consortium representatives.

Comparisons of the rankings of goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs were made between master teachers and teacher education department chairmen, between master teachers and consortium representatives, and between teacher education department chairmen and consortium representatives by using Spearman-Rho rank-order correlational techniques to determine the strength of the relationship between the respective groups.

There is a significant negative relationship between the perceptions of master teachers and education department chairmen concerning the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs. There is a significant negative relationship between the perceptions of education department chairmen and consortium representatives. There is a significant positive relationship between the perceptions of master teachers and consortium representatives.

There is similarity in the relative importance assigned specific goals and objectives of teacher education programs by master teachers and consortium representatives. There is no identifiable relationship between teacher education department chairmen and consortium representatives. There is disagreement in the direction of importance of goals and objectives for teacher education programs between master teachers and university teacher education department chairmen.

Colleges and universities should seek the advice and counsel of classroom teachers' representatives in order to determine those things that teachers view as being particularly important to their effectiveness. The U.S. Office of Education, along with state and local accreditation agencies, should address themselves to reviewing instructional needs of the classroom teacher as perceived by the classroom teacher. Similar research can be conducted examining factors such as age, sex, experience, training, etc. of respondents to determine if such demographic data relates to perceptions held as goals and objectives for programs.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

A survey of teachers in any city is likely to reveal that many teachers feel that their training for professional teaching has been inadequate. That view is corroborated by Spillane, who observed that many new teachers assigned to schools in the nation's cities have indeed not received adequate preparation and veteran teachers have had little say in their training and retraining. He stated,

All the competency-based teacher education courses... leave the control of teacher education with the colleges and the state departments of education which have created our present intolerable situation. The two groups which have the greatest stake in the result of teacher training, teachers and school districts, are left powerless. To give these two interest parties a major share of control in the professional preparation of teachers would require a rethinking of much of the philosophy and financing of public education. Without such a shift in power, teacher education will never achieve intellectual respectability.¹

The inadequacy of teacher preparation is frequently seen in the quality of the interaction that takes place between teachers and their pupils. Both the teacher and the pupil bring certain personal needs and goals with them to the classroom environment. As each acts, the other assimilates

these acts according to his own perceptions. In other words, after the teacher acts, the act has some effect upon the pupil; the pupil's act in turn, is perceived by the teacher, who may then modify his subsequent actions according to his training. It is within this process that the quality of teacher preparation exerts its influence upon the teaching-learning environment and thus influences good teaching.

It is clear, however, that the characteristics of a 'good teacher' have been difficult to define precisely. In some schools, rating techniques have permitted and encouraged persons other than the teacher himself to define the optimal conditions for learning in his classroom. By overlooking the teacher's intentions as a relevant criterion base, classroom effectiveness unfortunately has been defined as something quite apart from the goals of its teacher, independent of his motivation and disconnected from any self-definition of success.

If a teacher is able to meet the broad objective of enabling each student to be a productive, self-actualizing individual, it will require his best efforts and all of the skill and ability he has. Not all teachers achieve this goal, but those who strive to meet the individual needs of their students know that it is difficult to communicate effectively with the wide range and abilities of human beings. One who does this unusually well is sometimes referred to as a master teacher who according to John:

1. Is knowledgeable about subject matter and is himself a continual learner.
2. Develops in children the ability to question and weigh information given by others.
3. Is respectful of children's ways of thinking and acting.
4. Observes children's behavior in different situations and notes transfer or lack of transfer of learning processes.
5. Is concerned with current issues and helps relate school learnings to them.
6. Is able to do honest self-evaluation that becomes directive in future behavior.
7. Is a logical, well-organized person as a result of established well-defined objectives.
8. Has marked enthusiasm in working with others and is not afraid of emotional interaction with them. ¹

Where does a prospective teacher learn these traits?

Speaking to continual teacher training, John continued:

If the teacher must be a resource specialist and a methodologist par excellence, then colleges and universities should provide the broad training that would help to produce this kind of teacher. Many current teacher training programs would fall far short of the mark. Given the current teacher surplus, only the truly outstanding candidate will be able to get a teaching position. The School of Education in the university should assume the responsibility for producing a limited number of teachers who are truly outstanding due to the unique training program in which they have participated; such individuals have Master Teacher potential.

The teacher of the technological era will need a broader range of information about his world and the people that inhabit the earth than has been needed in the past. Can the university provide this broader knowledge in a way that will have some utilitarian value for the prospective teacher? Can the university provide direct experiences in dealing with other cultures via travel so that the teacher will have some personal experiences to serve as a reality base for him as he aids students in finding out about the people in our world? Teacher training programs could be designed to give extensive training

¹ Marsha Tyler John, "Rationale and Recommendations for a Graduate Training Program," Journal of Education, 155 (October, 1972), 41-44.
in the use of media and practice in locating resources on a variety of topics. Does the typical college research paper provide experiences with locating and using multi-media and information resources that will enable the teacher to serve as a guide for the multiple topics initiated by today's inquisitive youngster?

For the outstanding teacher of the future a longer apprenticeship in several different classrooms might be advisable. This would allow the teacher trainee to observe and practice a number of teaching skills. Research on imitation indicates that exposure to a number of models allows the imitating subject to become more eclectic in the development of his own unique style.1

Are teacher preparation institutions aiding potential teachers in assuring that they will become "Master Teachers?"

Speaking to the new responsibilities that today's teachers face, Minelli recounted the abilities and attitudes that the Master Teacher must have to educate America's youth in the ever-changing future. "The 'new breed' must be," he said,

1) mature, intelligent, insightful, and ingenious--a universal man possessing a professional, liberal, specialized education; 2) student oriented--must know the student's needs and be able to bring about changes in his behavior; 3) an instructional specialist, familiar with the latest instructional media, able to perform with a high degree of efficiency, employing instructional techniques with great precision; 4) a versatile person able to function effectively under a variety of circumstances and in a constantly changing instructional setting; 5) skilled in the identification and development of specifically measurable objectives that reflect student needs in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains; 6) skilled in designing appropriate learning experiences and evaluating student progress and teaching effectiveness; 7) capable of working cooperatively with others as a team planner

1 John, p. 41.
and teacher; 8) a super realist with up-to-date knowledge of the world of work.  

Demands for an ever-increasing level of educational achievement have precipitated an unprecedented need for effective teachers in the schools today. How to select, educate, and assign the constant flow of personnel entering the teaching profession is still an uncertainty. One reason for this uncertainty is the difficulty in defining, measuring, and evaluating teacher effectiveness and teacher training.

Statement of the Problem

The accumulation of data through insightful evaluation of teacher education programs must be a continuous process if such programs are to be improved. It is clear, however, that the criteria by which programs should be evaluated must be well established and reflect the input of a variety of sources. While many universities and public school officials have initiated collaborative training activities to provide better preparation for future and present teachers, better processes of developing criteria for teacher education programs may be required if programs for teacher development are to be improved. A frequently overlooked input into the process of goal setting and the development of objectives held for teacher preparation programs is that of the master teacher. It is likely that the addition of such input could achieve

---

the desirable effect of providing continuous diagnostic feedback for program development and revision and thereby facilitate the improvement of the individual teacher trainee. Although it may not be desirable to provide program development and revision based on teachers' practical experiences alone, combined with research and other informed opinions such inputs may result in more effective design, implementation and evaluation criteria for teacher preparation programs.

Presently, however, there is little information concerning the perceptions of successful teachers about the necessary ingredients for effective teacher preparation. It is important, therefore, to examine whether or not master teachers hold similar views about the ingredients necessary for effective teacher preparation as those traditionally held and exemplified by university teacher education programs and by criteria established for teacher preparation programs by the National Consortium of Competency Based Education Centers currently used for describing and evaluating competency-based teacher education programs.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs vary among master teachers, university teacher education department chairmen, and established criteria for teacher competency-based teacher programs.
The following research questions were examined:

1. What, if any, relationship exists between the perceptions of master teachers and teacher education department chairmen concerning the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs?

2. What, if any, relationship exists between the perceptions of teacher education department chairmen and consortium representatives concerning the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs?

3. What, if any, relationship exists between the perceptions of master teachers and consortium representatives concerning the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs?

**Hypotheses of the Study**

The questions above led to the following hypotheses to be tested:

1. There is no relationship between the perceptions of Master Teachers and those of education department chairmen concerning the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs.

2. There is no relationship between the perceptions of education department chairmen and consortium representatives of the National Consortium of Competency Based Teacher Education concerning the relative importance of specific goals and
objectives held for teacher education programs.

3. There is no relationship between the perceptions of Master Teachers and members of the National Consortium of Competency Based Teacher Education concerning the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher education programs.

**Definition of Terms**

1. Master Teacher - A teacher selected as the "Teacher of the Year" in each state. This teacher represents a model for that state as a good (effective) teacher. The selection of Teacher of the Year is conducted in each state by the state education agency using specified criteria that determines that selection.

2. Established Criteria for Teacher Education Programs - The goals and objectives that have been incorporated into a set of criteria for describing and assessing competency based teacher education programs by the National Consortium of Competency Based Education Centers.

3. Teacher Education Department Chairmen - The chairmen of accredited departments of teacher education located in Midwestern colleges and universities, whose departments are responsible for the training of classroom teachers.

4. Consortium Representatives - The four individuals who had a major role in the editing and compiling of the Criteria for Describing and Assessing Competency-Based Education Programs which were developed and published by the National
Consortium of Competency Based Education Centers.

**Significance of the Study**

Many teachers experience frustration and difficulty in the classroom, possibly because they have not received the kind of training they need for more successful experiences. It is not uncommon to hear teachers express the view that they learned more about teaching during their first year of teaching than during their total period of formal study. Thus, teacher training programs are accused of failing to prepare teachers to perform successfully.

In the past, teachers have had little input into decisions made about programs designed for teacher preparation. These programs have been determined almost exclusively by state departments of education and accreditation agencies. It is clear, however, that programs must consider the needs of the teacher, as perceived by the teacher, if they are to become more effective.

