

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 033

HE 003 339

TITLE Director's Evaluation Report. Training Program for Inexperienced College Teachers.
INSTITUTION Iowa Univ., Iowa City.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 18p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Educational Improvement; *Higher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Professors; Special Programs; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

Among formal organizations, higher educational institutions are perhaps the worst offenders in failing to prepare staff to function successfully in their professional roles. Because of this, the University of Iowa initiated a training program for inexperienced college teachers. The primary purpose of this short-term training program was to assist in the initial development of teaching competence for faculty members in 4-year liberal arts colleges. This purpose has been expanded into 3 broad objectives that represent the major aims of the program. (1) The comprehension of selected major principles of college teaching with particular emphasis on: (a) clarification of the aims of higher education; (b) course planning; (c) basic principles of learning and instruction; (d) characteristics of students considered important to instruction; (e) alternative teaching strategies and techniques; (f) innovative ideas in education; and (g) techniques of evaluation. (2) The application of these principles by each participant to instruction in his own discipline. (3) Development of an awareness and understanding by each participant of his potential strengths and weaknesses as a college teacher and initial development of a program of self-improvement to overcome instructional weaknesses. (ES)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DIRECTOR'S EVALUATION REPORT
TRAINING PROGRAM FOR INEXPERIENCED COLLEGE TEACHERS
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned
this document for processing
to: HE

In our judgement, this document
is also of interest to the clearing-
houses noted to the right. Index-
ing should reflect their special
points of view. SP

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Name and Address of Institution. University of Iowa, Iowa City,
Iowa. 52240.

B. Name of Institute. Training Program for Inexperienced College
Teachers, Program Number NIH #56-4064 (Grant No. 32).

C. Director. H. Bradley Sagen. Address: Jessup Hall, University
of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, 52240. Telephone Number: 319-353-4377.

Groups Primarily Responsible for the Training Program. The program
was the primary responsibility of the College of Education and the Graduate
College of the University of Iowa.

Other Departments or Groups Included in the Program. The Training
Program was co-sponsored by the Committee on Liberal Arts Education of the
North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The program
Director, H. Bradley Sagen, also serves as Director of the North Central
Liberal Arts Committee, and most of the program planning and operation was
carried out by Dr. Sagen under the sponsorship of the Liberal Arts Committee.

D. Program Dates. August 10-21, 1970.

II. PROGRAM FOCUS

Objectives

The primary purpose of the short term training program was to assist in
the initial development of teaching competence for faculty members in four
year liberal arts colleges. This purpose has been expanded into three broad
objectives which represent the major aims of the program.

1. The comprehension of selected major principles of college teaching
with particular emphasis upon: (a) clarification of the aims of higher education,
particularly of liberal education; (b) course planning, i.e., definition of
objectives, and selection and organization of content; (c) basic principles
of learning and instruction; (d) characteristics of students considered important
to instruction; (3) alternative teaching strategies and techniques; (f) inno-
vative ideas in education; and (g) techniques of evaluation.

2. The application of these principles by each participant to
instruction in his own discipline.

3. Development of an awareness and understanding by each participant
of his potential strengths and weaknesses as a college teacher and,
initial development of a program of self-improvement to overcome instructional

ED 067033

HE 003 339

weaknesses and maximize potential.

Need for the Program

Among formal organizations higher educational institutions are perhaps the worst offenders in failing to prepare staff to function successfully in their professional roles. In a survey conducted several years ago by the Association of American Colleges, less than half of the responding graduate schools reported even modest programs in preparation for college teaching, and a recent survey by the North Central Liberal Arts Committee of 45 small private liberal arts colleges revealed that less than 10% had in-service programs beyond an occasional lecture or faculty orientation session. Follow-up studies of participants in the Training Program for Inexperienced College Teachers for the past several years report consistently that less than 40% of the participants have had any pre-service or in-service training in college teaching prior to attending the present program.

The North Central Liberal Arts Committee and the University of Iowa have both supported the efforts by developing institutions especially to conduct in-service faculty development programs, but such institutions quite often lack the resources, both financial and human, to conduct effective programs.

