ABSTRACT

A MODEL DEVELOPED FOR THE ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF A COMPETENCY-BASED SYSTEM AND FIELD TESTED WITH NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

By

Harold Blaine Street

The major problem undertaken by this study was to develop a model which could be useful in the analysis and evaluation of the administration and operation of a college's "Mastery Learning" in a competency-based system.

Though institutions of higher education differ, they have many common elements. The major objective of the study was to develop a model which could be used with a particular college and with slight modification be useful elsewhere. It was also the objective of the study to use the model in evaluation of a specific institution, National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois.

The model incorporated the functions of initiating, maintaining, and monitoring a competency-based system. The initiating function focused on the historical review of the early stages of development of the competency-based system. The maintaining function considered various measures employed to sustain and develop the competency-based system. The monitoring function of

the model emphasized an analysis and evaluation of the administration and operation of the competency-based system.

In order to demonstrate the initiating, maintaining, and monitoring functions, the study answered these supporting questions:

1. How is the competency-based system defined?
2. How is there an understood and accepted model of competency statements used by the faculty?
3. How widely accepted is the competency-based system by the administration, faculty, and the students?
4. How are the students able to pace themselves in an individual manner?
5. How is a consistent position on the competency-based system reflected between the public school critic teachers and the college supervisors?
6. How does using the competency-based system contribute in a positive fashion to the teaching profession?
7. How much paper work is required by the system?
8. What are the major advantages and disadvantages to using the competency-based system?

The initiating and maintaining functions of the model were applied by reviewing the college historical documents, minutes of meetings, reports, and materials distributed by the Dean regarding the competency-based system.

The monitoring function of the model included an analysis of:

a. student teaching records,

b. Teacher Competency Evaluation Forms completed by principals,

c. faculty and student rating of the occurrence of characteristics included in a "good" competency-based system, and

d. administration and faculty response to interviews regarding the competency-based system.

The application of the model at National College indicated a thoughtful and careful development of the initiating function of the competency-based system. The analysis of the data also indicated that the maintaining function was initially strong, but due to various factors in more recent years, shifted somewhat from that position of strength.

The application of the monitoring function revealed many strengths in the competency-based system at the college, but also noted some weaknesses.

Overall, the "Mastery Learning" in the competency-based system at National College was evaluated as being superior to the former traditional system. Nevertheless, the application of the model revealed that the administration, faculty, and students recognized the need for modification of the system.

Based on the findings of the model developed for the analysis and evaluation of the competency-based system, a series of recommendations was offered. The recommendations included providing the necessary support system to assure the monitoring function

and thus to strengthen the effectiveness of the competency-based system at National College of Education.

A MODEL DEVELOPED FOR THE ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF A COMPETENCY-BASED SYSTEM AND FIELD TESTED WITH NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

By

Harold Blaine Street

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1977

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many individuals have contributed to the completion of this dissertation, and the writer takes this opportunity to acknowledge his appreciation and gratitude.

Dr. Norman Bell, chairman of the dissertation, has been valued as a friend and counselor in the completion of this study and throughout the doctoral program. Special thanks are due to Dr. Richard Featherstone, Dr. Henry Kennedy, and Dr. George Sargent, members of the doctoral committee, for their advice, insights, and assistance with the dissertation and throughout the doctoral program.

Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Norman Dodl, Dr. Del Felder, Dr. W. Robert Houston, Dr. Karl Massanari, Dr. J. T. Sandefur, Dr. H. Del Schalock, and Dr. Gilbert Shearron for their help as jury members on this study.

The special encouragement and support of Dr. Glenn Heck, Dr. Paul Trafton, Dr. Robert Stalcup, and Dr. Lewis Troyer as friends and colleagues shall be remembered and appreciated.

The assistance of the administration, faculty, and students at National College of Education was most helpful and appreciated.

The constant support of his wife Dee, and her assistance as she devoted many long hours to typing the dissertation, and

to sons James and Kent as they gave up family activities, have made the completion of this dissertation possible, and a grateful husband and father acknowledges his loving appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background for the Problem	1
Elam's Essential Elements of Competencies	4
Weber State's Model of Competency-Based Education	6
Early Models of Competency-Based Education	8
Identification of the Problem and Statement of Objectives	9
Functions of the Model	10
Significance of the Study	12
Delimitation of Study	15
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED RESEARCH	17
Definition of Competency-Based Education	17
Houston and Howsam's Characteristics of Competency-Based Instruction	19
Johnson's Comparison of Competency-Based and Traditional Education	22
Dodl and Schalock's Rationale for Competency-Based Education	24
University of Houston's Competency-Based Teacher Education Program	28
Turner's Levels of Criteria for Teacher Education	33
Houston's Criteria for Assessing Competency-Based Programs	36
Implications	40
Critiques	42
Summary	43
III. DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES	44
Historical Review of National College	45
The Continuing Search for Criteria	46
Items Concerning Nongrading Proposal	50

Chapter Page

The Initiating Function at National College 52
The Maintaining Function 55
The Monitoring Function 65
Procedures to Field Test the Model With National College 67
Student Teaching Records 68
Principals' Ratings of First-Year Teachers 69
Teaching Job Market 70
Questionnaire Used With Administration, Faculty, and Students 71
Interviews 74

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA 76

Student Teaching Records 76
Principals' Ratings of First-Year Teachers 80
Teaching Job Market 84
Characteristics of a Competency-Based System 84
Interviews 100

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS 115

Summary 115
Conclusions 125
Recommendations With Respect to National College . . 127
Recommendations for Use of THE MODEL 130

APPENDICES 131

A IS NCE REALLY A LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE? 132

B_1 THE CONTINUING SEARCH FOR CRITERIA 148

B_2 LEAVES FROM THE NOTEBOOK OF A DEAN 167

B_3 ITEMS CONCERNING NON-GRADING PROPOSAL 173

B_4 LETTER TO PARENTS OF NATIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS 183

C GRADES HAVE GONE: WHAT THEN? 188

D_1 EVALUATING UNDERSTANDINGS, ATTITUDES, SKILLS, AND BEHAVIORS 205

D_2 MAKING THE GRADE 212

D_3 MEMO TO ALL INSTRUCTORS 217

Chapter Page

E_1 NATIONAL COLLEGE OFFICIAL POSITION ON THE COMPETENCY-BASED SYSTEM 221

E_2 ROVING REPORTER 227

F_1 FOLLOW-UP LETTERS 232

F_2 COMPETENCY-BASED RATING FORM 235

F_3 NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION COMPETENCY-BASED RATING FORM 238

F_4 PRINCIPAL'S TEACHER COMPETENCY EVALUATION FORM 242

BIBLIOGRAPHY 246

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Principals' Ratings of First-Year Teachers	81
2.	Jury Members' Ratings of Characteristics	87
3.	College and Jury Ranking of Characteristics	90
4.	College Personnel Rating of Characteristics	91

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background for the Problem

There has been a recognized need for change in teacher education to provide instruction which can meet the challenges of a technological society. In a 1969 Phi Delta Kappan article, Jay Monson[1] indicated that he received a personal letter from the United States Office of Education, dated March 17, 1969, in which they emphasized that elementary teacher education programs need improving and updating. The United States Office of Education helped to bring about some of this change in teacher education in the late 1960's by inaugurating the United States Office of Education Elementary Models Project. In their request for proposals, emphasis was placed on detailed educational specifications which could be used as guides in developing sound teacher education programs. The Request for Proposal called for teacher training program goals in terms of expected and measurable teacher behaviors. Evaluation and feedback techniques were to be used throughout and at the end of a student's program to determine the extent of teaching behaviors acquired.[2] Ten models were selected by the

---

[1]Jay A. Monson, "New Models in Elementary Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan 51 (October 1969): 101.

[2]U.S. Office of Education, Request for Proposals No. OE-68-4, October 16, 1967. (Mimeographed.)

U.S. Office of Education from over 80 design proposals submitted to be used as models for the needed change in teacher education.

Utz and Leonard stated in their preface that,

> Teaching and learning have been characterized as pedestrian, and in violation of contemporary knowledge regarding learning and organization into feasible experiences. Teacher roles, student behavior and goals, methods, and evaluation procedures are typified by vagueness and diffusion such that recipients of this education receive little more than frail knowledge storehouses which fail in competition of recall with computers.[3]

Houston and Howsam[4] indicated that each of these 10 models emphasizes competencies. Since then, with impetus from a variety of sources, pilot projects have sprung up in many colleges and universities across the United States. This movement is generally referred to as "Competency-Based" or "Performance-Based" Teacher Education.[5] In the 1972 survey of American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, a 65 percent response indicated that 17 percent of the colleges and universities were operating limited or full-scale competency/performance-based teacher education programs. It also revealed that 54 percent were exploring or developing plans to initiate these programs, while 29 percent reported

---

[3]Robert T. Utz and Leo D. Leonard, A Competency-Based Curriculum, A Model for Teachers (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1971), p. vii.

[4]W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam, Competency-Based Teacher Education Progress, Problems and Prospects, ed. W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972), p. ix.

[5]Allen A. Schmieder, "Profile of the States in Competency-Based Education," Performance Based Teacher Education (U.S. Office of Education) 3 (November 1974).

that they were not presently involved or had no plans to begin competency/performance-based teacher education.

In a follow-up survey in 1975 there was a 66 percent response with 52 percent of the colleges and universities reporting operating a limited or full-scale competency/performance-based teacher education program. It further revealed that 31 percent were exploring or developing plans to initiate these programs, while 17 percent reported that they were not presently involved or had no plans to begin competency/performance-based teacher education.[6]

Even though competency/performance-based teacher education has spread in the United States, some confusion still exists regarding the meaning of the movement. The following definitions of competency/performance-based teacher education are offered in an attempt to provide a common basis for consideration:

> In performance-based programs, performance goals are specified and agreed to in rigorous detail in advance of instruction. The student preparing to become a teacher must either be able to demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning or exhibit behaviors known to promote it. He is held accountable not for passing grades but for attaining a given level of competence in performing the essential tasks of teaching: the training institution is itself held accountable for producing able teachers. The emphasis is on demonstrated product or output.[7]

---

[6]American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Bulletin (1976), p. 3.

[7]Stanley Elam, Performance-Based Teacher Education, What Is the State of the Art? (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1971), pp. 1-2.

Elam's Essential Elements of Competencies

Stanley Elam further developed a definition which contains the following essential elements:

1. Competencies mean knowledge, skills, and behaviors that the teacher (or would-be teacher) must have.
2. Competencies are based on what teachers actually do in the classroom.
3. Criteria for determining competence are explicit and public.
4. Performance is the major source of evidence of competence.
5. Rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency (not time, semester hours, or some other standard).[8]

In addition to the confusion relating to the meaning of competency-based teacher education, considerable controversy and misunderstanding also exists about its principles. Indications are that some think competency-based teacher education is merely a new language to describe old ideas, while others feel that it is like the former "normal school" approach with too great an emphasis on "training" and "modularized" instruction and an over-emphasis on measurement. Those in this general category often strongly resist this movement toward competency-based teacher education.[9]

There are other educators, while not being as vocal in their disapproval, who express reservations about the competency-based teacher education movement. Sometimes concern is voiced that costs are prohibitive or that this type of program requires an unreasonable amount of sophistication to individualize as required.

---

[8] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[9] H. D. Schalock, B. Y. Kersh, and J. H. Garrison, From Commitment to Practice: The Oregon College of Education Elementary Teacher Education Program (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976), p. v.

Others indicate that the concepts in competency-based education are sound, but more evidence is needed regarding its merit before widespread adoption.[10]

"Competency-based teacher education has become one of the most extensively debated, strenuously resisted, repeatedly maligned--and widely adopted--ideas in education since the great debate that came with the orbiting of Sputnik."[11]

Nash and Agne[12] have indicated competency-based teacher education is only one response to the preparation of teachers and that it will perpetuate the status quo unless more attention is paid to personal, educational, and social reform desires.

Nash[13] indicated that teacher educators are offering training only in performance skills, when students are demanding training that challenges social and educational values. They relegate behavior modification to social and personal contexts. He raised questions that educators should ask themselves about fetishism in their programs.

Karl Massanari, who is the Associate Director of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Director of the Performance-Based Teacher Education Project, stated:

---

[10]Ibid. [11]Ibid.

[12]Robert J. Nash and Russell M. Agne, "Competency in Teacher Education: A Prop for the Status Quo?" The Journal of Teacher Education 20 (Summer 1971): 147-56.

[13]Robert J. Nash, "Commitment to Competency: The New Fetishism in Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan 52 (December 1970): 240-43.

> Contrary to what some people believe, competency-based teacher education is not a neatly packaged, sharply defined program which training agencies can transplant from some outside source. Hopefully, it will never be that, for it would lose much of its power to generate change. Rather, it is a dynamic and catalytic strategy for educational personnel development and as such consists of little or no predetermined content. Because it is essentially process oriented, its substance in a particular context will emerge from employing that process. . . . As a strategy for educational personnel development, competency-based teacher education is pregnant with potential for generating reforms, intelligent leadership, and adequate support for development and research.[14]

The misunderstanding and controversy which exists regarding competency-based teacher education is in part due to the fact that the movement is fairly recent. Because of the limited number of models established for use in evaluating competency-based teacher education and the fact that many questions remain regarding meaning, use, and value of the system, a need exists to conduct additional research to obtain additional data in this area.

Weber State's Model of Competency-Based Education

Weber State College of Utah has been recognized by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education as developing a model with an individualized, competency-based system of teacher education. Caseel Burke,[15] who is Dean of the School of Education, indicated

---

[14]Karl Massanari, "Competency-Based Teacher Education's Potential for Improving Educational Personnel Development," Journal of Teacher Education 24 (Fall 1973): 244.

[15]J. Bruce Burke, "Curriculum Design," in Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospects, ed. W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972).

that their competency-based system at Weber State is not the result of a rejection of all teacher education practices of the past. That which is appropriate is retained or modified as needed to meet the emerging patterns. He emphasized that the real potential of many teacher education practices is still undiscovered. It was noted that the efforts at Weber State College were undertaken by a faculty that hoped to correct the faults of teacher education. The philosophic framework within which the group chose to function contained the following major elements.

Teacher preparation should:

1. develop in teacher candidates the competencies characteristic of successful teaching,
2. be held accountable for the success of its practices,
3. be academically respectable and appeal to the scholarly,
4. demonstrate a variety of effective teaching models,
5. allow for a variety of student and faculty needs,
6. be based on skills of effective human interaction,
7. place responsibility on the student for his own progress and accomplishments,
8. be readily adaptable to need for change,
9. demonstrate theory in practice,
10. make extensive use of meaningful field experiences,
11. utilize technological aids to learning, and
12. be a shared responsibility of the total educational system.[16]

This Weber State model is cited as an example, but additional models need to be considered to address the question of "What is competency-based teacher education all about?"

---

[16]Ibid., pp. 1-2.

Early Models of Competency-Based Education

Another one of these early models was described by Clegg and Ocha[17] regarding the College of Education, University of Washington's model working with 20 trainee participants in a field-based program. Predefined behavior objectives and their accompanying performance criteria were included in the program integrating theoretical knowledge with practical experience. Courses were taken on a pass-fail basis and seminars were coordinated with concurrent classroom experiences in inner-city, urban, and suburban schools.

In another study, Iris Elfenbein[18] made a comparative description of 17 programs from 13 public and private institutions of higher education. These were selected from throughout the United States and were of varying sizes and varying resources. They were operating performance-based teacher education programs before August 1, 1971.

Elfenbein stated:

> An in-depth examination of each of the systems identified . . . would be useful and fruitful. Information about their development and operation might benefit others intending to develop such programs. Management and cybernation systems, in particular, would benefit from further research. Attempts to optimize the operation of these systems in performance-based teacher education programs would also be useful. . . . Finally, research and development in innovation, itself,

---

[17] Ambrose A. Clegg and Anna Ocha, Evaluation of a Performance-Based Program in Teacher Education: Recommendations for Implementation (University of Washington, College of Education, 1970).

[18] Iris M. Elfenbein, Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs, A Comparative Description (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972).

> should be attempted. Successful application of innovation and change theory to performance-based teacher education programs offers the possibility of further strengthening the philosophical and theoretical base of performance-based teacher education.[19]

With the rapid rise in the use of competency-based systems, it has been noted that considerable controversy and confusion regarding its meaning, use, and value exists and that additional research is still needed to answer lingering questions. Further considerations in this study will focus on a model to be developed for the analysis and evaluation of the administration and operation of a competency-based system and field tested with a specific college.

Identification of the Problem and Statement of Objectives

The major problem undertaken by this study is to develop a model which can be used in the analysis and evaluation of a college's competency/performance-based system.

There are two basic objectives of this study: (1) design a model which can be used to assess a competency-based system and (2) field test the model with a specific institution. Though institutions of higher education differ, they have many common elements and it is expected that the use of the model with a particular college can, with slight modification, also be useful elsewhere.

---

[19]Ibid., pp. 21-22.

Elfenbein's[20] study on the 17 programs of performance-based teacher education indicates that the performance-based teacher education programs were neither well-developed nor problem-free. Nevertheless, they tended to be innovative, made significant advances, and opened up new paths for future exploration.

The need for further research in the area of competency-based teacher education has again been stressed as Elfenbein stated:

> Performance-based training programs offer the alternative of professional training based on competency models designed to provide and enhance a multitude of skills which the profession identifies as desirable to make the professional a competent practitioner and effective change agent within his profession.[21]

An objective of this study is to field test this model with a specific institution of higher education, namely National College of Education of Evanston, Illinois. This is a private liberal arts college, established in 1886, and recognized for its emphasis on training elementary school teachers. To demonstrate the model in this specific fashion is expected to produce data and a model which will be useful to the general education profession.

Functions of the Model

The model will include the functions of initiating, maintaining, and monitoring a competency-based system as stressed in the North Central Association Guidelines. Function refers to the

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid., p. 21.

purposes expressed in activities and services by the central education agency.[22]

The initiating function will focus on the historical review of the early stages of development of the competency-based system. This involves a review of the process of the embryonic stages of development of a competency-based system. Included in the initiating function is a review of reports, minutes of meetings, and other documents used in the initial period to establish the competency-based system.

The maintaining function will consider various measures employed to sustain the competency-based system. Included is a review of the support services provided to sustain and develop the system.

The monitoring function of the model will place the major emphasis on an analysis and evaluation of the competency-based system. A variety of instruments and techniques will be employed in the development and use of the model to assess the competency-based system.

In order to demonstrate the initiating, maintaining, and monitoring functions, this study will attempt to answer these questions:

1. How is the competency-based system defined?
2. Is there an understood and accepted model of competency statements to be used by the faculty?

---

[22]James C. Charlesworth, Contemporary Political Analysis (New York: The Free Press, 1967), pp. 6-7, 72-73.

3. How widely accepted is the competency-based system by the administration, faculty, and the students?
4. Are the students able to pace themselves in an individual manner? Does the use of modules (individualized learning units) of instruction aid in this regard?
5. Is a consistent position on the competency-based system reflected between the public school critic teachers and the college supervisors?
6. Does using the competency-based system contribute in a positive fashion to the teaching profession or does it detract from it?
7. Does the use of the system require minimum paper work?
8. What are the major advantages to using the competency-based system?
9. What are the important impediments to using the competency-based system--i.e., time, effort, evaluation?

Significance of the Study

Competency-based teacher education is expected to make a significant contribution as the teaching profession moves toward accountability and changing accreditation standards. As Houston and Howsam[23] pointed out, in traditional teacher education programs, assessment basically is norm-referenced and summative. Students are assessed with comparative means with other students. The "better" students, usually those "better" in cognitive

---

[23]Houston and Howsam, op. cit., p. 122.

skills rather than demonstrating performance or consequence objectives, being recommended to school systems for employment.

Accountability requires collection of data and assessment of the data. In traditional teacher education this has been difficult. The competency-based system shows promise of being more accountable. Houston and Howsam[24] elaborated that in a competency-based system, assessment usually involves criterion-reference and formative assessment, even though it may also use summative assessment. The competency-based system is criterion-referenced because the student's progress is measured against his own personalized objectives in relation to the criteria, rather than to be measured against the progress of others. Because assessment procedures are used prior to graduation or certification, it is called formative. Then personalized programs are planned on the basis of this information. "An accountable teacher education program is one that demonstrates the proficiency and effectiveness of its clients as teachers. . . . Assessment procedures in competency-based instruction certainly are no less difficult than those in traditional programs."[25]

McDonald drew the conclusion, "No one model adequately describes all the kinds of learning to be mediated by teaching; while there may be performances common among the models, each

---

[24]Ibid. [25]Ibid.

appears to include unique performances or combinations of performances."[26] It follows that each competency-based model has certain distinctions, but research regarding the various models can contribute to the process of accountability in teacher education.

There is a continuous need for additional data regarding the administration and operation of institutions of education and particularly now regarding competency/performance-based teacher education.

Houston and Howsam wrote:

> Competency-based objectives permit more effective evaluation, both of students and of the program. The objectives of traditional programs often are so general that they provide little direction for instruction. Adequate evaluation is impossible. Competency-based programs, on the other hand, identify the objectives, the criteria, the performance indicators, and the criterion levels so clearly for the student that he can assess for himself whether or not the objectives have been met.[27]

Researchers are able to collect data on the competency-based system by working with students and faculty so that programs can be modified or changed to meet the newly determined needs. Any additional data collected will increase the likelihood of wiser decisions being made by the professional educators.

J. Bruce Burke, writing on curriculum design, stated:

> In the competency-based curriculum, the constant is student achievement while variability of instruction, assignments, and time is permitted and even encouraged. The

---

[26]Frederick J. McDonald, "The Rationale for Competency-Based Programs," in Exploring Competency Based Instruction, ed. W. Robert Houston (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974), p. 24.

[27]Houston and Howsam, op. cit., p. 8.

> components necessary to a comprehensive competency-based teacher education program already exist. There are many experimental and developmental programs using the principles of competency-based instruction. However, no single institution as yet has put all the operational pieces together in a working model of the competency-based curriculum. Creative and adequately funded leadership is critical to making competency-based teacher education a reality.[28]

Since the competency-based teacher education movement is of fairly recent origin, there are only limited models in operation. Even fewer models have been designed to evaluate the administration and operation of the competency-based system. This study takes on particular significance as it is expected that the model developed to analyze and evaluate the administration and operation of a competency-based system and used with National College of Education will be useful as a model with other institutions of higher education. Henceforth, THE MODEL will be used to denote "The Model developed to assess and evaluate the administration and operation of a competency-based system and field tested with National College of Education."

Delimitation of Study

National College's system contains some elements of a competency-based system, i.e., stated competencies to be demonstrated by the students. Nevertheless, perhaps a more accurate description of the system is one of "Mastery Learning" with emphasis on stated goals which may or may not have been behaviorally

---

[28] J. Bruce Burke, "Curriculum Design," in Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospects, ed. W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972), p. 34.

stated, and with an unspecified time frame in which to complete the required objectives. This study will describe and assess what exists at National College of Education regarding "Mastery Learning" in the competency-based system of education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED RESEARCH

The review of selected related research on competency-based education will include background and definitions, characteristics, program design, evaluation and assessment, implications, and critiques.

Definition of Competency-Based Education

Competency is usually defined as "adequacy for a task," or as "possession of required knowledge, skills, and abilities." Competency-based instruction usually emphasizes the "ability to do" rather than traditional instruction's emphasis on the "ability to demonstrate knowledge."

Houston and Howsam indicated that two characteristics are essential to the concept of competency-based instruction:

> First, precise learning objectives--defined in behavioral and assessable terms--must be known to learner and teacher alike. Competency-based instruction begins with identification of specific competencies that are the objectives of the learner. The second essential characteristic is accountability. The learner knows that he is expected to demonstrate the specified competencies to the required level and in the agreed-upon manner. He accepts responsibility and expects to be held accountable for meeting the established criteria.[1]

---

[1] W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam, Competency-Based Teacher Education, Progress, Problems and Prospects (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972), p. 4.

An additional review of definitions is included to attempt to establish a common basis for consideration of competency-based instruction. Karl Massanari stated,

> Competency-based teacher education is a dynamic and catalytic strategy for educational personnel development and as such consists of little or no predetermined content. . . . It is pregnant with potential for generating reforms, intelligent leadership, and adequate support for development and research.[2]

Elam added,

> In performance-based programs, performance goals are specified and agreed to in rigorous detail in advance of instruction. . . . The student is held accountable not for passing grades but for attaining a given level of competence in performing the essential tasks of teaching.[3]

As indicated earlier, Stanley Elam's definition also includes:

1. Competencies mean knowledge, skills, and behaviors that the teacher (or would-be teacher) must have.
2. Competencies are based on what the teachers actually do in the classroom.
3. Criteria for determining competence are explicit and public.
4. Performance is the major source of evidence of competence.

---

[2]Karl Massanari, "Competency-Based Teacher Education's Potential for Improving Educational Personnel Development," Journal of Teacher Education 24 (Fall 1973): 244.

[3]Stanley Elam, Performance-Based Teacher Education; What Is the State of the Art? (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1971), pp. 1-2.

5. Rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency (not time, semester hours, or some other standard).[4]

Houston and Howsam's Characteristics of Competency-Based Instruction

Houston and Howsam indicated that competency-based instruction has the following central characteristics:

1. specification of learner objectives in behavioral terms;
2. specification of the means for determining whether performance meets the indicated criterion levels;
3. provision for one or more modes of instruction pertinent to the objectives, through which the learning activities may take place;
4. public sharing of the objectives, criteria, means of assessment, and alternative activities;
5. assessment of the learning experience in terms of competency criteria;
6. placement on the learner of the accountability for meeting the criteria.[5]

The preparation of teachers requires the acquisition of knowledge and the ability to apply it, as well as the development of a repertoire of critical behaviors and skills, elaborated Houston and Howsam.[6] As knowledge, behaviors, and skills can be

---

[4]Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[5]Houston and Howsam, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

[6]Ibid., p. 6.

identified, they become the competency for the teacher education program. They develop the position that the criteria may be applied to assessing performance. The five kinds of criteria which are discussed include cognitive, performance, consequence, affective, and exploratory.

Cognitive objectives relate to knowledge and intellectual skills or abilities that can be demonstrated by students. Examples in this area for teacher education may include knowledge of subject matter to be taught or psychological theories to be taught. Competency is normally assessed through written tests.

Performance objectives require the student to demonstrate an ability to do or perform an activity. Students, for example, may be asked to develop instructional modules.

Consequence objectives normally are expressed in terms of the student's actions. In teacher education a student teacher may be required to change the level of achievement as demonstrated through testing of one of his students. The student teacher must not only know about teaching, but he must be able to produce change in his students.

Affective objectives deal with attitudes, values, beliefs, and relationships. These areas are difficult to measure precisely but need to be considered in teacher education as being integral to other aspects of competency.

Exploratory objectives are sometimes called experience objectives but do not fit in with behavioral objectives because they do not have a definition of desired outcomes. They specify

activities that hold promise for significant learning and require the student to experience the designated activity. Assessment is made in terms of whether the student actually participated in the required activity. In teacher education prospective teachers may be asked to visit and observe students in a special education class.

Houston and Howsam stressed, "The ultimate objective of the competency-based movement is the maximal employment of consequence objectives."[7]

Competency-based teacher education includes explicitness of objectives and assessment criteria. These programs make explicit what the certified teacher is able to do and each teacher must demonstrate ability to meet specific objectives at specific criterion levels. These explicit competency-based objectives permit more effective evaluation. "Competency-based programs identify the objectives, the criteria, the performance indicators, and the criterion levels so clearly, that each student can assess for himself when the objectives have been met," stressed Houston and Howsam.[8]

Competency-based programs promote self-pacing of students through modules or learning experiences. Each student proceeds at the rate which best meets his needs. Depending on his previous experiences, a student may "opt-out" of some aspect of the program for which he has demonstrated competency through the use of pre-assessment procedures. Effective competency-based teacher education

---

[7]Ibid., pp. 6-7. [8]Ibid., p. 7.

programs will employ an extensive array of instructional strategies according to Houston and Howsam.[9] They indicated that modules provide for alternatives from which the learner may choose. These choices may include teacher presentation, a computer-based program, a slide-tape presentation, or other alternatives. Sometimes these activities include the entire class, or in subgroups of the class, while at other times this individualization of program is in isolation.

Houston and Howsam wrote:

> In a competency-based program, the emphasis is placed on exit rather than entrance requirements. With this approach the possibility is opened for admitting a wider variety of persons to the group entering the program. Continual assessment of progress, optional choices of learning experiences, and performance criteria within the program make entrance requirements far less crucial than they are in traditional programs. Many who previously would have been precluded from entrance by their cultural development or by their previous educational choices and performance safely can be admitted to a competency-based program. Many of these students may be expected to enter and to complete successfully such a program. The result can be a wholesome diversity of backgrounds in the teaching profession.[10]

Johnson's Comparison of Competency-Based and Traditional Education

Charles Johnson made a comparison between competency-based and traditional educational practices. This comparison is directed to practitioners:[11]

---

[9]Ibid., p. 9. [10]Ibid.

[11]Charles E. Johnson, "Competency-Based and Traditional Education Practices Compared," Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Winter 1974): 355-56.

Characteristics of CBE Programs	Characteristics of Traditional Education Programs
1. The main indicator of student achievement is ability to do the job effectively and efficiently.	1. The main indicators of student achievement are knowledge of the subject and ability to do the job effectively and efficiently.
2. Once a student has demonstrated ability to do the job, his or her preparation is complete. Time is not a factor. Some students finish early, others late.	2. Students operate within specified time limits, such as academic years, semesters, or quarters. Class hour requirements are generally adhered to.
3. The criterion of success is demonstration of ability to do the job. Mastery criteria are used to determine how well students perform. These criteria must be met for students to be considered competent.	3. The criteria of success are letter grades which indicate the extent to which the student knows the required subject matter.
4. Entrance requirements are not of paramount concern. Students start where they are. If they are not ready, they are helped to become ready.	4. Entrance requirements are important concerns. Students who are not ready cannot be admitted.
5. Flexible scheduling of learning activities is essential to provide for individual differences among students. This allows for year-around educational opportunities and numerous possible times for enrollment.	5. Students are scheduled for instruction into fairly rigid blocks of time. The academic year and infrequent mass registration are standard practices.
6. There are no fixed rules as to how, when, or where learning is to be accomplished.	6. On-campus classroom teaching is the most common approach to instruction. Required lengthy on-campus attendance is standard practice.

7. Opportunities are provided to acquire competencies in practical field or on-the-job experiences.	7. Practical field experiences are limited.
8. Learnings (competencies) are presented in small learning units or modules, combinations of which are designed to help students acquire full competence.	8. Learnings (subject matter) are organized into courses representing academic time units.
9. Provision is made for differences among students in their styles of learning by providing them with various alternate paths for acquiring competence.	9. Lecture-discussion is the most common mode of presentation, supplemented by seminars, laboratory activities, and limited field experiences. Little attention is given to student style of learning.
10. The criterion for a "good" instructor is the extent to which he or she is effective and efficient in helping students acquire the competencies they are seeking.	10. The criterion for a "good" instructor is how much he or she knows about the subject and how well it is presented.