This study examined whether master teachers, those selected within each state as Teacher of the Year, held views relative to the goals and objectives of teacher training programs that are consistent with those held by teacher education department chairmen and exemplified by a set of criteria established to evaluate competency based teacher education programs. If consistencies occur, then this would highlight the need to consider teacher input when program goals and objectives are
developed. Such input could lead to the improvement of teacher education programs.

This study is an extension of a study previously done by the author. The prior study concerned the same types of comparisons as this study. The major difference was that department chairmen were selected only from institutions of higher education in the Midwest in the previous study.

Limitations

This study is limited in two respects:

First, only State Teachers of the Year were selected for the 1975-76 school year teacher sample.

Second, since the concern was with perceptions held by identified groups, the major analysis concerned only that characteristic of the participants.
Chapter 2

RELATED LITERATURE

A review of related literature indicated that only in the last few years has there been significant amounts of research in teacher education with the major purpose of improving programs and methods of training teachers. Researchers are beginning to examine the criteria or standards and competence levels which those who train teachers must meet. One of the common problems of teacher training education has been the lack of appropriate instruments to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher training programs. Another problem has been the profusion of criteria viewed as important in teacher training programs and indecision concerning who should have input in determining these program criteria.

Cyphert attempted to summarize a review of all studies conducted between 1955 and 1971 that dealt directly with how teachers are prepared. His major conclusion was:

Research in teacher education has had a very limited impact on the education of teachers . . . . Existing research has been based upon such a variety of assumptions and theories that the data or conclusions of one study have no relationship to the results of another.¹

Smith observed that teacher education programs,

... have developed on the basis of meager and inadequate knowledge acquired largely from the practical experiences of teachers, general psychological principles, and studies in philosophy and the social sciences.¹

Cyphert concluded that,

Current teacher education programs are organized around the questions to which educators have answers, even though modern teacher education researchers and enlightened persons operating teacher preparation programs agree that these are not the crucial understandings required. In effect, we teach what we know, even as we recognize that what we know isn't very helpful to teachers.²

Cyphert pointed out that although teacher education research may have had a severely limited impact on training programs nationally, it may have had considerable influence upon practice at a given institution. He stated that most teacher education research conducted in the past ten years was designed to stimulate further research rather than to produce actual change in teacher preparation. He contended that theoreticians and scholars in teacher education asked dynamic questions such as: What student behaviors occur when a teacher poses a question and how can a teacher be taught to influence these behaviors?

Teacher education practitioners have based their programs on questions and answers of a completely different and more static order: What are the common characteristics and attitudes of teachers? What are the major facets of predominant educational philoso-

²Cyphert, p. 145.
phies? With what theories of learning should teachers be familiar?1

Cyphert contended that in 1970 "fewer than ten percent of research was concerned with teachers and prospective teachers as people."2 He concluded that there was considerable evidence that faulty research design strategy has been a significant deterrent to the production of quantities of valid knowledge in teacher education. He thinks that one shortcoming centers around the apparent inability of investigators to differentiate between exploratory research which produces a kind of soft data needed when first probing a target area, and the well-controlled studies, which extract hard data utilizing clues from the preceding studies.

Many research efforts have used sophisticated designs and complex statistical treatments when simple procedures would have been sufficient, have failed to define and isolate variables clearly, and have settled for a small effect from a large number of variables instead of seeking large main effects from a few crucial factors.3 He further states,

There is little doubt that both the results and the processes of research have had some impact on teacher education, but whether research findings or processes are most important remains an unresolved issue. There are those who contend that teaching is such a uniquely individual activity that merely engaging in and developing competence in the processes of research accrue greater benefits to the student than do the products.

---

1 Cyphert, pp. 146-147.
2 Ibid., p. 148.
3 Ibid., pp. 145-151.
that result from the research activity. . . . Today there appears to be a strong undercurrent developing which postulates that teacher education should not look to research in teaching for help in training teachers; on the contrary research must look to teacher education for help in developing a science of teacher behavior as a by product of the processes of teacher education. ¹

According to Cyphert, the federal government, during the 1960's, markedly increased its funding efforts to improve teacher education. In 1964 research in teacher education brought to mind such names as B. O. Smith, Hilda Taba and David Ryans. Currently, producers of teacher education research results in names such as Northwest Regional Laboratory, the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, and the Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. ²

Concerning research in teacher education, Gage distinguished three stages of knowledge derived from the research in teacher education. "In the first stage, knowledge is already being used in programs in teacher education. In the second stage, knowledge is already available but not being used. And in the third stage, desirable knowledge is not yet available." ³

The remainder of this chapter is organized in the following manner:

¹ Cyphert, p. 149.
² Ibid.
- Achieving Good Teacher Education Programs.
- New Designs in Teacher Education Programs.
- Competency Based Teacher Education.
- Instrumentation for Evaluation of Teacher Training Programs.
- Selected Issues in Teacher Education.
- Summary of Related Literature.

**Achieving Good Teacher Education Programs**

Teacher education has been the form of professional training least respected by professionals and the general public. Few teachers believe that their expertise was gained in education courses. Few parents concede that teachers have special access to an esoteric body of knowledge.¹

Departments of education have instituted programs of teacher education while the profession argues over whether it is known how to judge those competencies. What is basically needed is a reliable standard of measurement of what a good teacher education program should consist of. Most new programs that have appeared are merely bits and pieces of old programs and have no real measure of validity. Spillane and Levenson contend that teacher educators are arguing about the content of the courses, not about the essential issue which is the control of the courses.

All of the competency-based teacher education courses . . . leave the control of teacher education with the colleges and the state departments of education which have created our present intolerable situation. The two groups which have the greatest stake in the result of teacher training, teachers and school districts, are left powerless.¹

Their view is that in order to give these two interested parties a major share of control in the professional preparation of teachers would require a rethinking of much of the philosophy and financing of public education. They feel that without this shift in power, teacher education will never achieve intellectual respectability.

A National Study Commission of Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, revealed:

. . . that out of 90,000 teachers surveyed, almost half said that there was little correlation between what students thought education should be and the actual reality of the college experience. Some sixty-three percent thought that a student should have a detailed grasp of knowledge in a specific field and only twenty-seven percent thought they had received no training. Nearly two-thirds of senior class candidates thought that they had not received enough advice and guidance from faculty and staff. Nearly ninety-five percent of senior teacher candidates said that coursework was of little value and had no transference to actual classroom teaching and another eighty-five percent felt that more attention should be paid to the emotional growth of the student. The survey showed that all wanted more and earlier classroom experience. All agreed that the student teaching experiences which are provided by most of our four year institutions which is equal to a few short weeks in the senior year is inadequate.²

¹Spillane and Levenson, p. 435.
²Ibid., p. 146.
The past decade in higher education has evidenced a growing participation and involvement by students in the policy-making levels that affect campus life and college programs. More assurance has also been expressed for students' rights through various eligibility criteria being established by the U. S. Office of Education and state education agencies, according to the student Iowa State Education Association.

Since its inception in 1957, the Student National Education Association has proclaimed prospective teachers as vital members of a college community and has provided an opportunity for teachers in training to express their views regarding the improvement of teacher education programs. Currently, the Student NEA is an associate member of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and participates directly in the application of standards and accreditation of teacher education at the national level.

Although each of the twenty two NCATE standards for accreditation of teacher education programs at the basic level is of concern to the Student NEA, there are two specific standards that invite students to take direct responsibility for maintaining the quality of prepared programs:

**Standard 1.4 - Use of Guidelines Developed by National Learned Societies and Professional Associations.**

"In planning and developing curricula for teacher education the institution gives due consideration to guidelines for teacher preparation developed by National Learned Societies and Professional Associations."
Standard 13.4 - Student Participation in Program Evaluation and Development.
"The institution has represented student participation in the evaluation and development of its teacher education programs."  

It can be assumed that the Student NEA is the only national organization with a special interest in the preservice students in a variety of college curricula for the preparation of teachers; therefore, the Student NEA can best reflect the relevance and language of the student dimension.

The goal of the Student NEA was to develop and maintain a set of criteria that would reinforce current standards, emphasize particular elements within the standards and generate goals that required the attention and/or consideration of conditions viewed to be essential to students but not present in all existing programs.

The Student NEA indicated that the following were among the changes that they felt were needed:

1. Teachers and students who were preparing to teach directly involved in evaluating and improving standards for teacher preparation and certification

2. Teacher educators certified and experienced in their instructional areas

3. Responsibility for the practicum experience shared

---

by the public schools, the institutions that prepare teachers, and professional associations

4. Immediate steps to evaluate and improve standards for entrance into the teaching profession

5. Educators critically assessing current college and university programs of teacher education and making specific recommendations for changes

6. Guidelines for qualifications of cooperating teachers and college coordinators of student teachers

7. Improvement in the selection of persons entering the profession through more effective screening of applicants for professional practice

8. The student NEA offering guidance to teacher preparation institutions to prepare teachers in numbers consistent with projected need for teacher positions

In the Olson Study Commission, two commonly expressed concerns of participants were expressed in publications entitled *The University Can't Train Teachers* and *What Is School/Community Based Teacher Education*. There was a strongly expressed commitment to the idea of school-based teacher training.

The professional aspect of the training of teachers needs to be centered in the schools and controlled by them as a 'technical training' comparable in some ways to industrial training. The role of higher education in the education of teachers may be to provide a good general or liberal education in the first three years

---

1Student National Education Association, pp. 1-19.
of college. School-based professional training should be offered in the fourth and possibly the fifth year.