Major Emphases of the Training Program

The stated objectives of the program emphasize knowledge of the basic principles of college teaching; instructional skills; and the ability to apply these principles and skills to the participant's own subject field. The staff has found, however, and contends more strongly each year that the program succeeds or fails in large measure to the extent that participants enlarge their conception of the aims of education and of the role of the teacher. Thus, attitude change has become a major emphasis of the program.

Another somewhat recent emphasis has been the development of participants' sensitivity to their own strengths and weaknesses as college teachers and the creation by each participant of at least some initial plans for a program of self-improvement (objective #3).

The emphasis upon attitude change and self-awareness have in turn led to changes in the structure of the program. The staff has felt that to achieve these program goals, attention must be given to: (a) The creation of a "climate" in which participants feel free to discuss with staff and each other their own shortcomings and concerns of college teachers. A climate of openness must be created in which participants begin to "cope" with the problem of improving teaching, rather than "defending" against possible criticisms and sanctions; (b) Greater use of feedback devices has been stressed in recent years through such techniques as micro-teaching, human relations labs (micro labs), and extensive consultation with participants individually and in small groups.

III. PROGRAM OPERATION

A. Participants

Quality. The staff were pleased with the increase in quality of the participants in the 1970 Inexperienced Teacher Program over those who parti-

cipated in the 1969 program. Earlier notification of funding by U.S.O.E permitted a significant increase in the scope of publicity. Also publicity was generated by the 1969 program which, in turn, resulted in several inquiries. The result was that the 1970 program generated 114 completed applications versus 87 for the 1969 program. The percentage of Ph.D.'s enrolled in the program tripled from 10% in 1969 to 30% in 1970. The quality was not uniform across various subject matter groups, however, a condition which the Director feels can be overcome only through increased publicity and the generation of more applications.

Despite the increased emphasis on publicity in scholarly journals and higher education newsletters, the mailing of program brochures to the presidents and deans of North Central Association Liberal Arts Colleges was again the main source of publicity regarding the program. A contributing factor is that participants must eventually be nominated by their president or dean and that schools are limited to two participants. In 1970, five out of every six participants were informed about the program by the president or dean with the remainder learning of the program essentially through journals and newsletters. U.S.O.E. publicity to developing institutions was also a factor in securing better geographic spread and more minority group applications.

Selection Criteria. Required criteria included current position, recommendations, and degrees held. Preferred criteria included geographic factors and age. Test scores, academic achievement and interviews were not utilized. The target group for the program was composed of teachers with less than three years of full-time teaching experience who were teaching in smaller four year liberal arts colleges in the nineteen-state North Central Association region. Since the program was organized around four subject matter seminars, participants were selected by subject area to develop four seminars of approximately fifteen participants each. The program also emphasized teaching of the liberal arts areas, but teachers from allied professional areas were selected in several cases.

For a two-week program the selection procedures functioned about as well as would be expected. To a great extent, participants are self-selected by the nature of the program. The major factor, however, is that since the program has functioned for several years, presidents and deans of North Central area Colleges have come to recognize what the program can and cannot do for individual faculty, and administrators now can often nominate participants who can best benefit from the program. Since the Director of the program is also Director of the sponsoring North Central Liberal Arts Committee, his personal contacts with many of the presidents and deans who write such nominations, permits perhaps more candid appraisals of qualifications of applicants and of the program itself than would be possible under other circumstances.

B. Staff

The design of the program emphasized both the acquisition of general principles of instruction and the application of these principles to specific subject matter fields. The staff was thus heavily inter-disciplinary and

consisted of educational specialists who presented and discussed the general principles of teaching, and subject matter specialists provided specialized resources regarding the application of general principles and the development of conceptions more appropriate to the various broad subject areas. Another inter-disciplinary emphasis in the program was achieved through the grouping of the participants themselves into four broad subject area seminars which enhanced interaction among related disciplines such as the social sciences. This "cross-hatching" of ideas has proven to be one of the major outcomes of the program.

A further interdisciplinary emphasis was achieved in 1970 through placing the participants from all the subject areas in a variety of small group discussion settings during the program. These discussions also gave the participants from various areas a chance to interact on a small group basis with program staff from other disciplines.

