DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 172 TM 004 619

AUTHOR Garman, Noreen
TITLE A Mastery Model of Evaluation as a Strategy for Developing Professional Teaching Competencies.
PUB DATE [Apr 75]
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D. C., March 30-April 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Objectives; Educational Strategies; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; Models; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Interns
IDENTIFIERS *Professional Teaching Competencies

ABSTRACT

The primary focus of the study is an instrument (developed in the public school setting) entitled, "Professional Teaching Competencies," which clusters interrelated planning and implementation competencies around instructional roles of the teacher. The concept, "Stages of Mastery," is used as the evaluation method. The study summarizes data related to the development of the instrument, problems with implementation, and its effectiveness as a strategy for developing teaching competencies in two graduate internship programs. The instrument has been adapted for use in professional staff development by four Pittsburgh-area school districts. (Author)

A MASTERY MODEL OF EVALUATION AS A STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPING PROFESSIONAL TEACHING COMPETENCIES

A paper presented to

American Educational Research Association
1975 Annual Meeting, March 31, 1975
Washington, D.C.

by

Noreen Garman, Ph.D.
University of Pittsburgh

In mid-1973 the idea of "teaching competencies" as a way to articulate what teachers do was remote to many educators in Pennsylvania. The State Department of Education was encouraging its teacher-preparing institutions to initiate behavioral competency studies as the first step toward Competency Based Teacher Education, and although there was much activity, especially during June, 1973, at the state level, the residue had not yet settled into the programs of universities, colleges and public schools.[1] Also during the month of June a small group of public school and university personnel were struggling with competency statements in Bethel Park, Pa. but not necessarily because the State Department wished it so. Reasons for the effort will be described below. This study will attempt to examine the results of that effort, which included the development of an instrument entitled, "Professional Teaching Competencies;" intended as a strategy for program implementation in the Graduate Internship Program during the Bethel Park-University of Pittsburgh 1973 Summer Session. In September of that year the document was adopted for another intern program, the Teacher Corps Middle School Program (Pittsburgh Public Schools - University of Pittsburgh) for use by their interns and team leaders.

The purpose of the study is to determine the effectiveness and limitation of the Professional Teaching Competencies document as a strategy for developing teaching competencies. The strategy includes four objectives which reflect critical elements of both programs, 1) mutual collaboration and dialogue among participants, 2) specification of common teaching behaviors which provides the learner with responsibility for managing resources, 3) a conceptual framework for organizing behaviors, and 4) a developmental attitude toward growth and assessment by

all participants. Conclusions concerning the effectiveness of the Professional Teaching Competencies as a strategy will be drawn by comparing outcomes of the objectives as they emerged in the two different intern programs. The data collected included: responses on the Professional Teaching Competencies document; extensive interviews with participants; products of intern folders which reflected intern development, such as lesson plans, tests, materials; summaries of classroom observation; and supervisory conferences as well as program evaluation data. No attempt will be made to present the above data systematically, but rather to descriptively summarize and answer the critical questions of each objective.

The four objectives included in the strategy and the critical questions concerning the outcomes are stated as follows:

Objective One:

Participants will develop and implement (in a collaborative process) a document which includes commonly-agreed upon, observable teaching behaviors for all interns irregardless of content areas.

CRITICAL QUESTION: TO WHAT EXTENT DID PARTICIPANTS COLLABORATE IN ORDER TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT THE DOCUMENT?

Objective Two:

Participants will implement a process which encourages interns to assume responsibility for managing the resources of the program in order to develop their competency. The Professional Teaching Competencies will be provided as guidelines for the process. Assessment responses will be used primarily as profile data indicating the emerging development of the intern. Therefore emphasis cannot be placed on the responses of the instrument as a direct final evaluation for purposes of grading.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS: HOW DID INTERNS ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGING THEIR OWN LEARNING? WAS THE INSTRUMENT PERCEIVED BY THE PARTICIPANTS PRIMARILY AS PROFILE DATA RATHER THAN A DIRECT EVALUATIVE PROCESS FOR GRADES?

Objective Three:

Participants will organize and cluster behaviors so that they relate to one another by conceptualizing and practicing instructional roles which

are easily understood and manageable by all participants.