School based professional training should include a strong component of teaching by the community, and control by parents and students. It should respect the life-style, value system, language, and expressive system of the culture in which the school which provides training is located; both teacher-trainees and the IHE training faculty should respond to these culture aspects.¹

Spillane stated that in the case of teaching, the only big power has been the colleges so certification requirements usually consist of taking courses at institutions that the state department of education has decided are capable of transmitting particular skills. Teacher education has developed rapidly and bad schools have devalued the good schools. Many of these educational schools profit because of the factors involved. These include teachers taking extra courses for credit or salary and who do not wish to travel to other institutions miles away; housewives returning to college for pleasure and those returning for a teaching degree. Most institutions did not regulate the number of teachers in training.

Teachers' organizations have been effective in upgrading salaries, improving working conditions, and protecting the jobs of their members. The time has come for them to tackle the two problems of training and numbers. Success . . . will greatly improve and strengthen their ability to bargain effectively. Failure to solve the two problems could well destroy the present organizations. Any high school graduate can gain entrance into some kind of teacher training program. Do we really believe that everybody has

¹Spillane and Levenson, p. 435.
the qualities of intelligence and compassion needed to become a good teacher? Surely there are ways of sorting out those who show promise of becoming effective teachers. At a time when the number of teaching positions is rapidly shrinking, this is not elitism but common sense. Instead of being redirected into more appropriate courses of study while in college, the unfortunate ones are now being sorted out by school district personnel offices... the teachers' organizations should now be considering ways of deciding who should enter the teaching field... They should also be taking a hard look at the training offered their members.1

While it is often true that newly graduated teachers are not trained in many of the competencies needed to function effectively in the schools, they are also not adequately trained to deal with the immediate, pressing problems of the schools. Teachers need to be part of a whole school. Young prospective teachers are not taught to cope with the kinds of problems that deal with parents and community and problems really facing students. Spillane and Levenson feel that skills needed by a teacher are essentially those of dealing with people: students, parents, community people, and fellow staff members.

Teacher training should be a continuing, never-ending process, closely related to the reality of the life of children and families... we may be able to develop a four-way partnership of state education departments, colleges, school districts, and teacher organizations which will design a respected and satisfying form of teacher training... The place to learn to be a teacher is in a school. The people who can tell the novice about the real world of school are the experienced teachers.2

1Spillane and Levenson, p. 435.
2Ibid., pp. 437-438.
There are also other concerns. "With a drop in new positions for teachers from 78,000 in 1969 to only 19,000 in 1971"¹ and assuming that the teacher shortage is over for some time to come, upgrading professional standards can come about in more than one way: by being more selective in admitting students to undergraduate preservice programs, by appointing only the qualified, and by making sure that the teacher preparation programs are updated continuously to meet the needs of the student teachers participating in them.

Cyphert indicated that educators have become evaluation conscious and that they are finally accumulating data relating to the development and impact of specific teacher behaviors and limited teacher education program innovations through wide-spread evaluation attempts.

He stated that the accumulation of data through insightful evaluation of teacher education programs in action over a period of time should build a much-needed stock of information. A bank of such data would enable teacher educators to weed out from the theoretical content of programs those extrapolations that do not work, as well as shed light on those that do, indicating which have validity for what purposes, and under what conditions.

This evaluation emphasis points to an evolving research strategy quite different from anything we find in the

past. It appears that research, evaluation, and the teacher's own preparatory experiences can all merge into a single operation that has the potential of achieving the three desirable functions of developing research knowledge, providing continuous diagnostic feedback to programs, and facilitating the improvement of the individual teacher trainee. The relationship that ought to exist between research and teacher education is quite clear. The plan or design of a modern teacher education program should be based on the answers supplied by research literature to these three questions:

1. What are the behavioral skills a teacher must possess in order to be effective?
2. What are the characteristics a prospective teacher must possess before he can acquire these skills?
3. What are the training experiences that will help him acquire the skills most efficiently?

To these questions a fourth could be added:

4. Can and will teachers have significant and relevant input into teacher education program criteria?

Up to the present, research has produced few useful answers to these questions. Research groups have indicated increasing concern about the lack of useful answers. Modern technology has produced and made accessible several training models that might result in improved teacher training. These models also have the potential to control, record, and study this training. Emphasis upon evaluation, upon understanding as well as improving, and upon measuring performance represent possibilities for research.

New Designs in Teacher Education Programs

One major research and development effort involving the ideas and cooperation of schools and universities devoted

\footnote{Cyphert, pp. 145-151.}
to the improvement of teacher education is the Teacher Education Programs of the Far West Laboratory.

Since 1967, the Far West Laboratory has been engaged in a large-scale program of research and development. The major outcome of the program is the development of a number of mini-courses which are short, self-instructional courses designed to train teachers in specific classroom skills. The program has two specific goals: to develop and test instructional models that can bring about major changes in specific skills related to effective classroom teaching. Using these models, the second goal is to develop a sub-system of teacher education in the area of classroom skills.

Although the Far West Laboratory has developed a number of mini-courses to date, other instructional models are being designed to help teachers build skills and behavior patterns.

According to Borg,

It seems fair to conclude that current teacher education programs are probably most effective in preparing the teacher in specific subject matter. Such programs are generally less effective in providing teachers with a sound professional foundation, i.e., with the knowledge and insight needed to understand the learner and the teaching-learning process. It is suggested that most current programs are seriously deficient with regard to building the specific skills and behavior patterns the teacher needs to structure efficiently a variety of classroom teaching-learning situations.¹

Borg believes that conventional teacher education programs fail because although many of the skills involved in teaching have been known for decades, and that although we know many things that would make the teacher more effective are known, on the whole teacher educators have not transmitted this knowledge into useable form.

The attempts of teacher education institutions to equip their students with classroom skills have generally suffered from four serious deficiencies: 1) Emphasis is on telling rather than doing, 2) Instruction is general rather than specific, 3) Effective models are not provided, 4) Effective feedback is not provided.\(^1\)

Since current programs appear to be most deficient in helping teachers to develop specific classroom skills, the Far West Laboratory has decided to focus on this aspect of teacher education.

Another new design in teacher education has been implemented in Ohio. The State Department of Education in Ohio set out to obtain public and educator reaction to what it labeled a major design of teacher education in Ohio by using the results of its year long "Search for Consensus Project." Proposals up for consideration included earlier classroom experience for the prospective teacher and giving every teacher "proven competency" in the instruction of reading. The State Department's plans were discussed during a meeting in Columbus in 1973 and attended by more than 100 representatives from Ohio's fifty-three colleges and

\(^1\) Borg et al., pp. 22-23.
universities which prepare teachers. State Superintendent Martin W. Essex told the conference participants that,

The citizens of Ohio have identified clearly the tap-root for excellence in education—that of better prepared teachers. . . . Conditions are optimum to switch from the numbers game played in teacher education during the past thirty years and start perfecting professional teacher quality for the hard responsibility of educating everyone to their highest potential.¹

In anticipation of an improved teacher situation, the Ohio State Department of Education in 1968 authorized the Cleveland-based Educational Research Council of America to conduct a comprehensive study of teacher education. Recommendations from the report were correlated with findings from team evaluations of ten colleges of education. The proposals are ready for public consideration. Essex continued, "We are prepared to meet with every interested individual, group or organization in Ohio during the next three months to draft these teacher education standards which will get the job done." He felt that the biggest challenges in teacher education reform are to provide the following:

1. Earlier and more frequent experiences in rural, suburban, and urban elementary and secondary schools for all college students desiring to be teachers. Abilities in motivating children and establishing a rapport with pupils since these can only be assessed in the actual classroom situation. This will also allow ample time to students early in their college careers to decide if teaching is for them.

¹Martin W. Essex, "Redesigning Teacher Education," Ohio Schools, 51 (October, 1973), 16-34.
2. Extensive clinical work to prepare future teachers with the skills to diagnose individual pupil learning factors and to prescribe appropriate learning experiences.

3. Develop the body of knowledge in professional education into a balanced, consecutive series of college courses that will not only make sense to future teachers but make a difference in how they teach.

4. Certification of professors who prepare teachers to assure the appropriateness of their preparation and adequacy of their experience.

5. Academic rigor in the general education of elementary teachers. Every elementary teacher should have at least sufficient mastery in one of the major academic disciplines.

6. Requiring experience and proven competence of all teachers in teaching of reading. Regardless of the subject taught, every teacher shall be prepared to become a teacher of reading and to have proven experience as to competence.

7. Requiring all new teachers to serve at least one year in a closely supervised internship under a special one year limited certificate. The cardinal factor in converting that initial certificate into a standard four-year credential will be based on demonstrated classroom performance.

8. Improved funding for teacher education. A fifty percent increase in state dollars for teacher education at Ohio's twelve state-supported universities which prepare seventy-five percent of all new teachers in Ohio each year.¹

Support for the redesign of teacher education was also voiced by the Ohio Director of the State Department of Teacher Education Certification, Paul R. Hailey. He felt that the findings of the ten comprehensive team evaluations of colleges of education in 1973 found far more weaknesses than strengths in the preparation of teachers according to the present standards.²

¹Essex, pp. 16-60.

²State Board of Public Instruction, "Deficiencies Cited at Four Institutions," Ohio Schools, 51 (October, 1973), 34.
In yet another study, it was found that the State Board of Education in Ohio had cited deficiencies at four institutions of higher education whose teacher education programs were found to have serious deficiencies. Deficiencies commonly cited in the final reports to the four institutions included lack of financial support of teacher education programs, too little academic counseling for students and insufficient library resources. The report also noted inadequate supervision of prospective teachers in student teaching, limited laboratory experiences and a lack of early and frequent field experiences in the school classroom for prospective teachers. All of these deficiencies did not apply to all the institutions, however.¹

Perhaps educators as well as teacher education researchers are beginning to take a serious look at teacher training programs as a culprit in the inadequacies in teacher education.