The quality and personal rapport of the staff with the participants has consistently been the program's strongest asset throughout its several years of existence. The quality of the full time teaching staff was judged outstanding or very good by almost three out of four participants (72%, Table 7). The full-time staff has worked together on similar programs for about seven years and has developed a degree of rapport and openness perhaps somewhat unique to short programs of this type. In addition to the five full-time staff, three consultants were also utilized, two for two days, and one for one-half day. The consultants handled rather specific assignments in areas such as curriculum development, and served as resource persons for various subject seminars. This latter utilization of consultants has been a major benefit for those participants in areas peripheral to the interests of the subject matter specialists. In the future, consideration will be given to holding open one or two consultant lines until the subject matter fields of participants can be determined.

C. Activities

For the reader who is unfamiliar with the details of the training program, a short description is provided in Appendix A. In evaluating the program, two forms were used. The evaluation itself is described in more detail in Section IV. But briefly, the two forms employed were the U.S.O.E. Participant Evaluation forms, referred to hereafter as the U.S.O.E. form and the form developed by the participants themselves from forms used in previous years, and which is referred to as the "Iowa Form." The overall evaluation of the program was quite favorable. On the U.S.O.E. form (Question 11), 65% of the participants thought the program outstanding or very good, 30% rated the program as "good," or "adequate," and only 5% gave the program a "poor" rating.

Almost two-thirds of the participants (63%) felt that the program would be very useful in their professional work (U.S.O.E. item #12), and an additional 29% thought it would be fairly useful. Only one person felt that the program would be not at all useful and four persons were undecided. On the Iowa form, two out of three participants (66%) indicated they would "Strongly urge" participants with a similar background and experience to attend the program in future years, and an additional 25% would "suggest" the program to similar participants. Only one person would not recommend the program (2%) and four were uncertain (7%).

Another indication of the impact of the program is the spontaneous responses by the participants to the question: "What major changes do you

plan to make as a result of participation in the program? The participants generated a variety of responses indicating that they were responding to different elements of the program and that for many of them some of the material being covered in the program represented an extension of their present thinking and planning rather than any major new "change" in instruction, (Table 1).

The results verify the emphasis upon attitude change and upon planning for the personal growth in instructional effectiveness. Over half of the teachers (54%) plan to change their courses to better meet the needs of students. Many participants planned also to place more emphasis upon participation by students (37%) and to reduce the amount of material covered (23%). The openness of the program experience seemed to have an impact on the participants since 42% indicated they planned a major change in the direction of sharing of information experience regarding teaching and teaching problems with other colleagues.

While there was a general consensus on the value of the overall program, there was considerable diversity of thought as to which objectives were most important and which areas of emphasis were of most value. As expressed in the report of the 1969 program, the Director's impression of the program is one of "synergism;" i.e., ". . . the individual program components did not give the program its outstanding effectiveness, rather bringing together and facilitating the interaction of program components, staff, and participants leads to insights and changes of perspective that cannot be ascribed to specific elements or goals of the program."

Considerable diversity of opinion existed regarding the primary value of various program emphases (Table 2). Participants ranked changes in attitudes, improvement of methodology, and improvement in communications of about equal value, with 59-60% of the participants marking one of these three emphases as first or second in value to them. Since participant attitudes had been selected for special emphasis in the 1970 program there was special interest in the fact that 40% of the participants ranked attitude change first in importance.

Although few of the specific program objectives were perceived as being achieved to the same degree as the total effect of the program, participants generally felt the program enhanced the achievement of specific objectives to a "considerable" degree. Of twenty specific program objectives, the program was judged by over half the participants to be of "considerable" or "outstanding" value in the achievement of nine (Table 3). The program was perceived at least of "some value" by 80% of the participants in achieving all twenty of the objectives.

Certain weaknesses of the 1969 program were overcome to a significant degree as judged by the fact that only the one program area (Development of student values) was rated as of "little or no value" by as many as 20% of the participants. In contrast, in the 1969 program, six of the nineteen specific program objectives received similar low ratings.