CRITICAL QUESTION: IS "INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE" A VIABLE CONSTRUCT FOR ORGANIZING BEHAVIORS SO THAT THE PARTICIPANTS CAN UNDERSTAND AND OBSERVE THE RESULTS.

Objective Four:

Participants will conceptualize a developmental set which suggests that interns are at various levels of mastery of stated teaching skills by using a mastery model for assessment of competencies based on the concept "Stages of Mastery" (included in research by Dilts).

CRITICAL QUESTION: WERE THE PARTICIPANTS ABLE TO INTERNALIZE THE DEVELOPMENTAL CONCEPT BY USING THE STAGES OF MASTERY AS THEY WERE INTENDED?

Description of the MAT Summer Program

The Bethel Park-University of Pittsburgh Summer Session served as a concentrated equivalent of student teaching for approximately thirty MAT interns in secondary education.

Each new intern candidate spent six weeks at Bethel Park High School (near Pittsburgh) between late June and early August. Normally there were about 500 public school pupils in attendance. Interns were paired off, by subject matter field, and assigned to a master teacher, typically a Bethel Park faculty member. The master teacher acted as a resource and guide throughout the summer, releasing the interns to take full responsibility of the pupils as soon as possible, for four hours of teaching each day. Supervision of classroom instruction was provided by Pitt faculty and additional help was given by graduate (primarily doctoral) students in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision (C&S) at the University. Instruction in Supervision was held on site for C&S students during the summer session. Interns received 8 credits for the summer experience. Interns who were considered unready to proceed to the public school classroom were given grades that did not penalize them academically, but required that they do additional work before they were released to full-time teaching. In past summers

at least three interns each year had been placed in this holding category, pending evidence that they were prepared to take full responsibility of a classroom.[2]

Prior to 1973 interns took Special and General Methods seminars on the Bethel site each afternoon. Special Methods instructors were Pitt faculty in the content areas of secondary education.

Redesigning the Program

In the summer of '73 the Internship Program, as many others, experienced a severe cutback in budget. Money was not available for Pitt faculty in the content areas to conduct the Special Methods seminars. Thus the coordinators were forced to consider staff potential that year in light of the restriction. There were 12 master teachers (all veterans of previous summer sessions, paid by the school district and skillful with new interns), 11 Curriculum and Supervision graduate students (professionals from other school districts in the area, using the session as a practicum 4 credit experience), 2 university faculty members (the Director, new to the program, and the C&S-Secondary Education Instructional Coordinator, a veteran of past summers and author of this study), and approximately 400 high school students of various shapes. There was considerable expertise available to the interns but there had to be a way to bring them together. The following structure was designed to replace the traditional Special Methods seminars and the description was given to all participants:

Special Methods Competency Development Experience - 3 credits

> In the past Special Methods seminars were held at Bethel Park during the summer session in order to contribute to the development of the teaching competencies of the interns in their subject matter field. This summer the Pitt-Bethel Park staff will initiate a competency development special methods experience (3 credits) instead of the traditional seminars, in order to establish a structure to help interns in a more individualized way by encouraging them to assume re-

sponsibilities for managing their own learning. The program will provide a list of competencies, "The Professional Teaching Competencies" document as guidelines for all participants. The experience reflects two major components which include resources for the intern to manage: 1) Planning and evaluation sessions conducted by master teachers and, 2) instructional feedback provided by Curriculum and Supervision persons during classroom observation and conferences.

Planning Sessions with Master Teachers

Master teachers and interns will conduct Planning Sessions during regularly scheduled time periods in the afternoon. Written products of these sessions (lesson plans, quizzes, tests, materials, etc.) will be kept in an individual intern folder in the main office so that a record of each intern's progress may be assessed from time to time. There are sections on the Professional Teaching Competencies document which include planning and evaluation skills. It is hoped that the products of the Planning Sessions will demonstrate the intern's ability to demonstrate these skills.