In an article entitled Exploring Teaching, Dr. Robert O. Highland reported offering an experience to sophomores interested in a degree in education, in an attempt to better prepare college students for teacher education. The course was called "Exploring Field Experiences." Dr. Highland said that the course was designed to aid the student in making an early, firm commitment to teaching or in deciding teaching is

¹State Board of Public Instruction, p. 34.
not the right career. Students taking the mini-course spent one full week (thirty-forty hours) in a public school classroom with an experienced teacher. The public school people involved indicated the experience was of great value to the college students and was enjoyable for the public school students to have a fresh personality in the classroom. The college students said it helped them understand teaching better. The general objectives for the students of the course were as follows:

1. Encounter and explore individual differences and the needs of young people and see how these factors may be considered in teaching. Observe characteristics of child and adolescent behavior and factors underlying it.

2. Observe the teacher's role in a classroom, what is done, how it is done, and why it is done. Determine some of the qualities which contribute to teaching success.

3. Develop concepts related to the techniques and procedures which should contribute to their effectiveness in working with groups of a total school program from teacher's, rather than student's, viewpoint. See how many different activities are related to the concept of over all purposes of education and how they fit into the organizational patterns found in public schools.1

Although the importance of laboratory experiences in the preparation of prospective teachers has long been recognized, a growing opinion in recent years suggests laboratory experiences earlier and more frequently enhance the level of competence of teacher education graduates. A one-time experience during the last semester of the senior year is

no longer regarded as adequate in the preparation of teachers. Results of similar programs in other schools show that students who have participated in such a course are the most enthusiastic and the most eager to complete the education sequence.

Lawrence suggests that for several decades now the main criteria for teacher certification has been the grade point average for a given number of courses in the different areas of study, a student teaching experience, and a recommendation from a recognized teacher education institution that the candidate is "qualified to teach." In effect, course grades are assumed to be good indicators of teaching capability.

A competency-based approach to teacher certification questions this assumption and acknowledges a need to gather evidence of the ability of a prospective teacher to behave in specified ways or to carry out the functions for which he will be responsible within a school once he is certified. The prospective teacher is presumed to have attained a competency when he demonstrates an ability or a set of abilities, knowledge and personal attributes, according to some specified criteria. Thus, demonstration of competencies replaces course grades as the standard for granting certification.¹

In Florida, the goal of the State Department has been to move toward teacher certification practices with such a demonstrated base. Early in 1969, the Teacher Education Advisory Council of the State of Florida appointed a task force to draft some guidelines for the preparation of teachers.

¹Gordon Lawrence, "Measuring Teacher Competencies for the Middle School," National Elementary Principal, 51 (November, 1971), 60-66.
This task force produced a proposed set of guidelines, which were adopted by the council with the intention that they would have an influence on teacher education and certification for middle schools in Florida. In June 1970, the Florida Department of Education asked the University of Florida to develop a set of instruments and procedures that would measure the fifty-four teacher competencies listed in the task force guidelines. The materials and procedures developed under this contract were to serve in teacher training activities and/or in the selection of candidates.

There are several ways to approach research into teacher competencies, but the general path taken in this project was specified by the nature of the contract: start with a given list of fifty-four competencies and find ways to measure them. The competencies on the Teacher Education Advisory Council list are subdivided into three sets: personal qualities, understanding, and instructional skills. The list was drafted by a team of educators who collectively have observed the educational scene for many years. This list was not derived by research. Therefore, there was no assurance that all of the competencies could remain as independent competency elements. In the second of three field tests, the list was reduced to thirty statements that could be measured unambiguously.¹

They are as follows:

TEACHER COMPETENCIES TO BE MEASURED

A. PERSONAL QUALITIES
   1. Positive view of self: is not overly protective of his dignity; has the emotional strength to live with the ups and downs of transients.
   2. Flexibility, openness to change: can live with and admit his errors; gets involved with student concerns; has a great deal of patience and readiness to listen.

¹Lawrence, pp. 29-62.
3. Respect for the dignity and worth of the individual, with a personal commitment to a value system supportive of a democratic society.

4. Ability to interact constructively with others: can easily relate to transescents; is approachable, responsive, supportive, as youngsters struggle with the problems peculiar to their stage of development.

5. Commitment to the education of transescents (willing-transescent in and out of the classroom).

B. UNDERSTANDINGS

Nature of the Transescent Learner

6. Physical development of the transescent (the need for physical activity; the diversity of rates in physical growth).

7. Intellectual development (understanding of the transition from the "concrete" to the "formal operation stage").

8. Socioemotional development (the need to adjust to a changing body, to achieve an appropriate dependence-independence pattern, to interact constructively with others, to learn an appropriate sex role).

Nature of the Teaching-Learning Process

9. The various theories of learning.

10. The effect of heredity and environment on ability.

11. Group dynamics and leadership theory.

Nature of the American Educational Enterprise

12. Appropriate curriculum plans and opportunities in the middle school (those that facilitate the developmental tasks of transescence).

13. Relationships between various subcultures and the school, especially the middle school (intraschool situations).

14. Relationships between the school and the community and how these relationships affect the curriculum.

Nature of Educational Research and Evaluation

15. Understanding of methods of evaluating and revising curriculum and instruction.

C. INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS

16. Techniques of counseling individual middle school learners (to promote self-direction through indirect guidance).

17. Identifying appropriate resources for teaching in the middle school.

18. Use of audiovisual materials and equipment.

19. Techniques of studying (alternative) values and developing a (personal, workable) valuing system.

20. Diagnosing (individual) learning levels and problems and prescribing for them.
21. Teaching communication skills such as reading, listening, writing, and speaking (as a responsibility of all teachers and not just language arts teachers).

22. Teaching problem-solving techniques.

23. Working with teachers across subject areas and with other resource personnel (skills or working in cooperative teaching situations).

24. Working with small groups of learners (techniques).

25. Developing and using behavioral objectives in curriculum planning.

26. Helping students to develop leadership.

27. Providing opportunities and guidance for (group) decision making.

28. Teaching students to evaluate themselves.

29. Providing opportunities and guidance to help students become independent learners.

30. Management of classroom groups and other classroom problems.¹

It may be that the quality of the teachers is the most crucial consideration in the improvement of education. As a result of several efforts to evaluate the quality of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs in secondary education, the Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program was created. A task force was appointed by the Dean of the Teachers College to examine the status of teacher preparation and to recommend new approaches for consideration. As a result, undergraduate students viewed the supervised student-teaching experience as meaningful and worthwhile, and two-thirds of them expressed the opinion that methods courses were generally of value and their view of other professional courses were negative.

In another study, Moller found that "first-year

¹Lawrence, pp. 29-62.
secondary school teachers felt that their background and preparation were inadequate with respect to motivating their students and devising meaningful ways to individualize instruction."  

1 Other follow-up studies have provided similar findings.

The Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program (NUSTEP), according to Witters, replaced three courses traditionally required for secondary education candidates. It attempted to integrate the essential features of courses previously offered as separate areas of instruction such as learning in the classroom, special methods, and principles. Built around identifying and developing certain teacher behaviors and skills, the program is performance-oriented and based upon the assumption that the role of the teacher is that of a director of learning activities. The project had two major goals: (1) Students should have the opportunity to practice skills in a setting aimed at developing teacher competencies, and (2) students should practice ways of improving the individualization of instruction.

In the summary of the study, it was found that students in secondary schools taught by NUSTEP teachers scored significantly higher in skills than those taught by prospective

teachers trained in the traditional manner. Here, a continuous assessment provided by the project is a major need. Also, some type of evaluation will be required.

In an article by Stashower, a field centered teacher training program at Brooklyn College in New York is benefitting both students and schools throughout Brooklyn from an innovative approach to producing good teachers. Here, the old-style college courses have been replaced by a sequential curriculum in which each course combines classroom work with field experience in school and community settings and in progressively more complex teaching-learning situations. Student teaching has been expanded to include two semesters at the middle and secondary levels and is always preceded by school experience in tutoring or other related work.

At first, the student has limited responsibility for instruction and is closely supervised by the cooperating classroom teachers. In advanced student teaching, the student has greater responsibility in the classroom. Under the traditional system, students often have no real classroom experience until they were plunged into student teaching in the final semester of the senior year. By that time, the career choice was made and it was difficult to reverse even if their performance was questionable. Under the Brooklyn

---

1Lee Witters, "NUSTEP: A Program for Improving Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 23 (Fall, 1972), 301-306.
program, students have the opportunity to opt out of education at a far earlier point and can enter or re-enter the sequence at various stages. Those students who seem unsuited to teaching even after intensive advice and support are "counseled out" of the field and into some type of work that seems more appropriate for them.¹

In an undergraduate Urban Teacher Education Program in New York, instead of thrusting college students into full responsibility, the college program provided for its potential teachers a sequential development of expertise under the guidance and direction of experienced teachers. It recognized a diversity of teaching tasks, techniques and styles, and suggests that teaching be separated into various roles and responsibilities to allow for different interests, ambitions, and talents of teachers. It facilitated the use of college students to differentiate tasks, individualize instruction, and provide for a better educational program. Student prospective teachers were first utilized as aides, assistants, and associates.²

Competency-Based Teacher Education

Although the performance based concept in teacher


education programs is gaining in popularity and is being widely implemented, few studies can be found on its effectiveness. Pyatte assessed the effectiveness of two performance-based modules on the topic of planning and presenting a lesson. He used a fifteen-item, criterion-referenced pre- and post-test to measure both pre-service and in-service teachers' gain in knowledge. An eighty percent gain was arbitrarily set as the acceptable standard of performance. In addition, a questionnaire was used to obtain reactions from participants regarding the materials and mode of instruction. Results indicated that (1) the students gained in knowledge about the topic and (2) the students had highly positive reactions to the method of instruction.¹

Weber evaluated seven Teacher Corps programs that were scattered throughout the country and attempting to implement performance-based instruction. Three aspects were considered: (1) interns' perceptions of the programs, (2) interns' attitudes toward teaching, and (3) interns' attitudes toward low income, minority groups. Interns were asked to rate their attitudes toward "ideal competency-based instruction" as opposed to "traditional instruction" along a graduated scale ranging from negative to positive. Attitudes were found to be more favorable toward ideal competency-based

¹Jeff Pyatte, "The Effectiveness of Performance-Based Training Modules on Planning and Presenting" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, Ill., April 1972).
instruction.\textsuperscript{1} Other investigators, McAvoy and Carter,\textsuperscript{2} have used similar procedures. This type of evaluation has specific limitations, some identifiable problems being that even though the use of a criterion-referenced test is appropriate for measuring the students' attainment of the objectives of an instructional unit in a performance-based program, such a procedure will not indicate whether the objectives can be achieved more efficiently through another means of instruction or even if the objectives are valid in the beginning. Also, opinions and attitudes toward a program do not necessarily reflect the effectiveness of a program.