Dodl and Schalock's Rationale for Competency-Based Education

Dodl and Schalock, in considering a rationale for competency-based teacher education, stated:

> As the teaching profession moves toward accountability, the point of view represented by a competency based approach assumes the following:
> 1. Rigorous criteria for knowing, as well as systematic specification of what is to be known (knowledge), must be a part of teacher education.
> 2. Knowing and the ability to apply what is known (performance) are two different matters.
> 3. The ability to attain specified objectives with learners (product) represents still another kind of competency that will be required of teacher candidates.
> 4. The criteria for assessing what a prospective teacher can do (performance) should be as rigorous, as systematically derived, and as explicitly stated as the criteria for

assessing either what he knows (knowledge) or what he can achieve in learners (product).
5. Assessments of knowledge, performance, and product must be described and made systematically.
6. Only when a prospective teacher has the appropriate knowledge, can perform in a stipulated manner, and can produce anticipated results with learners, will he meet competency based requirements.[12]

Dodl and Schalock elaborated their position by indicating that using product-based criteria to assess teacher competency has certain definite advantages.

1. A product oriented basis for competency assessment approximates a one-to-one relationship between an initial or laboratory assessment and its achievement in real teaching.
2. It represents or provides an absolute criterion of teaching effectiveness and thereby meets the ultimate test of accountability.
3. It accommodates individual differences in teaching preferences or styles by allowing for wide variation in the means of reaching a given outcome, i.e., teaching behaviors. At the same time, however, it holds all teachers accountable for being able to bring about given classes of outcomes.
4. It allows for the fact that we are not yet sure what teaching behaviors cause specific outcomes in pupils, but it does require that effective behaviors and/or instructional programs be identified and used.
5. It forces the entire educational system (not just the teacher education program) to be clear about the goals or objectives of education.
6. It will take much of the guesswork out of hiring new teachers, since each teacher will have a dossier that summarizes in detail what he can do or cannot do when he receives certification.[13]

In considering the historical context which has led to performance-based teacher education, Stanley Elam[14] indicated

---

[12]Norman R. Dodl and H. Del Schalock, "Competency-Based Teacher Preparation," in Competency-Based Teacher Education, ed. Dan W. Anderson et al. (Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1973), pp. 46-47.

[13]Ibid., p. 48.

[14]Elam, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

that probably the roots of the movement lie in general societal conditions and the institutional responses to them characteristic of the 1960's. He made reference to the increasing governmental attention to racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic minority needs, with particular emphasis as related to educational needs. He mentioned the claim that traditional teacher education programs were not producing people equipped to teach minority group young people effectively has pointed directly to the need for reform in teacher education. In addition is the claim of minority group youths that there should be alternative routes to professional status, resulting in serious questions being raised about the suitability of generally recognized teacher education programs.

Following the Russian Sputnik, the federal role in education was legitimized and federal monies became available for a variety of exploratory and experimental programs including the United States Office of Education Models Ten Project (referred to earlier), and investigations of performance-based certification by state departments of education.

Technological developments have made available new resources for teaching and learning. New concepts of management (e.g., the systems approach) were pioneered by government and industry. In education they were used in planning, design, and operation of more efficient, product-oriented programs.[15]

"Confronted with the ultimate question of the meaning of life in American society, youths have pressed for greater relevance

---

[15]Ibid., p. 3.

in their education and a voice in determining what its goals should be. Thus performance-based teacher education usually includes a means of sharing decision-making power," wrote Elam.[16]

Perhaps because of the fact that traditionally teacher-preparing institutions have been operated at quite some distance from the schools, teacher preparation has tended to get out of date. Performance-based teacher education is an effort to meet the challenge of keeping the training of teachers relevant.

Having considered the background and definitions of competency/performance-based teacher education in the earlier sections of this chapter on related research, consideration shall now focus on the aspects of competency/performance-based teacher education. This shall include a consideration of program design, evaluation and assessment, implications, and critiques of competency/performance-based teacher education.

There is a need for program design in competency/performance-based teacher education. Most preparation programs in teacher education are characterized by their lack of unified, cohesive, and directed efforts. Usually there is a lack of interrelatedness as individual faculty members in various departments go their separate ways. Often the so-called "curriculum" is filled with contradictions, unexplained or undefined theories, and very little translation of theory into viable practice. Rarely can this practice be used to improve the student or the program. Most of this teaching

---

[16]Ibid., p. 4.

relies on intuition with little distinct discipline of teacher education.

University of Houston's Competency-Based Teacher Education Program

Houston and Jones described a distinct program at the University of Houston. They indicated that five propositions regarding the role of the teacher were specified and were the basis for the competencies, objectives, materials, and the design of the evaluation procedures.

The first proposition specified that the teacher was expected to be a liberally educated person with a broad background in his teaching field.

The second proposition specified that the teacher reflects in his actions that he is a student of human behavior. Teachers are expected to demonstrate the full range of competencies derived from a general awareness of the behavioral sciences. These understandings are translated into a realistic understanding of self and others. The premise stated that it is believed that teachers who better understand themselves and others are likely to be more effective teachers.

The third proposition specified that the teacher was expected to make decisions on a rational basis. It is expected that prospective teachers will be able to analyze important functions of their roles and the consequences of their actions. Goals are stated, strategies for achieving the goals are planned,

plans to achieve the goals are implemented, and the efforts are evaluated.

The fourth proposition specified that the teacher is expected to be able to use various appropriate communication and instructional strategies.

The fifth proposition specified that the teacher is expected to exhibit behavior which reflects professionalism. Included is the ability to work closely with others to solve problems and assess themselves.

The following competencies were generated from the five propositions.

1. Diagnoses the learner's emotional, social, physical, and intellectual needs. . . .
2. Identifies and/or specifies instructional goals and objectives based on learner needs. . . .
3. Designs instruction appropriate to goals and objectives. . . .
4. Implements instruction that is consistent with plan. . . .
5. Designs and implements evaluation procedures which focus on learner achievement and instructional effectiveness. . . .
6. Integrates into instruction the cultural backgrounds of students. . . .
7. Demonstrates a repertoire of instructional models and teaching skills appropriate to specified objectives and to particular learners. . . .
8. Promotes effective patterns of classroom communication. . . .
9. Uses resources appropriate to instructional objectives. . . .
10. Monitors processes and outcomes during instruction and modifies instruction on basis of feedback. . . .
11. Demonstrates an adequate knowledge of the subject matter which she/he is preparing to teach. . . .
12. Uses organizational and management skills to facilitate and maintain social, emotional, physical, and intellectual growth of learners. . . .
13. Identifies and reacts with sensitivity to the needs and feelings of self and others. . . .
14. Works effectively as a member of a professional team. . . .
15. Analyzes professional effectiveness and continually strives to increase effectiveness. . . .

> As the reader glances through the competencies described above the question must come to mind: "Isn't this what all teacher education efforts are designed to focus on? Don't all effective teachers perform these global goals?" The answer, of course, is yes and effective teachers demonstrate these competencies in their own unique ways.
>
> CBTE proponents, however, hold prospective teachers accountable for demonstrating minimal competence prior to certification. . . . In competency-based efforts the decision becomes: what competencies do I expect of the teacher? Toward this end, CBTE proponents note an important principle--prospective teachers are held accountable for the demonstration of competencies, not for the acquisition of competencies. In other words, the student is expected to demonstrate competence, and how he achieves this competence is up to him. The instructor's role is facilitation--helping students identify means to achieve or increase competencies.[17]

In competency/performance-based teacher education the prospective teachers are held accountable for demonstrating their competence prior to certification. This is in contrast with the traditional teacher education systems where the instructor directs the student through a range of experiences. The prospective teacher under the competency-based system may acquire his competence through any measure he may deem to be of value. The teacher model is one of facilitator, rather than as merely a dispenser of knowledge.

Bruce Joyce et al. wrote regarding the model of a teacher,

> Present knowledge does not raise us above the level of a complex hypothesis. Nor can we know before hand that the model will work; it cannot be tested until much of the program has been developed and implemented. What reliable knowledge we have resides in fairly small units--i.e., models of teaching which can serve specific purposes. Our model of the teacher has to be extrapolated from studying these small units, combined with judgments about other characteristics essential

---

[17] W. Robert Houston and Howard L. Jones, Three Views of Competency-Based Education: II University of Houston (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundtion, 1974), pp. 17-18.

> to defining teaching tasks. Then the program elements have to be created and teachers trained with them before testing can begin.[18]

Kay[19] considered what competencies should be included in a competency/performance-based teacher education program, and indicated that there is no single route that is best under all circumstances for competency identification. She indicated that the theoretical approaches often result in conceptually unified programs, but may not be too useful in the real world. Task analysis procedures run the risk of being so close to reality that new knowledge about teaching and learning is unusual. Course conversion methods appear to be the most expedient approach to identifying teaching competencies, but can result in program fragmentation and may not result in producing hypotheses for continuing research. She advocated the eclectic approach with a continuing process of program evaluation and competency validation research.

Burns[20] assessed the role and function of objectives in his work on competency-based teacher education. He considered the objectives' desirability, practicability, source, nature, standardization, and teacher accountability. He also discussed the

---

[18]Bruce R. Joyce, Jonas F. Soltis, and Marcia Weil, Performance-Based Teacher Education Design Alternatives: The Concept of Unity (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974), p. 6.

[19]Patricia M. Kay, What Competencies Should Be Included in a C/PBTE Program? (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1975), pp. 11-12.

[20]Richard W. Burns, "The Central Notion: Explicit Objectives," in Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospects, ed. W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972), pp. 17-33.

problems that exist in the development and use of objectives, the writing of objectives, criteria for grading, constraints, and affective objectives. Burns concluded, "that while competency-based teacher education is at present too young to be judged a success, it certainly cannot be judged a failure."[21]

Burke, writing on curriculum design in competency-based teacher education, described competency-based curricula, considered learning goals, issues and practical problems of competency-based instruction, and concluded with, "No single institution has put all operation pieces into a working model, but the movement is becoming national."[22]

McNeil and Popham elaborated on assessment of teacher competency by developing the following list of six attributes for discriminating among criterion measures:[23]

1. Differentiates among teachers--This might include such items as under what condition will teacher A perform best? This can assess variance in teacher skills.
2. Assesses learner growth--Emphasis is on the results rather than on the process of teaching.

---

[21]Ibid., p. 33.

[22]J. Bruce Burke, "Curriculum Design," in Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospects, ed. W. Robert Howsam (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972), p. 55.

[23]John D. McNeil and W. James Popham, "The Assessment of Teacher Competency," in Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. Robert M. W. Travers (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1975), pp. 218-44.

3. Yields data uncontaminated by required inferences--Stresses the acquisition of data with a minimum of extrapolation on the part of the user.
4. Adapts to teacher's goal preference--Allows for adaptability or adjustment to goal preferences on the part of the teacher.
5. Presents equivalent stimulus situations--Measures which could produce results not easily discounted because certain teachers were at a disadvantage due to their situations.
6. Contains heuristic data categories--Provides for the gathering of information or interpretations which illuminate the nature of the instructional tactics.

These measures can be useful by pre-service and in-service supervisors in assessing teacher competency.

Turner's Levels of Criteria for Teacher Education

Richard Turner has developed six levels of criteria which he claimed are applicable to all teacher education programs which are performance and data based as well as those programs which are oriented toward pupil outcomes.[24]

Criterion Level 1--Highest Level--Normally conducted over a two-year period.

---

[24]Richard L. Turner, "Rationale for Competency-Based Teacher Education and Certification," in The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Report, ed. Benjamin Rosner (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), pp. 3-23.

Classify teacher behaviors in both affective and cognitive domain.

Systematic analysis of outcomes achieved by the pupils. This level used for permanent certification and teacher education feedback.

Criterion Level 2--Identical to Level 1 except that a shorter performance period is involved.

This level used for initial certification.

Criterion Level 3--Pupil performance data are eliminated.

This level is used for provisional certification of teachers and in teacher education programs.

This is the most appropriate level for accountability in teacher education. This provides evidence for competency-based certification.

Criterion Level 4--Teaching context and the teacher behavior observed are restricted. The context might be a typical micro-teaching context before a group of students. This level provides feedback to the student regarding his progress as well as to the teacher education program regarding some particular aspect of their program.

Criterion Level 5--This level differs from Level 4 in that the teacher need not perform before live students. He must be able to show at least one teaching skill, e.g., probing. Helpful information derived regarding training materials or modules.

Criterion Level 6--The teacher need not engage in a performance, but merely show that he understands some behavior, concept, or principle germane to teaching. The utility of this level is that it may provide data regarding a particular component of the teacher education program.

Although Criterion Level 3 carries the major weight in competency-based teacher education, Criterion Level 1 is used for assessing the validity of the competencies which comprise the teacher education curriculum.

As one considers competency/performance-based teacher education it becomes apparent that assessment lies at the heart of this movement. Goals of instruction must be so stated that they can be assessed; throughout the instructional process the student's performance must be assessed and reassessed; and the evidence obtained must be used to evaluate the accomplishments of the learner and the efficacy of the system.

Assessment is usually difficult and threatening and in many competency-based programs is very limited or neglected. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education[25] has indicated that seldom has assessment been carried on with sufficient rigor to test the basic hypotheses underlying the PBTE approach. The committee has

---

[25]AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations, pp. 18-40.

stressed the position that any effort to develop a performance-based teacher education program should place major emphasis on developing and applying appropriate techniques of assessment. They further recommended that persons skilled in assessment collaborate with those establishing the programs.

The committee further recommended that plans be developed before a program begins for assessing the on-going program to assure that student needs are being met and to provide data for the revision of the program.

> The Committee recognizes that the evaluation system in any new program is likely to represent simply a first approximation; it will be expected to evolve through incremental improvements. But before the program is launched, there should at least be a basic rationale, a recognized commitment to assessment, agreement on initial sets of materials and techniques to be used, and provision for suitable record keeping. . . . As the program develops, these instruments, techniques, and procedures should be sharpened, and budgetary and staff arrangements should be effected to make possible studies relating evidence obtained to the variables in the program judged to be most significant. . . .[26]

Houston's Criteria for Assessing Competency-Based Programs

A further consideration of the criteria of assessment has been developed by Houston et al.[27] in which they have compiled a list of criteria for assessing the degree to which professional preparation programs are competency based. They indicated that

---

[26] Ibid., p. 29.

[27] W. Robert Houston, J. Bruce Burke, Charles E. Johnson, and John H. Hansen, "Criteria for Describing and Assessing Competency Based Programs," in Competency Assessment, Research and Evaluation, ed. W. Robert Houston (Albany, New York: Multi-State Consortium on Performance Based Teacher Education, 1974), pp. 168-71.

this effort represents the third major revision following considerable debate by a wide range of persons. The list is included because of its relevance.

Criteria for Assessing the Degree to Which
Professional Preparation Programs
Are Competency Based

Competency Specifications

1. Competency statements are specified and revised based upon an analysis of job definition and a theoretical formulation of professional responsibilities.

2. Competency statements 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.

3. Competency statements facilitate criterion-referenced assessment.

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

5. Competencies are specified and made public prior to instruction.

6. Learners completing the CBE program demonstrate a wide range of competency profiles.

Instruction

7. The instructional program is derived from and linked to specified competencies.

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

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

10. Learner progress is determined by demonstrated competency.

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

12. Instructional specifications are reviewed and revised based on learner feedback data.

Assessment

13. Competency measures are validly related to competency statements.

14. Competency measures are specific, realistic, and sensitive to nuance.

    14.1 Procedures for measuring competency demonstration assure quality and consistency.

    14.2 Competency measures allow for the influence of setting variables upon performance.

15. Competency measures discriminate on the basis of standards set for competency demonstration.

16. Data provided by competency measures are manageable and useful in decision making.

17. Assessment procedures and criteria are described and made public prior to instruction.

Governance and Management

18. Statements of policy exist that dictate in broad outline the intended structure, content, operation and resource base of the program, including the teaching competencies to be demonstrated for exit from the program.

19. Formally recognized procedures and mechanisms exist for arriving at policy decisions.

    19.1 A formally recognized policy making (governing) body exists for the program.

    19.2 All institutions, agencies, organizations, and groups participating in the program are represented in policy decisions that affect the program.

    19.3 Policy decisions are supported by, and made after consideration of, data on program effectiveness and resources required.

20. Management functions, responsibilities, procedures, and mechanisms are clearly defined and made explicit.

    20.1 Management decisions reflect state program philosophy and policy.

    20.2 The identified professional with responsibility for decision has authority and resources to implement the decision.

20.3 Program operations are designed to model the characteristics desired of schools and classrooms in which program graduates will teach.

20.3a Job definitions, staff selections, and responsibility assignments are linked to the management functions that exist.

20.4 Formally recognized procedures and mechanisms exist for arriving at the various levels of program management decisions.

Staff Development

21. Program staff attempt to model the attitudes and behaviors desired of students in the program.

22. Provisions are made for staff orientation, assessment, and improvement.

23. Staff development programs are based upon and engaged in after consideration of data on staff performance.

Total Program

24. Research and dissemination activities are an integral part of the total instructional system.

24.1 A research strategy for the validation and revision of program components exists and is operational.

24.2 A data-based management system is operational.

24.3 Procedures for systematic use of available data exist.

25. Institutional flexibility is sufficient for all aspects of the program.

25.1 Reward structure in the institution supports CBTE roles and requirements.

25.2 Financial structure (monies and other resources) in the system supports collaborative arrangements necessary for the program.

25.3 Course, grading, and program revision procedures support the tentativeness necessary to implement the program.

26. The program is planned and operated as a totally unified, integrated system.

Implications

The next consideration in this chapter on related research pertains to implications of competency/performance-based teacher education. What is its potential for educational improvements and also educational problems?

Karl Massanari, as indicated earlier, has stated that "As a strategy for educational personnel development, competency-based teacher education is pregnant with potential for generating reforms, intelligent leadership, and adequate support for development and research."[28]

Whenever plans call for change, usually problems need to be overcome. This is true in competency-based teacher education as certain questions need to be answered. Who decides what about teacher education? Who determines the desired competencies needed and how they are to be assessed? How does one assess teaching behavior? How does one assess the effect of teaching behavior on pupil learning? How does one manage a competency-based teacher education program with all of its complexities? How does one obtain the necessary support for developmental activities?

Karl Massanari stressed the various problems of competency-based teacher education as challenges to be met. He indicated forces which push educators to keep developing new kinds of training programs. These include asking the right questions at the right

---

[28]Karl Massanari, "CBTE's Potential for Improving Educational Personnel Development," Journal of Teacher Education 24 (Fall 1973): 244.

time, defining professional roles, designing educational personnel development programs for specific roles, relating pre-service preparation programs more closely to schools, explicating of program objectives which are made public, providing instruction and experiences which will facilitate the desired objectives, personalization of instruction, instructing to facilitate learning, developing new training materials and new management systems, applying appropriate assessment techniques, conducting research, broadening the decision-making base, accountability, systematic change strategy to keep training programs responsive to societal needs.[29]

Massanari wrote,

> Some people believe that CBTE is just another development which will fade away into the oblivion of educational faddism. On the other hand, some of us believe that CBTE--given intelligent leadership and adequate development and research support--can generate the kinds of reform so long sought and now so urgently needed.[30]

Jones discussed the progress being made in implementation of competency-based teacher education programs as well as problems which have arisen in relation to its implementation. The author stated that the real strength of the competency-based effort is relationship to the total program rather than on course-by-course development. He stressed the need to adapt to programs rather than just to adopt programs.[31]

---

[29]Ibid., pp. 244-46. [30]Ibid., p. 247.

[31]Howard L. Lones, "Implementation of Programs," in Competency Based Teacher Education, ed. W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972), pp. 102-42.

As cited earlier, Dr. Rolf W. Larson, Executive Director of NCATE, indicated the need for data and material on competency-based teacher education which NCATE can use for accreditation. In his paper Dr. Larson discussed our basic problems of accreditation. The first is to allow for institutional differences; the second, the need to base decisions on substance rather than on form; the third, the need to determine the qualifications of the graduate; and, last, the need to determine the focus or function of accreditation.[32] He also discussed standards used as minimal or for improvement of programs.

Critiques

The final section of this review of related research on competency-based teacher education will focus on critiques of competency/performance-based teacher education and teacher organizations' reaction to the movement. Criticism of PBTE can be useful by aiding understanding and providing a view from a different perspective.

Harry Broudy wrote a critique of performance-based teacher education. He stressed the need for theory in performance-based teacher education. He stated that, "if PBTE insists that it does

---

[32]Rolf W. Larson, Accreditation Problems and the Promise of PBTE (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1974).

not exclude theory from its design, it has to make provisions for the study of theory as theory somewhere in the total program."[33]

Sandra Feldman presented a unionist's view of competency-based education:

> We believe that in education we ought to stop reinventing the wheel, stop bringing in one tired "innovation" after another. For once, at least, we ought to base a fundamental change on substantive proven knowledge instead of on public relations and guesswork.
>
> We believe that experienced teachers have an important contribution to make, and if they are truly involved, in a nonthreatening way and with the time and conditions provided for, they will be telling us not just what to do for prospective teachers, but what kind of retraining and help they themselves need. Experienced teachers and the representatives of teachers must be involved in this if it is to succeed.[34]

Summary

This review of selected related research on performance/competency-based teacher education has included sections on background and definitions, program design, evaluation and assessment, implications, and critiques. These studies considered have contributed background material and information.

The next chapter will describe the procedures used to establish the model developed for the analysis and evaluation of the administration and operation of a competency-based system and field tested with National College of Education.

---

[33]Harry S. Broudy, A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972), p. 11.

[34]Sandra Feldman, "Performance-Based Certification: A Teacher Unionist's View," in Exploring Competency-Based Education, ed. W. Robert Houston (Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974), p. 99.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to (1) describe the procedures used to develop the initiating, maintaining, and monitoring functions of THE MODEL; and (2) describe the procedures used to field test THE MODEL with National College of Education.

In order to gain an understanding of the functions of the proposed model, a review of the historical development of competency-based education has been conducted by reviewing selected related research. This review has provided information to help develop THE MODEL for use with National College.

The initiating function of THE MODEL includes the measures taken to establish a competency-based system. The maintaining function of THE MODEL includes the measures used to sustain or support a competency-based system. The monitoring function of THE MODEL emphasizes the measures used to assess and evaluate a system. This study focuses on the monitoring function of THE MODEL. Consideration of the initiating function and the maintaining function is provided by reviewing the developmental process of the competency-based system of National College of Education. The monitoring function of THE MODEL included various measures to assess and evaluate the competency-based system at National College.

Historical Review of National College

A brief historical review of National College of Education is offered to provide perspective for this study. "National College of Education, a private college, is committed to the central purpose of preparing men and women who are well qualified to guide the development of children and to offer leadership and service in education and related fields."[1]

The college was founded in 1886 to meet the demand for teachers in the developing kindergarten classes in Chicago. Out of this effort emerged a formalized curriculum for the preparation of kindergarten teachers and the establishment of the Chicago Kindergarten College, later to be named National Kindergarten College.

The movement of the campus in the 1920's from South Chicago to Evanston permitted further development of the curriculum to include preparation of teachers for nursery, kindergarten, and grades one through eight of the elementary school. In keeping with the then current trends, the college was reincorporated in 1930 as National College of Education with a four-year curriculum and the right to grant the Bachelor of Education degree.

The Baker Demonstration School, formerly called The Children's School, was founded in 1918. A graduate program was launched with emphasis upon the role of the master teacher in "the elementary classroom" leading to a Master's in Education degree in 1952.

---

[1]Official Philosophy of National College of Education adopted by the Board of Trustees of National College in October, 1975.

The college's program for training early childhood teachers has always included liberal arts. In 1965, a liberal arts curriculum was formalized (Appendix A) and the college now confers Bachelor of Arts degrees on its undergraduates.

In 1969-1970 the faculty abandoned the traditional letter grade system of student evaluation in the undergraduate program and substituted the currently used competency-based system of evaluation.

The 1970's brought continual change with the recognition and formal naming of the Foster G. McGaw Graduate School and the acquisition in the Chicago Loop of the facilities of Pestalozzi-Frobel Teacher's College as National's Urban Center.

National College of Education is accredited by the North Central Association, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and the Illinois Department of Education. In addition, National College has received special state entitlements for its designated programs in Early Childhood, Library Science and Instructional Media, Special Education, and Administration and Supervision at the Master's degree level.

"National College of Education continues its dedication to the founding purpose of educating early childhood and elementary school teachers."[2]

The Continuing Search for Criteria

The consideration of the initiating function of the competency-based system at National College included a review of

---

[2]National College of Education Undergraduate Bulletin, 1976-1977, p. 5.

various college documents, minutes of college meetings, and materials distributed by the Dean of Instruction and more recently called the Vice-President for Academic Affairs at the college.

In his March 2, 1967, bulletin, "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean," Dr. Troyer shared with the faculty thoughts from H. S. Broudy's address on "The Continuing Search for Criteria," presented at the AACTE meeting in February, 1967. The following statements from the bulletin are pertinent to the initiating function of National College of Education's Competency-Based System, with the entire bulletin included in Appendix B_1.

> The truth inherent in the quality-of-product criterion is that we must search not only for criteria or signs of good teaching but also for what they presuppose in the way of training and institutional arrangements to provide that training. We should, ideally, be able to relate training to success behavior.
>
> I doubt that we are ready, even after hundreds of researches, to apply the method of the single variable to this problem. Systems analysis, on the face of it, is more promising because it takes account of many variables, and one can--if one likes--regard a classroom as a social system. Yet I am not sure that we are even ready to be dogmatic about which dozen variables really delineate the system. We need as a preliminary to do a more modest analysis--a kind of crude phenomenological description of what we do and mean when we judge a teacher in a classroom. For we can, I believe, identify good teaching and make highly valid judgments within our field of expertness, even though we cannot generalize the basis of that judgment into a formula. . . .
>
> How does one qualify as an expert in so amorphous and complex an enterprise as teacher competence? I submit that expertise here comes about as it does in any field. First, one specializes within a limited domain; second, he and his peers arrive in time at certain agreed upon distinctions within the domain; third, they build up models of "good" within each domain; fourth, they are familiar with virtually the whole range of samples within the domain; fifth, they know the rules for applying their criteria, and finally, they often share with their peers a theory or theories as to why the rules are applicable. Please consider that complete agreement among experts is not a necessary condition for expertise, but

> the possibility of distinguishing an expert from the layman is. . . .
>
> Criteria need only meet the criterion of being usable by experts, i.e., those men and women who carry in their heads models by which they scale what they observe. I think it is neither unreasonable nor impracticable to send in experts in foundational studies, the content of a subject-matter area, the theory of teaching, and teaching techniques to examine an institution's teacher-training operation and resources, human and otherwise. In a remarkably short time the specialist can give an estimate that he can defend and explain. Another expert may disagree with him, but not so often as is sometimes asserted. The important point is that it will be an enlightened disagreement which upon explication is often converted into qualified agreement. It is perhaps not too extravagant to say that in areas where there are no experts, i.e., no acknowledged specialists, evaluation starts more arguments than it settles, and teacher-training programs are no exception. . . . Given appropriate specialists, evaluations of program, resources, faculty, and commitment loses much of its unwieldiness and mystique. Lacking specialists no amount of careful listing of objectives and specifications will yield anything more than voluminous and spongy claims and counterclaims. . . .
>
> So the search for criteria must go on, but it had better be undertaken by those who have examined their commitment to teacher preparation. The search for criteria is complex and difficult enough when we are clear and honest with ourselves; it becomes a witless kind of masochism when we lacerate ourselves by fantasies and rationalizations that have no basis in the social reality of today or as we envision it for the generation to come. It is perhaps not too much to say that our search for criteria is impeded far less by their elusiveness than by a vague and persistent dread of finding them.[3]

It is interesting to note that in order to help bring about change, ideas pertaining to the possibility and desirability of change were presented to the faculty in a fashion that these ideas, like seeds, could germinate and mature.

---

[3]Harry S. Broudy, "The Continuing Search for Criteria," address presented at the February, 1967, AACTE meeting, included by Dean Lewis Troyer, "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean," National College of Education Bulletin (March 1967): 5,8-9,11.

These ideas on nongrading and teaching competency were presented in written form to the faculty in a rather nonthreatening fashion from the Dean. Some faculty members probably did not read the material but others started to discuss the ideas presented with their colleagues, and some began to interact with the Dean regarding the ideas generated. The process was slow, but faculty members were able to refine their thinking, bounce some of their ideas off the students to get their reaction and help, and have input into the embryonic process of developing the competency-based system.

Additional material was presented in "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean" in Volume 10, Number 6 on "Critical Thinking in Courses" by Robert H. Ennis, "The Evidence of Good Teaching" by Winslow R. Hatch, and "Clue Words in Stating Objectives" by Paul E. Blackwood and included in Appendix B_2.

The Council on Academic Standards, responsible to set and monitor academic standards, had been considering the nongraded competency-based system for several months and recommended that the faculty seriously consider adopting the competency-based system of evaluation.

Copies of B. S. Bloom's Taxonomies of Educational Objectives were provided through the Faculty Bulletin to help the faculty in their thinking and development regarding the nongraded competency-based system.

Items Concerning Nongrading Proposal

In May of 1969 the Dean of Instruction distributed a paper to all faculty members on "Items Concerning Nongrading Proposal" and included in Appendix B_3. Quotations are included from the Dean of Instruction to convey to the reader some of the planning and process which was used at National College to initiate the competency-based system.

> To some extent the implementation of the Proposal must be considered an experiment, an adventure into unknown territory, and if we find the going just too rough for our strength and resources, we shall, of course, retreat. I would hope that the spector of possible problems to be faced would not, however, cause us to lose heart and accept defeat before we had even started on the journey. From some experience, I know that one is hardly ever aware of the resources available in the world until one has committed himself to some undertaking that calls them forth. If our objective is a worthy one, the means to its accomplishment probably are available. . . .
>
> The Proposal also implies certain things with regard to planning and conducting of courses. One of these certainly has to do with the identification of the competencies themselves. The student will need to know at the beginning of the course specifically what is expected. Theoretically the competencies should parallel or coincide with the stated objectives of the course. On this point it is not necessary to get "hung up" on a strict behaviorism. As a matter of fact, going through some visible motions (jumping through prescribed hoops) may not indicate significant competencies at all unless the particular action can be taken as symbolic of a tendency, attitude, habit, developed capability (call it what you will) with some sustaining power across a period of time and in a variety of situations. If competency means a capability of doing something, there must be some evidence of persistence. . . .
>
> Assuming the faculty makes the decision to adopt the proposal on nongrading, it is the intention of the Academic Affairs office to give the time, effort, and resources to assist all departments in the "tooling-up" job for implementation of the proposal. All of us are much nearer that objective than we may realize. . . .
>
> Undoubtedly, we shall continue for some time, even after starting the new plan, to have questions and problems; we could hardly expect otherwise. I am afraid that postponing the decisive action will yield few if any real values, since

> later rather than sooner the same start will have to be made. While there is, as all of the above clearly recognizes, work to be done yet in preparation, there should be much strength obtained from going forward together as a united group, with resolution to help each other meet the challenge, and the strength of morale that comes from the knowledge that we are all equally involved. I believe the faculty as a whole should vote now to get on with the job. I pledge the resources and leadership of my office, and ask the cooperation of all, to translate this belief and action into successful pioneer accomplishment.[4]

Following this presentation, the Council on Academic Standards made a formal proposal to the faculty that National College move to the nontraditional grading system for the 1969-1970 academic year. The majority of the faculty voted in favor of the shift to the nongraded competency-based system for the 1969-1970 academic year.

A letter written to the parents of National College of Education students from the Dean of Instruction is included in Appendix B_4. This letter further illustrates the proposed system as well as showing the communication process from the College to the parents as part of the initiating function of the competency-based system. Emphasis in the letter is on the value of the change for students within the new system, stressing high standards of learning and accomplishment for each individual. This requires demonstrated mastery of competencies by each individual student, guided by faculty in a more personal fashion.