Instructional Feedback by C&S Supervisors

Initially C&S persons will be assigned to interns for their use. Intern-supervisor relationships are flexible and can be changed as the needs of the interns are identified. Supervisors will observe in classes, collect information for the interns and provide feedback concerning the instructional process. The goal of supervision eventually is to help the intern manage the supervisor, set his/her goals and move toward self-supervision and self-evaluation (Area 5 of the Professional Teaching Competencies). Supervisors will write summaries of their observations and conferences with the interns, share the information and decide together whether the information will be included in the intern's folder.

Evaluation of the Development of Competencies

One advantage of a program such as this is that the intern's skill and abilities are viewed as developmental and individually unique by all concerned. This is the basis for the evaluation responses. An honest assessment of what the intern can and cannot do in six weeks is important. In order to facilitate this, the intern is asked to think about evidences of growth and development to be included in his/her folder and to check the folder periodically to see that it is up to date.

The folders will include plans, tests, materials, supervisory summaries and profile data from the Professional Teaching Competencies which will be filled out by all members of the program. These are considered in total as data for evaluation of the intern's developmental patterns. After all recommendations from interns, master teachers and supervisors are in, the final analysis of data and evaluation will be done by the Director of the program and the Instructional Coordinator.

The Bethel Park-Pitt MAT Program had reached its thirteenth summer, progressing in that time from a divergent, content-centered experience to a competency-referenced one with major emphasis on common goals, shared resources, and participation. All participants came together during the first week to generate competencies central to the program and to develop an instrument and a process which would serve to operationalize the talents of the participants, most of them not knowing that this would be the last summer of the soon defunct program.

Thus the Professional Teaching Competencies document was conceived:

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING COMPETENCIES

_____

_____

Designed for use in the Graduate Internship Program--1973 Summer Session.

Name of Intern _____

Date: _____

Signed _____

INTRODUCTION

The following teaching competencies were generated by the university staff and the master teachers of the Graduate Internship Program for use during the Bethel Park-Pitt Summer Session, 1973. It is hoped that the interns and staff members will begin to refine them, add to them and generate new areas of competency. Included also is a recommendation for a mastery process of evaluation using the "Stages of Mastery" code as a productive way to assess individual competencies.

The competencies are organized and clustered in six areas, reflecting instructional roles, some of which are familiar from past summer experiences and some new roles, not easily practiced in six weeks. Although it is simplistic to suggest that the complexities of the teaching-learning phenomena can be reduced to six roles, these are used primarily as an organizing way to show that skills such as planning, implementing and evaluating are interrelated for particular purposes. Hopefully interns and staff will identify other roles and competencies based on purpose of instruction and student needs.

This document should be viewed as a vehicle for identifying and developing specific teaching skills, as well as for communicating with staff about the nature of the growth. The interns are responsible for managing the resources of the program in order to develop their own unique teaching styles, using the competencies as a set of guidelines not a formula. There are no required number of competencies which must be met at all cost. The only requirement is that we all develop humane and sensitive relationships with one another as we proceed through an exciting program.

Dr. Noreen Garman
Instructional Coordinator and
Assistant Professor
University of Pittsburgh

A "MASTERY" SYSTEM OF EVALUATION

The results of the assessment in this document are to help the intern determine a profile of his or her development of the teaching competencies within a given period of time and to plan for future practice. Responses will be recorded using the "Stages of Mastery" code below as the method of determining the intern's growth at a particular date. Evaluation will be done by all members of the program: interns, master teachers, C&S supervisors, and others who have served as resources to the interns. The results will be shared and discussed in evaluation conferences throughout the summer. The intern's own evaluation of the Stages of Mastery is the most significant. Each evaluator may choose to respond to only those competencies which have been observed. Spaces may be left blank for those competencies not observed. (Which simply means that the evaluator has no knowledge of the skill or has not observed it--it does not mean that the competency has not been developed by the intern.) Since the program represents a brief period of time, it is unlikely that a new teacher will develop a great many skills reflecting level 4 and 5 Mastery. The broad list of competencies is a way of introducing some skills which interns may wish to develop further as they proceed through their careers.