Table 1
Major Changes in Instruction Resulting From Participation
in the Program
(Iowa Item II)

Major Change, by Area

A. Course Planning

- 37%, course objectives have to be specified
- 23%, limit the course content
- 16% plan the course around a basic concept
- 12%, vary the teaching procedures
- 12%, allow students to participate in course planning

B. Classroom Behavior

- 37%, more student classroom participation
- 19%, more flexibility in teaching technique
- 19%, less lecture
- 12%, awareness of individual differences
- 10%, sensitive to students needs
- 3% encourage free expression of thought

C. Role as Teacher of Undergraduate Students

- 54%, give more assistance in their various needs
- 29%, emphasize interpersonal relations
- 17%, encourage creative response

D. Further Personal Education

- 27%, attend seminars and workshop
- 27%, take summer classes or pursue graduate studies
- 24%, do more readings in your area of specialization
- 22%, communicate with other teachers for further information
- 22%, talk with other teachers for further information

E. Relations with other Teachers

- 42%, share your experience or information
- 29%, establish rapport with colleagues
- 24%, participate in group discussion
- 5%, encourage holding of in-service training

Table 2
Ranking of Program Emphases
According to Value to Participants (1)
(USOE Item 13)

Emphasis	Percent Ranking of Program Areas (in Descending Order of Value)				
	Rank: <u>1</u> (high)	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u> (low)	<u>NA</u> *
Content	07	13	13	49	18
Attitude	40	19	23	18	00
Methodology	29	40	27	04	00
Communication	31	31	31	07	00

1. N=59

*Not Applicable

Table 3
Participant Ratings of the Achievement of Specific Program Objectives by the 1969 and 1970 Programs
 (Iowa Form Item 3f)

Program Objective	Percent Rating of Value of the Program(1)							
	Little or No Value		Some Value		Considerable Value		Out-Standing Value	
	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969
Principles and Methods								
Selection of course objectives	06	(02)*	25	(27)	53	(46)	16	(25)
How to construct behavioral objectives	11	(NA)	46	(NA)	30	(NA)	13	(NA)
Alternative ways of selecting and organizing course content	07	(09)	39	(47)	39	(34)	15	(10)
Characteristics of knowledge generally and your subject field as they affect course planning	07	(26)	53	(44)	38	(20)	02	(10)
Innovative ways of organizing courses How to differentiate and plan for in- struction at various levels of understanding	07	(23)	38	(44)	40	(28)	14	(04)
Principles and methods of teaching students to reason and to solve problems effectively	16	(NA)	45	(NA)	35	(NA)	04	(NA)
Ways of developing student values	13	(09)	55	(66)	29	(23)	03	(02)
How to develop alternative teaching strategies	20	(31)	48	(47)	25	(22)	07	(00)
Ways of making courses more relevant to the current concerns of students	06	(17)	35	(44)	47	(40)	12	(08)
Ways of individualizing instruction for stu- dents of differing ability and achievement	16	(25)	50	(46)	23	(30)	11	(00)
Ways of individualizing instruction for stu- dents of differing motivation and interests	13	(21)	50	(66)	27	(09)	10	(04)
Teaching Techniques								
Lecture	10	(09)	16	(44)	50	(40)	24	(07)
Discussion	07	(07)	17	(27)	50	(43)	26	(13)
Independent Study	11	(09)	24	(46)	44	(34)	21	(11)
Case study	07	(20)	36	(34)	44	(34)	13	(11)
Evaluation								
Instruction of classroom tests	05	(12)	50	(42)	33	(39)	12	(07)
Grading Practices	11	(12)	50	(54)	32	(33)	07	(00)
Other								
Teacher role of college faculty member	15	(07)	40	(40)	37	(45)	08	(08)
Characteristics of your type of institution	17	(18)	46	(38)	30	(34)	07	(13)

1. NA=Not Applicable

The evaluation of various activities included in the program was generally favorable, indicating again that the participants typically gained something of value from most program activities, even though the gain may have been something other than or in addition to the specific objectives for which the activity was planned (Table 4). Participants in some cases came to the program with rather specific objectives in mind; e.g., improvement of lecture techniques, planning a particular course, and often gained something of benefit to these concerns even though the stated objectives of the program may not have been viewed as significant.

The most important aspects of the program, as perceived by participants, were the opportunities for interaction among participants and staff. The specific activities which contributed to this interaction were the four subject matter seminar groups which were judged of "considerable" or "outstanding" value by almost nine out of ten (88%) of the participants, individual or spontaneous discussions with other participants (88%) and individual consultations with staff members (70%) (Table 4).