---

[4]Lewis Troyer, "Items Concerning Non-Grading Proposal," Bulletin: National College of Education (May 27, 1969): 1-5.

The Initiating Function at National College

In November, 1969, Dr. Lewis Troyer, Dean of Instruction, shared with the faculty his article entitled, "Grades Have Gone: What Then?" In the article Dr. Troyer described in detail the function of initiating the competency-based system at National College of Education. The article is included in Appendix C. Parts of this article are quoted here as background information for the initiating function.

> With the advent of the 1969-1970 academic year National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois, abandoned the traditional grading system "lock, stock and barrel." This significant change was made essentially because the faculty of the college, after careful study, became convinced that the so-called letter-grade pattern functioned to subvert rather than to support the goals of the curriculum for both the student and the institution. A new and hopefully more effective scheme of evaluation based on the designation and demonstration of specific sets of competencies appropriate to given courses and levels of learning was developed, subjected to scrutiny by both faculty and students, and is currently undergoing its second trial year. . . .
>
> The measurement specialist would classify this pattern as "criterion-referenced" rather than "norm-referenced." It is grounded on the assumption that students are unique human beings and that all of them--or very nearly all--can develop adequacy and effectiveness if given proper instruction and time to grow (or learn), and if the self-esteem of each is not destroyed in insidious comparison with others supposedly better, smarter or faster. The object is to maximize the potential of all, in a society more and more dependent upon the intelligence and personal development of the total population, rather than to encourage continuance of an intellectual elitism characteristic of societies of the past. The plan holds high but not unrealistic standards of accomplishment for everyone and makes it possible within broad limits of time and teaching effort for each to go as far or as deep or as high as he can.
>
> Under this plan no student can squeak through by having "passed" only part of a course. All students must meet the same performance criteria by demonstrating the required competencies. There is no possibility of settling for a C or a B and avoiding the learning necessary to acquire an A. For some it may take a little longer, as the current TV commercial

on the gaining of crowns has it, but all students, even the slower ones, have a real opportunity to succeed. In other words, the plan puts the focus on learning and achievement for each individual student. It sees this as the fundamental basis or reason for evaluation. That, at least, must be accomplished first, and all other purposes are to be subordinated and made incidental to it. . . . On 10 July 1968 the Council on Academic Standards, charged with responsibility for development and administration of policy concerning evaluation of student progress, recommended to the faculty a revolution in grading practices to become effective with the opening of the 1969-1970 school year. It further recommended that the 1968-1969 year be spent in studying the implications of, and tooling up for, the proposed change. Faculty meetings and workshops were subsequently held for these purposes, and the faculty voted general approval of the plan in December. It reserved final enactment, however, until the student body had had a chance to discuss and react to the proposal. By the early weeks of the spring term several meetings and opinion polls had been conducted, and the Student Senate reported that the student response, while divided over certain specific items, was favorable to the plan and its proposed time of implementation, including total application to all classes. The faculty then completed its enabling action.

Thus every effort was made to involve the entire campus community, or at least all those who would be immediately affected, in the decision-making and in accepting this step as a significant experiment in harmony with the fundamental philosophy of the college. During the summer of 1969 a letter explaining the new venture was sent to all parents of currently enrolled and newly accepted students, including one sentence which expressed something of the depth of faculty conviction and commitment: "We think it has a chance of restoring to your sons and daughters the zest for learning and a realization of the true values of education. . . ."

The plan adopted, and presented in detail, while certainly not considered perfect by anyone, provides, it is believed, a means of overcoming the apparent deficiencies in the present system and of fulfilling the positive criteria. One faculty member spoke the viewpoint of most of his colleagues in saying:

> This new plan calls for a chain of events in which the student has a number of concrete opportunities to show his competencies. It affords a chance for the student to address himself directly to the attainment of these competencies, and thus to his own learning and personal development. It views success and failure in terms of situations realistically defined and emphasizes a positive rather than a negative, a constructive rather than a punitive psychology. It recognizes fully the significance of individual differences in growth patterns,

> learning, and indeed, in the end-product of education. It provides the instructor, as well as the student, with a less ambiguous opportunity to be authentic in his own efforts and to realize himself in his learning and teaching. . . .[5]

In "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean," Dr. Troyer included the following material on "Evaluating Understandings, Attitudes, Skills, and Behaviors." The entire article is included in Appendix D_1.

> Evaluating Understandings, Attitudes, Skills and Behaviors
>
> Evaluation is a constant process in the classroom. It is present in every activity, written exercise, oral report, discussion and work period. The kinds of questions asked by students and the behaviors following a discussion are part of assessment. This continuous evaluation serves two purposes. First, and most important, it tells the teacher what to plan and how to plan. Faulty or inadequate information, limited understandings and the lack of skills are to be improved by providing follow-up lessons or activities. Some things are retaught; new illustrations are sought; time is provided for review or practice. This evaluation of all aspects of student work indicates when to move rapidly to a new topic, when to move more slowly, and what choices to make concerning assignments.
>
> This same over-all assessment is used to describe or profile what the student can do, where he now stands. It is well to remember that any one test yields only one measure and that measure is limited to the called-for responses. The score on a test asking for recall of factual information gives a rating which indicates only how well the student memorized that particular data. It does not say how much he knows, what skill he has in finding information, how willing he is to look up references, nor how well he understands relationships. For this reason a variety of observations and different kinds of tests should be used to determine achievement. . . .[6]

---

[5]Lewis Troyer, "Grades Have Gone: What Then?" Liberal Education 56 (December 1970): 542-56.

[6]Lewis Troyer, "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean," Bulletin: National College of Education 13 (November 19, 1969): 16.

The December 9, 1969, issue of "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean" contains information of training teachers for the future as well as a book review by Dr. Troyer on Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life by Becker, Greer and Hughes, and is included in Appendix D_2.

Considerable thinking and careful planning went into the initiating function of the competency-based system at National College of Education. The efforts of the Dean of Instruction, Dr. Lewis Troyer, contributed significantly to the developing of the system. His work with the other administrators and his encouragement and guidance were basic to initiating the competency-based system at National College. The administration and faculty are also to be credited with willingness and in some instances even eagerness to move ahead with the new system.

The Maintaining Function

In shifting thinking to the function of maintaining the competency-based system, consideration is given to the period from the 1969-1970 academic year to the 1976-1977 academic year.

In April of 1970, as part of the maintaining function of the competency-based system at National College, the Dean wrote to the faculty in "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean" (Appendix D_3) regarding student reaction to the system. He indicated:

> A great deal of static (unpleasant noise) is flowing from students into the various administrative offices concerning the current operation of the competency evaluation system.
>
> Much of it, if true, indicates that many instructors of courses have adopted or continued practices which

> violate the stated intentions of the new system and make a mockery of faculty pretensions of real concern for the development of the student. Some of it is misinformation, ignorance with regard to what is really being done. There is always a modicum of such in any human situation.
>
> But even if it were largely misunderstanding, the question would still be pertinent--Why? Are we failing to interpret our procedures adequately?
>
> Or is the real truth rather that we not only have neglected to interpret but have nothing to interpret? Are we ourselves subterfuging the system because we either don't believe in it or have not taken it seriously? Are we doing anything differently, or are we simply carrying on old habit patterns without change? Are we living on the basis that going through some motions will be enough? Who was really corrupted by grading--the student or the instructor, or both? If we were corrupted (which is likely the truth), can we recognize it about ourselves and do anything about it?. . . .[7]

A list of particulars included such items as lack of distributed competency lists, limited faculty interaction with students, or of faculty imposing additional requirements after the competency list had been completed.

The Dean concluded the article:

> It does not register the "positive" side which is undoubtedly there. It is easy to be happy with the good things said about us. It is important, however, to look carefully at our purported shortcomings, for thereby we may open the way to improvement and genuine accomplishment.
>
> Now, therefore, I must come back to the main point of this memo: There is too much flak! It would not be unlikely that this experimental flight could soon be shot down. Next year the NCA accreditors will be here to look at it. Unless student response gets a great deal more positive and comprehending than it now seems to be, the writer of this memo wouldn't want to place any money bets on its survival. Nor on achievement of accreditation for the college.[8]

---

[7]Lewis Troyer, "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean," Bulletin: National College of Education 13 (April 7, 1970): 16-17.

[8]Ibid., p. 18.

Through this communique, pressure was exerted on faculty members to continue to upgrade their performance so that the competency system would be received more positively by the students and that the North Central Accreditation team would continue to grant accreditation.

To help encourage faculty members in the maintaining function of the competency-based system and prior to Dr. Benjamin Bloom's meeting with the faculty on November 11, 1970, the Dean of Academic Affairs distributed an article by Dr. Bloom on "Learning for Mastery."

". . . We are expressing the view that, given sufficient time (and appropriate types of help), 95 percent of students (the top 5 percent plus the next 90 percent) can learn a subject up to a high level of mastery."[9]

This degree of mastery was a challenge for any faculty to consider, but with the likelihood of Dr. Bloom serving as a consultant, it became an interesting possibility.

Dr. Bloom continued, "We believe that if every student had a very good tutor, most of them would be able to learn a particular subject to a high degree. A good tutor attempts to find the qualities of instruction (and motivation) best suited to a given learner."[10]

---

[9]Benjamin Bloom, "Learning for Mastery." This paper will be published as a chapter in Bloom, Hastings and Madaus, Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning (New York: McGraw-Hill), p. 6.

[10]Ibid., p. 7.

Teachers were challenged to be facilitators of learning rather than primarily disseminators of information, as Dr. Bloom further indicated:

> . . . But most important, the presence of a great variety of instructional materials and procedures should help both teachers and students overcome feelings of defeatism and passivity about learning. If the student can't learn in one way, he should be assured that alternatives are available to him. The teacher should come to recognize that it is the learning which is important and that instructional alternatives exist to enable all (or almost all) of the students to learn the subject to a high level.[11]

This was a challenge for a faculty that already considered themselves to be at the growth edge of teacher education. For students to be able to demonstrate competencies would help convince others of the value of the system.

Dr. Bloom challenged,

> We are convinced that it is not the sheer amount of time spent in learning that accounts for the level of learning. We believe that each student should be allowed the time he needs to learn a subject. A strategy for mastery learning must find some way of solving the instructional problems as well as the school organizational (including time) problems.[12]

The idea that most students can learn to a high level of mastery with appropriate help and sufficient time was the main thrust that Dr. Bloom stressed. He continued to emphasize his thinking regarding diagnostic and prescriptive teaching and learning for life:

> Frequent formative evaluation tests pace the learning of students and help motivate them to put forth the necessary effort at the appropriate time. . . . For students who lack mastery of a particular unit, the formative tests should reveal the particular points of difficulty. We have found

---

[11] Ibid., p. 11.

[12] Ibid., p. 13.

> that students respond best to the diagnostic results when they are referred to particular instructional materials or processes intended to help them correct their difficulties. The diagnosis should be accompanied by a very specific prescription if the students are to do anything about it.[13]

The article concludes with the following challenge:

> Finally, modern society requires continual learning throughout life. If the schools do not promote adequate learning and reassurance of progress, the student must come to rejecting learning--both in the school and later life. Mastery learning can give zest to school learning and can develop a lifelong interest in learning. It is this continual learning which should be the major goal of the educational system.[14]

The November 11, 1970, workshop at National College provided the opportunity for the faculty to interact with Dr. Benjamin Bloom. This exchange resulted in probing questions being considered and a refinement of the competency-based system at National College. Dr. Bloom served as a consultant to National College of Education during the initiating and the early maintaining periods of the competency-based educational system.

Continued development of the system has taken place over the years with new faculty members being absorbed into the system, but also adding input into the refinement of the system.

Administrative personnel have also made a difference in the maintaining function of the competency-based system at National College of Education. In 1972, President K. Richard Johnson retired after serving in that capacity for 23 years. An interim president was appointed until the current president, Dr. Calvin E. Gross, was inaugurated as the college's fifth president in December, 1972.

---

[13]Ibid., p. 18. [14]Ibid., p. 22.

Also in 1972, Dr. Lewis Troyer, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, moved into teaching until his retirement. Men from outside the college became Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs. The maximum tenure in office for each of these men was less than two years, and during these periods much of their effort was devoted to getting to know the institution and preparing for major accreditation visits by the NCATE, North Central, and Illinois Department of Education accreditation teams.

During this period, the Faculty Association of National College emerged as a more powerful force, exerting a greater amount of leadership in the institution than had been the case under Dr. Troyer. The faculty continued to use and revise the competency-based system, but with a President and a Vice-President for Academic Affairs who were not part of the initiating function of the system the administrative support, guidance, and leadership have not been comparable in the maintaining function to that provided during the initiating function of the competency-based system.

The faculty and student body have repeatedly indicated that they believe the competency-based grading system to be superior to the former traditional grading system, and have voted to continue its use recognizing that it is in need of ongoing development.

To better understand the maintaining function of the competency-based system at National College of Education, various college reports and publications were reviewed. This included

reports like the NCATE and North Central accreditation reports, the Undergraduate Bulletin, summary of faculty meetings, and the student newspaper.

The Institution Report to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education was prepared for the accreditation team in March of 1975. This report contains a rather comprehensive statement of the maintaining function of the competency-based system at National College and is included here.

> This plan emphasizes criteria of achievement by the individual student in contrast to the older type of measures of comparison between students. It is not a "pass-fail" system as that term is generally understood. It is not even a "pass-incomplete" system, although passing and incompletion are aspects of it. It is, rather, a new and different pattern of evaluation, probably not translatable into the older rubrics of grades and averages. It is basically grounded on the psychological finding that a much larger proportion, than was traditionally expected, of human beings can achieve high quality academic levels if provided with adequate instruction and sufficient time--the essential elements of the mastery of learning concept. The competency system excludes no one from trying, but holds high standards for everyone. No student gets by with being outstanding or successful in any single part of a course. All students are given generous opportunity to succeed rather than to fail, but each must meet the challenge of demonstrating all required competencies. Some, of course, do not make it; for others it may take "a little longer." A regularly registered student in a given course may request the privilege of demonstrating required competencies at any time from first registration date to the final deadline for removing an incomplete, except as otherwise indicated below.
>
> Completed courses are reported to the Registrar by the instructors. If a student, however, has not completed by the end of the term of original enrollment, the course may be designated as "in-progress" and may be completed during the following term. "In-progress" may be assigned only if the student has continued to work toward course completion through the last official day of the term. Designation of "in-progress" is not automatically given at the end of the first term of enrollment. A student having any course "in-progress" after the end of a term must make contact with his instructor during the first three weeks of his next term of

> enrollment and make specific arrangements for completing the course or the "in-progress" will be changed to "no credit." All courses must be completed within one academic year following the term of original enrollment.
>
> This competency system is regarded as consistent with the College goals of "liberal arts in teacher education." The Faculty is in continual process of trying to revise and improve the competency statements. Fall Faculty Workshops have had considerable time devoted to developing and discussing competencies. At the present time the lists vary considerably from course to course and department to department, indicating different stages of thinking, whether the use of Bloom's taxonomies, simple statement of content topics, listing of activities, or two dimensional efforts that include both skills and content. Some difficulty tends to continue in differentiating competencies from criteria to measurement or demonstration.[15]

The NCATE accreditation team praised National College for their training of teachers and were particularly complimentary regarding the use of the competency-based system at the institution.

An on-going concern of various accreditation teams is the matter of financial resources, and the North Central Accreditation body had raised this question regarding National College in an earlier visit. The Self-Study Report for North Central Accreditation prepared by the college for the North Central visit in December, 1975, included,

> For the past nineteen years, National College of Education has operated with a balanced budget. The highlight of recent fund-raising activities was the National Promise Campaign in which college constituents matched a 2.5 million challenge from philanthropists Foster and Mary McGaw. The campaign raised over 5 million in vitally needed endowment funds.[16]

---

[15] Institution Report to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Evanston, Illinois: National College of Education, March 3-5, 1975), pp. 155-57.

[16] Self Study Report of National College of Education Prepared for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the

In maintaining the competency-based system of evaluation the North Central report further stated,

> For six years, the College has been using a system of student evaluation based upon specific sets of competencies in given courses. When a student has demonstrated that he has mastered these competencies his record indicates "credit" for the course. Additional evaluative statements about the students are made in the form of professional promise cards which are filled out by all instructors for each student in required courses. Those cards which are filed in the student's professional file indicate objective assessments in areas of professional promise as well as written statements of instructors regarding the student's performance in his or her class. Competency work sheets are submitted to Division Chairmen for review and filing. In addition, a student's record at the request of an instructor may indicate that a course was completed "with faculty commendation." "In-progress" is recorded in the event course requirements are not fulfilled within the quarter and students are given a designated amount of time during the next quarter in which to complete the work. Upon completion of the work, the "In-progress" is changed to course credit.
>
> Record keeping and problems related to completion of "In-progress" courses pose some problems for instructors and for the Registrar's Office. In general, however, there is acceptance of the grading system and considerable effort is being extended by faculty and staff to make the system work.[17]

The North Central team commended the college for its use of the competency-based system. The team indicated that the competency-based system more clearly focused on purposes and objectives, that the outcomes were more explicit, and that the competencies were more relevantly conceived.

The National College of Education Undergraduate Bulletin, 1976-1977 contains a recent official statement of the college's

---

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (Evanston, Illinois: National College of Education, December 1, 1975), pp. 1-44.

[17]Ibid., pp. 31-32.

position regarding the competency-based system. It includes the topics of evaluation of student progress, honors, and admission to professional studies sequence and is included in Appendix E_1.

In the February, 1976, issue of Chaff, the student newspaper published by the Student Senate of National College, students' responses were printed to the Roving Reporter's question, "What do you think of the competency system? And, why?" Some of those responses are included here and the entire article is included in Appendix E_2.

> "If it (the competency-based system) were done consistently, it would be a good idea. Some teachers still grade on a curve which doesn't let you be yourself. If you have to worry about tests at the end of the semester, you're still worrying about the 'A.'"
>
> "I like it because there's not so much tension to get grades. I hate competing for grades against other people, and with this system, you don't have to."
>
> "I like it. My only question is what other schools or people think it's worth."
>
> "I abhor it! I would much prefer to have something concrete to show for my hard work. A letter grade is preferable to a 'complete.' Competing for grades has always been a part of my schooling, so that's no problem whatsoever!"
>
> "I like the competency system because it is challenging, but not competitive, and I find that there's not as much pressure, therefore I'm able to absorb more knowledge. It's helpful for me to know where I stand in a course, and I can check it whenever I want."
>
> "I think it is a good system because a person's mind is not all around grades. You have to learn everything to pass."[18]

---

[18] Chaff, 1975-1976, No. 3 (Evanston, Illinois: Student Senate of National College of Education, February 1976), pp. 4-5.

As indicated, the competencies have been refined and the faculty and students have voted to continue the use of the competency-based system, but limited time and energy have been allocated to the function of monitoring the system.

The Monitoring Function

This effort will now focus on the function of monitoring the system, with an analysis and evaluation of the administration and operation of the competency-based system at National College of Education. The procedures used to consider the monitoring function will include a review of what the college has done in this area and then to use THE MODEL developed to monitor the competency-based system at National College.

A questionnaire follow-up study was given to a limited number of National College students on April 27, 1970. Approximately 60 percent of those responding indicated that the competency-based system had aided the learner in appraising his own strengths and weaknesses more easily than in a grading system. Seventy-four percent of the respondents indicated that there was less emphasis on comparisons of one student to another. Seventy-three percent of the respondents indicated that the system had not decreased tension due to school work. Seventy-one percent of the respondents indicated that the competency lists were stating the goals of the course followed by the teachers.

Almost 67 percent of the respondents indicated that the new system had not increased their desire to learn and 74 percent

did not think that the new system had increased the quality of their work. Finally, the questionnaire indicated that approximately 30 percent of the students were learning more under the new system, while 20 percent were learning less and about 50 percent were learning the same.

In December, 1975, students and faculty were asked to evaluate the competency-based system at National College of Education. Again there was a limited response, but The Dais, the faculty-staff newsletter dated January 30, 1976, stated:

> In general, the students were more enthusiastic than the teachers. Of the 127 students surveyed, 82 said they were learning more than under a traditional grading system, 35 said they learned equally well under both systems, and 10 said they were learning less under the competency system. More than half the students said the competency system helped them appraise their own progress more easily, gave them more feedback from teachers, and increased their desire to learn and the quality of their work. However, it has not alleviated mental and emotional strain caused by grade pressures, or decreased cheating, most students believed. . . . Slightly more than half of the faculty felt the competency system helped motivate students, but that there were problems maintaining the quality of "overall student performance" and distinguishing between students who performed at minimally acceptable and above-average levels. Most of the teachers who responded favored keeping the competency system with major or minor revisions rather than returning to the traditional grading system.[19]

The subcommittee on competency evaluation from the Council of Academic Standards gave a summary report in March, 1976, of its conclusions resulting from the student and faculty questionnaires and discussions. The report indicated that there was

---

[19]The Dais, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Evanston, Illinois: National College of Education Faculty-Staff Newsletter, Public Relations Office, January 30, 1976).

general student support of the system, that there were concerns by a minority of the students about transfer problems, graduate school admission problems, and recognition of outstanding work. The report further indicated that faculty reactions were similar to student reactions and that there was a need to rehabilitate and renovate the system, to reach consistency of operation of the system, and to consider alternative evaluation system options for some or all courses by student choice.

It was decided that the Council on Academic Standards would continue to review the current practices of the competency-based system and would air the "myths" currently circulated about the consequences of the system. They would also further assess the support services which might enable the system to function better and conduct a study of possible changes or optional alternatives to be recommended to the faculty for discussion.

These efforts taken by the college to assess the competency-based system have indicated that the students, faculty, and administration, while voting to continue the use of the system, recognized the need for additional study and refinement of the system.

Procedures to Field Test the Model With National College

THE MODEL's monitoring function involved an analysis of student teaching records; the study of the principal's rating of first-year teachers; a consideration of the teaching job market as related to National College graduates; the use of questionnaires

with the administration, faculty, and students; and the use of a 10-question interview with National College personnel.

Student Teaching Records

A review of a sample of student teaching performance was conducted to analyze observations of public school and private school cooperating teachers and college supervising teachers regarding the training of students under the competency-based system at National College.

The Student Teaching Department maintains complete records for each student doing student teaching at National College. Two student teaching experiences are normally expected for certification of the National College of Education students. The first student teaching contact is a half-day experience for an academic term. The second assignment consists of completing full-day student teaching for another term, usually at a different grade level than the first experience. A random sample of 1500 student teaching records was considered in THE MODEL. The records included students admitted to student teaching for the years 1973-1976. Whenever possible the records pertained to the full-day student teaching experience. These years were used because they were the first years that the graduates would have received all of their training under the competency-based system.

The public school cooperating or critic teacher normally evaluates his or her student teacher and returns the evaluation to the college Student Teaching Department to be retained in the

department's records for that student teacher. Each college supervisor of student teaching is expected to observe and confer with the teacher and student teacher a minimum of five times during each quarter. The college supervisors also evaluate each student teacher assigned to them for that academic term and the evaluation is kept in the Student Teaching Department records for each student teacher. These records were examined to determine the consistency of the cooperating teacher's ratings with those of the college supervisor. In addition, the records were examined to determine the percentage of students in each class who satisfactorily completed their competencies and those who performed in their student teaching in such an outstanding fashion that they received a rating of "commendation." A "commendation" rating is issued for superior performance.

Cooperating teachers and college supervisors assessed the demonstrated competencies of the student teachers in the areas of preparation skills, implementation skills, evaluation skills, and interpersonal skills. In addition, they were asked to mark a checklist of experiences encountered by the student teacher ranging from the areas of the curriculum to evaluating and assessing student progress and learning.

Principals' Ratings of First-Year Teachers

The "Teacher Competency Evaluation" completed by principals was a second measure employed to evaluate THE MODEL.

The principals rated each first-year teacher's performance at the end of the school year in the areas of curriculum, organization, participation, communication, professional growth, effectiveness of teaching, and compared the National graduates with other first-year teachers in their buildings. (See Appendix F_4.)

The College Placement Office has conducted "Teacher Competency Evaluation" on an annual basis for several years. While the individual rating categories have changed somewhat with the use of the competency-based system, the overall rating categories of the teachers have remained the same. Thus, by comparing records of the teachers who were certified after the system was adopted with those who graduated before the system was adopted, it is possible to evaluate the competency-based system.

Each year approximately 65 to 80 percent of the principals have completed and returned the "Teacher Competency Evaluation Form," or the formerly used "Evaluation of First-Year Teacher Form," to the Placement Office. An analysis of these data is included in Chapter IV.

Teaching Job Market

Another measure of the institution's effectiveness is the willingness of consumers to "purchase" the product. Placement Office records of National College were reviewed to determine the percentage of National College certified teachers who were able to obtain teaching positions in view of a "tight" teaching job market.

Questionnaire Used With Administration, Faculty, and Students

To further consider the monitoring function of THE MODEL, a list of the characteristics of a "good" competency-based system was compiled from the review of related research. To validate the list of "good" characteristics, the list was sent to a jury of seven members selected by working with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education special committee on Competency/ Performance-Based Teacher Education, chaired by Dr. Karl Massanari.

The jury members were identified by Dr. Massanari as being leaders in the field through their contributions in the professional literature, special committee work in competency-based teacher education, and general leadership in professional education.

The identification of the jury members with a brief description of their major responsibility follows:

> Dr. Norman Dodl, Education Department of the New Polytechnical University, Blacksburg, Virginia. Formerly with Education Department of Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.
>
> Dr. Del Felder, Education Department, University of Houston, Houston, Texas.
>
> Dr. W. Robert Houston, Associate Dean, Education Department, University of Houston, Houston, Texas.
>
> Dr. Karl Massanari, Associate Director, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; Director, AACTE's Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education.
>
> Dr. J. T. Sandefur, Dean, College of Education, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky.
>
> Dr. H. Del Schalock, Education Department, Oregon College of Education, Monmouth, Oregon.

Dr. Gilbert Shearron, Chairman, Elementary Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

Each jury member was contacted by telephone and asked if he would be willing to serve on the jury to identify characteristics of a "good" competency-based system. A follow-up letter (Appendix F_1) was sent, which asked each member to rate the characteristics of "good" competency/performance-based teacher education systems as being: (1) essential; (2) desirable, but not essential; (3) not essential, nor desirable. In addition to rating the list of characteristics provided, they were asked to add other characteristics which they considered to be essential. This rating form is included in Appendix F_2.

The results of the jury's responses to the rating form, Appendix F_2, were tabulated and used to establish the list of characteristics of a "good" competency-based system for use in THE MODEL. This information from the jury's rating was used as the basis for developing the form which would be used with National College. This revised form is included in Appendix F_3.

The National College Rating Form, Characteristics of the Competency-Based System (Appendix F_3), was used as a questionnaire with National College of Education academic faculty and administration and selected students.

A meeting was scheduled with the Undergraduate Dean of National College and his cabinet to discuss and plan the use of the instrument, "National College Rating Form--Characteristics of the Competency-Based System."

The discussion resulted in Division Chairmen distributing the rating forms to the faculty members in their divisions. In addition, the faculty in each division used the rating form with those students who had declared their concentration or major emphasis to be in that particular division. Chairmen distributed and collected the rating forms for further study.

The student responses on the rating form of the characteristics of the competency-based system were recorded by freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior classifications. The faculty responses were separated into two categories, tenured faculty and nontenured faculty. Students and faculty also designated the number of years of personal experience with the competency-based system.

Not every individual who completed the instrument rated all items on the rating form of characteristics of the competency-based system. Percentages were calculated, based on the responses for each characteristic and the results tallied into three categories (see Table 4). The first category used was faculty, the second was seniors, and the third was freshmen, sophomores, and juniors together as one group. An analysis of the responses by the jury to the first rating form and by the college personnel to the revised form is included in Chapter IV as part of the monitoring function of the study.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with the National College academic cabinet, division chairmen, department chairmen, and a full-time teaching faculty member from each department. Prior to each interview, the following list of questions was sent to each individual to be interviewed for consideration and help with the interview.

1. How do you define the competency-based system?
2. Is there an understood and accepted model of competency statements to be used by faculty in your division and/or department? What is the basis for your response?
3. How widely accepted is the competency-based system by the administration, faculty, and students?
4. What evidence can you offer to indicate that the students are able to pace themselves, when desirable, in an individual manner? Are modules of instruction used?
5. Is a consistent position on the competency-based system reflected between the public school critic teachers and the college supervisors? What evidence can you offer to support this position?
6. How do you view the competency-based system in terms of the teaching profession?
7. How do you rate the amount of paper work under the competency-based system?

8. What are the major advantages to using the competency-based system?
9. What are the important impediments to using the competency-based system--i.e., time, effort, evaluation?
10. Is there anything you wish to add about the use of the competency-based system?

Each interview took approximately 30 minutes to complete; an analysis of the interviews is included in Chapter IV.

Having described the procedures taken to develop THE MODEL for use with a competency-based system, the next phase of this study included in Chapter IV is an analysis and evaluation of the data regarding National College of Education. This included measuring the college against the proposed functions of THE MODEL, using the criteria identified by the Competency/Performance-Based Teacher Education Jury as being characteristic of a good competency-based program. The final dimension of this study presents conclusions and recommendations in Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analysis of the data focuses on THE MODEL's monitoring function. Consideration is given to the analysis of student teaching records; the study of the principal's rating of first-year teachers; a consideration of the job market as related to National College graduates; the use of a questionnaire with the administration, faculty, and students; and the results of the 10-question interview with National College personnel.

Student Teaching Records

Cooperating public and private school teachers and college supervisors assessed the demonstrated competencies of the student teachers trained at National College from 1973 to 1976. In each of the years from 1973 to 1976, there was an extremely high degree of consistency between the rating given by the public school cooperating teacher and that given by the college Student Teaching Department supervisor. Undoubtedly, the close cooperation and frequent conferencing of the personnel involved in assessing the degree of competency exhibited by the student teachers is a major factor in the high degree of consistency of the ratings by the cooperating teachers and the college supervisors.

In the 1973-1974 school year 10.5 percent of the student teachers completed the competencies, but with some problems noted. For example, the cooperating teacher noted, "The student teacher exhibited some weakness in the teaching techniques, attitudes, and behavior toward children." The college supervisor indicated, "The student teacher needs growth in coping with the demands of the teaching situation with poise, stability, and maturity as well as discretion and judgment making decisions." Also in the 1973-1974 school year, 47.4 percent of the student teachers satisfactorily completed the competencies as established and 42.1 percent of the student teachers received commendation recognition. Comments like, "This person is a credit to the teaching staff" or "Outstanding" were often included in the recommendations for the commendation by the cooperating teachers or the college supervisors.

In the 1974-1975 school year, 4.8 percent of the student teachers were encouraged to explore alternate career possibilities. In addition, 4.8 percent of the students who were admitted to student teaching decided not to do student teaching and 4.8 percent of the students completed student teaching, but with problems. Examples of statements offered by the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor included the following regarding the student teachers: "Poor preparation and lack of poise on occasion"; "Student is aware of several areas where she still needs to exert more effort." The analysis of the student teaching records revealed that 48.6 percent of the students received a "commendation" rating in the 1974-1975 school year. A typical comment stated that

the student teacher exhibited a "consistently outstanding performance in integrating the cognitive and affective skills with children."