CODE--STAGES OF MASTERY

0. Non-readiness - indicates that an intern is not yet ready to consider the developmen of a particular competency. The intern may not have the pre-requisite skills or con cepts to begin, there may be an attitude of anxiety blocking the readiness or there may not be time in the program to consider the development.
1. Readiness - indicates previously learned or pre-requisite skills and/or concepts. This implies that the intern may have the conceptual knowledge necessary for develop ment, and perhaps knowledge of the skill itself (as observed or described) but has not been able to put the components together.
2. Development - indicates development of concept and/or skills being introduced. The intern has been able to combine knowledge and performance. The performance may be fragmented, but some evidence is observable.
3. Practice - indicates performance of skill prior to mastery. The intern has been abl to perform the skill, but he/she and the staff may determine that practice should continue before demonstration level is achieved.
4. Demonstration - indicates performance of behavior at established criterion. The int is able to demonstrate mastery based on criteria established jointly by the intern a the staff. This may differ with various relationships as well as different competen
5. Maintenance - indicates performance of behavior beyond the established criterion: c sistent maintenance of skill after it has been learned.

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING COMPETENCIES--Area 1

The following competencies reflect the role of teacher as being directly responsible for content and information presented to students. The teacher is primarily the imparter of information in some form.

PLANNING COMPETENCIES: As a result of planning, the teacher will:	LEVEL OF MASTE
Date:	
1. Select appropriate materials.	
2. Organize for sequencing of materials which includes an introduction, development and conclusion.	
3. Select appropriate media for intended results.	
4. State content objectives.	
5. Demonstrate an awareness of time limitation in the classroom.	
6. Design appropriate curricular tests.	
7. Evaluate what students have learned as a result of information given.	

IMPLEMENTATION COMPETENCIES: During implementation teacher will:	
1. Introduce lesson communicating to students why they are learning the information presented.	
2. Impart information verbally in a well-organized manner using handouts when appropriate.	
3. Use appropriate media as integrated part of classroom instruction.	
4. Sequence information--rate, sequence, scope.	
5. Assign and monitor students' reading of appropriate material.	
6. Evaluate what students have learned in order for students as well as the teacher to know what they have learned from the material during the session.	
7. Give tests and help students to evaluate results, (in numerical, graphic or verbal form).	

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING COMPETENCIES--Area 2

The following competencies reflect teacher-directed instruction, concerned both with content and student processing of content. The teacher directs the process of learning of the group and, generally, all participants are focused on the same content. The role suggests the teacher as director of learning activities.

PLANNING COMPETENCIES: As a result of planning, the teacher will:	LEVEL OF MASTER
Date:	
1. Recognize in some phenomenological fashion the complex mix of the experience to be planned for (number of students, content, time, place, values, egos, cultures, etc.).	
2. Formulate questions and anticipate student responses from them.	
3. Recognize cognitive level of questions and select appropriate presentation. (Determine when they can be answered verbally and when they need to be written).	
4. Translate content into classroom activities.	
5. Plan clear directions for all activities.	
6. Identify and design various evaluation strategies.	
IMPLEMENTATION COMPETENCIES: During implementation, teacher will:	
1. Introduce the lesson indicating what is expected and how it will be evaluated.	
2. Ask clear, well focused questions and listen for appropriate answers.	
3. Facilitate student ideas during discussion.	
4. Give clear directions and implement student activities, such as board work, role play, work books, etc.	
5. Use student products as part of classroom activities or discussion.	
6. Discriminate the use of re-inforcement.	
7. Implement various evaluation strategies interpreting results to students.	

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING COMPETENCIES--Area 3

The following competencies reflect student-centered instruction. The content may be the same or different for each student, however, the process of learning is managed individually or in small groups by the teacher's planning and implementing of learning tasks described to students in student terms. The role suggests teacher as designer and manager of learning tasks.