The general sessions were judged to be of somewhat less value than other aspects of the program although most participants rated the majority of the sessions to be of at least "some" or "considerable" value. Only two general sessions were perceived as having "little or no value" by as many as one-third of the participants.

More specific reactions to the general sessions especially can be ascertained from participants' spontaneous comments and from their recommendations for change (Table 5 and 6). About one-third of the participants (31%) (Table 6) recommended that the general sessions be shortened and that increased emphasis be placed on small group discussions, and almost one-fourth (22%) recommended an increased emphasis on "practical aspects of teaching."

General sessions inevitably emphasized one or more persons talking at the participants or, at most, discussion by a small number of the sixty participants. The problem is how to retain the strength of assisting participants to consider problems of teaching in a context somewhat broader than the specific problems of their own discipline, while at the same time facilitating intensive discussion of the issues. In contrast to previous years, more extensive use was made of handout materials and the reaction was generally quite favorable (Table 4). The most promising approach to the general sessions seems to be to increase the emphasis on materials to be read prior to the session and to utilize smaller discussion groups during the time available. This was done several times during the 1970 program with generally favorable results. An increased emphasis on application of principles can also be achieved by greater use of handouts in the four subject matter seminars which would make more time available for discussions of the application of these principles to the various disciplines.

Related to the practical-theoretical concerns of participants is the question of long-term versus short-term outcomes of the program. Participants often bring rather specific concerns about preparing for courses they are to teach several weeks hence. While these concerns must receive

Table 4
Rating of Specific Program Areas
(Iowa Form Item 7)

7. Rating of Each Area (1)

	Did Not Participate		Little or no Value		Some Value		Considerable Value		Outstanding Value	
	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969
<u>Materials Distributed</u>										
Handouts			8		47		37		8	
Teaching tips	14		5		68		10		3	
<u>General Sessions</u>										
Aims of Liberal Ed	2		17		49		24		8	
Nature of Knowledge	2		36		40		17		5	
Levels of Understanding			14	2	50	38	27	43	9	18
Relation of Course to Curriculum development	3	2	14	6	50	54	30	35	2	6
Instructional strategies			16		36		35		13	
Lecture and discussion techniques					28		36		36	
Group dynamics	5		13		38		26		18	
Conversation as Teaching	2		36		25		29		9	
Independent study	2		9		44		33		12	
Course planning	8	NA*	17	5	46	35	17	39	10	18
Testing and grading	2	NA	18	7	40	60	7	17	12	14
<u>Subject Matter</u>										
Seminar Groups	0		2	4	10	25	44	39	44	32
Individual consultations with staff members	9	NA		8	21	28	40	42	30	23
Spontaneous discussion with other participants	0	NA								
Individual readings	2		2	2	10	14	43	43	45	41
Specific course planning	2		5		38		45		10	
Video tape experience (Micro-Teaching)	2	NA	7	5	36	20	49	38	6	36
	5		24		24		25		22	
<u>Special Session</u>										
Session on Inter-disciplinary courses	64		7		18		11		4	
Session on innovation	46		18		18		14			
Micro lab session	39		2		21		26		12	

Table 5
Spontaneous Comments of Participants Regarding
Major Strengths and Weaknesses of the Training Program (1)
(USOE Item 18)

Strengths

- 38% cited discussion and interaction
- 30% cited quality and availability
- 15% cited deeper insight to the teaching profession
- 11% cited facilities
- 6% cited general program structure and organization

Weaknesses

- 27% cited content as too theoretical
- 16% cited the need to improve general sessions
- 16% cited the need to improve scheduling
- 10% cited the need for more time to deal with important
and common problems in the profession
- 9% cited the need for specific instructions in teaching methods
- 7% cited the need to improve lecture
- 4% cited some materials as being too technical
- 4% cited the need to group into small discussion units
- 4% cited not enough time with consultants
- 3% cited need to improve financial support

1. N=59

Table 6
Spontaneous Comments of Participants Regarding
Specific Changes Recommended by Participants⁽¹⁾
(USOE Item 17)

Changes Recommended Regarding Program Structure

- 31% recommended that the general sessions be shortened, and that increased emphasis be placed on small group discussions
- 14% felt they needed more time for seminar discussions
- 12% recommended an increase in the flexibility of the schedule

Changes Recommended Regarding Program Content

- 22% recommended an increase in practical emphasis (e.g., teaching demonstrations, construction of tests, etc.)
- 3% recommended increased interdisciplinary emphasis
- 3% recommended greater use of handout materials

Changes Recommended Regarding Staff

- 7% recommended an increased contact with specialists in various fields.