Rosner reported on a proposed model of criterion levels to suggest the points at which performance may be assessed. The levels were as follows:

Criterion Level 1: Appraisal of teacher behaviors (cognitive and affective) plus pupil outcome (cognitive and affective) in a classroom situation over a relatively long period of time.
Criterion Level 2: Same as Level 1 but for a shorter performance period.
Criterion Level 3: Appraisal of teacher behaviors only in a classroom situation.
Criterion Level 4: Appraisal of a restricted range of teacher behaviors under laboratory or training conditions with a few pupils.
Criterion Level 5: Same as Level 4 but without pupils.

\textsuperscript{1} Wilford A. Weber, The Competency-Based Teacher Education Development Projects, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 059 986, 1971, pp. 1-10.

Criterion Level 6: Appraisal of a teacher's knowledge and understanding without producing a performance. 1

An alternative scheme is proposed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. According to this model, the demonstration of performance involved four variables: (1) the pupil outcome desired, (2) the characteristics of the pupils, (3) the characteristics of the instructional setting, and (4) the nature of the instructional act per se. Since this plan could lead to a number of performance situations, samplings from each variable are crossed to form "classes of events." A teacher would demonstrate performance in a number of "classes" of performance situations. 2

The competency approach seems well suited to the new pressures in teacher education. Lawrence stated:

As colleges of education are being called upon to make their teacher preparation programs more field-oriented, and more school-based, the middle schools are developing new instruction patterns that can accommodate greater numbers of teachers-in-training within the schools. Differentiated staffing, variable grouping, extensive use of community resource persons, these and other trends in middle school programs open up needs for trainees to serve in the schools. Logic dictates that as teacher education moves farther out into the field, it must decentralize its curriculum. Decentralization is exactly what the competency approach is

---


capable of offering: self-pacing, self-instructing, self-check or progress, and a linkage with performance in actual school situations. And the competency approach, when based in the schools, is equally appropriate for in-service teachers. Its potential now remains relatively unmined.¹

Jongsma stated: "One of the more complex issues facing developers of performance-based programs is the identification of criteria for judging the effectiveness of trainees and the specification of the settings in which performance is to take place."² Broudy has cogently criticized the assumption that the performance unit is a matter of indifference and that the number and character of the performance units can vary from one program to another. Broudy contended that what is clearly needed as a guide to future research in this area is some sort of conceptual scheme or model.³

Burke and Stone introduced the evident features of a research-based learning process model of teaching competency and attempted to illustrate the model's use in assessing the comprehensiveness of the content.

¹Lawrence, pp. 60-66.


For curriculum development and evaluation, the model reflects both traditional and current learning theories and has potential to be used as a guide to curriculum development and evaluation. The teaching competencies within the model could lend themselves to the development of a variety of evaluative procedures. Evaluative instruments developed for the model such as the tests, scales and observation guides could very well be used with other systems. This model could also be used as a basis for system assessment. One of the assessments for this model was applied in an analysis of the professional components of Weber State College.

Some evaluative questions arise here. One such question is whether or not the content of the curriculum is truly reflected in the behavioral objectives. Another is that the inventory does not reveal inconsistencies that may exist between objectives and what happens in a system.

The results of Burke's inventory revealed that attention was given to all the skill areas identified in the model in the objectives of the Weber State System. Since there appeared to be no gaps in the coverage, this seems to imply that there was consistency and considerable validity in the process of developing the Weber State Curriculum.

If more comprehensiveness and balance of curriculum were undertaken, then present data of this type could provide focus and clarity to problems inherent in teacher education curricula. A further look at a study of this sort might
provide a model and base for the development of new evaluational systems.¹

Instrumentation For Evaluation of Teacher Training Programs

Jongsma reported on the inadequate instrumentation that exists for evaluating teacher preparation programs. He concluded that researchers in teacher education have been hampered by an inadequate supply of good measurement instruments. They have intended to over-rely on just a few basic instruments.²

During the past few years, we have seen a great increase in the production of 'systematic observation instruments' that are designed to describe and evaluate various aspects of the teaching process. An important point to consider is that most of the newly developed observation instruments, such as the Flander's system, were designed, almost exclusively, to describe particular aspects of the teaching process, such as verbal interaction. With the onset of performance based programs, many such instruments have been shifted from a 'descriptive role' to a 'prescriptive role', that is, of specifying what teacher behaviors should occur. Unfortunately, this transition has taken place with very little research evidence to substantiate that the behaviors identified in such instruments are indeed related to pupil achievement.³

Simon and Boyer, in An Anthology of Classroom Observation Instruments, describes a recent collection of such


²Jongsma, pp. 200-209.

³Ibid.
instruments, yet Rosenshine reported that out of the sixty-five observational systems that were included in the anthology, only six have been validated by relating behaviors to measures of student growth.²

Jongsma continued,

With the increased attention on performance-based instruction and the measurement of teacher competencies, we are likely to see a surge in the development of paper-pencil type tests which are supposedly predictive of a teacher's performance in the classroom.³

An example that best illustrates this point is the State Department of Education in Florida who gave the University of Florida the task of developing a set of instruments that would measure a given list of fifty-four teacher competencies. A set of 200 paper-pencil items were developed and correlated with observation systems such as the "Reciprocal Category System", the "Florida Taxonomy of Cognitive Behavior", and the "Teacher Practices Observation Record".⁴ Because four-fifths of the items correlated statistically with one or more sets of observation data, the author

---


³Jongsma, pp. 200-209.

⁴Lawrence, pp. 60-66.
concluded that the paper-pencil items measured a counterpart of observable teacher behavior. He also stated that one must remain cautious of such efforts because there was no research base for the selection of the original fifty-four teacher competencies. The State Department "believed" they were important. Secondly, attempts at establishing concurrent validity are meaningless if the criterion is suspect.¹

LeBaron and Klatt stated, "We simply don't possess adequate information in a number of areas especially the relationship between a teacher's behavior and a student's learning to adequately design programs."² Barak Rosenshine, one of the better known spokesmen in this area, contended that many performance criteria specified in programs come from expert opinion and experience rather than from experimental studies. He concluded,

Educational researchers have not provided those who train teachers with a repertoire of teaching skills which indicate to a teacher that if he increases behavior X and/or decreases behavior Y, there will be a concomitant change in the cognitive or affective achievement of his students.³

In speaking to evaluation, Millman stated:

How should would-be teachers be told how to teach? First, there have been several dozen reasonably

¹Lawrence, pp. 60-66.


³Rosenshine, pp. 647-662.
well-controlled studies relating process variables to pupil growth. Until more research results are in, and I predict a rapid expansion in the amount of such research, student teachers might best be instructed to display those behaviors at least tentatively associated with pupil growth in some learning situations...

He prescribed, as a second aspect of teacher training programs, the use of the performance tests in a training mode.

In my opinion student teachers should be encouraged to look at the knowledges, skills, and affect of their pupils as a basis for judging the success of their teaching effort. These testing materials, with their prespecified objectives and matched criterion tests do just that. It is my opinion that the education of our children would be markedly improved if teachers were to make their decisions about the future instruction of their students by attending to the performance of their students on criterion measures matched to the goals of the instructional program. ... I would also advocate that a component of all teacher education programs be the conduct of research on the process correlates of student growth... Fourth, in the last dozen years the demand for beginning teachers has remained relatively constant whereas the supply has more than doubled, creating the large job shortages previously reported. This suggests to me that, whenever politically feasible, teacher training institutions should work toward smaller, higher quality programs. A larger faculty-to-student teacher ratio would facilitate incorporating a performance orientation and ongoing research effort into the training program.

He continued by saying that,

We have had such measures for years. We aren't going to lick the criterion problem by making explicit the

---


2 Ibid.
required grades that teachers must earn in college or other presage variables, by delineating ever so carefully how the teacher is supposed to teach, or even by looking at pupil growth under controlled conditions.1

If the term "performance-based indicators" is limited to pupil skills, abilities, and attitudes measured with valid instruments under the rigidly controlled conditions described here, then it is indeed time to bring about change.

Selected Issues in Teacher Education

It is apparent that although teacher input in teacher training programs has not been initiated in the past on any large scale basis, it may be that teacher training institutions are looking more closely at the teacher's role and input into teacher training programs.

Marking the professional advancement of classroom teachers at the public school level has proven to be an intense effort to gain greater recognition and voice in all aspects of educational decision making...Some personnel from teacher preparation institutions have tended to smile indulgently at school administrators and teacher association representatives who were caught up in the resultant teacher militancy and negotiation process...It seems that one area of discussion at the bargaining table may force the colleges and universities to become more cognizant of and concerned with what teachers and school boards are negotiating. This particular area involves student teaching programs and other related clinical experiences that are part of the undergraduate preparation of teachers. The policies and practices that govern those clinical experiences in programs are seen by classroom teachers as negotiable

1 Millman, pp. 68-75.
topics. Such local-level determination by means of negotiations has very profound implications for teacher preparation institutions...since such institutions rely heavily upon the public schools for providing education students direct experiences with pupils of various school-age levels.¹

The National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers are also concerned with this area of negotiations. National teacher groups are inviting local affiliates to take steps toward becoming more actively involved in teacher preparation programs. According to excerpts from the teacher education resolutions, affiliates were urged to:

1. Develop guidelines for qualifications of cooperating teachers and coordinators of student teachers.
2. Formulate standards for school systems receiving student teachers. Supervising or cooperating teachers in a student teaching program should have reduced teaching loads and be given a minimum established compensation.
3. Recommend Student NEA membership before participation in pre-professional experiences and student teaching.
4. Take immediate steps to improve the selection of persons entering the profession through more effective screening of applicants for the preprofessional practicum.
5. Offer guidance to teacher preparation institutions to prepare teachers in numbers consistent with projected need for teacher positions.
6. Support inclusions in master contracts or school policies that acceptance of student teachers be on a voluntary basis.²

¹Donald S. Kachur and Duaine C. Lang, "Negotiating Clinical Experiences: Do Colleges and Universities Want In?," Journal of Teacher Education, 26 (Fall, 1975), 203-205.