In the 1975-1976 school year 5 percent of the students demonstrated minimal competency during their student teaching experience. An analysis of the records revealed that during that same year 70 percent of the student teachers were given a rating of "commendation." The Student Teaching Department indicated that they do expect a high percentage of commendations if the student teachers are really performing up to their potential and considering the training and experiences they have received and the competence they have demonstrated. Typical comments written by cooperating teachers or college supervisors include:

> "Most poised and well prepared. She is adept, confident, innovative and flexible."
>
> "Consistent excellence. Demonstrated professional objectivity and expertise. Integrated cognitive and affective skills. Maintained cooperative and adult working relations."
>
> "Highly sensitive toward and accurate identification of needs of children and consistency in initiating and assuming responsibilities with a spirit and commitment admirable for a student teacher."
>
> "This individual made an important transition from thinking of herself as a 'student' teacher to a 'teacher.'"

The review of the records for the total period of 1973 to 1976 indicated that 1.7 percent of the students were provisionally admitted to student teaching, but that the students decided not to do student teaching and that an additional 1.7 percent of the students were encouraged to explore alternate career possibilities.

During the period 6.7 percent of the students completed student teaching with problems and minimal competency demonstrated, and 37.7 percent completed the competencies as stated or expected. The study further revealed that in the period from 1973 to 1976, 53.3 percent of the student teachers were given a rating of "commendation."

The Student Teaching Department records also included the fall quarter of the 1976-1977 school year when 77 percent of the students were given a rating of "commendation." The actual Student Teaching Department average for the three-year period including the fall quarter of 1976-1977 indicated that 57 percent of the students received a rating of "commendation." This figure is offered in comparison with the sample average of 53.3 percent of the students receiving "commendation." The sample statistic did not include the fall quarter of 1976-1977 in the average.

Normally the student teaching experience is the final test of competency that the students receive before graduation and certification as teachers. As indicated by the reported findings, 37.7 percent of the students demonstrated satisfactory completion of the expected competencies and an additional 53.3 percent of the students were given a rating of "commendation" by their cooperating teachers and college student teaching supervisors. This total of 91 percent of the student teachers receiving a completion of competencies rating or a "commendation" rating indicates that other professional educators believed that the student teachers were

well trained and in effect paid tribute to the competency-based system of training used at the college.

Principals' Ratings of First-Year Teachers

The "Teacher Competency Evaluation" completed by the principals was the second measure employed to evaluate THE MODEL.

Table 1 indicates the principals' ratings of first-year teachers trained at National College. Those students graduating in 1968, 1969, and 1970 prior to the use of the competency-based system at National College are compared with those graduating in 1973, 1974, and 1975 under the competency-based system. In recent years there has been approximately an 80 percent return of the first-year "Teacher Competency Evaluation" forms from the principals.

Prior to the adoption of the competency-based system, an examination of the records reveals the tendency of the principals to rate National College first-year teachers a bit lower than has been the case recently. In 1968, 64 percent of the teachers were rated as either strong or superior. In 1969, 63 percent of the teachers were rated as strong or superior and in 1970, 57 percent of the teachers were rated as strong or superior. This is an average rating in the three-year period of 61.3 percent of the teachers being rated as strong or superior.

A comparison of these findings with those when the competency-based system was implemented reveals that in 1973, 77 percent of the teachers were rated as strong or superior. In 1974, 82 percent of the teachers were rated as strong or superior

Table 1.--Principals' ratings of first-year teachers.[a]

Rating	Evaluation of First-Year Teachers (Former Form Used) 1968	1969	1970
Number rated	77	103	78
Superior	26%	19%	18%
Strong	38%	44%	39%
Average	28%	23%	31%
Fair	6%	11%	9%
Inferior	2%	3%	3%

Rating	Teacher Competency Evaluation (Present Form Used) 1973	1974	1975
Number rated	85	83	45
Superior	33%	47%	29%
Strong	44%	35%	53%
Average	16%	14%	18%
Fair	5%	3%	0%
Inferior	2%	1%	0%

[a]Evaluations reported by principals of first-year teachers trained at National College of Education.

and in 1975, 82 percent of the teachers were rated as strong or superior. This is an average rating for the three-year period of 80.37 percent of the teachers being rated strong or superior. This compares with the 61.3 percent for the 1968-1970 period.

At the lower end of the rating scale the results were similar. In 1968, 8 percent of the National College teachers were rated as fair or inferior. The results of the 1969 survey revealed that 14 percent of the teachers were rated as fair or inferior and in 1970, 12 percent of the first-year teachers received a rating of fair or inferior. This is an average rating for the three-year period of 11.3 percent of the teachers being rated fair or inferior.

By contrast, in 1973, 7 percent of the first-year teachers were rated as fair or inferior and in 1974, 4 percent of the teachers received a rating of fair or inferior. The most recent survey, that of the 1975 graduates, revealed that the principals did not rate any of their first-year teachers from National College as fair or inferior. This is an average rating for the three-year period of 3.67 percent of the teachers being rated as fair or inferior as compared to the average of 11.3 percent for 1968-1970.

It is obvious that the principals not only rated more of their first-year teachers trained under the competency-based system in a higher fashion than under the traditional system, but they also rated substantially fewer teachers trained under the competency-based system as only fair or inferior teachers.

The "Teacher Competency Evaluation" of 1975 indicated that the one area that received the lowest rating was "Uses community

resources and extends the classroom into the community." Fifty-four percent of the teachers were rated average and 1 percent was rated as fair in the category. It is expected that it will take teachers new to a community a period of time to become aware of the various community resources available to their students. It is also expected that they would not be as competent in this area as other teachers formerly acquainted with that community.

The teachers received their highest ratings in two areas with approximately 90 percent of the students receiving a rating of superior or strong. The two areas were: "Demonstrates respect for individuals by being honest and polite with children and parents" and "Attends professional meetings, participates in workshops, and indicates desire for further study."

A closer scrutiny of the results of the "Teacher Competency Evaluation" rating form as reported by the principals reveals a particular change for the 1975 graduates in comparison to the 1974 graduates. The rating forms were sent out later in 1976 than other years, with fewer responses returned from the principals. Forty-five responses were returned out of 60 sent out, for a 75 percent return rate. In 1974, 47 percent of the graduates were rated as superior; however, in 1975 only 29 percent of the first-year teachers were rated as superior. While this percentage is more like those ratings issued prior to the use of the competency-based system, as noted in Table 1, this unfavorable result needs to be observed carefully over the next few years to see if it connotes a trend.

Teaching Job Market

The records from National College of Education's Placement Office indicate that of the total number of undergraduate candidates in the active teaching job market between 1972 and 1975, better than 90 percent had secured teaching positions. This is in contrast with teachers certified in other public Illinois universities where approximately 50 percent of those certified obtained teaching positions.

The teaching job market has continued to tighten, but the Placement Office records indicate that of the 1976 BA certified graduates from National College, 86 percent have obtained teaching positions. The record is even better at the graduate level, with 95 percent of the Masters-level graduates securing teaching positions. This positive record is another indication of the effectiveness of the training program at National College of Education using the competency-based system.

Characteristics of a Competency-Based System

The review of the literature on competency-based teacher education yielded a list of characteristics which could be classified as essential or desirable in a "good" competency-based system. In order to further develop THE MODEL, as indicated in Chapter III, the list of characteristics was sent to a jury of recognized experts in the field of competency-based teacher education for their consideration and rating. (See Appendix F_2.)

The jury was asked to rate 23 characteristics in terms of being (1) essential; (2) desirable, but not essential; and (3) not essential or desirable. Each characteristic was given a value, with the lowest possible value of seven receiving an essential rating by all jury members. A rating value of 21 would result when all of the jury members rated a characteristic as neither essential nor desirable. As in golf, the lower the value, the better or more essential the characteristic.

All of the jury members rated the following six characteristics as being "essential" to a "good" competency-based system, with a total value of seven for each characteristic.

1a. "Competencies to be demonstrated by the student are derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles in achieving school goals." (Value 7)

b. "Competencies to be demonstrated by the student are supported by research, curriculum and job analysis, and/or experienced teacher judgment." (Value 7)

c. "Competencies to be demonstrated by the student are stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies." (Value 7)

2a. "Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies." (Value 7)

b. "Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions." (Value 7)

4a. "Assessment of the student's competency uses his performance as a primary source of evidence." (Value 7)

The list of six characteristics became the basic list of "essential" characteristics used in the model for the assessment and evaluation of a competency-based system.

The jury members were also asked to add other characteristics which they considered to be essential. No characteristics were added by any jury member. The inference is drawn that the jury members considered the list of essential characteristics to be complete.

None of the characteristics rated by the jury members received a value of 21, indicating that that particular characteristic was considered to be neither essential nor desirable. In fact, only one of the characteristics received as high a value as 14, which indicated that all jury members were in agreement that that particular characteristic was not essential, but was desirable. (See Table 2.) The characteristic with this value of 14 was Number 10, "Instruction is modularized in a competency-based system."

The other 16 characteristics received a value that placed them in a category between "essential," with a value of seven, and "desirable," with a value of 14. The characteristics are listed in rank order by the value rated. The lower value shows that more of the jury members indicated that a particular characteristic was considered to be essential, i.e., rating of one. (See Table 2.)

4c. "Assessment of the student's competency strives for objectivity." (Value 8)

5. "The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency." (Value 8)

1d. "Competencies to be demonstrated by the student are made public in advance." (Value 9)

Table 2.--Jury members' ratings of characteristics.

Characteristic	Jury Members' Ratings							Total Value
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1a	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
b	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
c	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
d	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	9
2a	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
b	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
c	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	9
3	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	10
4a	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
b	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	10
c	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
d	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	12
5	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8
6	1	1	1	2	2	2	1.5	10.5
7	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	10
8	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	10
9	1.5	1	1	2	2	2	1	10.5
10	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	14
11	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	9
12	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	12
13	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	12
14	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	12
15	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	11

2c. "Criteria to be employed assessing competencies are made public in advance." (Value 9)

11. "There is student and program accountability." (Value 9)

3. "The instructional program provides for the development of the student's achievement of each of the competencies specified." (Value 10)

4b. "Assessment of the student's competency takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behavior." (Value 10)

7. "The learning experience of the individual is guided by feedback." (Value 10)

8. "The program as a whole is systematic." (Value 10)

6. "Instruction is individualized." (Value 10-11)

9. "The emphasis is on exit requirements rather than on entrance requirements." (Value 10-11)

15. "The program is research-oriented and regenerative." (Value 11)

4d. "Assessment of the student's competency facilitates future studies of the relation between instruction, competency attainment, and achievement of school goals." (Value 12)

12. "The program is field-centered." (Value 12)

13. "There is a broad base for decision making." (Value 12)

14. "Preparation for a professional role is viewed as being continuous rather than merely preservice." (Value 12)

This list of characteristics with a value of from 8 to 12 received a rating of "essential" by at least one jury member. These characteristics were used in THE MODEL for the assessment and evaluation of the competency-based system at National College of Education. The importance of the characteristics with a value that

places them between "essential" and "desirable" was determined by the value they received in the rating. Those with a lower value rating were considered to be more important. (See Table 2.)

The jury of "experts" on the competency-based system had indicated that six characteristics were "essential," i.e., a rating of one, to a competency-based system. The analysis of the college personnel's rating and ranking of the characteristics revealed the following data. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

The first of these was 1a: "Competencies to be demonstrated by the students are derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles in achieving school goals." Five percent of the National College faculty rated this characteristic as always occurring, 85 percent of them indicated that it usually occurred, and 10 percent of them indicated that it rarely occurred. Nine percent of the seniors indicated that this always occurred, 73 percent indicated that it usually occurred, and 18 percent indicated that it rarely occurred. In the third category of students, 14 percent indicated that it always occurred, 68 percent indicated that it usually occurred, 11 percent indicated that it rarely occurred, and 7 percent indicated that it never occurred.

As the statistics reflect, the faculty and students did not place the same priority on this characteristic as did the jury when they indicated that it was "essential" to a good competency-based system.

The second "essential" characteristic was 1b: "Competencies to be demonstrated by the students are supported by research,

Table 3.--College and jury ranking of characteristics.

Characteristic	Faculty Ranking N = 28	Senior Ranking N = 43	Freshman-Junior Ranking N = 58	Jury
1a	11	11	3	1
b	12	17	10	2
c	8	5	14	3
d	4	21	1	9
2a	7	4	7	4
b	18	15	15	5
c	5	13	4	10
3	3	10	21	11
4a	1	2	6	6
b	14	9	18	12
c	6	7	19	7
d	22	12	23	19
5	13	8	13	8
6	15	21	20	16
7	9	16	12	14
8	10	22	16	15
9	16	1	5	17
10	23	23	17	23
11	17	18	11	11
12	19	14	8	20
13	21	19	22	21
14	2	6	2	22
15	20	20	9	18

Table 4.--College personnel rating of characteristics.

Characteristic	Classification[a]	Percentage of Personnel Rating of Occurrence of Characteristic			
		Always	Usually	Rarely	Never
1a	F	5	85	10	0
	S	9	73	18	0
	F-J	14	68	11	7
b	F	35	50	15	0
	S	23	42	35	0
	F-J	6	74	14	6
c	F	29	58	13	0
	S	24	62	14	0
	F-J	13	63	24	0
d	F	46	46	4	4
	S	35	62	3	0
	F-J	41	36	15	8
2a	F	40	48	12	0
	S	27	54	19	0
	F-J	24	61	12	3
b	F	32	44	16	8
	S	13	54	33	0
	F-J	8	68	21	3
c	F	38	54	8	0
	S	23	50	19	8
	F-J	25	55	14	6
3	F	46	50	4	0
	S	33	50	17	0
	F-J	19	60	21	0
4a	F	58	42	0	0
	S	31	61	8	0
	F-J	32	56	12	0
b	F	29	48	23	0
	S	15	58	19	8
	F-J	19	64	11	6
c	F	36	60	4	0
	S	15	63	15	7
	F-J	16	55	29	0

Table 4.--Continued.

Characteristic	Classification[a]	Percentage of Personnel Rating of Occurrence of Characteristic			
		Always	Usually	Rarely	Never
4d	F	5	41	50	4
	S	5	65	25	5
	F-J	9	63	29	0
5	F	27	50	18	5
	S	28	56	12	4
	F-J	37	42	18	3
6	F	19	48	33	0
	S	11	37	44	8
	F-J	5	42	47	6
7	F	19	71	10	0
	S	11	54	29	6
	F-J	12	68	20	0
8	F	19	57	19	5
	S	21	29	33	17
	F-J	25	50	25	0
9	F	30	50	20	0
	S	41	52	7	0
	F-J	49	49	2	0
10	F	5	21	74	0
	S	16	36	44	4
	F-J	15	55	30	0
11	F	11	63	26	0
	S	8	56	36	0
	F-J	14	63	20	3
12	F	20	35	45	0
	S	16	56	24	4
	F-J	22	70	8	0
13	F	32	37	31	0
	S	0	54	42	4
	F-J	11	61	28	0
14	F	57	33	10	0
	S	37	52	11	0
	F-J	32	61	7	0
15	F	5	55	25	15
	S	11	48	30	11
	F-J	17	67	14	2

[a]F=Faculty; S=Seniors; F-J=Freshmen, sophomores, juniors.

curriculum and job analysis, and/or experienced teaching judgment." (See Tables 3 and 4.)

Thirty-five percent of the faculty indicated that this characteristic always occurred, 50 percent of them indicated that it usually occurred, and 15 percent of them indicated that it rarely occurred. Rating this characteristic as always occurring were 23 percent of the seniors, with 42 percent of them rating this characteristic as usually occurring and 35 percent of them indicating that this characteristic rarely occurred. The students in the third group rated this characteristic in the following fashion: 6 percent always occurring, 74 percent as usually occurring, 14 percent rarely occurring, and 6 percent as never occurring.

It is noted that those rating this characteristic at National College did not rate this characteristic as always occurring and "essential."

The third area considered to be "essential" by the jury was 1c: "Competencies to be demonstrated by the students are stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies." (See Tables 3 and 4.)

On this characteristic, 29 percent of the faculty indicated that it always occurred, 58 percent of them indicated that it usually occurred, and 13 percent of them indicated that it rarely occurred. The seniors' rating was somewhat similar, with 24 percent indicating that it always occurred, 62 percent indicating that it usually occurred, and 14 percent indicating that it rarely occurred. In the lower classes, 13 percent indicated that it

always occurred, 63 percent indicated that it usually occurred, and 24 percent indicated that it rarely occurred.

This characteristic as viewed at National College does not measure up to the "essential" classification in usage as established by the jury.

The fourth "essential" characteristic as rated by the jury was 2a: "Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are based upon, and in harmony with specified competencies." Forty percent of the faculty marked this characteristic as always occurring, 48 percent as usually occurring, and 12 percent as rarely occurring. The rating by the seniors indicated that 27 percent rated this characteristic as always occurring, 54 percent indicated that it usually occurred, and 19 percent indicated that it rarely occurred. The lower classes rated 24 percent as always occurring, 61 percent as usually occurring, 12 percent as rarely occurring, and 3 percent as never occurring. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

This characteristic does not rate as being "essential" by those at National College, yet the jury did consider it to be "essential."

The fifth "essential" characteristic as rated by the jury was 2b: "Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions." Thirty-two percent of the faculty indicated that this always occurred, 44 percent indicated that it usually occurred, 16 percent indicated that it rarely occurred, and 8 percent indicated that it never occurred. Thirteen percent of the seniors

indicated that the characteristic always occurred, 54 percent indicated that it usually occurred, and 33 percent indicated that it rarely occurred. Eight percent of the lower classmen indicated that this characteristic always occurred, while 68 percent of them indicated that it usually occurred, 21 percent of them indicated that it rarely occurred, and 3 percent indicated that it never occurred. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

As was the case in each of the first four characteristics listed as "essential" by the jury, so was the case with the fifth characteristic. Those at National College did not indicate that this characteristic always existed and so in effect did not rate it as being "essential."

The last "essential" characteristic rated by the jury was 4a: "Assessment of the student's competency uses his performance as a primary source of evidence."

This characteristic received the highest rating by the faculty of the six "essential" characteristics rated by the jury. The rating given by the faculty indicates that 58 percent believed that this characteristic always occurred and 42 percent believed that it usually occurred. None of them thought that this characteristic rarely or never occurred. Thirty-one percent of the seniors indicated that this characteristic always occurred, 61 percent indicated that it usually occurred, and 8 percent indicated that it rarely occurred.

In the freshman, sophomore, and junior classes of students, 32 percent of them indicated that this characteristic always

occurred, 56 percent indicated that it usually occurred, and 12 percent of them indicated that it rarely occurred. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

While the faculty and students rated all six characteristics fairly high, they obviously did not receive the highest of ratings in terms of operational practice at National College of Education. Since the literature on competency-based education stresses these characteristics and since the jury of experts on the competency-based system considers all of the characteristics to be "essential," this evaluation finds the College to be deficient in this regard. Part of the problem resulted from an unfamiliarity with the terminology used. Some of the students and faculty members expressed concern in this regard.

The Humanities Division expressed concern with the instrument terminology and usage. The chairman had been advised regarding the process used to validate the characteristics listed prior to presenting the rating forms to the members of his division. As a division they decided that they did not want to or were not able to complete the rating form. Several members of the division did individually respond to the rating form, but the attitude reflected by the division does indicate a need for further work in clarification of the concepts of the competency-based system, including the terminology considered by others with expertise to be appropriate.

The jury rated the other characteristics listed on the rating form as being between "essential" and "desirable," with

the exception of the one characteristic, #10 "Instruction is modularized," which was rated as desirable by all of the jury members. The National College faculty members indicated that 5 percent believed that that characteristic always occurred, 21 percent indicated that it usually occurred, and 74 percent indicated that it rarely occurred. The seniors indicated that 16 percent of them believed that this characteristic always occurred, 36 percent indicated that it usually occurred, 44 percent indicated that it rarely occurred, and 4 percent of them indicated that it never occurred. Both faculty and seniors ranked this characteristic last of those rated. These ratings are in agreement with the rating of this characteristic by the jury members. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

The additional characteristics were ranked according to the percentage received by the three categories of faculty, seniors, and freshmen to juniors. The characteristics that the jury considered to be "desirable" are listed in order as rated by the jury. Also included was the ranking given by each of the three groups for that particular characteristic. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

4c. Assessment of the student's competency strives for objectivity. (Value 8)

Faculty Ranking	Senior Ranking	Freshman-Junior Ranking
F-6	S-7	F-J-19

5. The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency. (Value 8)

F-13	S-8	F-J-13

1d. Competencies to be demonstrated by the student are made public in advance. (Value 9)

F-4 S-1 F-J-1

2c. Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are made public in advance. (Value 9)

F-5 S-13 F-J-4

3. The instructional program provides for the development of the student's achievement of the competencies specified. (Value 9)

F-3 S-10 F-J-21

11. There is student and program accountability. (Value 9)

F-17 S-18 F-J-11

4b. Assessment of the student's competency takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behavior. (Value 10)

F-14 S-9 F-J-18

7. The learning experience of the individual is guided by feedback. (Value 10)

F-9 S-16 F-J-12

8. The program as a whole is systematic. (Value 10)

F-10 S-22 F-J-16

6. Instruction is individualized. (Value 10-11)

F-15 S-21 F-J-20

9. The emphasis is on exit requirements rather than on entrance requirements. (Value 10-11)

F-16 S-3 F-J-5

15. The program is research-oriented and regenerative. (Value 11)

F-20 S-20 F-J-9

4d. Assessment of the student's competency facilitates future studies of the relation between instruction, competency attainment, and achievement of school goals. (Value 12)

F-22 S-12 F-J-23

12. The program is field-centered. (Value 12)

F-19 S-14 F-J-8

13. There is a broad base for decision making. (Value 12)

F-21 S-19 F-J-22

14. Preparation for a professional role is viewed as being continuous rather than merely preservice. (Value 12)

F-2 S-6 F-J-2

10. Instruction is modularized. (Value 14)

F-23 S-23 F-J-17

The results from the rating form of the characteristics of a "good" competency-based system do indicate the need on the part of the National College administration and faculty for further clarification and development of the system. The faculty and students rated these characteristics in terms of their occurrence at National College. While these characteristics were rated fairly high by the faculty and students at National College, they were not rated as always occurring at the college. Since the jury considered these characteristics to be "essential" to a "good" competency-based system, then the college does not measure up to that "essential" level of expectation or operation. It was suggested that part of the problem for some faculty and students was the unfamiliar terminology used on the rating form. Nevertheless, this points to the need for additional professional growth and development as well as further work in clarification of the concepts of the competency-based system.

Interviews

Another component used to develop THE MODEL for the analysis and evaluation of the administration and operation of the competency-based system at National College was the use of interviews. Interviews were conducted with administrative personnel including the Academic Dean of the Undergraduate College and his Advisory Council, Division Chairmen, Department Chairmen, and faculty members from each department.

The first question asked in the interviews was, "How do you define the competency-based system?"

As would be expected from reading the literature on competency-based education, considerable disagreement exists in the area of definition. At National College, the interviews indicated that each faculty member and administrator offered a distinct definition of the competency-based system. Nevertheless, certain common descriptive phrases or words occurred frequently throughout the interviews. Some of these were:

> "Criterion referenced rather than norm referenced."
>
> "Demonstrated mastery of stated goals, objectives, or designated areas."
>
> "Sets a standard and expectation with a specified level of mastery, but with a time frame differential."
>
> "Learning for mastery where all segments need to be learned prior to completion, rather than just an averaging of grades."
>
> "Emphasis is placed on involvement with a demonstrated level of proficiency."
>
> "The focus is on goals or objectives and necessary accomplishments rather than on a more artificial system of learning."

William Spady from the National Institute of Education wrote an article entitled, "Competency Based Education: A Bandwagon in Search of a Definition."[1] In the article Mr. Spady, after discussing the difficulty of defining competency-based education, offered a definition of his own. It is,

> Competency education is a data-based, adaptive, performance-oriented set of integrated processes that facilitate, measure, record and clarify within the context of flexible time parameters the demonstration of known, explicitly stated, and agreed upon learning outcomes that reflect successful functioning in life roles."

The task of definition is a difficult one, and while the faculty and administration stressed many common elements during the interviews a certain amount of confusion obviously still exists at this writing. In 1975 Dr. Lewis Troyer wrote,

> Without a clear and acceptable definition of the term "competency," there is bound to be chaos, confusion, anarchy, and conflict in the system. I think the faculty as a whole has not been willing to put forth the rigorous intellectual effort necessary to achieve the necessary consensus of meaning.[2]

Dr. Troyer offered a definition of competency as "A person's developed capability to respond (adapt, behave) proficiently in meeting the demands (requirements) of a defined situation."[3]

It would seem that as the faculty spends the time necessary to reach closer agreement, if not consensus on the meaning

---

[1]William G. Spady, "Competency Based Education: A Bandwagon in Search of a Definition," Educational Research (January 1977): 9-14.

[2]Lewis W. Troyer, "Competency Based Student Evaluation" (a mimeographed paper developed in response to a request from the Student Teaching Department of National College of Education), February 1975, p. 1.

[3]Ibid., p. 8.

of competency-based education, a clearer focus on the objectives of the college will occur and an overall strengthening of the program will result.

The second interview question was asked to determine the degree of uniformity regarding the competency-based system within departments and divisions of National College. The second question was, "Is there an understood and accepted model of competency statements to be used by faculty in your division and/or department? What is the basis for your response?"

There seemed to be a greater emphasis at the division level to use the same language in talking with students and with other faculty. Frequently, faculty or administrators stated how much time or how many sessions were spent as a department or division, reviewing and revising competency statements as a team or agreeing to positions regarding commendations, etc. One faculty member stated, "We have spent several sessions on this area, especially making clear our attitude regarding commendations and that doing extra work is not the way to receive commendations." Nevertheless, some faculty members indicated that there are different models within the general competency framework of a division. These differences allow for individualization on the part of the faculty and the students. Some faculty members emphasized that there is commonality, but not total agreement among the faculty in their departments regarding the competency statements. Other faculty members indicated that there definitely was not an understood and

accepted model of competency statements in the division or department, and that they also recognized the need for precise statements.

Though there were some differences in certain departments or divisions, most of the faculty members indicated that there was general agreement within departments regarding the competency-based statements. This was also largely true at the divisional level, but as the numbers of faculty members increase and the focus of the division broadens, less agreement occurs. Additional time devoted to working and planning together will help to clarify and refine expectations.

The third question of the interview asked, "How widely accepted is the competency-based system by the administration, faculty, and students?"

The responses reflected personal feelings about the competency system and ranged from "They have adjusted to it" to "Our department thinks it's great" or "I feel the percentage in all three areas is strongly for the system."

Asking for specific percentages, the respondents indicated that they believed the greatest acceptance was on the part of administration, with approximately an 80 to 85 percent rate average. The next highest rate of acceptance was by the students, with an approximate average of 70 to 75 percent expressed. Those interviewed indicated that there was a strong majority of faculty in favor of the system, with an approximate average of 60 to 65 percent endorsement by the faculty. It was also noted by those

interviewed that there was an ongoing need for the refinement of the competency-based system at National College of Education.

The fourth question asked, "What evidence can you offer to indicate that the students are able to pace themselves, when desirable, in an individual manner? Are modules of instruction used?"

The response to this question again indicated a wide range of responses and differences in the practices of the various departments. Several faculty members indicated that the freshmen and sophomores as well as some transfer students needed more precise time lines laid out for them until they really get to know the competency-based system. It was also stated that often the upper division students are much more independent, responsible, and better able to pace themselves. Others indicated that only the good students were able to pace themselves and were able to do some very intense, in-depth study, but that the majority of the students needed to be assisted, and that the slower students sometimes took advantage of the system and performed at the minimal level.

The competency-based system does lend itself to individualization. Some faculty members indicated that sometimes the slower students require more of the faculty time to complete the work and that sometimes the better or more highly motivated students are somewhat neglected. One faculty member indicated that approximately 3 percent of the students complete their work early, while approximately 20 to 25 percent receive an "in-progress" or incomplete rating. These students continue into the next quarter and

the faculty work load builds up and at times has been difficult to manage. Faculty in other departments or divisions indicated that not very many "in-progress" ratings were given. In discussing the student progress, it was emphasized that this is not a self-instruction process, but that students do pace themselves with the interaction and guidance of the faculty members.

In discussing the use of modules, some faculty members indicated that their area of specialization did not lend itself to the use of modules, while others stressed that modules were used extensively in their department or division.

The fifth question of the interview was primarily directed at the Student Teaching Department, but some other faculty members also had dome some supervision of student teachers or consultant work in the local public schools where student teachers were placed. The question asked, "Is a consistent position on the competency-based system reflected between the public school critic teachers and the college supervisors? What evidence can you offer to support this position?"

As indicated earlier in the discussion of the review of the Student Teaching Department records, the similarity between the ratings given by the public school cooperating teacher and those given by the college supervisors was extremely high. The interviews indicated that it was the normal practice for the involved personnel to frequently confer and plan the experiences of the student teachers.

The National College Student Teaching Department also met regularly with a representative group of cooperating public and private school teachers to plan and revise the form used to rate student teachers from the college. There appears to be a positive working relationship between the college personnel and the local school practitioners in helping to train competent teachers.

The one area where additional discussion would appear to be desirable pertains to the area of "commendations" granted to student teachers. The interviews indicated that the Student Teaching Department takes a more aggressive role in determining which students are to receive the commendations. It would appear that a more evenly shared responsibility between college personnel and local practitioners in all of the areas of student teaching would strengthen the program and foster on-going mutual respect and support.

The sixth question asked, "How do you view the competency-based system in terms of the teaching profession?" Almost everyone interviewed indicated that the competency-based system was helpful in preparing elementary teachers for teaching responsibilities. Comments ranged from focus on "an alternative approach to teaching" to "the emphasis is on performance" or "it's innovative." One faculty member responded, "The best!" That individual went on to say that additional modeling is necessary. Another indicated that it was a more accurate picture of what our students have accomplished and that they are more responsible for their own learning. Emphasis was given in this area to both "process" and "product."

One faculty member indicated that the system did not prepare the students and elaborated by indicating that the faculty does not know how to write good competencies. Another faculty member indicated that the system had helped the students to pace themselves and that it gave them greater confidence because of the demonstrated competencies with emphasis on "learning" rather than on grades. Another elaborated, "Teachers need to be competent in the task, not just parrot the material."

The seventh question dealt with record keeping and asked, "How do you rate the amount of paper work under the competency-based system?"

Again the response was interesting and varied. They ranged from "no difference" to "much more" or "voluminous." Those who indicated the amount of paper work was similar under a traditional system to that under the competency-based system stressed the fact that when one works with individuals in a personalized fashion, considerable paper work and conferencing is required.

Others indicated that the competency-based system resulted in much individualization and the paper work was more time consuming. Since many of the students received ratings of "in-progress," some faculty expressed a need for additional work-study assistants or computer assistance to help with the extra load. Faculty members also expressed the idea that the competency-based system forces the college teachers to become aware of individual differences on the part of the students and to adapt their teaching to

meet the needs of the students. This, in effect, can produce more responsive and competent faculty members as teaching models.

The eighth question asked, "What are the major advantages to using the competency-based system?"

The following comments were expressed: "It forces a greater degree of self-responsibility upon the student, though not all students can handle it. It allows for learning to take place is a less competitive fashion. The student as well as the instructor is measuring his own achievement. The instructor must find more than one approach in order to meet the individual needs of different students. Over all, fewer students 'slip-by' on an average degree of learning. The competency-based system clarifies expectations and goals and helps to structure experiences."