Changes Recommended Regarding Finances

- 8% recommended an increased stipend or travel allowance

1. N=59

attention if the goals of the program are to be realized, consideration of immediate problems should be balanced by the transmission of systematic knowledge and the development of competencies appropriate to a professional in the field. Despite the concerns about the theoretical nature of some sessions, nine out of ten participants (88%) felt that the material was integrated with their previous background and experience (U.S.O.E. item #14.)

In addition to the general sessions there were two special sessions, organized upon request of the participants. The first was on innovation, the second on inter-disciplinary courses. Between one third and half of the participants attended each of these sessions, and at least two thirds of those attending, seemed to feel that the sessions were of at least "some" or "considerable" value (Table 4).

The U.S. Office of Education form (Table 7) provides another perspective on the quality of the program. In general the evaluation parallels the ratings of specific program objectives and activities. Some concern is evidenced over the scheduling of activities. This likely represents the concern expressed elsewhere (Tables 5 and 6) over the general program sessions.

1. New Techniques. Two instructional techniques were introduced in 1969 on an experimental basis. The first "micro-teaching" (video taping of short teaching segments with subsequent discussion and critique), was incorporated into the 1970 program as a major component. The second technique, "micro-lab" (a short, modified version of human relations training), had been considered only moderately successful and was included in the 1970 program on a voluntary basis.

The Iowa Evaluation form requested participants to evaluate both of these activities (table 4). Almost half (47%) of the participants found the micro-teaching to be of considerable or of outstanding value to them, and an additional one fourth (24%) found the experience to be of some value. However, about one fourth of the participants (24%) found the experience of little or no value. The video tape experience was used in part to motivate participants to try alternatives to lectures or instructor-dominated discussions. There was emphasis which some of the participants resisted, upon at least trying teaching by "discovery" or by inductive methods. More experience with a variety of teaching techniques earlier in the program and more experience with TV before the session in which the critique was made did help many participants to overcome apprehension regarding the use of video tapes. Also, the micro-teaching experience must be integrated with other aspects of the program, particularly the work on instructional strategies. Nevertheless the benefits derived from micro-teaching were such that the experience will be incorporated in the future programs.

Over half of the participants (61%) took part in the "micro-lab" session. The experience with the session in 1969 lead to somewhat different pre-planning and structuring of the "lab" in 1970. There was more emphasis on awareness about how a person affects others and less upon general attitudes toward other participants. There was, as a result, greater satisfaction with the session in 1970.

Table 7
Evaluation of Program Characteristics
(HSOE-Item 15)
% Rating for Each Area

Rating:	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Adequate	Poor	NA
Areas						
Quality of Curriculum	10	42	37	05	06	
Quality-Inte-nsHIP Experience			02			98
Administrative Arrange- ment - Learning	20	37	29	07	07	
Administrative Arrange- ment - Schedule of Activities	17	29	30	17	07	
Quality F-T Teaching Staff	38	42	15	03	00	02
Quality P-T Teaching Staff	14	32	19	05	00	30
Quality-Consultants	30	36	17	06	02	09
Usefulness-Lab Sessions	34	24	27	07	03	05
Quality-Instructional Facilities	13	35	35	15	02	
Living-Lining Facilities	29	53	13	03	00	02
Rapport-Participants	60	28	08	02	02	
Adm. - Faculty - Participants Rapport	38	38	17	05	02	
Criteria-Selection of Participants	20	39	31	05	02	03
Follow-up on Participants	04	21	30	16	07	22

2. Effectiveness of Program Dates and Duration. Almost nine out of ten participants (87%) thought that the program was about the right length (USOE item 16). Three persons (5%) thought the program too long and 8% found it too short. A mid-August setting is not the optimum time for an academic program of any kind, but the evidence is that about one third of the participants were enrolled in summer school or engaged in similar projects during the summer. Other times thus would have decreased the number and probably the quality of applications. Considering these circumstances, the program dates and duration would seem to be about optimum.