According to Kachur and Lang, agreements which restrict the university's ability to design and implement programs appear to be a serious threat.

What implications do provisions...have for the development of innovative programs which require concentration of student teachers for improved supervision, as found in teacher education centers, or which provide for participation in team teaching, differentiated staffing, or open spaced instruction?¹

According to the National Education Association there is evidence that classroom teachers are taking the initiative in challenging the structure that has long been held by teacher preparation institutions with regard to clinical experience programs and practices. These classroom teachers are united behind the strength of their professional organizations.²

Hayes suggested that in the case of school-college relationships and partnerships in teacher education, the so-called partnerships have merely involved representation from the teacher preparation institution and public school administration with little or no participation or influence from classroom teachers themselves.³

¹Kachur and Lang, pp. 203-205.

²Association of Classroom Teachers, p. iv.

Kachur pointed out that, even though clinical experience has been continually expanded so that preservice teachers have earlier and longer contact with students in different grades and/or subject levels in the public school setting, the colleges and universities have failed to involve classroom teachers more fully in the planning and implementation of many expanded programs.¹

According to Kachur and Lang, if the colleges and universities want to maintain control of clinical experience programs and still use the public schools, they will need to:

1. Take the initiative in assuming a negotiation parity with school boards and teacher associations; or
2. Reexamine their current types of written agreements with public school districts to assure both their legality and inclusion of classroom teacher associations as a bargaining agent; and/or
3. Reexamine their own preparation programs to determine whether, in truth, cooperative decision making includes participation from all school personnel, from selection of candidates through certification; and/or
4. Explore other types of professional services (research, consultation, curricular development, in-service training) that can be rendered to the public schools, particularly as they affect teachers, as an incentive for their continued involvement in off-campus clinical experience programs.

If the universities choose not to exercise the above options, it would appear that they have at least three other alternatives to follow:

1. Explore and implement alternative models as substitutes for clinical experiences in the public schools such as: reestablish the campus laboratory schools, establish university-controlled laboratory schools in the field, or substitute simulated experiences for real teaching experiences; or

2. Permit the major responsibility for policy determination to become the prerogative of the public schools and the local teacher associations; or

3. Abandon the responsibility for the clinical preparation of teachers.

Whatever stance the colleges and universities take, there will be witnessed, within the next few years, rapid and dramatic changes in teacher preparation. Some of the most important changes with reference to clinical experiences in the field may very well come about via the negotiation process spearheaded by the professional teacher associations.¹

Summary of Related Literature

Research on teaching has come a long way from the naive effort of the 1930's to the more sophisticated and genuine progress in the 1970's.² Where the earlier effort sought predictions of overall teacher effectiveness on the basis of a few test scores, research is now found in improving effectiveness in specific skills on the basis of intensive and validated training procedures. What is clearly needed now and in the future, is research based on the effectiveness of the teacher training institution in equipping teachers with these skills.

One major lag in research on teacher education preparation is that there is no commonly agreed-upon definition of what constitutes research in teacher education preparation. The research regarding teaching is vast but data-based

¹Kachur and Lang, pp. 203-205.
²Gage, p. 205.
literature regarding teacher criteria in education for teaching for effectiveness and the implication of those needed to supply that information is considerably less. Also, much of the knowledge gathered from research in teaching needs to be translated into meaningful teacher preparation programs.

By overlooking the teacher's intentions as a relevant criterion base in research concerning teacher education, classroom effectiveness has been defined as something quite apart from the goals of classroom teachers and independent of his motivation and disconnected from self definition of success.

Cyphert best exemplifies the tone of research in teacher education stating,

"Today there appears to be a strong undercurrent developing which postulates that teacher education should not look to research in teaching for help in training teachers; on the contrary research must look to teacher education for help in developing a science of teacher behavior as a by-product of the processes of teacher education."

On the basis of the review of the literature, it appears that teacher input to teacher training programs should increase and have more impact on the program content than has been true in the past.

This paper examines the relationships between the perceptions of teachers, education department chairmen and

\[1\] Cyphert, p. 145.
members of the National Consortium of Competency Based Teacher Education concerning the goals and objectives for teacher education programs.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The topic of this study concerned the extent to which master teachers, teacher education chairmen, and consortium representatives agree or disagree on the relative importance of various criteria that may contribute to teacher effectiveness if held as goals and objectives and implemented in teacher training programs.

In order to do this, it was necessary to identify those characteristics of a teacher education program to which the individuals of the study could respond. This was done by selecting the Criteria for Describing and Assessing Competency Based Programs published by the National Consortium of Competency Based Education Centers.

In order, then, to be able to determine the extent to which there is agreement, it was necessary to put these into inventory form. This resulted in a list of twenty-four criteria.

Cover letters were composed and mailed along with the inventory to master teachers, teacher education chairmen, and consortium representatives. (See Appendix pp. 81-82). These letters, indicated to each recipient the purpose of the study and the nature of the inventory. Each letter
requested the recipient's cooperation in completing and returning the inventory in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Participants were asked to respond to the list of twenty-four teacher training program criteria by rank-ordering them in terms of their importance in a teacher training program. The directions to the subjects stated that they were to indicate a first, second, third choice, etc., in order of importance. Four weeks after the initial mailing, those who had not responded were sent a second request for participation. After an additional four weeks, it was assumed that all those who were going to cooperate had done so.

Sample

Teacher Education Department Chairmen

Due to the large number of teacher education programs throughout the fifty states, a random sampling procedure was employed to obtain a representative number of teacher education department chairmen for the study. Numbers were assigned to the schools (001-N) and a table of random numbers was used to identify the one hundred fifty needed for the study. One hundred fifty colleges and universities which have teacher education programs accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education were selected by this process. The teacher education department chairmen of these schools were recipients of the inventory. Schools were selected from each of the fifty states.
State Teachers

The criterion used to qualify an individual as a master teacher for this study was that the individual had been chosen as a state's "Teacher of the Year". Thus, by using the selections for the 1975-76 school year, a potential group of fifty was available. The respective state education agencies were utilized in locating the subjects. Four could not be located, resulting in forty-six who received the survey instrument.

Consortium Representatives

The criteria for describing and assessing competency based programs was primarily the work of four authors and was published by the National Consortium of Competency Based Education Centers. Each of the four consortium representatives was contacted by phone to solicit his participation in the study prior to receiving mailed inventories.

Instrumentation and Data

The criteria established by the National Consortium of Competency Based Education Centers entitled Criteria for Describing and Assessing Competency Based Programs was used. The Consortium: 1) serves as the coordinating body for the National Competency Based Education Centers; 2) serves as a conceptual forum focusing on the refinement and
advancement of Competency Based Education concepts; 3) provides a source of Competency Based Education leadership at the national level; and 4) functions as a clearing-house for the provision of developmental assistance to meet national priority CBE needs.

The Consortium is a formally organized group of educational leaders in competency based education instrumental in developing and studying the feasibility of models for exemplary teacher education programs under grants from the United States Office of Education. Since 1972, the National Consortium of CBE Centers has been working on the continuing problems faced by institutions attempting to re-do their teacher education programs. A list of criterion statements was produced for examination; an instrument was developed, explained and tested in several institutions.

In 1973, twelve educators from nine teacher training institutions and agencies of the U.S. Office of Education had input into the process of developing this set of criteria.

In 1974, this instrument was improved by a selective group of four. A tentative version was field tested at eight institutions in 1974 and revised by field testers. While it is primarily the work of the four authors, it is the result, actually, of the collective work of individuals at twelve institutions of teacher education. The instrument consisted of twenty-four criteria for describing and assessing competency based teacher education programs.
The primary usage of this instrument up to the present time has been in institutions which are currently operating, at least for part of their students, a competency-based teacher education program. The criteria have been used by staff members at a number of teacher training institutions. (See Appendix)

Data Analysis

Comparisons of the rankings of goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs were made between master teachers and teacher education department chairmen, between master teachers and consortium representatives of the Criteria for Describing and Assessing Competency Based Education Programs and between teacher education department chairmen and these major authors.

Spearman-Rho rank-order correlational techniques were used to determine the strength of the relationship between the respective groups as cited in the preceding paragraph.

In order to determine an average weighting for each criterion it was necessary to assign point values for each criterion response made by the teachers, education chairmen and authors.

The relative weights for the various criteria were determined by adding all the points credited to a goal and objective by respondents in the respective group and dividing them by the number of respondents. This resulted in a mean
ranking for each criterion for each of the three groups.

In order to test each of the hypotheses, a Spearman-Rho rank-order correlation was the process chosen. To do this, it was necessary to change the mean ranks for each group into rank order.

The respective rank orders by pairs of groups were then checked for relationships by using the following formula:

\[
e = 1 - \frac{6\sum D^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}
\]

where:
- \(e\) refers to the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient
- \(D\) refers to any difference in rank assigned by the respective groups
- \(N\) is the number of items ranked

In each case, the hypothesis of no relationship was rejected if the coefficient obtained would have occurred less than .05 of the time by chance.
Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

This chapter presents the data and the analysis and discussion of these data.