Additional comments regarding the advantages of the competency-based system included: "Students can concentrate on real learning without the pressure of grades and competition. It helps us to place students where we feel they ought to be and the slower students are able to achieve success at their own pace. The competency-based system helps to reduce gaps in learning because the students must show competency in all aspects of the work rather than to average grades together as in the traditional system."

Others said, "The students have demonstrated their success as they have learned for understanding, not just to repeat something from a list. The competency-based system enables the students to have a good self-concept and fosters cooperation among

and between students rather than emphasizing competition. The competency system facilitates better instruction. The focus is on what a particular student needs to learn rather than comparing himself with his peers."

Others said, "A faculty member is forced to spend time with students who are having difficulties. With students helping each other rather than competing against each other, the good students are further motivated and their learning reinforced by using their positive influence to help others master the competencies."

"The competency-based system forces the teachers to crystallize what they are going to teach and to define expectations in a very precise manner. The system also allows for novel ways of measuring and provides students with alternative ways of indicating competence. The competency system can allow for a crisis in a student's life and still carry over into the next quarter with an "in-progress" without being such a difficult experience. The system provides for explicitly stating the goals or objectives of a course at the beginning of the course. It does provide mastery learning in all areas rather than to allow gaps to exist in some areas. Grades do not necessarily reflect the degree of competence."

Some faculty members talked in terms of less subjectivity in grading with the competency-based system. Students must demonstrate that they have mastered all of the concepts to a certain

standard of proficiency. One faculty member indicated that the system requires less agonizing over than whether to give an "A" or a "B."

In general the comments reflect the positive attitude of the majority of the faculty toward the competency-based system at National College of Education.

The ninth question asked, "What are the impediments to using the competency-based system--i.e., time, effort, evaluation?"

The most frequently mentioned area of concern was the matter of inconsistency of operation throughout the college. Faculty indicated that there needed to be room for individual differences, but that through additional discussion and planning some of the inconsistencies could be worked out. Several other faculty members indicated that new faculty members needed to be more carefully and methodically oriented to the competency-based system.

Different ones indicated that sometimes students take advantage of the competency system by placing a great deal of pressure on the teachers to let them retake tests when the limitation of time or number of retakes has clearly been established. Other students act as though faculty can be "worn down" and won't require the same level of performance on a particular competency at the very end of the quarter.

It was noted that some felt that certain faculty members sometimes took "short-cuts" in the amount of time guiding students and thus reduce the effectiveness of the system.

Another frequently mentioned concern pertained to the difficulty within the competency system to adequately reflect the quality of the students' performance. If students were not able to perform at the commendation level, but were better than those just meeting the minimum competencies, under the present system there is no way to recognize that degree of accomplishment.

Others considered the great amount of time necessary to teach students in an individualized fashion to be somewhat of a problem under the competency-based system. Students who did not master the competency when initially exposed must be evaluated, retaught, and re-evaluated. It was stated that this has been a real problem for marginal students, and faculty need to be consistent with limits.

Another stressed, "The largest problem is the ease in which a student can let time pass--then is caught in a bind near or at the end of the quarter. Not every student has the self-discipline to keep himself on top and on time in all areas."

Others indicated that the use of the competency-based system of evaluation at National College is like an island in society. Most of the students have come from a background with limited or no exposure to the competency system and most of those who go on to graduate school will not encounter the competency system there. These individuals went on to indicate the problems encountered by some of the students as they attempted to get into the graduate schools that did not understand or appreciate the competency-based system. These faculty members reported that this

system has posed a greater problem for the borderline students to get into graduate school than would be the case with a traditional system.

Another faculty member indicated that the world is competitive and teachers are normally compared with one another. This person also believed that bright students were not as challenged under the competency-based system as under the traditional system. Again the need was stressed for the refinement of the concept and usage of "commendation."

Someone else said that it has been difficult for students to competency out of courses early and that it is particularly hard to use the system in the internship programs.

The final question of the interview asked, "Is there anything you wish to add about the use of the competency-based system?"

In the interview this question was initially left open, but after the individuals expressed their thoughts, if they did not offer suggestions for improving the competency-based system, they were urged to respond in this regard.

Some of the comments included stressing the ongoing modification of the system emphasizing the need to stress "consistency" and standardization of the criteria for commendations. Others reiterated the need for some kind of step between completion of competencies and commendation, but also indicated that this step should not be equated with a "B" grade.

Another indicated that the competency-based system provides the faculty and the students with a great many readings regarding the mastery of work rather than just a grade score. This person emphasized the fact that the system does provide a minimal base for learning, but does not have a ceiling so that each individual can advance as much as he wants to with the guidance of the faculty or can move to independent learning for life.

Another indicated that he believed the system allowed students to develop positive self-concepts, but that the system has not yet measured up to its potential.

The need to do additional work in the orientation of new faculty and students was stressed by others. In addition, a need was expressed for periodic faculty workshops on evaluating and refining the competency-based system.

A few faculty members indicated that they believed it would be better if the college returned to a traditional evaluation system. Others said that they would not want to return to the old system.

One faculty member summarized his thinking by stating,

> It is not a system without problems, it is not perfect, but it seems to work better than the old graded system and that makes it worthwhile. Any system which forces faculties and students to evaluate and re-evaluate where they are, where they are going and where they have been, has to be an improvement over aiming at an average or creating a bell curve or a standard via a percentage.

The final comment included in this area was in effect expressed by several individuals. They stressed, "Let's work at it to make it work!"

The work with students, faculty, and administration revealed that the competency-based system is widely accepted at National College. Approximately 60 to 65 percent of the faculty, 70 to 75 percent of the students, and 80 to 85 percent of the administration indicated a favorable reaction to the system, but each group also recommended that the system be modified to make it even more effective.

The next chapter in this study will focus on a summary, conclusions, and recommendations in THE MODEL.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The major problem undertaken by this study was to develop a model which could be useful in the analysis and evaluation of the administration and operation of a college's competency/performance-based system.

Even though there has been rapid and extensive spread of the principles of competency-based teacher education in the United States, considerable controversy and misunderstanding have also existed. Because of the limited number of models established for use in evaluating competency-based teacher education and the fact that many questions remained regarding the meaning, use, and value of the system, a need existed to conduct research to obtain additional data in this area.

Although institutions of higher education differ, they have many common elements, and it was the major objective of this study to develop a model which could not only be used with a particular college, but with slight modification be useful elsewhere. It was also the objective of this study to use this model with a specific institution, National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois. THE MODEL was delimited by assessing the "Mastery Learning" in the competency-based system at National College.

THE MODEL was developed for the analysis and evaluation of the administration and operation of the initiating, maintaining, and monitoring functions of a competency-based system. In order to gain perspective and an understanding of the functions of the proposed model, a review of the historical development of competency-based education was conducted by reviewing selected related research.

The areas considered in the review of the literature on competency-based education included: background and definitions, program design, evaluation and assessment, implications, and critiques. The review of the literature also considered selected existing programs and models focusing on the initiating, maintaining, and monitoring functions of competency-based education.

Additional data were obtained and analyzed by reviewing the initiating, maintaining, and monitoring functions of the competency-based system at National College of Education. This college was selected because of its use of the competency-based system of evaluation since the 1969-1970 academic year without having conducted extensive research during this period regarding the effectiveness of the system.

To consider the initiating function of the competency-based system at the college and to gain perspective on the college, a review was conducted of the various college documents, minutes of college meetings, and materials distributed by the Dean of Instruction.

The ideas on nongrading and teaching competence were presented in written form to the faculty in a nonthreatening fashion from Dean Troyer early in 1967. This was an outgrowth of the shift of the college to "liberal arts in teacher education" from a more traditional position of general education and professional education. Faculty members began to discuss and develop the concepts of competency-based education as the "seed" of the system began to germinate and develop. Additional material was presented and various groups considered the feasibility of the system for the college.

In the spring of 1969 the Council on Academic Standards made a formal proposal to the faculty that National College move to the competency-based system of evaluation for the 1969-1970 academic year. The majority of the faculty voted in favor of the change and the system was initiated in September, 1969.

Considerable thinking and careful planning went into the initiating function of the competency-based system at the college. The efforts of Dean Troyer contributed significantly to the development of the system. His work with the other administrators and his encouragement and guidance were basic to initiating the competency-based system at National College. The administration and faculty are also to be credited with willingness and in some instances even eagerness to move ahead with the new system.

The second phase of the model used for assessing and evaluating the competency-based system considered the maintaining function. The review of minutes of meetings, bulletins, and other

pertinent information revealed that Dean Troyer exerted leadership in the refinement and development of the competency-based system. During this period, Dr. Benjamin Bloom served as a consultant to the faculty in helping with the maintaining function.

Continued development of the system took place with ideas refined by observation, experience in research, and discussion among administration and faculty. Changes in the administrative personnel made a difference in the maintaining function of the competency-based system at the college. In 1972, President Johnson retired after being president for 23 years, and President Gross became the college's fifth president.

In addition, in 1972, Dean Troyer assumed a teaching role until his retirement. Men from outside of the college who had not been involved extensively with the competency-based system became Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs. The maximum tenure in office for each of these men was less than two years. During this period the Vice-Presidents were extensively involved in preparing for major accreditation visitations from NCATE, North Central, and the Illinois Department of Education.

Without the active, direct leadership role of the Vice-President, the competency-based system was retained by faculty and student support, but the maintaining and monitoring functions were not given as much attention as had been the case formerly.

The accreditation reports and visitations were helpful by forcing faculty and administration to consider and describe the competency-based system for the visits. The accreditation teams

were complimentary about the use of the competency-based system at the college. The North Central team indicated that the competency-based system more clearly focused on purposes and objectives, that the outcomes were more explicit, and that the competencies were more relevantly conceived than under the traditional evaluation system.

The faculty and students voted to continue the use of the system, but very limited time and energy were allocated to the function of monitoring the system. Continued study by the Council on Academic Standards and other student and faculty groups indicated the need for additional study and refinement of the system.

To further develop THE MODEL for consideration of the function of monitoring the competency-based system, a list of the characteristics of a "good" competency-based system was compiled from the review of related research. To validate the list of "good" characteristics, the list was sent to a seven-member jury selected by working with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Special Committee on Competency/Performance-Based Teacher Education. The jury rated the characteristics and a rating form using the characteristics of a "good" competency-based system was developed. The faculty and students of National College rated the occurrence of the characteristics at the college as part of THE MODEL used for monitoring the competency-based system at the college.

The monitoring function used for the analysis and evaluation of the competency-based system at National College included the following components:

1. Analysis of a sample of 1500 student teaching records for the period 1973 through 1976.
2. Analysis of the "Teacher Competency Evaluation," a form completed by principals rating their first-year teachers from National College.
3. Analysis of the rating of characteristics of the competency-based system as completed by National College students and faculty.
4. Analysis of the responses of the academic administration and faculty to a 10-question interview conducted regarding the competency-based system at National College.

The review conducted regarding the initiating function of the competency-based system at National College revealed a minimal-pressure exposure to the concepts of competency-based education at the embryonic stage. The appendices provide detailed materials regarding the formative stage of development of the system at National College.

The appointment of Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs with limited backgrounds in the competency-based system, and with primary interest and responsibility in other areas, resulted in limited attention being devoted to the maintaining and monitoring functions of the competency-based system from 1972 until 1976.

Without an institutional research person to help in the monitoring function of the competency-based system at National College, the kinds of research undertaken by busy students and tightly scheduled faculty members were very limited.

Periodic discussions and voting by the students and faculty from 1972 to 1976 indicated that they did not want to return to the traditional evaluation system, but they also said that the present system needed to be modified.

Additional observations resulted from using the monitoring function of THE MODEL with National College of Education.

The faculty noted many common elements in the definition of the competency-based system. Included was the fact that the system is criterion-referenced rather than norm-referenced and requires demonstrated proficiency by the students on each designated competency. Nevertheless, there was enough disagreement regarding definition to lead to confusion among the faculty and students and an inconsistency of operation.

The analysis of the Student Teaching Department records indicated that there was substantial similarity between the ratings given by the cooperating teachers and the college student teaching supervisors.

An analysis of the records revealed that during the period 1973-1976, 57 percent of the students received a "commendation" rating for their student teaching rating. The Student Teaching Department indicated that during the fall quarter of the 1976-1977 school year, 77 percent of the student teachers received a

"commendation" rating. These figures indicated that other professional education practitioners believed that the students using the competency-based system were effectively trained. Others, however, question the high rate of "commendations" given to National College student teachers. The Student Teaching Department claimed that a high percentage of "commendations" was expected and that the students demonstrated their competence.

An examination of the responses of the principals' ratings of their first-year teachers who were recent graduates of National College was used for comparison with those before the competency-based system was adopted. The rating for the 1968-1970 period indicated that on an average 61.3 percent of the teachers received a rating of strong or superior. For the 1973-1975 period an average of 80.1 percent of the teachers received a rating of strong or superior.

On the low end of the rating scale, for the period 1968-1970 an average of 11.3 percent of the teachers were rated as fair or inferior. By contrast, during the 1973-1975 period, only 3.7 percent of the teachers were rated as fair or inferior.

An area that warrants scrutiny was noted by observing the rating of the 1974 graduates by their principals when 47 percent of the teachers received a rating of superior. This was compared with the 1975 National College graduates, when only 29 percent of the teachers received a rating of superior. One year's findings are not necessarily conclusive, but the evaluation needs to be watched to see if it connotes a trend.

The fact that 86 percent of the certified teacher graduates from National College in 1976 obtained teaching positions was cited as another credit to the training program at National College using the competency-based system.

In the refinement of the instrument used in the monitoring function of THE MODEL, the jury rated the following six characteristics as being "essential," i.e., a rating of one, to a "good" competency-based system.

1. "Competencies to be demonstrated by the students are derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles in achieving school goals."
2. "Competencies to be demonstrated by the students are supported by research, curriculum and job analysis, and/or expected teacher judgment."
3. "Competencies to be demonstrated by the students are stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies."
4. "Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are based upon, and in harmony with specified competencies."
5. "Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions."
6. "Assessment of the student's competency uses his performance as a primary source of evidence."

These six characteristics were rated by the faculty and students as to their occurrence at National College. Since the jury

considered these characteristics to be "essential" (i.e., rating of one) and the college rating did not measure up to this standard, the college was considered to be deficient in this regard.

The interviews indicated that some of the divisions and departments spent considerable time planning together to establish uniform expectations, practices, and terminology and still provide for individual differences, while others had made limited efforts in this regard and as a result some confusion existed. Many faculty members indicated in the interviews that the record keeping and conferencing under the competency-based system were substantially increased in order to help the students individually and redirect the "in-progress" students. Other faculty members indicated that if a teacher used personalized instruction under a traditional system the amount of record keeping and conferencing was similar to that required under this system.

During the interviews, the most frequently mentioned area of concern regarding the competency-based system pertained to the inconsistency throughout the college. This included the areas of terminology, expectations, and granting of "commendations." Another concern expressed was in the difficulty some students have in being admitted to graduate schools that do not understand or appreciate the competency-based system.

In general, however, this research has shown that the students, faculty, and administration were relatively pleased with the competency-based system and believed that it showed substantial potential. The study indicated that the National College personnel

were anxious to begin the modification of the system to reduce or eliminate the problems and increase its effectiveness.

Conclusions

1. The evaluation using THE MODEL with National College of Education leads to the conclusion that the college personnel preferred the use of the competency-based system of evaluation to the traditional system formerly used at the college.

2. The evaluation using THE MODEL with National College leads to the conclusion that there is a need for additional in-service education for the administration and faculty of the college to further refine and develop the competency-based system. The study leads to the conclusion that additional attention should be devoted to the following areas in order to make the system more effective:

   a. Common definitions and terminology.
   b. Consistency of terminology, expectations, and use of "commendations."
   c. Development of a more comprehensive understanding of the "essential" characteristics of a competency-based system.

3. The evaluation using THE MODEL with National College leads to the conclusion that the students trained under the competency-based system at National College are apparently better prepared for teaching than those trained under a more traditional system. This conclusion is based on the following data:

a. Student teaching records as cited in the study.

b. Principals' evaluations of first-year teachers as cited in the study.

c. Employment records of teachers certified through National College as cited inthe study.

4. The evaluation using THE MODEL with National College leads to the conclusion that the faculty and students consider the following points as being advantageous under the competency-based system:

a. "The competency-based system clarifies expectations and goals and helps to structure experiences."

b. "The competency-based system forces a greater degree of self-responsibility upon the student."

c. "The competency-based system allows for learning to take place in a less competitive fashion."

d. "The competency-based system encourages the instructors to find more than one approach in order to meet the individual needs of different students."

e. "The competency-based system helps to reduce gaps in learning because the students must show competency in all aspects of the work rather than to average grades together as in the traditional system."

f. "The competency-based system encourages faculty members to spend time with students who are having difficulty."

g. "The competency-based system forces the teachers to crystallize what they are going to teach and to define expectations in a very precise manner."

Recommendations With Respect to National College

1. It is recommended that the College secure the services of an institutional research person to help with the ongoing research necessary for the monitoring function of the College and to be available to help the various divisions with research to upgrade the effectiveness of the competency-based system. Included is the development of a unified definition of the competency-based system and the consideration of the characteristics rated by the jury as being "essential" to a "good" competency-based system.

2. It is recommended that the College allocate additional resources for inservice training for faculty members so that the problems of the system can be resolved and the potential of the competency-based system can be attained. As the College spends the time and energy to develop a consistency and standardization of terminology and expectations for completion of competencies and "commendations," all college personnel should benefit. This includes such matters as to the number of times a person can retake a test, the availability of faculty for conferences, and the stating of competency requirements at the beginning of the quarter and not altering them during the quarter.

3. It is recommended that each department and division devote time and energies to the refinement and development of the

competencies within each specialty and that the various members compare what they have done with others in their department and division. As faculty meet with members of the other divisions to compare practices and do mutual planning, it is expected that continued professional growth will result and development of the competency-based system will occur.

4. It is recommended that the College establish a thoroughly organized process of orienting new faculty and students to the competency-based system at the College. This may include a multi-media presentation which could be readily available as needed.

5. It is recommended that consideration be given to providing additional assistance to faculty to help with the record keeping and other routine instructional tasks. This may include additional help from work-study assistants or through more extensive use of the computers to assist faculty.

6. It is recommended that the College give consideration to the percentage of students receiving "in-progress" ratings. By reducing the number of "in-progress" ratings the pressures on faculty members to reteach and retest so many students from a former quarter will also be reduced.

7. It is recommended that the faculty give consideration to providing recognition for the students who do not receive a rating of "commendation" but perform above the rating of completion of the basic competencies. Care needs to be taken in this regard that the competencies do not just become the minimum standard.

8. It is recommended that the College watch carefully the results of the "Teacher Competency Evaluation" rating completed by the principals regarding their first-year teachers who have graduated from National College. The rating for 1975 graduates indicated that the percentage of teachers receiving a rating of superior dropped to 29 percent in contrast to the 1974 graduates' rating when 47 percent of the teachers received a rating of superior. This needs to be observed to determine whether or not this may develop into a possible trend.

9. It is recommended that the Student Teaching Department involve the local practitioners in mutually determining the eligibility of students receiving "commendation" ratings. This will foster ongoing mutual respect and trust.

10. Finally, it is recommended that the College give further consideration to the transferability of students using the competency-based system of evaluation. Perhaps an additional statement can be prepared for graduate schools and other institutions of higher education that do not understand and appreciate the evaluation of those trained under the competency-based system.

Because of the limited models available for the assessment and evaluation of the competency-based system, it is believed that the information derived from this model can be helpful to others who strive to develop or evaluate a competency-based system elsewhere.

Recommendations for Use of THE MODEL

In conclusion, the development of THE MODEL for the analysis and evaluation of the administration and operation of a competency-based system and field tested with National College has generated data which are expected to be helpful not only to National College, but also to the broader profession. Although the competency-based system as evaluated at National College was not without problems, its potential for use in training effective teachers is substantial and its usage has many advantages over a more traditional system.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

IS NCE REALLY A LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE?

APPENDIX A

"IS NCE REALLY A LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE?"

By

Lewis W. Troyer

Source: National College of Education News, May 1966.

Is NCE Really a Liberal Arts College?

This question has been asked a number of times recently--by prospective students, by faculty members, by members of the Board of Trustees, by representatives of the "fourth estate." It will probably be asked many more times in the future.

The answer now and in the future, the only unequivocal answer, must be: "Yes!

But, some protest, is the college not really a teachers college, a college preparing elementary teachers? How can it be that if it is this, or this if it is that? This question, likewise, has been asked a number of times recently, by the same types of people, and it, too, will probably be asked again and again.

And again, the only unequivocal answer must be: Yes! It can be, is, and will continue to be both this and that. National College of Education is a liberal arts college for prospective elementary teachers.

The idea may at first seem strange, perhaps paradoxical, but it is not crazy. It simply requires thinking of two things together which have been erroneously separated in the past and

which belong together as naturally as oxygen and hydrogen in the make-up of water.

There are people who do not know that two-thirds of the elementary and secondary teachers of the country are now, and have been, graduating not from so-called teachers colleges or their sublimated successors--the state colleges and universities; but from the liberal arts colleges. Most of them have graduated from fully accredited programs. A goodly share--perhaps in due proportion--have become excellent teachers. In other words, it is nothing new at all, nothing paradoxical, for elementary teachers--well prepared elementary teachers--to graduate from liberal arts colleges. Many of these colleges, over the years, have instituted and carried out in their regular curricula high quality professional sequences for their students who wished to be elementary teachers after graduation.

Why, then, should it seem strange that a teachers college should decide to institute and carry out a high quality liberal arts education for its students who wish to be elementary teachers after graduation? In what way is it thus doing anything really different than is being done in many of the finest colleges in the land? If a liberal arts college, with a considerable number of its students interested in elementary teaching, can offer a proper sequence of preparation within and as an integral part of its liberal arts curriculum, why is it not equally possible and appropriate for a teachers college, with a large majority of its students interested in elementary teaching, to offer a proper liberal arts education as the foundation of its professional sequence? At National College

is equal in course units to the typical academic concentration. This means that the student graduates with approximately nineteen general education courses, nine to eleven courses in the academic major, and eleven courses in the professional sequence. The total pattern is not unlike that obtaining in other liberal arts colleges with graduates entering the teaching profession.

So much for the over-all pattern. The question raised cuts deeper, however. In arriving at a definitive idea of liberal arts education in this pattern, it is well to look again at the catalog statements. After the statement of educational objectives of the College, the following appears: "It is this type of education which traditionally has been defined as liberal because it frees its possessors from the limitations of ignorance, prejudice, and provincialism. To develop a college curriculum on this basis is to express agreement with a growing consensus that the proper education of teachers is a liberal education. It recognizes that teacher education includes a judicious blend of general education, scholarly knowledge of subject matter, and professional skillfulness. But in and through all its aspects, the major emphasis is that of liberal education, which is not regarded as the antithesis but the heart of the kind of teacher education essential if our culture is to survive and develop" (p. 31).

"It is to be noted that the so-called fields of concentration in the new curriculum plan are not conceived specifically as pre-professional in character. . . . The purpose of the concentration is to provide a scholarly experience in depth and mastery in

of Education this is taken as no anomaly but as the natural step forward in improved elementary teacher education. It means that the College has committed itself to a concept of teacher education which is synonymous with highest quality liberal arts education; or, as its current slogan aptly puts it: "The New Horizon in Liberal Arts in Teacher Education."

But what, it will surely be asked, is meant by "highest quality liberal arts education," or "the new horizon in liberal arts"? If the liberal arts orientation is put all the way into teacher education, what does this imply both with regard to the nature of liberal arts education and to the resulting teacher education? It would be granted, without doubt, that some liberal arts education has always been a part of teacher education. Certain basic courses in the academic disciplines have been required and have been designated as general education. But in the enlarged liberal arts curriculum adopted by the NCE faculty the number and proportion of such courses in the total program of the student is enlarged. Furthermore, the student is now required to elect a concentration or major in a subject area other than professional education.

Separate Methods Courses Reduced

The professional sequence has been streamlined and transformed, with a drastic reduction in the number of separate methods courses. Including the required foundations courses in child psychology and psychology of learning the new professional sequence

harmony with the generally accepted concept of a liberal education" (p. 35). "By general education is meant those knowledges, appreciations, and skills required for intelligent living and participation in the affairs of one's own time. . ." (p. 69).

Knowledge Is Instrumental

"It is very important for both student and teacher to realize that the primary focus of the new curriculum is not upon information and the attainment of knowledge as such. Knowledge is important but instrumental. The end sought is a transformation or growth in the student. This transformation includes the acquisition of knowledge, but expresses itself best in terms of the development of certain intellectual abilities and skills: in the comprehension, that is, the translation, interpretation, and extrapolation of knowledge; in the application of knowledge; in the analysis of elements, relationships, and principles of knowledge; in the synthesis of knowledge through unique communication, plans of operations, and the development of sets of abstract relations for classifying or explaining knowledge; in the effective transmission of knowledge through teaching.

This growth, moreover, carries with it the implication of a strong affective component, denoting not simply awareness and willingness to receive, acquiescence in responding, but satisfaction in response, acceptance of values, commitment to values, the development of an intelligent and viable personal philosophy of life. It is this type of education which insures a resourcefulness

of personality that is able to build on new experience, that leads to continued growth in personal and teaching effectiveness. This resourcefulness is found in the attitudes, values, and understandings of the student. It is these which must be changed, developed, enriched in a college education" (pp. 31-32). To accomplish the ends of such a liberal education it may be advisable to organize courses around the strategies of inquiry within the disciplines (including Education) rather than around factual content per se. The distinction being made is sometimes conceptualized as the difference between training and education; sometimes as the difference between acquiry and inquiry. By acquiry is meant that process of learning and teaching in which the primary emphasis is upon the acquisition of information rather than upon its examination. By inquiry is meant that process of learning and teaching in which information is examined. It is that which is done after information has been provided or learned; it is the reason for acquiry. Inquiry is the essence of problem-oriented instruction.

A recent publication of the U.S. Office of Education, after reviewing research on quality in colleges, contains the following pertinent statements: "There is much evidence, both old and new, for the conclusion that when it comes to the acquisition of information students can do this better without the personal intercession of the teacher. . . . But how, practically, is a student, a counselor, or a parent to determine which colleges understand these problems and are doing something about them? These institutions will be those that: (a) Give the fewest expository lectures. This

does not mean that they will eschew lectures; they will simply avoid as much exposition as possible in favor of more effective techniques. The number of students involved may actually be large, but the approach will feature Socratic, case, or problem-oriented presentations. (b) Provide laboratory instruction which is experimental or problem-oriented. (c) Provide for group conferences, seminars, colloquia, and the like, of a quality and number that fully exploit the human resources of the institution. (d) Provide examinations that are appropriate in that they minimize rote memorization and maximize creative thinking. The condition of learning met in a and b above is that learning will increase to the extent that students are able to determine, frequently and in detail, just how well they are doing. The principle of learning involved in c is that active learning is more efficient than passive learning. . . . The applicable condition of learning in d is that 'if we base our grades on memorization of details, students will memorize the text. . . . To develop an interest in thinking we have to make it satisfying. . . . Experience in solving problems within the student's ken is essential'"

Belth Attacks Cliche

One of the most common cliches is that the basis for teaching is knowing. Marc Belth, in his Education as a Discipline, writes of this cliche: "Perhaps the best statement of another widely held notion is that knowing is the basic requirement for teaching. The worst is to argue that if one knows his subject

matter sufficiently, he can teach it. Much can be done with the first statement to make it quite defensible as an educational judgment. The second is merely a cynical rejection of the claim that there is a theoretical dimension to education. Of course one must know in order to teach. One must even know his so-called 'subject.' But just what does this mean? Certainly it does not mean that he 'had the facts down cold.'"

A rather common, but essentially erroneous, way of attacking this problem is to say that one can know in two different ways: He can know that, and he can know how. To know that means that one has committed to memory and is able to express in recognizable form certain information. Knowing how means that one is able to take the precisely necessary mediating steps to accomplish some defined objective in behavior. If you want to get a particular kind of result, you must do so and so first. Certain subjects have been classified as purely matters of how (automobile repair, electrical wiring, until recently much of mathematics, and not a little of science). This is the locus of the untenable and confusing distinction between "vocation" and "academic" studies. Unfortunately, the "pure" academic subjects, the liberal arts, have often been identified as those studies in which knowing that is the exclusive concern. The implication for college (or other) teaching then is that in these so-called academic subjects we teach that. We transmit the facts of the case, all properly connected and with the meanings (our meanings) clearly set forth.

"But," as Belth declares, "we have come to understand in a world which we view as an ever changing event, that knowing means knowing how to control, to regulate, to correct, to profit from the past, to apply concepts of what is not present. In this, knowing facts plays an important role, although such knowledge is not indication of the power to think, to produce what Gilbert Ryle has called an intellectual operation. . . . In the light of this, the knowledge required to educate is knowledge about procedures for inventing theories and models" (pp. 54-55, 59).

Discuss Science Course Content

The point of view here given exposition has something to say directly to a problem raised in the discussion of the faculty at its February 2 meeting concerning the content of college science courses and the alleged need of the student to be prepared to treat of "simple machines" or "safety rules" in the elementary school classroom. One position advanced was that the college courses should supply the necessary information; otherwise, the student would not be properly prepared for teaching. Perhaps in no other way could the focal problem of this exposition (Is N.C.E. really a liberal arts college?) be brought to concrete clarification than by consideration of what the content of liberal arts courses should be.

There certainly can be no quarrel with the claim that the elementary school teacher should know "simple machines" (or any other similar content, facts, knowledge) if he (she) is to teach this subject matter. One of the current travesties on education is the apparent prevalence of teaching of content not understood

by the teacher doing the so-called teaching. But from this it cannot be concluded that the solution is more information in college courses of the kind needed. If a teacher fails in the classroom on this type of problem, it is not because the college did not provide the needed knowledge, but rather because the college failed to educate the teacher--and that is a much more terrible failure.

If the proper aim of the college is to provide in its courses all the knowledge that is required by a student in successfully carrying out the role of the elementary teacher, little time and energy would be left for the liberal arts objectives of the new curriculum. Nor could the result of such a course of study be accredited at the "college" level: much of it would be simply repetition of the elementary and secondary school curricula. It is probably just because teachers colleges have in the past included so much of such study in their programs, especially their professional sequences, that these have earned for themselves such poor academic reputations.

Much that has been "handed out" to college students in such programs has not been intellectually respectable. Critics have rightly designated this as the "trade school mentality." And the results, generally, have not been better teaching, but inept, mechanical, unimaginative, uncreative teaching.

The teachers thus produced may have been able to recite a unit on simple machines but often have not known why, or whether the unit had any relevance to the developmental needs of particular children, or how such a unit could be related vitally to other

things going on in the child's expanding intellectual horizon. These are the teachers who want from their graduate course instructors, not help in learning how to solve their own problems, but training manuals and curriculum content pitched to the level of the child to be taught. These are not really teachers; however successful they are in keeping out of trouble with the principal, they are mechanics.

Now, lest the forthrightness of the above be misunderstood, let it be clear that this writer is not one to oppose the wholesome dictum of "starting with students where they are." This is an important part of the strategy of successful college teaching and is not gainsaid in the slightest in the so-called liberal arts course. What can be said, however, is that a college course, at least in most subject areas, cannot start with elementary school or high school content. The college teacher must be able to presuppose some pre-college background, and, if a student doesn't have it, there is a real question as to whether he should be in a college class at all.