3. Effectiveness of Distribution of Staff and Participant Time. There were no major criticisms regarding the distribution of activities, except for some concern with the length of the general sessions. This problem will hopefully be solved in future years by decreasing the length of the general sessions and utilizing prepared hand outs and other materials which can then be discussed in small group settings.

4. Participant Involvement in Program Decisions. Participant involvement was structured at several points in the program. During the first day of the program the participants selected a four-member steering committee which met several times a week with the Director to discuss and evaluate the progress of the program and to plan several activities during the two weeks. Participants took primary responsibility for the planning of social events with the administrative assistance by the director and his staff. The result was that about seven social events were held during the two-weeks. Most of these involved over half of the participants and several other events were planned for smaller groups. Two of the ten general sessions were also left open to be planned by participants. The first session on group dynamics was generally well rated by participants, with 82% finding the session at least of some value (Table 4). The second session was to be held the final day of the workshop but the participants decided they wished to devote more time to seminar meetings and individual consultations, so the session was cancelled in favor of a short summary session prior to adjournment.

Another participant committee was elected during the second week of the workshop to design in consultation with the Director the participant evaluation form referred to as the "Iowa Form."

D. Evaluation

Results of the evaluations have been incorporated into the preceding discussion of the program. Two major evaluations were made. The first consisted of a tabulation of the forms supplied by the U.S. Office of Education which was administered at the close of the two-week program. The second consisted of the form designed by the participants themselves and referred to as the "Iowa Form." This form was based in large measure upon an evaluation form used in previous years and was also administered at the close of the two-week program.

The Director is completing a longer-term follow-up study of the participants in the 1969 program to ascertain the problems encountered during subsequent teaching experience, and the extent to which the program provided some of the knowledge and skills needed for effective teaching. This study should be completed within the next month and the results will be sent to the U.S. Office of Education.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

There exist a number of alternatives to a two week training program for inexperienced college teachers as the method of induction into the teaching profession. Nevertheless, the program provides one viable option, especially for those persons who enter the profession without teaching experience or without formal preparation for teaching in graduate school. Although, much remains to be done to improve the quality of the program, the staff feel generally that a viable and coherent program format has been achieved. The task now is to further impliment and extend this format.

Several major strengths characterized the success of the program:

(1) The program was of significant value to most participants. About two-thirds (66%) of the participants thought the program of "considerable" or "outstanding" value, and 9 out of 10 (88%) would recommend the program to teachers with similar background and experience. Different participants react to different aspects of the program, and hence while specific areas of the program are not necessarily of outstanding value to all participants each participant seemed to find several aspects of the program of significant value.

(2) The basic objectives of the program, i.e., to transmit general principles of instruction and to assist participants to apply these to their own subject fields were achieved to a considerable degree as evidenced by participant ratings.

(3) The two emphases of (a) creating a group climate of openness, and of (b) exploration of participants' potential strengths and weaknesses as college teachers were achieved. The openness of discussion, the availability of staff, and the specific techniques of micro-teaching and "micro-labs" were judged quite favorably by the majority of participants.

The major weaknesses associated with the program included:

(1) The failure to communicate general principles of instruction to participants by means other than lecture. Greater attention must be given to instructional tactics which will involve participants in active consideration of principles, rather than sitting as passive listeners.

(2) Failure to provide specialized consultant help to participants in fields somewhat peripheral to the interest and backgrounds of the subject matter specialists. In some cases, the participants themselves seemed to be looking for technical advice in narrow subject fields. A clear statement of intentions to participants, particularly at the time of acceptance into the program should clarify this matter. On the other hand, greater flexibility in budget allocation would enable the program to secure one or more consultants in specialized subject fields for brief periods of time.

The conclusions regarding strengths and weaknesses lead to certain inferences regarding the program to be developed in 1971 if funded by U.S.O.E.

(1) The basic format of the program is adequate. The emphasis must now be placed on development of quality materials to be sent to participants prior to the seminar and upon instructional strategies which in-

volve participants more actively in the general sessions. Those sessions devoted to the explication of general principles of instruction should in several instances be divided into small groups or sessions in which participants can actively discuss the nature of these principles and their own concerns. Greater use of printed materials will allow general session time to be used for these other activities.