Presentation of the Data

The data in this investigation were collected from a twenty-four item inventory based on the work of four major authors of the Criteria for Describing and Assessing Competency Based Programs. The inventory items were ranked for importance by forty teachers, one hundred twenty-two teacher education department chairmen, and four consortium representatives.

A total of forty-six inventories were mailed on August 15, 1976, to state "Teachers of the Year", and forty of these inventories were completed and returned by October 15, 1976. This was an eighty-seven percent return, with many state teachers requesting the researcher to send a copy of the findings directly to them for their information.

A total of one hundred fifty inventories were mailed in August, 1977, to teacher education department chairmen and one hundred twenty-two of these inventories were completed and returned by October 15, 1977. This was an eighty-one percent return, and like many state teachers, many teacher education
department chairmen requested a copy of the findings of the investigation.

A total of four inventories were mailed on August 15, 1976, to the four authors of the instrument. Each of these consortium representatives had been contacted by phone prior to receiving mailed inventories. At the time of the phone contact, all four authors had agreed to participate. By October 15, 1976, four of the inventories were completed and returned. One author of the instrument indicated that each item on the instrument was equally important. Thus, responses for this one author were added in such a way that each item received the same ranking as each other item. Three authors requested a copy of the findings of the investigation.

Analysis

In order to indicate the findings of this particular investigation, the investigator analyzed each of the twenty-four criteria listed in the inventories in terms of the data received from the sample involved in the study. Mean rankings by group for each criterion were calculated.

The mean rankings were then rank-ordered for each group. These ordered ranks were the data used in calculating the correlations to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement between the respective pairs of groups. These are shown in Table 1.
TABLE 1

Ranks of the Mean Rankings of Goals and Objectives in Terms of their Importance as Seen by Teacher Education Department Chairmen, Consortium Representatives, and Master Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Teacher Education Department Chairmen</th>
<th>Consortium Representatives</th>
<th>Master Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 contains the ranks of the mean rankings for teacher education department chairmen and master teachers. This information concerns Hypothesis #1 which states:

**Hypothesis #1:** There is no relationship between the perceptions of master teachers and teacher education department chairmen concerning the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs.

The data in Table 2 result in a Spearman rank order correlation (Rho) between the rank orders of these characteristics for Teacher Education Department Chairmen and Master Teachers of -.552. This negative relationship is significant (p < .05) and indicates a tendency for master teachers to rank as more important those goals and objectives which chairmen of teacher education departments rank as less important.

A coefficient of this magnitude would occur less than once in twenty times by chance if there were no relationship in terms of relative importance of these characteristics as viewed by master teachers and chairmen of teacher education departments. Thus, the hypothesis of no relationship is rejected.

Table 3 contains the ranks of the mean rankings for teacher education chairmen and authors. This information concerns Hypothesis #2 which states:

**Hypothesis #2:** There is no relationship between the perceptions of teacher education department chairmen and consortium representatives of the National Consortium of Competency Based Teacher Education concerning the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher education programs.
# TABLE 2

## Ranks of the Mean Rankings of Goals and Objectives in Terms of their Importance as Seen by Teacher Education Department Chairmen and Master Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Teacher Education Department Chairmen</th>
<th>Master Teachers</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>72.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
<td>90.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ E = 1 - \frac{6 \sum D^2}{N(N^2-1)} = 1 - \frac{6(3570)}{24(575)} = 1 - \frac{21420}{13800} = 1 - 1.552 = -0.552 \]
### TABLE 3
Ranks of the Mean Rankings of Goals and Objectives in Terms of their Importance as Seen by Teacher Education Department Chairmen and Consortium Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Teacher Education Department Chairmen</th>
<th>Consortium Representatives</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>$D^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>182.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>90.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>380.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>132.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>72.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$e = 1 - \frac{6\sum D^2}{N(N^2-1)} = 1 - \frac{6(3186)}{24(575)} = 1 - \frac{19116}{13800} = 1 - 1.385 = -.385$$
The data in Table 3 result in a Spearman rank order correlation (Rho) between the rank orders of these characteristics for teacher education department chairmen and consortium representatives of -.385. This negative relationship is significant (p>.05) and indicates a tendency for the consortium representatives to rank as more important those goals and objectives which chairmen of teacher education departments tend to rank as less important. Therefore, the hypothesis of no relationship is rejected.

Table 4 contains the ranks of the mean rankings for master teachers and consortium representatives. This information concerns Hypothesis #3 which states:

Hypothesis #3: There is no relationship between the perceptions of master teachers and members of the National Consortium of Competency Based Teacher Education concerning the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher education programs.

The data in Table 4 result in a Spearman rank order correlation (Rho) between the rank orders of these characteristics for master teachers and consortium representatives of .363. This positive relationship is significant (p<.05) and indicates a tendency for master teachers to rank as more important those goals and objectives which consortium representatives also rank as more important.

A coefficient of this magnitude would occur less than once in twenty times by chance if there were no relationship in terms of relative importance of these characteristics as viewed by master teachers and consortium representatives.
### TABLE 4

Ranks of the Mean Rankings of Goals and Objectives in Terms of their Importance as Seen by Consortium Representatives and Master Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Consortium Representatives</th>
<th>Master Teachers</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
<td>90.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-15.5</td>
<td>240.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ e = 1 - \frac{6 \sum D^2}{N(N^2-1)} = 1 - \frac{6(1464.50)}{24(575)} = 1 - \frac{8787}{13800} = 1 - .637 = .363 \]
These groups agree to the extent that the relationship is significant. Thus, the hypothesis of no relationship is rejected.

The criteria for competency-based education have been categorized into five general topic areas by the consortium representatives. These are shown in Table 5 with the respective rankings of each of the criteria as well as mean rankings by category for teacher education department chairmen, consortium representatives and master teachers. Criteria 1-6 describe competency specifications. These concern how competency statements are determined, written, measured and used.

Examination of mean rankings of those competency specifications indicated in Table 5 reveals one notable factor. There appears to be more agreement between consortium representatives (10.5) and master teachers (8.5) than between either of those groups and teacher education department chairmen (15.5). Master teachers and consortium representatives rank these characteristics higher in relative importance than do teacher education department chairmen.

Items 7-12 deal with instruction. These criteria reflect system, order and direction. These instructional competencies focus on the job to be learned. This instruction helps the learner acquire subject matter, skills and attitudes and synthesize them back into the specified competencies. The instruction criteria facilitate this process.

Examination of the mean rankings of instruction criteria reveals that there is more agreement between master
The Ranks of the Mean Rankings of Goals and Objectives in Terms of their Importance as Seen by Teacher Education Department Chairmen, Consortium Representatives, and Master Teachers on Criteria Concerning Competency Specifications by Category and Mean Rank by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>TEACHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN</th>
<th>CONSORTIUM REPRESENTATIVES</th>
<th>MASTER TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competency Specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers (8.17) and consortium representatives (8.92) than between either of those groups and teacher education department chairmen (21.5). Again, master teachers and consortium representatives rank these characteristics higher in relative importance than teacher education department chairmen.

Criteria 13-17 focus the attention of the user upon the assessment procedures and competency measures. The criteria describe items reflecting validity and reliability concerns and contains implications for the determination of "levels" of demonstration, the data, their management and usefulness, and the public nature of the measures.

Examination of mean rankings of the assessment criteria reveals that the consortium representatives' mean ranking of these characteristics (14.7) in terms of relative importance is between the mean rankings of these five characteristics by teacher education department chairmen (9.6) and master teachers (17.0). The highest relative mean ranking for assessment criteria was made by teacher education department chairmen while the lowest was by master teachers.

Items 18 and 19 concern governance and management. Governance refers to the controlling, regulating and directing of program operation. It deals with the policies and processes which keep the system functioning. Program management refers to administering and supervising the activities of the program in accord with the policy. It includes responsibilities for facilitating operations by processing needed resources such as equipment, personnel and materials.
Examination of mean rankings of the governance and management criteria reveals that there is more agreement between master teachers (22.5) and consortium representatives (21.0) than between either of those two groups and teacher education department chairmen (1.5). Teacher education department chairmen see governance and management as relatively more important than do either consortium representatives or master teachers.

The criteria in items 20-24 direct attention to those areas concerned with the total operation of the program. These include staff and staff development characteristics, research and discrimination activities, the institutional flexibility necessary for a successful program and assessment of the total program as a unified integrated system.

An examination of the mean rankings of total program criteria reveals that once again, master teachers (14.0) and consortium representatives (13.6) agree more closely with each other than does either group with teacher education department chairmen (5.4). Teacher education department chairmen view total program criteria as relatively more important than do either consortium representatives or master teachers.

There is generally strong agreement between master teachers and consortium representatives in terms of relative importance for specific groups of goals and objectives for teacher education training programs. Sizable differences in mean rankings of criterion groups occurred between these two groups and teacher education department chairmen.
Table 6 shows the mean rankings of the five criterion groups for each of the three groups of subjects and the order of relative importance for each criterion group. Of particular note is that the order of importance is identical for master teachers and consortium representatives while the order is markedly different for teacher education department chairmen.

It is apparent from the information in Table 6 that teacher education department chairmen view as most important those criteria which have to do largely with program control while the other groups' views favor those criteria concerned with program and instruction content.
TABLE 6
Mean Ranks and Order of Relative Importance of Criterion Groupings by Subject Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION GROUPINGS</th>
<th>TEACHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN</th>
<th>CONSORTIUM REPRESENTATIVES</th>
<th>MASTER TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Specifications</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Management</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the relative importance of goals and objectives held for teacher preparation programs varies between master teachers, university teacher education department chairmen, and authors of criteria for teacher competency-based programs.

A stratified random sampling procedure was employed to obtain a representative number of teacher education department chairmen from accredited college and university programs throughout the United States. Master teachers referred to the individuals chosen as their respective state's "Teacher of the Year". By using the selections for the 1975-76 school year, a potential group of 50 was available. Views from four consortium representatives who were major authors of the Criteria for Describing and Assessing Competency-Based Programs from the National Consortium of Competency-Based Education Centers were also solicited for the study.