It is for this reason that college instructors are encouraged to use proficiency testing in their courses. . . . This is an excellent means of getting to know what the student can do. Where it is discovered that a major deficiency in pre-college level learning obtains, the student should be counseled to do remedial work. . . . This does not mean that students who meet entrance requirements should afterwards be ruthlessly flunked out of college. It probably should not mean setting up a whole sub-curriculum of

remedial courses; a few of these in crucial areas will no doubt be needed. Nevertheless, deficiencies should be spotted and the student should be helped to recognize his need and to overcome it. Today self-instructional programs are available in many subject areas. Tutoring and other remedial type forms of learning could be made available. In the meantime, college courses should be college courses.

A word is also necessary on this point with regard to methods courses in the professional sequence. It has been recognized by all concerned that the present sequence, streamlined into a four-year liberal arts program, does not provide all the professional education needed by the elementary school teacher today. It is essentially a pre-service preparation, intending to establish adequacy for teaching, but definitely predicating additional in-service and post-graduate learning. It cannot be expected that the student will show quite the same "polish" in teaching behavior with the present methods blocks and courses (13 semester hour equivalent) that may have been shown previously after completion of the required 23 semester hours of special methods courses. The problem is misconceived on the basis of any such comparison. The real problem is that of achieving the maximum possible effectiveness within limitations set by the total curriculum pattern.

Two significant points need to be kept in mind. First, the present methods blocks and courses cannot provide instruction in subject-matter knowledge or content. While it is true beyond a shadow of doubt that you cannot teach methods separate from

content, it is nevertheless just as true--and very important to understand thoroughly--that most content learnings will, and must come before the student enrolls in the methods courses, per se. This content is what the student ostensibly has been mastering all along. This is what general education and scholarship in a concentration are all about. To have to take time in a methods course in mathematics, for example, to teach basic concepts is to emasculate the methods course.

To the extent that methods courses as such are intellectually justifiable in a professional program, they must presuppose considerable prior learning. The student must be able to move freely with content in order to take the next step--that is, learn how to communicate and to use this content in the learning of others. If he must learn content as well as how to professionally communicate content all at the same time, and that within the prescribed time and energy limits of a single block, of course, "something's got to give." This means that we cannot afford in our streamlined professional sequence to load down the methods blocks with content learnings. We must be sure that the student has had a reasonable opportunity for these when he is admitted to the block.

The second of the two points promised above is that the methods blocks, and indeed all the courses of the professional sequence, should be taught as liberal arts courses. Yes, that is it precisely! The student may be, perhaps should be, well supplied with a quantity of specific information, in textbooks, course syllabi, acquaintance with reference sources, etc. But the courses

themselves should help the student avoid the old, old mistakes of not seeing the forest because of the trees. Here again, the emphasis should be upon principles, how to define and solve problems, so that the student becomes capable of growing, of adapting rather than adjusting to circumstances.

The bane of a good methods course is a recipe box or a scrapbook. Not that these are bad in themselves. They are part of the furniture needed in any teacher's study. But they are not methods instruction, and, if made the center of instructional attention, they become traps well calculated to stifle growth and cripple adaptability. Many an elementary teacher--perhaps some from NCE--teaches from a file-box, the latest entry of which may have been dated 20 years ago. It is even more stultifying to herself and to her children than the lecture notes yellowed with age sometimes employed by the college professor (of education and/or other subjects). In a methods course or block where the real importance of method in knowing, doing, teaching is understood and communicated to the student, the latter is equipped not only to practice certain techniques but to revise, refine, change these techniques as means to the accomplishment of deliberately selected and intelligently conceived purposes. It is in this sense that Dewey referred to the "supremacy of method."

I close this statement with a question, again from Belth, which ties what has just been said about the professional sequence indistinguishably to what was previously said about the liberal arts, so that in the last analysis they become, as they should be,

one unbroken tapestry of meaning. "It should be clear that it is not only the organizational plan that marks the movement from one phase of educational development to the next. The differences are also evident in the matter which is to be studied. Historical and philosophical inquiries are focused critically upon educational concepts. When methods are studied, they are studied for their relationships to the various models by which the facets of the whole educational procedure are identified. Techniques for doing any of the educational acts are explored in the sense of their being illustrations of practices rather than as lists of skills to be set to habit. . . . Where the educator performs his function of exposing and nurturing the powers of exploring and analyzing the models which shape our world, he makes it possible for each age to confront in new terms, with new instruments of thought, the experiences which impinge directly upon it. And, moreover, he makes it possible for each member of that generation to set the world into an order which would reflect his own growing powers of comprehension, vision, inventive projection, and model-making. If not all who come to learn are finally able to do this, and if not all who seek to teach finally reach that high level of ability by which they can assist each new member of each new generation, the fundamental character of education, and the study of education, still is intended to produce these powers in those who seek them out diligently" (pp. 304-306).

On these terms, NCE is on the way at least to becoming really a liberal arts college.

APPENDIX B_1

THE CONTINUING SEARCH FOR CRITERIA

APPENDIX B_1

"THE CONTINUING SEARCH FOR CRITERIA"

By

H. S. Broudy[1]

Source: "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean," National College of Education Faculty Bulletin, Vol. 10, No. 6, March 2, 1967.

Every so often we are startled by a page in a newspaper that seems totally blank. But we are not fooled: this is an advertising dodge, we say, and there must be a message here somewhere. And so there is. In the center of the blankness two tiny lines of print announce that: "This space reserved for the Acme Products Company." Did the Acme Company fail to provide copy for the advertising space? Or having nothing interesting to say, did the copywriter decide to say nothing? Or did he think that this odd way of capturing the attention of the reader would lead him to concentrate on the virtue of Acme products with extraordinary intensity?

What would happen if instead of filling the next 40 minutes with discourse about accreditation, certification, criteria, and standards, I merely invited you to meditate on all that you must have read, heard, and said about these topics. I lack the courage and the permission for so noble an experiment, which, at best, would be self-defeating, because if audiences expected speakers to remain silent, pretty soon there would be no audiences. What respectable

---

[1]H. S. Broudy, Professor of Philosophy of Education, University of Illinois, address at AACTE Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February 16, 1967.

excuses would then be left to schoolmen for leaving the hearth and the office for two or three days at a time?

Am I right in believing that you feel there is nothing left to be said on the subject? After a decade or more of assaults upon teacher training by its avowed enemies and alleged friends, are we not tempted to let this problem be solved by fatigue? Nonetheless, fatigued or not, we cannot stop talking about these matters, because the causes of the problems are still with us and give us no peace. Consider, if you please, that:

1. The teacher shortage has not abated. Instead, new educational ventures threaten to deplete already badly stretched teaching staffs in the public schools. It has been estimated that if projected funding of USOE projects for 1972 is carried out they will need 41,025 full-time equivalents of manpower.

2. The gap between what we expect from the classroom teacher and the pre-service training we provide to meet these expectations is broadening not diminishing. The government is demanding that the public school solve the problems of segregation and poverty, dropouts, and delinquency. Even more serious is the clamor for the schools to serve up mass education tailored to the individual needs of pupils: the demand for finely tailored custom clothes at mass production prices. The gap is approaching a critical stage; a catastrophic breakdown in public schools is not at all inconceivable if it is not reduced. Public school teaching today is too demanding for the nonprofessional and too ill-paid for those who are willing to become professional.

3. For these and other reasons the frenetic attempts to secure large numbers of classroom teachers by various shortcuts, by and large, have not been successful; neither have the attempts to take teacher preparation away from colleges of education and hand it over to the liberal arts colleges. Whether the bids of Peace Corps, Teacher Corps, and the education industries to train teachers will be more successful remains to be seen.

4. The pressures on the schools to innovate will either be controlled by a strong teaching profession, or they may not be controlled educationally at all. We cannot rely wholly or even in great part upon the public school superintendent to serve as the educational gatekeeper. He has about all he can do to cope with bonds, busses, boycotts, and buildings. Moreover, his traditional role of bargaining agent for the teaching force is rapidly being eroded. Teachers are showing greater willingness to deal directly and not always politely or timidly with the school board. On curriculum matters, on staffing, on materials, the superintendent must depend on specialists. Above all, he must depend on his infantry, on a corps of teachers, for despite all the massive experimentation and ballyhoo, there are still no teacher-proof curricula, no teacher-proof materials, no teacher-proof schools, and no teacher-proof administrators.

The issue, I submit, is not between federal and local control of the schools, but between educational and noneducational control. That is why certification and accreditation continue to be very live issues indeed, and so we are forced willy nilly to

resume our perennial search for the criteria by which teacher training programs and institutions are to be judged.

Blind Alleys

However, we do not have to continue the search down the blind alleys in and out of which our researchers have been scurrying for the last quarter of a century or more.

The first of these is the search for a set of personality or behavioral traits that uniquely determine a good teacher. But we know that the number of variables is indefinitely large and their effects impossible to isolate. Moreover, there is no way of knowing which variables are relevant unless we already have some notion of a good teacher in mind. It is no use pretending that this criterion of goodness emerges from statistical analyses of neutral data.

Because a teacher is a concrete human being, the most complex entity we know, and because teaching is a syndrome that involves many such human entities it lends itself to any analysis you please. Some look at it as a set of interactions between a teacher and one or more pupils. Some interactions are interpreted psychologically as ways of controlling responses; some are broken down into types of discourse between pupil and teacher. Some regard the teaching act as an encounter between persons, in which a drama is played out between forces of dominance and submission, strong and weak selves. Some regard teaching as analogous to an artistic performance, to be judged as a critic would judge a work

of art, and some as an input-output-feedback flow of information. There is little point in asking which of these ways of looking at the teaching act is right or wrong; about as little point as asking whether it is more right to compare life itself to a race, or a drama, or a dream, or a comedy, or a tragedy. These are figures of speech, analogies, models, not scientific theories. There is no limit to the number of relevant aspects; any one aspect is as apt and as limited as any other. Nor is there any harm in talking about teaching in figures of speech or comparing it to operations found in other areas of life, provided one remembers what one is doing and does not get illusions of scientific grandeur.[2]

The search for personality traits overlooks the fact that we are trying to evaluate the teacher not as a person or as a human being, but as a functionary in a very special situation, a public school classroom. Our search must try to isolate variables that are relevant to this situation and not to two males discoursing on a log, a family dinner table, a psychiatric clinic, a committee of citizens planning reform, or a teen-age discotheque. The present tendency to look at the teaching act in its own right is looking in the right direction.

We are forced to consider the possibility that, as Wittgenstein[3] observed with games, there is not one set of operations

---

[2]Robert M. W. Travers, "Taking the Fun Out of Building a Theory of Instruction," Teachers College Record, 68:1, 49-60, October, 1966.

[3]Ludwig Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations, tr. by G. E. M. Anscombe, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1953.

or personal qualities or even skills that all instances of teaching or good teaching have in common. To be sure, some instances of teaching resemble each other more than do others, e.g., two teachers assigning an eighth-grade algebra lesson may resemble each other more than an algebra teacher and a kindergarten teacher. Two inspirational teachers resemble each other more than do an inspirational mentor and a methodical one. The partial resemblances build up into what Wittgenstein called a family of meanings among which there are family resemblances. Some teachers resemble others in temperament but not in method; some in method but not in their attitude toward pupils. We call them all teachers because they exercise a common function, and not because we can discern in each and every one of them a set of characteristics that all display in performing that function.

The second blind alley may also serve as a red herring. I refer to the seemingly plausible dictum that a teacher-training program ought to be judged primarily by the quality of the teachers it sends out. The quality, in turn, should be judged, it is contended, by their success in actual teaching.

This is plausible because if there were no significant relation between a program of training and the character of the result, the search for criteria would be meaningless, as well as futile. It is deceptively plausible, however, once we ask: What is the criterion product by which to judge the teacher-training institution? The teacher in the classroom is a product, but so is her pupil, and what actions of the pupil shall we use to measure the

teacher? Performance on a test, success on the next highest rung of the educational ladder, happiness in adult life, including, as Aristotle would insist, the escape from a disgraceful death and ungrateful children? In practice, evaluation of the product is often done by the superintendent or principal, whose administrative comfort may be the chief criterion of teacher-goodness. Or it may be done by a supervisor who is committed to one style of teaching or to one sort of emphasis. Success, at our present stage of evaluation, is likely to be whatever favors the judge's goals, and we know that these goals vary with the time, the community, and his own troubles.

However, even if we stipulated in advance what "success" should mean, its presence or absence in a given teacher or set of them could not be attributed uncritically to the school from which they were graduated, and I need not belabor the reasons why this is so. This blind alley thus can be a red herring, because the criterion of product quality can be invoked to claim freedom from all other evaluation, on the ground that if the institution turns out "good" teachers, all other questions are superfluous.

The truth inherent in the quality-of-product criterion is that we must search not only for criteria or signs of good teaching but also for what they presuppose in the way of training and institutional arrangements to provide that training. We should, ideally, be able to relate training to success behavior.

I doubt that we are ready, even after hundreds of researches, to apply the method of the single variable to this problem. Systems

analysis, on the face of it, is more promising because it takes account of many variables, and one can--if one likes--regard a classroom as a social system. Yet I am not sure that we are even ready to be dogmatic about which dozen variables really delineate the system. We need as a preliminary to do a more modest analysis--a kind of crude phenomenological description of what we do and mean when we judge a teacher in a classroom. For we can, I believe, identify good teaching and make highly valid judgments within our field of expertness, even though we cannot generalize the basis of that judgment into a formula.

How We Judge Teaching

Let us begin with naive observers--parents or ordinary nonprofessional adults. I believe that even if they did not know they were in a classroom--suppose the observed group were in a hall--they would recognize a teaching-learning situation, and not mistake it for a family dinner or a session of the legislature. A classroom, like every other group function, organizes its members in a distinctive way. We recognize this mode of organization--teacher and pupils--even when it takes quite different forms. How do we do it? Perhaps it is by an "aesthetic prehension," a perceptive grasp of what the situation is trying to express. Thus the meaning of one group activity from its very form is seen as a quarrel; another is seen as a "lesson being taught."[4]

---

[4]Virgil Aldrich, "An Aspect Theory of Mind," Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 25:3, 313-326, March, 1966.

Even naive observers can, I believe, grasp directly the meaning of what is going on and distinguish the pervasive qualities in such diverse classrooms as the following:

1. The efficient classroom in which the most noticeable feature is order: the action moves along smoothly on a predetermined pattern; the teacher is flexible but has genuine and unmistakable authority at all times; children know what is expected of them; there may be variations but everything returns to the basic theme.

2. The creative classroom in which permissiveness, excitement, improvisation, creativity are the most noticeable features. Teacher and pupils act like players in a game. There is little predetermined routine. Originality, liveliness, and freedom pervade the situation.

3. The cooperative classroom in which the pupils attack all learning tasks together; there is group planning, group participation, group evaluation. With respect to predetermined structure it lies somewhere between the other two. The teacher is a committee chairman.

I believe that the naive observer can discern also that the activity going on in the classroom has more or less direction, i.e., it seems more or less clearly to be going somewhere. Further, he can note that the participants are more or less unified with what is going on. The children seem to be attentive, or are eager to volunteer; or, as is sometimes the case, there is marked disengagement from the classroom project. The types and degrees of

integration within a classroom are numerous, yet each in its way acquires a form that can be perceived.

These naive judgments are gross, yet they are the raw experiences out of which more refined judgments emerge. That a teacher knows what she or he is about; that the activity is regulated by method; that the teacher is not a robot; that she is in control of the situation--these are the basic bonefelt qualities that can be perceived even by naive observers as features of the total classroom atmosphere. However, this kind of intuitive report just about exhausts the evaluational potential of the average naive observer.

The refinement of these global judgments by the expert comes about, or can come about, by making significant distinctions within holistic judgment. For example:

1. One comes in time to distinguish a number of teaching styles. By style I mean the individual way in which a teacher uses and adopts teaching strategies. The three types of classroom atmosphere mentioned above are the results of a distinctive approach to instruction and classroom management. A teacher may use all three strategies, varying them as she moves from one type of learning outcome to another; from one management task to another. It has been noted that teachers may feel more comfortable with one strategy rather than another, and the same is probably true of pupils as well. Expertness in these matters makes the appropriate distinctions, but it goes further to a kind of evaluation that resembles grading done by judges of apples at a fair. Each variety

has its own criteria of goodness, so that a MacIntosh apple is judged as good in its own kind, and not as a Baldwin or a Delicious.[5]

2. It is conceivable that we might admire a teacher who is superb in using a group method and yet have doubts about her achieving certain classroom outcomes by this method. Suppose, for example, that systematic knowledge of mathematics or geography or history does not accrue, and suppose one thinks they ought to. Clearly if there is a relation between a style of teaching and a classroom outcome of instruction, then the choice of strategy and the flexibility of the teacher in adapting various strategic moves to the occasion are also subjects of expert judgment. By now we have left the novice far behind, and the experts can talk only to each other.

3. Given three teachers whose performances are judged equally good on a given day, is there anything further to consider in estimating their quality? Are there any other criteria? Suppose we ask each teacher to justify what she did at various times during the school day. Teacher A says that she just follows her impulses; she has no reasons and presumably needs none. She may be a "born" teacher or she may have a sure instinct for the right move; there is nothing further to say about teacher A except that we hope her instincts do not desert her.

---

[5]J. S. Urmson, "On Grading," reprinted in A. Flew (editor), Logic and Language, Second Series (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1953).

Teacher B says that given a situation S she always does M because the rule says: In S do M. If one asks her if this is a good rule, she may answer that it works pretty well most or all of the time. But suppose we ask, "What do you do when it doesn't work?" She may say many things: that she tries something else or calls in the principal. In any event it is clear that she has no notion of why the rule can be expected to work, or why it sometimes fails.

Teacher C may have resources for answering the "why" questions. These resources take the form of various types and levels of theory ranging from a perspective about the aims and nature of education to a theory of learning and teaching within his specialty.

Teacher C operates at a professional level; teacher B is a skilled craftsman; teacher A is a gift of nature to the public schools--one does not look a miracle in the mouth. We can clear up a lot of misunderstanding in our search for criteria, if we make clear to ourselves and to others whether we are using scales appropriate to C, B, or A teachers.

There is one point in this evaluation procedure that deserves to be noted, viz., that to differentiate teachers A, B, and C who perform equally well we had to go beyond the quality of a classroom performance, and we could do this by asking questions.

There is much to be said therefore for an examination system in which questions of this sort are asked, and we already have instruments that can be used for this purpose. Plumbers, electricians, and other craftsmen are licensed by means of state

board examinations, presumably because the state is not content to rely solely on demonstrations of technical competence. Nor are the states willing to grant licenses merely on the certification of the master to whom the worker has been apprenticed or the school which he may have attended. As for the professions, medicine, law, and accounting come to mind immediately as examples of licensing by examinations administered by the state, but in fact constructed by the members of the profession. Here also, the welfare of the public is not allowed to rest entirely on the accreditation of some school, although graduation from such a school may be a prerequisite for the privilege of taking the examination. Such examinations, however, will not testify to technical skill, just as a demonstration of skill does not insure the knowledge of fact and theory that rationalizes practice.

I have tried very sketchily to indicate a scaling of judgments of teacher competency from gross intuitions of a pervasive quality in a classroom and of types of teaching style of judgments by experts. How does one qualify as an expert in so amorphous and complex an enterprise? I submit that expertise here comes about as it does in any field. First, one specializes within a limited domain; second, he and his peers arrive in time at certain agreed upon distinctions within the domain; third, they build up models of "good" within each domain; fourth, they are familiar with virtually the whole range of samples within the domain; fifth, they know the rules for applying their criteria; and finally, they often share with their peers a theory or theories as to why the rules are

applicable. Please consider that complete agreement among experts is not a necessary condition for expertise, but the possibility of distinguishing an expert from the layman is.

Evaluation of Program

Once these distinctions--of theory, rules, information, skill, flexibility, techniques--are made, and experts can and do make them, the formal requisites of a program are not difficult to formulate. However, the criteria probably cannot be stated in observational terms so simple and clear that a novice can apply them. It would be idiotic to ask the medical profession to define the criteria of good medical practice so that any citizen who can read can apply them to a medical school.

Criteria need only meet the criterion of being usable by experts, i.e., those men and women who carry in their heads models by which they scale what they observe. I think it is neither unreasonable nor impracticable to send in experts in foundational studies, the content of a subject-matter area, the theory of teaching, and teaching techniques to examine an institution's teacher-training operation and resources, human and otherwise. In a remarkably short time the specialist can give an estimate that he can defend and explain. Another expert may disagree with him, but not so often as is sometimes asserted. The important point is that it will be an enlightened disagreement which upon explication is often converted into qualified agreement. It is perhaps not too extravagant to say that in areas where there are no experts, i.e., no

acknowledged specialists, evaluation starts more arguments than it settles, and teacher-training programs are no exception. (Aside from the scenery on the campus, the attractiveness of the coeds, and the food in the cafeteria, there is not much about an academic institution that does not call for expertise in evaluation.) Given appropriate specialists, evaluations of program, resources, faculty, and commitment loses much of its unwieldiness and mystique. Lacking specialists no amount of careful listing of objectives and specifications will yield anything more than voluminous and spongy claims and counterclaims.

Much of our difficulties with evaluation, I believe, lie with our inveterate faith that observational schedules can take the place of expertise. It is as if vintage wines were to be judged by a jury of citizens armed with a handbook on viticulture. But we know that this is somehow wrong; the wine expert does not need the book, although he may have written it, and it does the neophyte little good.

The persistent skepticism about evaluation of teacher-training programs and institutions stems, I believe, not so much from our lack of precise measuring instruments or even from our lack of experts. I doubt very much that disagreement among these specialists is the chief breeder of doubt. Putting aside the justified or unjustified airs of superiority that some of our teacher-training institutions believe justifies their contempt for all attempts to evaluate them, there still remain profound disagreements about the purpose and nature of education in our society,

and the role of the teacher in our public schools. Of these, I believe, the latter disagreement is the more immediate obstacle in our search for criteria. Two questions bring us into the midst of the disagreement.

1. Do you really believe that classroom teaching in the public schools requires anything more than a pretty fair general education plus some student teaching?

2. Is there <u>really</u> a body of knowledge or theory that one can specify as being that "more" and can show to be essential to the professional preparation of teachers?

These questions are in close but clandestine relationship. One could say "yes" or "no" to both, or "yes" to one and "no" to the other. In the teacher-training enterprise the literature of the institution on its objectives and aspirations usually says "yes," but often its program says "no." Even more important is the fact that the role assigned to the teacher in our schools deprives him of autonomy at those very decision points where the craftsman is distinguished from the professional. Professional autonomy is based on the possibility of appeal from the orders and demands of superiors to the authority of knowledge. If the appeal is not permitted or heeded, there is no professional autonomy, for it is not the sort of thing that one can achieve by the concession of a school board alone. It means a shift in function and status so radical that it would be tantamount to an educational earthquake.

And so it would seem in our search for criteria that we are trapped by an ideal that we can neither abandon nor achieve. Such

schizoidal tendencies are, I believe, institutionalized in our training institutions and internalized by those who preside over the training rites. It is tempting to abandon the ideal when charismatic figures proclaim that we can run our schools with white-collared apprentices and dedicated amateurs. It takes an obstinate fellow not to listen to the inner voice saying: "Perhaps they are right, after all. Perhaps there is no field of study called education; perhaps there is only the folklore of the elders musing at their conventions, and the bright ideas that proliferate after the second martini."

But the social reality is a stubborn reality. A nation that must have automotive engineers will not get by with auto-mechanics; a nation that must have physicians will not entrust the health of its citizens to pharmacists and hospital attendants, useful and necessary as these are. The social reality--not this or that educational establishment--indicates beyond any doubt that the public schools cannot serve that reality with a teaching staff made up of men and women whose specialized preservice training can be compressed into an academic year or less. With such modest requirements why should we expect commitment to a long career in public school teaching? Why are we surprised that it is regarded by women as a way station, a second income, a valuable asset to a prospective bride, and refuge from middle-aged boredom? And what effect do the modest intellectual and professional demands currently required for the teaching certificate have on the men who enter classroom teaching? Can it be other than a road to administration

for those who escape, and a life of frustrating drudgery for those who do not?

We must take a stand on this issue and become painfully lucid in our notions of the teacher as a professional before we can assay the numerous proposals to recruit staff as teacher aides, volunteer helpers, etc. Once we have this criterion we need not be defensive about these and other proposals, and any given institution can freely choose the level of personnel that it wishes to prepare for the educational enterprise. In the absence of such clarification evaluation will continue to be bedeviled by foolish pretensions or unwarranted timidity.

So the search for criteria must go on, but it had better be undertaken by those who have examined their commitment to teacher preparation. The search for criteria is complex and difficult enough when we are clear and honest with ourselves; it becomes a witless kind of masochism when we lacerate ourselves by fantasies and rationalizations that have no basis in the social reality of today or as we envision it for the generation to come. It is perhaps not too much to say that our search for criteria is impeded far less by their elusiveness than by a vague and persistent dread of finding them.

APPENDIX B_2

LEAVES FROM THE NOTEBOOK OF A DEAN

APPENDIX B_2

"LEAVES FROM THE NOTEBOOK OF A DEAN"

By

Lewis W. Troyer

Source: National College of Educational Faculty Bulletin, Vol. 10, No. 6, March 2, 1967.

Critical Thinking in Courses

An excellent article on the nature of critical thinking appears in the Winter, 1962, number of Harvard Educational Review. Entitled "A Concept of Critical Thinking," by Robert H. Ennis of Cornell University, this article presents in considerable detail "a proposed basis for research in the teaching and evaluation of critical thinking ability." A range definition of critical thinking is presented in terms of the following twelve aspects:

1. Grasping the meaning of a statement.
2. Judging whether there is ambiguity in a line of reasoning.
3. Judging whether certain statements contradict each other.
4. Judging whether a conclusion follows necessarily.
5. Judging whether a statement is specific enough.
6. Judging whether a statement is actually the application of a certain principle.
7. Judging whether an observation is reliable.
8. Judging whether an inductive conclusion is warranted.

9. Judging whether the problem has been identified.
10. Judging whether something is an assumption.
11. Judging whether a definition is adequate.
12. Judging whether a statement made by an alleged authority is acceptable.

To all who are looking for formulations of educational objectives, here is a gold mine.

The Evidence of Good Teaching

The following appears in a bulletin, "Approach to Teaching," issued by USOE under the authorship of Winslow R. Hatch, Specialist in Higher Education.

"Since the measure of teaching is the quality and quantity of learning that takes place, any inquiry into teaching must deal with the conditions of learning. It would, of course, be desirable to have a consensus as to what constitutes good learning, a consensus that reflects the judgment of persons who have done research on this subject and are able to appraise the considerable literature that attracts but dismays teachers who lack this competence. Although no consensus is available, it is possible to develop one from the following three papers: 'Principles of Learning' by Robert M. Gagné, formerly Professor of Psychology, Princeton University, and now with the American Institute of Research; 'Conducting Classes to Optimize Learning' by Ralph W. Tyler, Director, Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University; and 'Recitation and Discussion' by Wilbert J. McKeachie,

Professor of Psychology, University of Michigan. The consensus that emerged, quite apart from its substantive merit, is recommended by its brevity, the credibility of its witnesses, and by the fact that it was arrived at independently. The points emphasized by Gagné, Tyler, and McKeachie, stated as succinctly as possible, are: "Good conditions of learning are met when:

(a) 'The human learner . . . is made the central part of education as a system.' (Gagné)

(b) The learning reflects that which 'the learner learns,' that is, that which 'he is thinking, feeling, or doing.' (Tyler)

(c) The learning is 'active' rather than 'passive.' (McKeachie)

(d) 'The learning situation encourages generalizability, the learning of principles, as opposed to . . . rote learning.' (Gagné)

(e) A 'principle' is learned 'in a new situation.' This helps one to 'identify the common element in situations and shortens the learning process.' (McKeachie)

(f) A student 'explores something new.' (Gagné)

(g) 'Each new practice requires him to give attention to it because of new elements in it . . . [only so] does it serve adequately as a basis for effective learning.' (Tyler)

(h) Importance is attached to 'levels of aspiration.' (Gagné)

(i) The learner 'sets high standards of performance for himself . . . high but attainable.' (Tyler)

(j) 'We can teach students to enjoy learning.' (McKeachie)

"Endorsed were:

(a) 'Guided discovery.' (Gagné)

(b) 'Problem-solving.' (Tyler)

(c) 'Problem-oriented instruction. . . . Experience in solving problems within the students' ken is essential.'" (McKeachie)

Clue Words in Stating Objectives

Paul E. Blackwood, a contributor to Readings in Science Education for the Elementary School (MacMillan, 1967), presents the following listing of clue or action words in connection with the stating of objectives. It might be helpful in phrasing behavioral objectives for our course outlines.

"Knowing": Observes, identifies, describes, gathers, accumulates, counts, looks, sees.

"Manipulating": Measures, balances, selects, instruments, computes, demonstrates, weighs.

"Applying": Classifies, assigns, defines, associates, arranges, distinguishes, organizes, estimates, equates, sorts, plans, compares, concludes, experiments, controls, ponders, groups, decides.

"Creating": Hypothesizes, induces, deduces, speculates, analyzes, selects data, designs, experiments, reflects, proposes,

criticizes, conceives, invents, guesses, comprehends, doubts, incubates, predicts, estimates, explains, appreciates, infers, abstracts, synthesizes, formulates, interrelates, generalizes, forecasts, extrapolates, interpolates.

"Evaluating": Ponders, rejects, accepts, believes, disbelieves, pools data, recognizes errors, equates, distinguishes, questions, doubts, verifies, decides, interprets, criticizes, transposes, generalizes, controls variables.

"Communicating": Tabulates, graphs, writes, speaks, reports, explains, teaches, informs, charts, reads, debates, argues, describes, demonstrates, compares, questions, instructs, plots, draws."

This listing suggests how rich is the array of possibilities. When the student is able to (can) do these (or other) similarly classified behaviors to some acceptable degree of proficiency within a given field or subject matter area, his learning (education, etc.) is measureable, "evaluateable," and a simple declarative statement of this is a behavioral objective (or a goal card item).

APPENDIX B_3

ITEMS CONCERNING NON-GRADING PROPOSAL

APPENDIX B_3

"ITEMS CONCERNING NON-GRADING PROPOSAL"

By

Lewis W. Troyer

Source: National College of Education Faculty Bulletin, May 27, 1969.

1. A commonly expressed question about the Proposal has to do with its effect upon the work load of the instructor. This is a most legitimate concern, and one for which there cannot in the nature of the case be a definitive answer prior to actual trial operation. However, a few things may be said to alleviate anxiety and to provide some assurance that the work load will not be increased. Changed, perhaps, but not increased for any given person.

First, I can say emphatically that it is not the intention of the Academic Affairs office to add to the burden of faculty members. If this seems at any time really to be happening, administrative measures will be taken to lessen the pressure to normality. A number of possible steps may be taken in response to specific situations. I shall not spell these out here, but wish to emphasize the willingness of the college administration to deal with the problem if and as it arises. To some extent the implementation of the Proposal must be considered an experiment, an adventure into unknown territory, and if we find the going just too rough for our strength and resources, we shall, of course, retreat. I would hope that the specter of possible problems to be faced would not, however, cause us to lose heart and accept defeat before we had even

started on the journey. From some experience, I know that one is hardly ever aware of the resources available in the world until one has committed himself to some undertaking that calls them forth. If our objective is a worthy one, the means to its accomplishment probably are available.