(2) Effort must still be devoted to the translation of general principles of instruction into application to specific disciplines. Greater coordination through the use of printed materials, and active involvement of the staff in the general sessions should facilitate such application.

(3) More attention must be given to what the participants can accomplish prior to the training program. In addition to reading prepared materials, participants could begin to block out short teaching strategies to be video-taped and could give more consideration to the design of a course. The time during the program could then be used for discussion of issues to which the participants had already devoted significant attention.

Impact on Institutions. If graduate schools such as the University of Iowa, and smaller institutions through in-service programs, would fulfill their function of preparing and further developing college teachers, there would be little or no need for programs such as the present one. It has been to the credit of the University, the North Central Association, and the participating colleges that the failure has been recognized and that something has been done to overcome the problem.

The program has given visibility to the problem of preparing college teachers at several points throughout the university and increased interest on the part of several departments is evident. Deans and department chairmen have attended program sessions and have incorporated certain aspects of the program into their own work with graduate teaching assistants.

A follow-up study of participants in the 1969 program should yield evidence of the impact of the program upon participating institutions. The results of this latter study should be available within a month.

APPENDIX A

Sixty applicants will be accepted for the two-week TRAINING PROGRAM FOR INEXPERIENCED COLLEGE TEACHERS to be held on the campus of The University of Iowa, Iowa City, August 10-21, 1970. The program is designed for, but not restricted to, teachers who have not more than three full years of full-time college teaching experience, and who are teaching at smaller liberal arts colleges where the primary focus is upon undergraduate instruction. Applicants must be nominated by their President or Dean. Priority will be given to those teaching in the liberal arts and sciences in smaller liberal arts colleges in the nineteen-state North Central Association area. Stipends for all sixty participants selected will be awarded in the amount of \$150.00 under the U.S. Office of Education EDPA grant.

OBJECTIVES

The primary purpose of the training program is to assist in the initial development of teaching competence in faculty members from small liberal arts colleges. This broad purpose can be subdivided into two objectives which represent the major foci of the program. These are: (1) The comprehension of selected major principles of college teaching with particular emphasis upon the areas of (a) course planning, definition of objectives, and selection and organization of material; (b) basic principles of learning; (c) characteristics of students of importance to instruction; (d) alternative teaching techniques; (e) innovative ideas in instruction; (f) techniques of evaluation; and (2) The application by the participant of these principles to his own subject field.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

synopsis

The first objective will be met by holding general sessions and discussions of topics such as definition of course objectives, alternative approaches to selection and organization of course content, principles of learning, lecture versus discussion techniques, student characteristics, independent study, instruction in classroom tests, and the role of the faculty member in student advising. The emphasis will be upon presenting reasonable alternatives and upon assisting inexperienced teachers to develop a frame of reference from which to appraise these alternatives as they might be applied to a given teaching situation.

The second objective, the application of alternative approaches to specific subject areas, will be achieved through small seminars in several broad subject areas led by master teachers. In these seminars each participant will develop a specific course which he is to teach in the coming year. Through these seminars and through consultation with the master teachers and other staff, the participants will come to see the appropriateness and sometimes the modifications necessary for the application of general principles to specific areas.

The program will consist of ten working days over a two-week period, August 10-21, 1970, on the campus of The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. A schedule consisting of general sessions, subject-matter seminars, and individual consultations will be followed for the first eight days. The ninth day will be devoted entirely to individual consultation and to final preparation by each participant of a report on the course he is to teach in the coming year, and the tenth day will be devoted to a final summary and appraisal by the staff and participants. The program will incorporate appropriate technical aids to teaching, including the opportunity for the participant to use audiovisual equipment for micro-teaching units.

program costs

No instructional or course registration fees will be charged to the participant. The stipend of \$150.00 is intended to cover the participant's living costs during the two weeks. No provision is made for participants' travel expenses. Participants may be required to purchase instructional materials up to \$5.00.

The stipend of \$150.00 will be paid to the participant on the opening day of the program. Stipends cannot be paid in advance to the participant.

graduate course offering

Graduate credit will be granted for two semester hours, under the University's course offering, "7H:211 Problems in College Teaching." Participants need not enroll for credit. Under the terms of the EPDA Grant, there will be no course registration fee charged to the participant.