Data were collected by the means of mailing an inventory to be rank-ordered by each participant. The returns of the inventory amounted to an eighty-seven per cent response
for master teachers, an eighty-one per cent response from
teacher education department chairmen, and a seventy-five
per cent response from the consortium representatives.
Specifically, the investigation tested the following hypo-
theses as related to the study:

1. There is no relationship between the perceptions
of master teachers and those of education department chair-
men concerning the relative importance of specific goals and
objectives held for teacher preparation programs.

2. There is no relationship between the perceptions
of education department chairmen and members of the National
Consortium of Competency Based Teacher Education concerning
the relative importance of specific goals and objectives held
for teacher education programs.

3. There is no relationship between the perceptions
of master teachers and members of the National Consortium of
Competency Based Teacher Education concerning the relative
importance of specific goals and objectives held for teacher
education programs.

In response to the first hypothesis, a significant
negative relationship occurred. This indicated a tendency
for master teachers to rank as more important those goals and
objectives which chairmen of teacher education departments
ranked as less important. Master teachers and teacher edu-
cation department chairmen did not agree on the relative
importance of specific goals and objectives for teacher
training programs.
Concerning the second hypothesis, a significant negative relationship occurred. This indicated a tendency for consortium representatives to rank as more important those goals which chairmen of education departments ranked as less important.

In relation to the third hypothesis, a significant positive relationship occurred. This indicated a tendency for master teachers and consortium representatives to hold similar views toward the relative importance of specific goals and objectives for teacher training programs.

Conclusions

1. There is disagreement in the relative importance of specific goals and objectives for teacher education programs between master teachers and teacher education department chairmen.

2. There is disagreement in the relative importance of specific goals and objectives for consortium representatives and teacher education department chairmen.

3. There is similarity in the relative importance assigned specific objectives and goals of teacher education programs by master teachers and consortium representatives.

4. Both master teachers and consortium representatives place a high premium on instructional criteria which reflect system, order and direction, and which help the learner acquire subject matter, skills and attitudes and synthesize them back
into the specific competencies.

5. In terms of various criteria groupings for programs, teacher education department chairmen are more concerned with the management and control of the program while teachers and consortium representatives are more concerned about instruction and competence.

Discussion

Since teachers and teacher education department chairmen disagree on the relative importance of specific goals and objectives for teacher education programs, it would appear that perhaps there is some lack of understanding of what classroom teachers need on the part of those charged with administration of the teacher training programs. If that is reflected in the training that teachers are receiving, then it is possible that the effect of this training has been inadequate since it has been a practice of most colleges to establish their curriculum and program emphasis on the basis of the faculty and those in charge of the program. It is feasible that program emphases may be inappropriate to what teachers need.

There is an apparent lack of communication between the teacher education institutions and teachers, both prospective and experienced. This would appear to be true simply because of the lack of agreement that is evident between the relative importance assigned to specific goals and objectives for teacher education programs. There also appears to be a lack of
communication between consortiums and teacher education department chairmen. Possible implications include:

1. Dissatisfaction with training programs on the part of practicing teachers.

2. Continuation of traditional programs when new emphases should be considered.

3. A lack of relevant and available training for experienced teachers choosing to update and continue their training through the teacher training institutions.

If teacher dissatisfaction concerning teacher training and retraining exists, and continues over a period of time, then there may be a greater emphasis in on-going training and retraining outside the purview of teacher training institutions such as teacher controlled inservice, teachers' centers, education agencies participating in teacher inservice, etc. This, then, could lessen the traditional status and role of the colleges and universities in the preparation of teachers.

Recommendations

1. Colleges and universities that train teachers should begin to seek the advice and counsel of classroom teacher representatives in order to determine what would be most effective in providing training for prospective teachers.

2. School Superintendents and Directors of Education should establish a program with their teachers in which those things that teachers see as being particularly important to
their effectiveness can have feedback into the institutions which supply the training for teachers.

3. Local educational agencies should establish inservice programs in which classroom teachers, school administrators, local school districts, and teacher education personnel from teacher training institutions can be informed regarding goals and objectives for teacher preparation perceived necessary for success in the role of classroom teacher.

4. The U.S. Office of Education, National Institute for Education, and Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, along with state and local accreditation agencies and area education agencies, should sponsor and attend regional meetings in which these experts in the field and teacher representatives could address themselves to instructional needs most important to classroom teachers. This information, then, could be fed back into those systems which provide teacher training.

5. Teacher training institutions need to include in their research efforts in-depth studies of the needs of the classroom teacher as perceived by the teacher if their training programs are to meet the needs of their clientele.

6. Additional studies similar to this seem warranted. When such studies are conducted, questions which might be examined are:

(a) Are variations in emphases dependent on the sex
of the respondent?

(b) Would women Teacher Education Department Chairmen respond differently than male Teacher Education Department Chairmen?

(c) What relationship is age to the response of the participants?

(d) What relationship is experience to the response of the participants?

(e) What relationship is training to the response of the participants?

(f) To what extent would the above factors relate to perceptions held as goals and objectives for teacher education programs?
APPENDIX

Letters to Participants

and

Opinionnaire
September, 1977
Des Moines, Iowa

Male __________
Female __________

Dear ____________________,

I am currently engaged in a study to determine to what extent master teachers, university and college teacher education program chairmen, and a group of educational specialists agree in their perceptions of the relative importance of specific goals and objectives for teacher education programs.

The results of this study will be useful to all teacher training institutions in developing and/or modifying their teacher training programs. Your assistance is vital to the successful conduct of this study. It will require only a few minutes of your time to complete.

The enclosed inventory consists of twenty-four teacher training program criteria that may contribute to teacher effectiveness if held as goals and objectives and implemented in teacher training programs. Please rank the enclosed inventory of criteria in order of importance from one to twenty-four (one being most important, etc.) and return it as soon as possible.

Enclosed is an addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience.

Thank you for your time and participation.

Sincerely,

Bettie Burres Youngs
Ed. Specialist
Dear ______________________,

I am currently engaged in a study to determine to what extent master teachers, university and college teacher education program chairmen, and you, the developers of the Criteria for Describing and Assessing Competency Based Programs agree in your perceptions of the relative importance of specific goals and objectives for teacher education competency based programs.

The results of this study will be useful to teacher training institutions in developing and/or modifying their teacher training programs.

Your assistance is vital to the successful conduct of this study. It will require only a few minutes of your time. As you may recall, I telephoned you about this inventory this summer asking for your assistance.

Please rank order the list of twenty-four criteria in order of importance (one being most important, etc.) and return it as soon as possible.

Enclosed is an addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience.

Thank you for your time and participation.

Sincerely,

Bettie Burres Youngs
Ed. Specialist
Required competencies are based on an analysis of the professional role(s) or a theoretical formulation of professional responsibilities. (Emphasis is upon the connection between professional competence and the specification of trainee learning experiences.)

Statements of competency describe outcomes expected from the performance of profession related functions, or those knowledges, skills, and attitudes thought to be essential to the performance of those functions.

Statements of competency facilitate criterion-referenced assessment. (Assessment of trainee performance is based upon measurable criteria rather than on standard norms.)

Competencies are treated as tentative predictors of professional effectiveness, and are subjected to continual validation procedures.

Competencies are specified and made public prior to instruction. (Required competencies and options are known to learners as they enter the program.)

Learners completing the program demonstrate a wide range of competency profiles. (Instead of having a list of courses and a grade point average as the evidence of his competency, the trainee has a competency profile as evidence of his performance at specific tasks and a more accurate index of professional capability.)

The instructional program builds the design of the instructional program on the specified professional outcome identified and expressed by competency statements.

Instruction which supports competency development is organized into units of manageable size.

Instruction is organized and implemented so as to accommodate learner style, sequence preference, pacing and perceived needs.

Learner progress is determined by demonstrated competence. (The student is knowledgeable of the general nature of competencies and criteria used to determine the extent to which performance approaches professional standards for acceptability.)

The extent of learner's progress in demonstrating competencies is made known to him throughout the program.

Instructional specifications are reviewed and revised based on feedback data.
Competency measures are related validly to objectives. (Assessment procedures can be logically derived from and related to objectives.)

Competency measures are specific, realistic, and sensitive to nuance. (Measures assess consistency of performance and reliability.)

Competency measures discriminate on the basis of standards set for competency demonstration. (Standards are realistic expectations of professional development.)

Data provided by competency measures are manageable and useful in decision making. (Student and advisor examine data on his performance and make decisions relative to his progress in the program.)

Competency measures and standards are specified and made public prior to instruction. (Requirements of the program are known in advance both to students and to faculty.)

Policy statements are written to govern, in broad outline, the intended structure, content, operation and resource base of the program.

Management functions, responsibilities, procedures and mechanisms are clearly defined and made explicit. (Management decisions reflect stated program philosophy and policy.)

Program staff attempt to model the attitudes and behaviors desired of students in the program. (Staff brings to the task their full human potential and concern so that students experience instructional leadership which is concrete and related to life.)

Provisions are made for staff orientation, assessment, improvement, and reward. (Staff development activities are recognized as important as teaching, research, and publication. Staff receives orientation to new perspectives and new demands, management procedures, learning commitments, and available resources.)

Research and dissemination activities are an integral part of the total instructional system. (A research strategy for validating and revising the program is operational.)

Institutional flexibility is sufficient for all aspects of the program. (The emphasis on objectives implies alternative instructional strategies, differentiated staffing patterns, teaming, group determination of appropriate goals and objectives, student involvement in
decision making, and more extensive and intensive counseling. It also implies closer working relations with schools and involvement of school people in objective and instructional specifications.)

The program is planned and operated as a totally unified, integrated system. (The program is continually evaluated against the actual professional needs, and refined based on feedback.)
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