2. I am quite sure that implementation of the Proposal cannot be successfully brought about without some careful re-thinking and possible modification of present instructional procedures. There must certainly be a major change in the role of the instructor in relation to the student. To accomplish the purposes of the new proposal, the instructor cannot afford much time for the purpose of presenting information (knowledge) to the students in his classes. He will have to become a facilitator of learning rather than a source of knowledge. He will have to spend most of his time <u>helping each student</u> meet the competency goals of the course. This will mean much more time in conference with individual students, with small groups of students, with classes operating as seminar-type situations. The information resources will be written and audio-visual materials, and the instructor will be forced to require the student to use these resources. He will not be able to spend his own time or that of whole classes regurgitating textbooks. He will need to encourage good students who can read, or do whatever the course requires to gain necessary knowledge, to operate independently; so that he can have more time to confer with and to help slower, less able students.

Each course is now scheduled to meet for one hour four times per week. Considerable flexibility could be allowed within this framework to provide for the real needs of students: some sessions certainly could be used for individual conferences, small group discussions, etc.; some students could be released from everyday attendance to carry forward independent study projects; some days, and perhaps portions of terms, could be set aside for reading or special study periods; the number of days for the instructor to have "his say" to the whole class at once could be drastically reduced. The point of this statement is to show how at least some of the time required for the kind of teaching implied by the competency-scale approach may be had largely within the present course structure of the curriculum. It is conceivable also that a reorganization of the course concept itself will be advisable, and especially the present time scheduling pattern. If our purpose is to facilitate the learning of the student, to help him achieve the required competencies (rather than simply to judge whether he has or has not), we can rearrange any and all aspects of the traditional folkways to accomplish that end. We might even decide that some more flexible time scheduling arrangement--with some courses meeting for single whole day sessions, etc., etc., would be better than the way we now do it. If competency is what we are looking for, perhaps we should organize our time specifically to accomplish that purpose, rather than clinging to the rubrics and arrangements of tradition centered around the fixed credit unit and the uniform class hour.

The Proposal also implies certain things with regard to planning and conducting of courses. One of these certainly has to do with the identification of the competencies themselves. The student will need to know at the beginning of the course specifically what is expected. Theoretically the competencies should parallel or coincide with the stated objectives of the course. Both will need to be phrased as precisely and objectively as possible--and in terms of what the student can do. On this point it is not necessary to get "hung up" on a strict behaviorism. As a matter of fact, going through some visible motions (jumping through prescribed hoops) may not indicate significant competencies at all unless the particular action can be taken as symbolic of a tendency, attitude, habit, developed capability (call it what you will) with some sustaining power across a period of time and in a variety of situations. If competency means a capability of doing something, there must be some evidence of persistence.

Furthermore, we must think of the number of competencies to be required. If we seek to measure rather minute actions, the number required will probably be rather large. If we concentrate on those competencies which are really important as marks of the educated person at a given stage of development, my feeling is that the number will be small. We must ask ourselves what it is really that we wish our students to be able to do--what capabilities do they need to live as educated persons. In connection with any given course we shall ask what that particular course can contribute to the general objectives of the college, as well as

what may be peculiar or unique to the course itself. I would recommend again that each faculty member consult the Taxonomies of Educational Objectives (by B. S. Bloom, et al.), copies of which were previously provided in the Faculty Bulletin. These summarize and bring into manageable condition educational goals (competencies) in the "cognitive and affective domains." They provide a hierarchy of capabilities appropriate to every course and every department. Certain skills, such as ability to communicate both orally and in writing and others peculiar to a given subject matter would have to be added, for the taxonomies are as yet incomplete--a third volume originally was planned to deal with the psychomotor or skills domain. The eventual list in each course should, I believe, identify basic skills, cognitive or intellectual abilities, and some degree of engagement or commitment--the affective domain. Several of these will embody a common core of competencies for all courses. For logistic purposes--both in terms of humane expectations from the students, and of the available time and energy output of the teacher--the list in every case should be kept as short as possible. The requirement is to select the crucial competencies, not to list every possible item; otherwise the task becomes unmanageable indeed. It is my opinion that a list in excess of fifteen items for a single course is too long and a list of fewer than ten items is probably too short.

3. Another factor of importance with regard to the management of this approach is that of pre-testing. Just as the instructor will have to make clear at the beginning of each course what

the competencies to be tested are; so also he will certainly want to provide some pre-testing to find out which of his designated competencies need special attention and for whom. It should be understood that a real competency, especially of the kind suggested above as appropriate, can be tested--demonstrated--in a variety of ways. A given test or demonstration is not in itself the competency; it is but one sampling, one bit of evidence that the competency is possessed. However, considerable time and energy may be saved if competencies already possessed at the beginning of a course can be recognized, for then attention can be given to the yet unlearned or only partially learned. Part of the boredom and wastefulness of past and present education comes undoubtedly from unnecessary redundancy, from assuming ignorance or inabilities that are not there. We should start from where our students really are, and go on from there. This is frequently taken only in the negative sense of "getting down to their level." It should also be applied to the positive acceptance of what "they already know." We should give full recognition to knowledge and competencies already possessed and gained from whatever sources. In a typical situation it might amaze us thus to discover that some of the "work of the course" is completed--at least for some students--at the very beginning. Attention could be more efficiently directed to removing remaining deficiencies rather than recapitulating over and over again what has been attained. Some repetition is conducive, of course, to learning, but there is too much of it, particularly of the unrecognized types, in our teaching.

The function of the instructor, moreover, is not "to cover the subject" after the manner of the Sherwin-Williams paints which are said to "cover the earth," but to find out what the student lacks and help him get it. Even in subjects in which considerable reading or absorption of basic information is indispensable, this is nevertheless a means, not the real end-in-view, educationally speaking. No one, it must be admitted, can appreciate Shakespeare or Milton or Chaucer without a thorough reading acquaintance with the original texts, but in the end it is not the number of pages read that counts; it is rather what can be done (sensed, felt, understood, appreciated, used in the illumination of on-going experience, etc.) with that contact with great literary art that marks the educated person: what perceptions are deepened, what values are clarified and strengthened, what capabilities of analysis, comprehension, synthesis, communication, expression are expanded. Memorizing the botanical taxonomy or the multiplication table may be necessary grist for the mill of learning and applying the principles of a science or of mathematics, but it is the latter abilities toward which our main attention must be focused. The difference between an educated and an uneducated person is not a measure of the load of knowledge each carries around within himself, but rather of what one "makes" of it in contrast to the other, of how one is better able to do those things which are important to enlightened and appreciative and responsible living than the other. The load of "knowledge" can be a dead weight and even a "millstone around the neck"; it should be a help, but that depends upon the competencies of use.

So in our concern for these competencies, let us get at those needing development in the specific student as rapidly as possible. To use a common cliche, our efficiency as facilitators of learning will increase to the extent we can "keep our eye on the ball." We find out what is not yet adequately known, what cannot yet be done that should be a capability of doing, and we focus on these things with particular individuals, with small groups, and maybe with whole classes at times.

Assuming the faculty makes the decision to adopt the proposal of non-grading, it is the intention of the Academic Affairs office to give the time, effort, and resources to assist all departments in the "tooling-up" job for implementation of the proposal. All of us are much nearer that objective than we may realize. Some departments are well along in the formulation of competency scales. Help for others may be obtained by these examples. But more direct help also will be available. The Dean of Instruction intends to meet with each department to help assess each situation and to provide step-by-step procedures for getting from wherever we happen to be to where we must go. This will not be in any spirit of imposition from outside but rather to offer available technical help and to give the assurance which some may need in taking the necessary steps. Time--as much as will be really helpful--can be set aside during the Fall Faculty Workshop and the period immediately thereafter to compare efforts, to benefit from general faculty discussion, to develop all-institution understandings and, where advisable, common forms and procedures. This writer does not feel that mixed

or piecemeal implementation is either feasible or advantageous. The difficulties of maintaining parallel grading systems with some departments working on the new system and others still carrying on under the old plan are sufficiently great that the transition would be complicated rather than made easier. Both faculty and students would find themselves in an ambiguous situation within which uncertainties and inconsistencies could lead to misunderstanding, disaffection, and defeat rather than genuine progress.

Undoubtedly, we shall continue for some time, even after starting the new plan, to have questions and problems; we could hardly expect otherwise. I am afraid that postponing the decisive action will yield few if any real values, since later rather than sooner the same start will have to be made. While there is, as all of the above clearly recognizes, work to be done yet in preparation, there should be much strength obtained from going forward together as a united group, with resolution to help each other meet the challenge, and the strength of morale that comes from the knowledge that we are all equally involved. I believe the faculty as a whole now favors the change to the new plan. I believe the faculty as a whole should vote now to get on with the job. I pledge the resources and leadership of my office, and ask the cooperation of all, to translate this belief and action into successful pioneer accomplishment.

APPENDIX B_4

LETTER TO PARENTS OF NATIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS

APPENDIX B_4

LETTER TO PARENTS OF NATIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS

Dear Parents of National College of Education Students:

No doubt you have become aware that the College is taking another major step with the beginning of the Fall term, 1969-1970, in its continuing effort to improve the quality of its educational program. I refer here to the decision by the faculty to abandon the traditional grading system as a means of evaluating student progress toward the completing of graduation requirements.

Many other colleges have made some movement in this direction or are in the midst of studies concerning the possibilities. We are out ahead both in the forthrightness of our move and in the quality of the substitute for the old system. However, we recognize that this courageous step cannot be taken without much concern on the part of students, parents, and, indeed, also of the college faculty itself.

I shall briefly describe our plan, but, first, I wish, on behalf of the College, to assure you of our sincere conviction that no student here to secure a college education will suffer from this change. We believe, on the contrary, that every student will receive multiple benefits. The new evaluation plan puts the focus upon learning and accomplishment for each individual student. No longer will one student be compared with another in determining a rank order or curve of grade distributions. The plan holds high but not impossible standards for everyone. No student will squeak

through by being good in just a part of a course. All students will meet the same performance criteria by demonstrating all required competencies. For some it may take a little longer, but all will have the opportunity to fully succeed.

Furthermore, the record kept of such actual achievements will be so much more precise and definitive than the old manner of listing grades and averages that the College anticipates not only no serious difficulty for students transferring or seeking entrance to graduate schools, but actually increasing respect and acceptance by educational authorities and prospective employers as they are made aware of the philosophy and practice of the new system and witness its products more effectively meet the challenges of life.

The new system includes the following specific points:

1. Only courses successfully completed appear on the student's permanent record. There is no listing of failures. There is no listing of any grade symbol at all. The number of courses for graduation remains the same.

2. For each course in which a student is registered he will be provided with a competency scale (or as we shall refer to it--a competscale). To complete the course he must have each item checked by the instructor. The instructor may recommend the student for departmental honors if his work is exceptional. A cumulative file of competscales will be maintained by the Registrar, and this file may be used, in addition to the formal listing of courses completed, in providing positive recommendations for transfer or employment purposes.

3. A student may complete the competscale at his own pace--early in the course, along with the body of other registered students, or by taking an incomplete and carrying over some items into the subsequent term.

4. A student may without penalty take two terms if necessary, to complete the competencies listed for a given course. At his own expense he may take even longer, but he may not remain indefinitely in school without progress.

5. As long as a student makes normal progress through his course work, he is in good standing. If he finds it necessary to take one or more incompletes, he comes under the supervision of the Council on Academic Standards. He will not be allowed to dilly-dally, but every help possible will be given to see that he has a chance of success. If it seems advisable, he will be encouraged to maintain a slower pace, but in the end to succeed with the actual achievement of educational goals. He meets the entrance standards for later aspects of the curriculum, such as admission to professional study, by completing prerequisite courses.

This system is <u>not</u> a pass or fail system. It is a new and different pattern of evaluation, with a very different emphasis probably not translatable in terms of letter grades and averages. We do not believe that averaging a grapefruit with a kumquat will produce an orange. Nor do we think that a kumquat should receive a lesser rating because it is smaller than or otherwise different from a grapefruit; it should be valued for its own unique qualities. We believe that students are unique human beings, and all

of them--or very nearly so--can develop adequacy and effectiveness if given the proper amount of personal help and time to grow, and if the self-esteem of each is not deflated in insidious comparison with someone supposedly better, smarter, faster, etc. At any rate, we are going to give it a trial. We think it has a chance of restoring the zest for learning and a realization of the true values of education to your sons and daughters.

Please wish us well, but do not hesitate to ask questions if these will help toward understanding.

Very sincerely,

Lewis Troyer
Dean of Instruction

LT:ke

APPENDIX C

GRADES HAVE GONE: WHAT THEN?

APPENDIX C

"GRADES HAVE GONE: WHAT THEN?"[1]

By

Lewis W. Troyer

Source: "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean," National College of Education Faculty Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 3, November 19, 1969.

If "grades must go,"[2] as indeed they must, what will take their place? This question troubles not a few conscientious educators, for the concept of evaluation of student progress seems to be implied in any process of learning that deserves the name of education. There are many who see no assurance in demolishing the present system, defective as it is, until a better, or at least more promising, one is found to replace it. Efforts toward this end are multiplying in the landscape. They deserve watching and encouragement. And that explains why it appears very pertinent to submit for wider consideration and reaction an account of one such adventure in the current scene.

With the advent of the 1969-1970 academic year National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois, abandoned the traditional grading system "lock, stock, and barrel." This significant change was made essentially because the faculty of the college, after careful study, became convinced that the so-called letter grade

---

[1]Submitted to Educational Record for publication.

[2]George Mannello, "Grades Must Go!" The Educational Record, Vol. 50, No. 3 (Summer, 1969), pp. 305-308.

pattern functioned to subvert rather than to support the goals of the curriculum for both the student and the institution. A new and hopefully more effective scheme of evaluation based on the designation and demonstration of specific sets of competencies appropriate to given courses and levels of learning was developed, subjected to scrutiny of both faculty and students, and is currently undergoing the first trial year of operation.

A. Context and Rationale

While the new plan at National College of Education is, obviously, part of the more general response of the times to "do something" about grades, it does embody certain unique features and a combination of particulars that go beyond what has been developed or tried elsewhere. It is singularly free, for example, from the various compromises which have marred and eventually destroyed earlier modifications in grading at the college level. It does not simply substitute words for letters or numerical symbols--"fail," "pass," "honors," "high honors," etc., for A, B, C, D, F--as if a grade by any other name were not still a grade. It is not a "pass-fail" system separating the goats from the sheep but blithely ignoring any distinctions among the sheep. Nor does it maintain a double standard of evaluation--one for the student, and another under the table for other institutions and employers. It is quite literally a new and different pattern of evaluation with a very different emphasis probably not translatable at all in terms of letter symbols and grade point averages.

The measurement specialist would classify this pattern as "criterion-referenced" rather than "norm-referenced." It is grounded on the assumption that students are unique human beings and that all of them--or very nearly so--can develop adequacy and effectiveness if given proper instruction and time to grow (or learn), and if the self-esteem of each is not destroyed in insidious comparison with others supposedly better, smarter, or faster. The object is to maximize the potential of all in a society more and more dependent upon the intelligence and personal development of the total population, rather than to encourage continuance of an intellectual elitism characteristic of societies of the past. The plan holds high but not unrealistic standards of accomplishment for everyone and makes it possible within broad limits of time and teaching effort for each to go as far or as deep or as high as he can. No student under this plan can squeak through by having "passed" only part of a course. All students must meet the same performance criteria by demonstrating the required competencies. There is no possibility of settling for a "C" or a "B" and avoiding the necessary learning to acquire an "A." For some it may take a little longer, as the current TV commercial on the gaining of crowns has it, but all students, even the slower boys, have the real opportunity to succeed. In other words, the plan puts the focus upon learning and achievement for each individual student. It sees this as the fundamental basis or reason for evaluation. That, at least, must be accomplished first, and all other purposes are to be subordinated and made incidental to it.

To provide some appreciation of the particularity of this new system of evaluation it is useful, furthermore, to review briefly the background of concern and action at the college within which it emerged. Some of this context is unique to the particular institution; some of it is shared by many other colleges and universities. Probably the most formative factor in the scene was the inauguration in 1965 of a new curriculum which the college community has defined as "liberal arts in teacher education." The rationale of this curriculum includes the following pertinent declaration.

"It is very important for both students and teachers to realize that the primary focus of the curriculum is not upon acquisition of information or the attainment of knowledge as such. Knowledge is important, of course, but it is instrumental to something even more important. The primary end sought is a transformation or growth in the student."

"This transformation includes knowing, but it expresses itself in the development of certain intellectual abilities and skills: in the comprehension and application of knowledge; in analysis of elements, relationships, and principles of knowledge; in synthesis of knowledge through communication, classification, and explanation; in evaluation of knowledge; and, not least of all, in effective transmission of knowledge through teaching."

"This growth in the student, moreover, will have a strong affective component, denoting more than a simple awareness or even a willingness to acquiesce in a pattern of conformity. Satisfaction in learning, formulation of values, commitment to values, the

development of an intelligent and viable personal philosophy of life are ideal outcomes. The student is expected to change; he should expect to become a different, it is hoped a better, more adequate, person as a result of this opportunity. For this type of education promotes the resourcefulness of personality which is able to build on new experience, which leads to continued growth in personal and professional effectiveness throughout life. This resourcefulness is found in the attitudes, values, and understandings of students. It is these which must be changed, developed, enriched in a college education."[3]

Such a statement, as many will no doubt testify, can appear in a college catalog as part of the public relations dressing typical of present-day advertising techniques. It need not be taken seriously, or literally, by anyone. But what if it were? What if a faculty and a student body chose to use it as the intellectual charter for determining the validity of the on-going educational program? How, with these principles in mind, would the quality of a curriculum be assessed? How would the achievement by students of these objectives be measured? The particular institution through its faculty found itself wrestling with such questions as it sought to determine for itself, and in the future for accrediting authorities, whether the new curriculum was any better than the old. A year of special study, in which instructional objectives for all departments and courses were reformulated, led to the realization that the letter-grade system and the employment of gradepoint

---

[3]National College of Education Bulletin, 1970-71, p. 37.

averages were questionable means, indeed, for the measurement of the most important of the acknowledged objectives. To this realization was added widespread circulation and perusal of current literature on the problems of grading. There was also some positive experience over a considerable time of the personnel engaged in supervision of student teaching from using performance criteria to determine professional growth and readiness.

Consequently, on July 10, 1968, the Council on Academic Standards, charged with responsibility for development and administration of policy concerning evaluation of student progress, recommended to the faculty a revolution in grading practices to become effective with the opening of the 1969-1970 school year. It further recommended that the 1968-1969 year be spent in studying the implications of, and tooling up for, the proposed change. Faculty meetings and workshops were subsequently scheduled and held for these purposes, and the faculty voted general approval of the plan in December. It reserved final enactment, however, until the student body had had a chance to discuss and react to the proposal. By the early weeks of the spring term several meetings and opinion polls had been conducted, and the Student Senate reported that the student response, while divided over certain specific items, was favorable to the plan and its proposed time of implementation, including total application to all classes. The faculty then completed its enabling action. Every effort, thus, was made to involve the entire campus community, or at least all those who would be affected immediately, in the decision-making and in regarding this step as a

significant experiment in harmony with the fundamental philosophy of the college. During the summer of 1969 a letter of explanation of the new adventure was sent to all parents of currently enrolled and newly accepted students, including one sentence which expressed something of the depth of faculty conviction and commitment: "We think it has a chance of restoring to your sons and daughters the zest for learning and a realization of the true values of education."

Undoubtedly important in the development of the consensus underlying the reported action was the growing body of contemporary literature, particularly from the fields of educational measurement and the psychology of learning, bearing upon problems of grading. No attempt can be made here to give extensive or adequate summary of this literature, but certain crucially influential items require mentioning to complete this orientation to the plan adopted. There was, certainly first in consideration, the evidence, such as that summarized by Hoyt,[4] which clearly indicated that grades are system-bound in predictive value; that is, they are predictive of levels of success in obtaining other grades within the educational system itself, but have very little or no value in indicating later professional or vocational achievement and success. Secondly, there was the position taken by psychologists and represented by Robert Glaser in the Spring, 1968, issue of Educational Record, where he

---

[4]Donald P. Hoyt, "The Criterion Problem in Higher Education," Learning and the Professors, O. Milton and E. J. Shoben, Jr., eds., (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1968), pp. 125-135; "College Grades and Adult Accomplishment: A Review of Research," The Educational Record, Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter, 1966), pp. 70-75.

goes so far as to declare that one of the "ten untenable assumptions" or "major myths" of college instruction is "That course grades tell us what the student knows and can do."[5] His summary of the distinction between criterion referenced and norm referenced evaluation is especially to the point.

Perhaps most influential in affecting the thinking of faculty members at National College of Education has been the work and writing of Benjamin Bloom and associates. The impact of their recently constructed taxonomies of educational objectives is clearly reflected in the statement on the curriculum quoted above from the college catalog.[6] Even more potent in effect, however, have been Bloom's more recent statements concerning "learning for mastery."[7] His strong criticism of the application of the normal curve in educational measurement, his new and challenging rendering of the concept of aptitude as a function of time in learning, and his recommendation that realistic performance standards be set and followed by instructional procedures enabling the majority of students to attain these standards certainly provided theoretical foundation for the new departure.

---

[5]Robert Glaser, "Ten Untenable Assumptions of College Instruction," The Educational Record, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Spring, 1968), pp. 154-159.

[6]B. S. Bloom, et al., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives I: Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956); David Krathwohl, et al., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives II: Affective Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964).

[7]B. S. Bloom, "Learning for Mastery," Evaluation Comment (Los Angeles: Center for the Study of the Evaluation of Instructional Programs, May, 1968), Vol. 1, No. 2.

Attention needs also to be called to the constructive work of Robert Bauernfeind of Northern Illinois University in developing for use in his graduate classes in educational measurement a so-called "goal-card" approach to evaluation.[8] Bauernfeind, it is of considerable interest, acknowledges finding the suggestive lead for his scheme in the "goal-contract" plan instituted a quarter of a century ago in the Winnetka, Illinois, elementary schools under the early leadership of Carleton Washburne.[9] Many of the members of the National College of Education faculty have been well acquainted with the Winnetka experience. Since the total orientation of the college for eighty-four years has been toward the production of elementary teachers, this faculty, consequently, has had little disposition to feel itself above learning from the insights and experience of elementary education. Perhaps this also helps in large part to account for the emphasis in the college philosophy upon the student as a unique and total being and of his development as a person as central to the educational enterprise.

In summing up its reasons for adopting the new evaluation system the proposal of the Council on Academic Standards contains both a listing of serious drawbacks of the traditional grading pattern and a positive statement of the criteria to be met by any

---

[8]Robert Bauernfeind, "Goal Cards and Future Developments in Achievement Testing," Proceedings of the 1965 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1966).

[9]Carleton W. Washburne and Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Winnetka: The History and Significance of an Educational Experiment (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963).

substitute system. The so-called drawbacks include: (1) The tendency of present symbols (letters) to become empty of content and meaning and thus to encourage legerdemain and illusion; (2) The reliance upon dubious statistical procedures such as the G.P.A. and the normal curve, with simplistic faith that these reflect reality; (3) The lack of sufficient feedback so that the student may know where he really stands and what he really knows; (4) The emphasis upon comparison, sometimes certainly invidious, of student with student, or individual student with numerical group or category, rather than upon intrinsic factors of achievement in and by the student himself; (5) The deleterious effect, already widely evidenced among entering high school graduates, of the pursuit of grades (or resignation to low grades) upon the mental health of the student, particularly upon self-esteem and openness to further learning; (6) The inadequacy of the system for self-appraisal, honest self-evaluation, and accurate diagnosis; and (7) The tendency of the system to encourage a morality of getting by and of "beating the system" at the expense of genuine personal development. A satisfactory system, in contrast, would (1) Aid the learner to realistically assess his own strengths and weaknesses; (2) Provide insights to both teacher and learner helpful to both learning and teaching; (3) Be consistent with values and purposes acknowledged by both individual student and institution; (4) Be broad enough to encompass total purposes, both personal and institutional; and (5) Produce records appropriate to the purposes of both student and institution.

The plan adopted, and presented in detail below, while certainly not considered prefect by anyone, provides, it is genuinely believed a means of overcoming the listed deficiencies in the present system and of fulfilling the positive criteria. One faculty member spoke the viewpoint of most of his colleagues in saying: "This new plan calls for a chain of events in which the student has a number of concrete opportunities to show his competencies. It affords a chance for the student to address himself directly to the attainment of these competencies, and thus to his own learning and personal development. It views success and failure in terms of situations realistically defined and emphasizes a positive rather than a negative, a constructive rather than a punitive psychology. It recognizes fully the significance of individual differences in growth patterns, learning, and indeed, in the end-product of education. It provides the instructor, as well as the student, with a less ambiguous opportunity to be authentic in his own efforts and to realize himself in his learning and teaching."

B. Problems and Prospects

It is accepted as axiomatic that the true test of the pudding is in the eating and that problems will no doubt arise in the attempted implementation of the new evaluation design. The first year or two of operation has become, therefore, a period for working out the bugs. Even the possibility that the design will prove ineffective has been admitted, hopefully without cutting the nerve. Success, as well as failure, it is assumed, may be

self-prophesying. Nevertheless, real success will depend upon meeting squarely and overcoming the problems that arise. It may be the better part of wisdom, therefore, to acknowledge that some such problems have already taken on recognizable shape.

The perceptive reader will perhaps have noted a tendency at least toward inconsistency of concept in the competency lists presented. The impression would be greatly strengthened by perusal of all of the lists so far developed. Most participants are apparently in favor of the general approach, but there are still wide differences in the specific denotation given to the term "competency." This variation at present extends from the one extreme which holds that any prescribed unit of external behavior constitutes a competency to the opposite extreme that competencies are really "states of mind" which cannot be measured at all. While the strict behaviorist tends toward an overly reductive position, the staunch subjectivist finds it difficult to give any measurable concrete form to his objectives. It is interesting, however, that the departments apparently most successful in their acceptance and formulation of the competency approach so far have been those departments in the humanities division which, because of their natural emphasis on intangibles, would be expected to be in trouble with this type of system. The departments normally stressing objective knowledge, on the other hand, seem still to need reformulation. The point of the statement is that considerable effort seems necessary yet to achieve basic conceptual consistency within the total design. Recognizing the nature of college faculties, one is perhaps

too sanguine to expect complete consistency, but certainly one area requiring continuing effort is indicated. It should go without saying, of course, that the term "consistency" as used does not preclude the listing of essentially different competencies in different courses or aspects of the curriculum; the ideal of consistency applies at a higher order of conceptualization.

A problem raised early and late by both faculty and students has to do with the probable reaction of other institutions to the records of students who wish to transfer or to enter graduate schools. Since the answer depends upon others outside the immediate context of the plan, final assurance on any scale of generality cannot be given at this time. Some preliminary survey of institutions in the same region indicates variant responses. Favorable response from graduate schools seems to depend upon (1) the reputation accorded to the college, (2) the relative strength of applicants on entrance or nationally standardized subject matter examinations, and (3) the adequacy of understanding and completeness of reporting of the new evaluation system. Institutions which equated the new plan with pass-fail systems tended to be negative. Some help comes on this problem from the experience of the Education Department in the placement of graduates in teaching. Personnel officers and superintendents of schools have generally welcomed the more clear-cut detailing of performance capabilities in contrast to letter grades. While employers generally prefer candidates with high level grades, it is commonly admitted that a straight "A" student does not necessarily become an outstanding teacher. On the basis

of this information, plus the expressed faith in the intrinsic superiority of the new system as over the old, the college has expressed its position on this problem with the statement: The record kept of actual achievements will be so much more precise and definitive than the old manner of listing grades and averages that the college anticipates not only no serious difficulty for students transferring or seeking entrance to graduate schools, but actually increasing respect and acceptance by educational authorities and prospective employers as they are made aware of the philosophy and practice of the new system and witness its products more effectively meeting the challenges of life. Whether this turns out to be true or not remains to be determined.

A final problem to be mentioned here centers on the overall evaluation of the curriculum, a primary concern which originally brought forward the proposal from the Council on Academic Standards. It was felt, and strongly so, that the old grading system yielded dubious data on which to judge the quality of the curriculum. Use of these data constituted at best an internal system of evidence yielding difficult if not completely unsatisfactory comparisons with other institutions. What was needed, it came to be agreed, was a two-fold approach--one facet of which could be fully justified in terms of achieving intrinsic or internal objectives, while the other would provide independent judgment on comparative values. A separate system of testing, unrelated directly to evaluation of student progress, has been set up and operates through the office of the Dean of Students. Starting with the College Board scores

required as a part of admission to the college, special subject matter examinations (C.E.E.B.) are to be administered at the end of the freshman, sophomore, and senior years. At present there is no intention of reporting individual scores on the student's official record, but it is definitely planned to develop the necessary summaries which will reveal to the faculty how the performance of the students compares with nationally established norms. Some idea may thus be obtained of the relative quality of the college curriculum offerings as compared with other institutions participating in the same nationwide testing programs. It will be seen, therefore, that the college has not abandoned the comparative or norm-referenced approach entirely; it simply has shifted its use from comparison of individuals (considered inadvisable and probably fallacious) to comparison of programs (a procedure at least still considered important by accrediting agencies and probably useful for the purpose intended). The resistance against employment of test scores as a means of measuring individual progress seems to rest upon the observation that success of such evaluation at institutions which have chiefly relied on it depends upon rigorous selection of students at high score levels for initial admission to college. This tack does not appear to be in accord with the basic educational philosophy and experience of this college.

In summary, then, what has been presented in this article is an account of the establishment and characteristics of a substitute system for traditional letter grades. The bread has been

cast upon the waters. In due time, the Bible assures, it will return. Whether still edible or with any increment of wisdom to be gleaned from the experience, only time will tell. Nevertheless, let it be recorded here as one brave, new effort to do something constructive about an old and widely acknowledged weakness of American higher education.[10]

---

[10]The very last sentence of the thoughtful study entitled, Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life, by the sociologists Howard S. Becker, Blanche Geer, and Everett C. Hughes (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968), not only summarizes their work but expresses the full poignance of the current situation: "What is most clear to us is that something ought to be done, for as matters now stand neither faculty nor students achieve their aims" (p. 148).

APPENDIX D_1

EVALUATING UNDERSTANDINGS, ATTITUDES, SKILLS, AND BEHAVIORS

APPENDIX D_1

"EVALUATING UNDERSTANDINGS, ATTITUDES, SKILLS, AND BEHAVIORS"

By

Lewis W. Troyer

Source: "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean," National College of Education Faculty Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 3, November 19, 1969.

Evaluation is a constant process in the classroom. It is present in every activity, written exercise, oral report, discussion and work period. The kinds of questions asked by students and the behaviors following a discussion are part of assessment. This continuous evaluation serves two purposes. First, and most important, it tells the teacher what to plan and how to plan. Faulty or inadequate information, limited understandings and the lack of skills are to be improved by providing follow-up lessons or activities. Some things are retaught; new illustrations are sought; time is provided for review or practice. This evaluation of all aspects of student work indicates when to move rapidly to a new topic, when to move more slowly, and what choices to make concerning assignments.

This same over-all assessment is used to describe or profile what the student can do, where he now stands. It is well to remember that any one test yields only one measure and that measure is limited to the called-for responses. The score on a test asking for recall of factual information gives a rating which indicates only how well the student memorized that particular data. It does

not say how much he knows, what skill he has in finding information, how willing he is to look up references, nor how well he understands relationships. For this reason a variety of observations and different kinds of tests should be used to determine achievement.

The Thirty-Fifth (1965) Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies is devoted to the many aspects of the problem of evaluation. Some very useful suggestions and a summary statement by Maxine Dunfee in chapter eight (pp. 154-173) of that publication are given below:

1. To test for information the pupil may be asked to engage in such activities as the following:

   To arrange in order the steps in a process

   To match events with periods of time

   To supply key words missing in statements of fact essential to the unit

   To match vocabulary and definitions

   To select from a collection of facts those related in some designated way

   To support a generalization with essential facts

   To match objects or agencies with their functions, principles with their applications

   To support responses to true-false items with confirming data

   To distinguish between facts that are subject to change and those that will not vary with time

   To make statements of fact derived from charts, diagrams, and graphs

   To select from a list of facts those that are useful in solving a given problem

   To place events or persons on a time line

In a multiple-choice item, to support responses with data

In true-false items, to alter false items to make them true

2. In a test for understandings the pupils may be required:

To match statements of cause and effect

To distinguish between facts and generalizations in a given list of statements

To supply the generalization to be drawn from a given set of facts

To support a given generalization with facts

To state the generalizations that can be drawn from a field trip or other project

To match a generalization with its supporting data

To select the generalization that may explain why a given situation exists

To draw conclusions from an imaginary dialogue in which an issue is discussed, i.e., what person has inaccurate information, what person's comments reveal prejudice, etc.

To state the most important ideas learned from the unit of work

To state an opinion about why a particular unit of work was chosen for study

To select responses to multiple-choice items which emphasize why something happened or why a condition exists

To match pictures with the generalization they represent

3. Attitudes are revealed when the pupil is asked:

To select, from a teacher-prepared dialogue, comments that reveal desirable or undesirable attitudes

To respond "yes" or "no" to questions which ask, "Do you think that_____?"

To respond to a list of statements of belief, feeling. or opinion by indicating degree--always, sometimes, never

To respond to statements that imply prejudice or lack of prejudice by indicating state of agreement--I agree, I disagree, I am uncertain

To match attitudes with likely resultant actions

To state what one liked best about the unit of work being developed

To give opinions about described situations which reveal the attitudes of the characters

To give reasons to support the action that should be taken in a described problem situation

To write the ending to a story which describes a problem situation

To complete an unfinished sentence such as, "Our unit of work has changed by ideas about _____."

4. Behaviors are best measured by seeing what action is taken. However, what a pupil says he will do can be ascertained by asking him:

To indicate what he would do about a problem situation described in the test

To choose from a number of suggested solutions to a problem

To write the ending for an unfinished story which describes a problem situation

To suggest and evaluate several possible solutions to a described situation

To complete an unfinished sentence, such as, "This unit of work has helped me to _____."

To select a course of action in a problem situation and justify the choice made

5. Skills can be tested by providing experiences in which pupils are required to demonstrate ability to use an index or a map legend, to take notes or to summarize a discussion. The following are examples of test items:

   To interpret an imaginary map, locating physical and cultural features and answering questions calling for an interpretation of information provided

   To answer questions which require the reading and interpretation of data of a graph or table

   To match kinds of references with types of information to be found in them

   To arrange in order the steps in cooperative planning or problem solving

   To select the duties of a chairman from a list of responsibilities of committee members

   To supply a missing step in directions for doing something that involves a skill

   To list the characteristics of a good discussion, a good report, etc.

   To describe how to take notes, how to locate information in a library, etc.

   To demonstrate how to conduct a meeting, how to give a good report, etc.

   To use a table of contents or index to locate specified information

Evaluation for the Future

The ultimate test of the success of the social studies curriculum, however, lies not so much in immediate tangible results but in the continuing and developing behavior of children as they grow up in the democratic society--the kind of persons they are, the extent to which they make use of what they have learned, and their continued interest in investigation and learning. Since the social

studies curriculum is designed to help children develop understandings, attitudes, skills, and behaviors essential to living in a democracy, the child's performance as a maturing citizen provides the most telling evidence of the success of teaching and learning in social studies. . . . When these learnings make a difference in his behavior in his world, when he can make use of the understandings, attitudes, skills, and behavior he has acquired, and when he begins to develop a thirst for more knowledge and more skill, social studies has been worthwhile in the life of that child and society will be the better for its efforts.[1]

---

[1]Harry D. Berg (ed.), Evaluation in Social Studies. Thirty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C. Chapter 8, written by Maxine Dunfee, pp. 154-173.

APPENDIX D_2

MAKING THE GRADE

APPENDIX D_2

MAKING THE GRADE

A Book Review

By

Lewis W. Troyer

Source: Howard Becker, Blance Geer, and Everett Hughes, Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968).

During the summer the present writer came across a small but potent volume entitled Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life by the sociologists Howard Becker, Blanche Geer, and Everett Hughes (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968). The writer's respect for these authors is very high, and even higher for the particular perspective or intellectual frame of reference from which they view aspects of present-day society. This is a case study of the undergraduate college of the University of Kansas.

Chapter headings briefly indicate the focus of the study: (1) Studying College Students: The Nature of Our Problem; (2) The University of Kansas; (3) The Grade Point Average Perspective; (4) Definition of the Situation: Organizational Rules and the Importance of Grades; (5) Definition of the Situation: Faculty-Student Interaction; (6) Information and the Organization of the Activity; (7) The Pursuit of Grades; (8) Bases of Judgment and Evaluation; (9) Evidence for the Existence of the Grade Point Average Perspective; (10) Conclusion. Of these, 3, 7, and 10 are especially interesting to anyone who may seek to compare his own with

the studied situation, or to generalize for the possible benefit of the larger educational world.

What is the "grade point average perspective?" "The GPA perspective takes the rules made by the faculty and administration about academic work as the basic reality with which a student must deal. . . . It accepts, of course, the definition embodied in college practice--the definition that makes grades the measure of academic achievement--and not various other definitions offered by University spokesmen from time to time which are not embodied in authoritative practice." Given this definition of what is important, the GPA perspective indicates various actions appropriate for students; such as: seeking information, working hard, attempting to manipulate faculty in order to get a better grade, organizing for college action to improve the chances of getting a good grade, allocating effort in such a way as to maximize the over-all GPA, and so on.

The authors point out that the student emphasis on making the grade is a response to an academic environment that poses the same emphasis. "But--and it is a big but--the influence on institutional rules extends only so far. The faculty may believe that students should put major, if not exclusive emphasis on academic work. Students see things differently." Within the area of academic work, they accept the definition that major emphasis must be put on grades. But they believe other areas of activity--organizational and personal--are important too. And they proceed to work out a balance, often settling for a lower level of academic

achievement in order to devote more time to other important pursuits. "Our analysis of the GPA perspective suggests that, as things stand, the chief obstacle to a more scholarly approach by students to their academic studies is their belief that they must give first priority to the pursuit of grades. The chief condition for the existence of that perspective is the institutionalization of grades as the reward for academic effort, and the linking of rewards in other areas as well to grades. If we deemphasize or abolish grading systems, the calculation of grade point averages, and their use as a way of discriminating among students, we destroy a major obstacle to academic activity (133-139).

Reference to literature on grading practices might seem to some on this campus as redundant or backward-looking. Aside from the fact that this study gives added support to what we have already done, however, it offers much more. In its basic social-psychological position that human beings shape their activities on the basis of collectively shared "definitions of situations," it provides an important reminder. Any evaluation plan is to be seen as part of a larger definition of the situation by means of which students and faculty orient their respective behaviors. What is the definition of the situation on the N.C.E. campus? How is the new evaluation plan related to it? How does it affect that definition? It is strongly suggested that the success of the new evaluation plan will depend upon the answers to these questions. Will a competency perspective take the place of the traditional GPA perspective? And,

if so, will it be just another means of subverting the academic goals on behalf of a "balance" with other goals of life? Will the intrinsic rewards of learning have a better chance of affecting the balance?

APPENDIX D_3

MEMO TO ALL INSTRUCTORS

APPENDIX D_3

"MEMO TO ALL INSTRUCTORS"

By

Lewis W. Troyer

Source: "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean," National College of Education Faculty Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 8, April 7, 1970.

A great deal of static (unpleasant noise) is flowing from students into the various administrative offices concerning the current operation of the competency evaluation system.

Much of it, if true, indicates that many instructors of courses have adopted or continued practices which violate the stated intentions of the new system and make a mockery of faculty pretensions of real concern for the development of the student. Some of it is misinformation, ignorance with regard to what is really being done. There is always a modicum of such in any human situation.

But even if it were largely misunderstanding, the question would still be pertinent--Why? Are we failing to interpret our procedures adequately?

Or is the real truth rather that we not only have neglected to interpret but have nothing to interpret? Are we ourselves subterfuging the system because we either don't believe in it or have not taken it seriously? Are we doing anything differently, or are we simply carrying on old habit patterns without change? Are we living on the basis that going through some motions will be enough? Who was really corrupted by grading--the student or the instructor,

or both? If we were corrupted (which is likely the truth), can we recognize it about ourselves and do anything about it?

The following is a list of particulars:

"None of my instructors last quarter distributed any competency lists."

"My instructor said we were to check off our competencies by ourselves, but I never knew whether my checks were the same as his."

"If you don't pass the test the first time, you can take it home and do it over. It's easy to copy the correct answers out of the textbook."

"My instructor gave a test the last day of the term, and I never knew what competencies I had completed."

"If you just get all 'pass' or 'inc.' on the papers, you still don't know the quality of your work."

"There's still pressure to maintain an 80% average. The goal is an 80% achievement for everyone."

"I can name an instructor who only gives checks and hardly any feedback."

"Some competency lists are only lists of required work."

"Some competency lists are incomplete; teachers add to them as the term goes on."

"Most instructors did not check off the competencies until the end of the course."

"Competencies are not defined. Is it a competency when one completes an assignment?"

"Many students have cheated more from non-grading than grading. Most kids cheat now to pass retests."

"The paper (competency list) says one thing and the teacher says another."

"Teachers should talk with each student about their progress more than they do and to outline definite goals with them."

"I have not received one competency list or conversed with teachers about my abilities."

"I have learned little. I do busy work to pass competencies."

"There are some teachers who, even though you finished your competencies, made you take the last test just like everyone else."

Well, this could go on and on!

It does not register the "positive" side which is undoubtedly there. It is easy to be happy with the good things said about us. It is important, however, to look carefully at our purported shortcomings, for thereby we may open the way to improvement and genuine accomplishment.

Now, therefore, I must come back to the main point of this memo: There is too much flak! It would not be unlikely that this experimental flight could soon be shot down. Next year the NCA accreditors will be here to look at it. Unless student response gets a good deal more positive and comprehending than it now seems to be, the writer of this memo wouldn't want to place any money bets on its survival. Nor on achievement of accreditation for the college.

APPENDIX E_1

NATIONAL COLLEGE OFFICIAL POSITION ON THE COMPETENCY-BASED SYSTEM

APPENDIX E_1

"NATIONAL COLLEGE OFFICIAL POSITION ON THE COMPETENCY-BASED SYSTEM"

Source: Academic Policies. National College of Education Undergraduate Bulletin, 1976-1977.

Evaluation of student progress

Students' academic progress is evaluated by a "competency system" instead of grades. At the beginning of each course students receive a list of the goals they must meet to receive credit. Whenever a regularly registered student feels prepared, he or she may attempt to show competency in one or more course goals. This demonstration may take place anytime, from the time of registration to the final deadline for removing an incomplete, except as indicated below.

This system emphasizes individual achievement instead of comparison of students. It allows students to accelerate their degree programs if they demonstrate competencies early in the term. It also gives all students full opportunity to succeed in the courses they attempt.

Instructors in each course determine circumstances for demonstrating competency. Except by mutual agreement with the instructor, students are expected to attend class meetings rather than work independently on competencies. Some competencies may be impossible to achieve without regular classroom attendance.

A student who requests an opportunity for demonstration of competencies ahead of class schedule, but who subsequently fails to

receive approval may not thereafter request separate privilege to repeat the demonstration, but must adhere to the schedule set up for the course by the instructor.

The competency system can enable students to go beyond minimum requirements and pursue their special interests in greater depth. Students are encouraged to use the system's flexibility constructively, and to avoid unnecessary Incompletes.

For transfer, admission to graduate study, or employment recommendations, a list of the competencies required in given courses, but not the specific competency records of the particular student, will be supplied, if requested, in addition to the transcript.

In-progress courses

If a student has not completed course competencies by the end of the term of the original enrollment, the course may be designated as "In-progress" and may be completed during the following term. "In-progress" may be assigned only if a student has continued to work toward completion through the last official day of the term; it is not automatically given. If a student has not attended classes or has not attempted to complete competencies, course credit may be lost at the end of first term of enrollment.

A student having any course "In-progress" after the end of the term must contact the instructor during the first three weeks of the next term of enrollment and make specific arrangements for completing the course, or the "In-progress" will be changed to "no

credit." Work for completion of a course "In-progress" must be completed no later than two weeks before the end of the term following the term of original enrollment, or the "In-progress" will be changed to "no credit."

For a student not enrolled in any term subsequent to the original enrollment, the "In-progress" credit will lapse to "no credit" if the course is not completed within the three terms immediately following the term of original enrollment.

Review of academic progress

The Council on Academic Standards reviews students' academic progress at the end of each quarter.

Any student who receives a "no credit" in two credit courses in one quarter or "no credit" in a total of two credit courses in two consecutive quarters will automatically be placed on a provisional status and may be placed under special stipulations by the council. Other students whose academic work is seriously deficient may also be placed on a provisional status and may be placed under special stipulations by the council.

At the end of each quarter, the council reviews the academic record of each provisional status student and decides on appropriate action.

Honors

Faculty Commendation

Faculty Commendation may be awarded at the completion of a course for exceptional work and consistent excellence in the

regularly assigned coursework. Students' academic records reflect this commendation.

Subject area and division honors

Students who have received Faculty Commendations in at least half of the upper level courses in their subject area or division concentration are considered for graduation with subject area or division honors. Students earning faculty commendations in at least two-thirds of professional courses are considered for education division honors. These honors are awarded upon recommendation of the department or division.

Admission to the Professional Studies Sequence:

These steps lead to the Professional Studies Sequence:

*Professional promise rating cards are completed by faculty for all students enrolled in general education and psychology courses which are prerequisites for Professional Term I.

*These cards are sent to the Office of Student Affairs where they are used for developmental counseling of students during their freshman year (or during the first year on campus for transfer students).

*At the end of the freshman year (or other appropriate time) the Office of Student Services forwards the student's cumulative professional file to the education division with a recommendation about the student's readiness to apply for professional study.

*A student applies to the education division for admission to the professional terms. This should be done by the first of January of the sophomore year or during the first term in residence by a transfer student who has sophomore or higher classification. The education division then reviews the student's professional file and makes a recommendation to the Council on Academic Standards concerning admission to professional study.

*The Council on Academic Standards takes final action on the application for admission to the professional terms. A student is expected to complete a full load with no "In-progress" courses before being admitted to professional terms. All coursework must be completed by the end of the term prior to any professional term. Failure to do this will delay the professional term.

*Assignments for enrollment in Professional Term I are based on the student's completion of prerequisites, area of concentration, anticipated date of graduation, and faculty teaching loads.

*Progress of students in professional terms is reviewed at the end of each term.

APPENDIX E_2

ROVING REPORTER

APPENDIX E_2

"ROVING REPORTER"

Source: Chaff II, Student newspaper published by the Student Senate. National College of Education, No. 3, February, 1976.

This issue's Roving Reporter question was, "What do you think of the competency system? And, why?" There were mixed emotions in answer to this question. Here are just a few. (If you would like to see certain questions in this column in the future, please give them to me, Mr. Ramsey, or any Chaff staff member.)

"If it was done consistently, it would be a good idea. Some teachers still grade on a curve which doesn't let you be yourself. If you have to worry about tests at the end of the semester, you're still worrying about the 'A.'"

"I like it because there's not so much tension to get grades. I hate competing for grades against other people, and with this system, you don't have to."

"I like it. My only question is what other schools or people think it's worth. It doesn't matter what we think about it if 'Society' doesn't accept it. Then, it's really not worth anything."

"I abhor it! I would much prefer to have something concrete to show for my hard work. A letter grade would be very preferable to a 'complete.' Competing for grades has always been a part of my schooling, so that's no problem whatsoever!"

"If others outside the school would accept a complete when transferred as a 'B,' then everything is fine. But, it isn't always this way. The honors system needs more guidelines, and, (in general), the faculty as a whole needs to agree on what constitutes an Honors program. I have mixed feelings on the system and the school. I think it has many more problems than the people here would like (lead people) to believe."

"I like the theory of the system, but it doesn't work out that way. But what is the big gripe, is the competency system. There seems to be no standard for it, and that can hurt."

"I feel the competency system is incomplete. There should be an equal opportunity for students to have a grade point system. One of the faults in the system is not being pressure enough."

"I especially feel that by having 3 tries on an exam or whatever, I do not work as hard."

"I like the competency system because it is challenging, but not competitive, and I find that there's not as much pressure, therefore, I'm able to absorb more knowledge. It's helpful for me to know where I stand in a course, and I can check it whenever I want. I'm not much in favor of professional promise cards, but I like competencies very much."

"I like the competency system because it forces the student to try. He must know everything. Also, it takes away the pressure of the grades and worrying about what you're going to get."

"I have mixed feelings about it. You definitely learn from it, however it sometimes puts too much pressure on the student, and

many times, it is too inflexible. I like it and I don't. I like the idea of having to do superior work. For example, I am by no means a brain in science, and I can tell that my science class will be giving me quite a bit of problems!"

"Yes, I like it, but you don't really work at your own pace. I really think it's a good idea, because when you get through, you know the material."

"The competency system is a system filled with vagueness and uncertainty. As we progress through school, we see that the competency system has basic flaws. One of them is commendations. Teachers on a school-wide basis have got to define what their standards are for commendation. This causes many students to become disinterested in a class. Another problem is that while the 'C' system stresses working at one's own pace, one is severely penalized on one's transcript for not completing on time."

"I like the competency system as it seems to put emphasis on learning the body of knowledge rather than on the grade symbol. I think, however, time needs to be spent in re-doing, up-dating competency sheets and competencies asked for."

"I think it's great. With the competency system, one has to understand all the concepts in the course if one is ever to complete."

"I had the competency system in high school and didn't like it at all. I just kept falling behind. But, I think the layout they have here is much better and there's much better understanding of the course itself."

"I think it is a good system because a person's mind is not all around grades. You have to learn everything to pass."

"The competency system is fair and will survive unless someone takes advantage. I feel I'm learning more academically, and how to schedule my time better."

"The competency system has good points and bad points. Positively, the system allows the student to work without intense academic pressure and enables him to use his own creativity if he wants to. On the negative side, the competency system does not provide the student with any motivation or stimulation to work. Unless the student can motivate himself internally, he will fall down. At this point, the 'system' picks him up and gives him an 'in-progress' so he can try again. The second chance seems sufficient. However, even after numerous failures, the system picks him up and coddles him until he feels he can try again. Why? What's wrong with failing? If we don't learn how to fail in school, what will we do later when we leave school? To fail is a reality. Never failing and not being given the chance to fail is unfair and unrealistic."

APPENDIX F_1

FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

APPENDIX F_1

FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

Dear Dr. :

As indicated to you on the phone, I really do appreciate your willingness to serve on this jury to identify characteristics of a good Competency/Performance Based Teacher Education System.

Please rate the enclosed list of characteristics as essential, desirable, or neither essential nor desirable. A return envelope is enclosed for your completed response.

Thank you again for your help in this project. It is super! Hope you are off to a good school year.

Cordially,

Harold B. Street

HBS:ds

Dear Dr. :

As indicated to you on the phone last month, I really do appreciate your willingness to serve on this jury to identify characteristics of a good Competency/Performance Based Teacher Education System.

Shortly after our conversation, I mailed to you a letter and a list of characteristics which I asked you to rate. Apparently the letter got lost in the mail. The responses from the other jury members in this project have been returned so I would appreciate your rating the enclosed list and returning it to me at your convenience.

Please rate the enclosed list of characteristics as essential, desirable, or neither essential nor desirable. A return envelope is enclosed for your completed response.

Thank you again for your help in this project.

Cordially,

Harold B. Street

HBS:ds

APPENDIX F_2

COMPETENCY-BASED RATING FORM

APPENDIX F_2

COMPETENCY-BASED RATING FORM

RATING FORM--C/PBTE
CHARACTERISTICS OF "GOOD" COMPETENCY/PERFORMANCE-
BASED TEACHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS

_____
Jury Member

DIRECTIONS: Please rate each listed characteristic in terms of "good" C/PBTE systems.

Rating Scale

1. Essential
2. Desirable but not essential
3. Not essential or desirable

Characteristics	Rating
1. Competencies to be demonstrated by the student are:	
a. derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles in achieving school goals,	1. a.
b. supported by research, curriculum and job analysis, and/or experienced teacher judgment,	b.
c. stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies, and	c.
d. made public in advance.	d.
2. Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are:	
a. based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies,	2. a.
b. explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions, and	b.
c. made public in advance.	c.

3. The instructional program provides for the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of each of the competencies specified. 3.

4. Assessment of the student's competency:

   a. uses his performance as a primary source of evidence, 4. a.

   b. takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behavior, b.

   c. strives for objectivity, and c.

   d. facilitates future studies of the relation between instruction competency attainment and achievement of school goals. d.

5. The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency. 5.

6. Instruction is individualized. 6.

7. The learning experience of the individual is guided by feedback. 7.

8. The program as a whole is systematic. 8.

9. The emphasis is on exit requirements rather than on entrance requirements. 9.

10. Instruction is modularized. 10.

11. There is student and program accountability. 11.

12. The program is field-centered. 12.

13. There is a broad base for decision making. 13.

14. Preparation for a professional role is viewed as being continuous rather than merely preservice. 14.

15. The program is research-oriented and regenerative. 15.

Please add other characteristics which you consider to be <u>essential</u>.

APPENDIX F_3

NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

COMPETENCY-BASED RATING FORM

APPENDIX F_3

NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
COMPETENCY-BASED RATING FORM

NATIONAL COLLEGE RATING FORM
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMPETENCY-BASED SYSTEM

Please indicate:

Faculty Member:

____Non-tenured
____Tenured

Student Classification:

____Freshman ____Junior
____Sophomore ____Senior

Please indicate your years of experience with the Competency-Based System by circling the appropriate numeral.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DIRECTIONS: Please rate the occurrence of each characteristic, as you perceive it at National College, in the following fashion:

Rating Scale

1. Always
2. Usually
3. Rarely
4. Never

Characteristics	Rating
1. Competencies to be demonstrated by the student are:	
a. derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles in achieving school goals,	1. a.
b. supported by research, curriculum and job analysis, and/or experienced teacher judgment,	b.

c. stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies, and — c.

d. made public in advance. — d.

2. Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are:

a. based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies, — 2. a.

b. explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions, and — b.

c. made public in advance. — c.

3. The instructional program provides for the development of the student's achievement of the competencies specified. — 3.

4. Assessment of the student's competency:

a. uses his performance as a primary source of evidence, — 4. a.

b. takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behavior, — b.

c. strives for objectivity, and — c.

d. facilitates future studies of the relation between instruction, competency attainment and achievement of school goals. — d.

5. The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency. — 5.

6. Instruction is individualized. — 6.

7. The learning experience of the individual is guided by feedback. — 7.

8. The program as a whole is systematic. — 8.

9. The emphasis is on exit requirements rather than on entrance requirements. — 9.

10.	Instruction is modularized.	10.
11.	There is student and program accountability.	11.
12.	The program is field-centered.	12.
13.	There is a broad base for decision making.	13.
14.	Preparation for a professional role is viewed as being continuous rather than merely preservice.	14.
15.	The program is research-oriented and regenerative.	15.

APPENDIX F_4

PRINCIPAL'S TEACHER COMPETENCY EVALUATION FORM

APPENDIX F_4

PRINCIPAL'S TEACHER COMPETENCY EVALUATION FORM

NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

TEACHER COMPETENCY EVALUATION

Name_____ Grade_____

Rating Scale: 1. Superior, 2. Strong, 3. Average,
4. Fair, 5. Inferior

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Exhibits knowledge of curriculum appropriate to grade level.					
2. Organizes and plans work carefully according to specific objectives and strategies.					
3. Participates in district and school activities.					
4. Uses proper channels of communication.					
5. Effectively implements district and/or school programs and policies.					
6. Attends professional meetings, participates in workshops, and indicates desire for further study.					
7. Evidences professional grasp of contemporary issues in education.					
8. Contributes to a good school/community relationship.					

Rating Scale: 1. Superior, 2. Strong, 3. Average,
4. Fair, 5. Inferior

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Works cooperatively with special area consultants (reading, library, special education), staff members and supervisory personnel.					
2. Copes with demands of teaching situations with poise, stability, and maturity.					
3. Demonstrates punctuality and attendance in executing assignments and programs.					
4. Accepts constructive criticism and displays capacity for change.					
5. Demonstrates respect for individuals by being honest and polite with children and parents.					
6. Evidences an awareness of appropriateness in grooming and dress.					
7. Adheres to a professional pattern in communicating with others in writing and speech.					
1. Provides learning activities suitable for the development, interests, abilities, and needs of children.					
2. Is enthusiastic and provides activities which stimulate and encourage students' creative expression.					
3. Effectively selects and uses appropriate teaching aids and instructional materials.					

Rating Scale: 1. Superior, 2. Strong, 3. Average, 4. Fair, 5. Inferior

	1	2	3	4	5
4. Is alert to the lighting, ventilation, and good housekeeping needs of the classroom.					
5. Recognizes causes of behavior; anticipates and solves disciplinary problems.					
6. Uses community resources and extends the classroom into the community.					
7. Uses adequate procedures for evaluating the achievement and growth of pupils.					

Please check how you would rank this teacher in relation to other beginning teachers on your staff:

Superior____ Strong____ Average____ Fair____ Superior____

Is he/she to remain in your school next year?_____

If not, why?_____

_____

Signature_____ Position_____

School_____ City_____

Date_____ State_____

(All information will be regarded as confidential. Thank you again for your cooperation.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education. Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations. 1972.

_____. Bulletin. 1976.

Bloom, Benjamin. "Learning for Mastery." To be published as a chapter in Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus. Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Broudy, Harry S. "The Continuing Search for Criteria." Address presented at the February, 1967, AACTE meeting. Included by Dr. Lewis Troyer. "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean." National College of Education Bulletin (March 1967).

_____. A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972.

Burke, J. Bruce. "Curriculum Design." In Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospects. Edited by W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972.

Burns, Richard W. "The Central Notion: Explicit Objectives." In Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospects. Edited by W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972.

Chaff. Evanston, Illinois: Student Senate of National College of Education, February 1976, pp. 4-5.

Charlesworth, James C. Contemporary Political Analysis. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Clegg, Ambrose A., and Ocha, Anna. Evaluation of a Performance-Based Program in Teacher Education: Recommendations for Implementation. University of Washington, College of Education, 1970.

Dodl, Norman R., and Schalock, H. Del. "Competency-Based Teacher Preparation." In Competency-Based Teacher Education. Edited by Dan W. Anderson et al. Berkeley, California: McCutchen, 1973.

Elam, Stanley. Performance-Based Teacher Education, What Is the State of the Art? Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1971.

Elfenbein, Iris M. Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs, A Comparative Description. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972.

Feldman, Sandra. "Performance-Based Certification: A Teacher Unionist's View." In Exploring Competency-Based Education. Edited by W. Robert Houston. Berkeley, California: McCutchen, 1974.

Houston, W. Robert; Burke, J. Bruce; Johnson, Charles E.; and Hansen, John H. "Criteria for Describing and Assessing Competency-Based Programs." In Competency Assessment, Research and Evaluation. Edited by W. Robert Houston. Albany, New York: Multi-State Consortium on Performance Based Teacher Education, 1974.

Houston, W. Robert, and Howsam, Robert B. Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems and Prospects. Edited by W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972.

Houston, W. Robert, and Jones, Howard L. Three Views of Competency-Based Education: II University of Houston. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1974.

Institution Report to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Evanston, Illinois: National College of Education, March 3-5, 1975.

Johnson, Charles E. "Competency-Based and Traditional Education Practices Compared." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Winter 1974): 355-56.

Jones, Howard L. "Implementation of Programs." In Competency Based Teacher Education. Edited by W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972.

Joyce, Bruce R.; Soltis, Jonas F.; and Weil, Marcia. Performance-Based Teacher Education Design Alternatives: The Concept of Unity. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974.

Kay, Patricia M. What Competencies Should Be Included in a C/PBTE Program? Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1975.

Larson, Rolf W. Accreditation Problems and the Promise of PBTE. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1974.

_____. Executive Director of NCATE, Washington, D.C. Telephone conversation, June 9, 1976.

Massanari, Karl. "Competency-Based Teacher Education's Potential for Improving Educational Personnel Development." Journal of Teacher Education 24 (Fall 1973): 241-44.

McDonald, Frederick J. "The Rationale for Competency-Based Programs." In Exploring Competency Based Instruction. Edited by W. Robert Houston. Berkeley, California: McCutchen Publishing Corp., 1974.

McNeil, John D., and Popham, W. James. "The Assessment of Teacher Competency." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Edited by Robert M. W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1975.

Monson, Jay A. "New Models in Elementary Education." Phi Delta Kappan 51 (October 1969): 101-102.

Nash, Robert J. "Commitment to Competency: The New Fetishism in Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan 52 (December 1970): 240-43.

_____, and Agne, Russell M. "Competency in Teacher Education: A Prop for the Status Quo?" The Journal of Teacher Education 20 (Summer 1971): 147-56.

National College of Education Undergraduate Bulletin, 1976-1977.

Official Philosophy of National College of Education adopted by the Board of Trustees of National College, October 1975.

Schalock, H. D.; Kersh, B. Y.; and Garrison, J. H. From Commitment to Practice: The Oregon College of Education Elementary Teacher Education Program. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Schmieder, Allen A. "Profile of the States in Competency-Based Education." Performance Based Teacher Education (U.S. Office of Education) 3 (November 1974).

Self Study Report of National College of Education Prepared for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Evanston, Illinois: National College of Education, December 1975.

Spady, William G. "Competency Based Education: A Band Wagon in Search of a Definition." Educational Research (January 1977): 9-14.

The Dais, Vol. 5, No. 4. Evanston, Illinois: National College of Education Faculty-Staff Newsletter, Public Relations Office. January 30, 1976, p. 1.

Thrash, Patricia, Associate Executive Director of North Central Association. Telephone conversation. Evanston, Illinois, June 9, 1976.

Troyer, Lewis W. "Competency Based Student Evaluation." Mimeographed paper developed in response to a request from the Student Teaching Department of National College of Education, February 1975, pp. 1-8.

_____. "Grades Have Gone: What Then?" Liberal Education 56 (December 1970): 542-56.

_____. "Items Concerning Non-Grading Proposal." Bulletin: National College of Education (May 27, 1969): 1-5.

_____. "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean." Bulletin: National College of Education 13 (November 19, 1969): 16.

_____. "Leaves From the Notebook of a Dean." Bulletin: National College of Education 13 (April 7, 1970): 16-17.

Turner, Richard L. "Rationale for Competency-Based Teacher Education and Certification." In The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Report. Edited by Benjamin Rosner. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

U.S. Office of Education. Request for Proposals. Bulletin No. OE-68-4. October 16, 1967.

Utz, Robert T., and Leonard, Leo D. A Competency-Based Curriculum, A Model for Teachers. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1971.