PLANNING COMPETENCIES: As a result of planning, the teacher will:	LEVEL OF MASTER
Date:	
1. Write lesson plans which include objectives, procedures, and evaluation in student terms.	
2. Assess individual student needs using all available information.	
3. Select (and making ready) appropriate material and methods for individual students.	
4. Define student learning tasks in simple, clear sequence.	
5. Identify the type of task (mastery of skills, problem-solving, inquiry, creativity) and plan for appropriate mode of instruction (programmed instruction, discussion, lecture, small group, etc.)	
6. Differentiate and describe various group learning structures (knowledge-based competency).	
7. Design various evaluative strategies based on objectives.	
IMPLEMENTATION COMPETENCIES: During Implementation teacher will:	
1. Communicate to students before class instruction begins the nature of the task to be learned, the procedures to follow in learning, and how the learning will be evaluated.	
2. Provide students with task description (in written form) and appropriate learning materials.	
3. Efficiently assign students to appropriate learning structures.	
4. Monitor student learning within the learning structures.	
5. Make conscious decisions about instruction during the class, (whether to change direction of plan, how much time to allow for tasks beyond plan, etc.) based on on-going evaluation.	
6. Employ on-going evaluation of student learning in order for students and teacher to use the results.	

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING COMPETENCIES--Area 4

The major thrust of the competencies reflects the teacher as designing and managing structures in which students learn "how to learn" about specific content. The instructor is primarily a resource person who facilitates the various learning processes. This implies individualized instruction and knowledge of the learning process itself. The role is teacher as designer and resource for the process of "learning how to learn."

PLANNING COMPETENCIES: As a result of planning, the teacher will:	LEVEL OF MASTE
	Date
1. Design planning sessions in which students will plan for their own learning (including objectives, procedures and evaluation).	
2. Design structures for students to identify and manage resources needed for learning.	
3. Identify appropriate materials for individual or group needs.	
4. Design diagnostic strategies which may include student self-diagnosis.	
5. Design procedures for students to identify their own learning processes and styles.	
6. Design ways to collect evidence of student learning.	
IMPLEMENTATION COMPETENCIES: During implementation teacher will:	
1. Conduct and facilitate student planning and collect product of planning session.	
2. Monitor and facilitate the students' managing of resources in order to learn about the content.	
3. Continually identify for the student how he is learning and what he is learning so that he will be able to use the learning process again.	
4. Collect products and evidence for students of their progress and involve students in the evaluative process.	
5. Help students to develop their individual skills in self-evaluation.	

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING COMPETENCIES--Area 5

One of the responsibilities of the teacher is to continue to develop the self both professionally and personally. This is accomplished by the teacher's ability to identify and manage resources for his/her own learning. Supervision is one resource to be managed by the teacher for the improvement of classroom instruction. The following competencies reflect the role of teacher as participant in supervision.

THE TEACHER WILL:	LEVEL OF MASTERY
Date:	
1. Take part of the responsibility in a supervisory conference by listening, clarifying, and focusing on specific suggestions.	
2. Apply supervisory information to subsequent lesson plan and implementation.	
3. Use classroom observation data (tapes, typescripts, supervisory notes) to begin to identify the development of teaching competencies as they occur in the data.	
4. Begin to analyze classroom observation data and plan for improvement of classroom instruction with the supervisor.	
5. Plan with supervisor how the supervision will occur.	
6. Plan objectives and procedures to manage the supervision.	
7. Develop skills in self-supervision.	

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING COMPETENCIES--Area 6

The following competencies represent the teacher as professional educator. These components reflect the needs of the students, the curriculum, the community, the school, and, finally, the teacher. All too frequently the teacher's needs are the first to be met and in the rigors of the daily routine other components may not be as important. In the final analysis, teaching means people interacting with other people and ideas. We would hope that our teachers implement this in the most humane and sensitive way possible.

THE TEACHER WILL:	LEVEL OF MASTER
Date:	
1. Develop humane and sensitive relationships with students.	
2. Demonstrate knowledge of academic content.	
3. Demonstrate knowledge of educational processes of teaching and learning.	
4. Make appropriate curriculum decisions.	
5. Diagnose learning mastery in order to plan instruction.	
6. Demonstrate attitudes and actions consistent with community needs.	
7. Demonstrate classroom management consistent with school-wide management.	
8. Develop commitment to one's learning.	
9. Develop skills in self-evaluation.	
10. Demonstrate professional concern for colleagues.	

Before the reader attends to the specific results of the strategy as they emerged in the Bethel-Pitt program, it is necessary to consider the description of the Teacher Corps Program. The two programs were substantially different and, since the document was used in both site phases, it is useful to look at the differences in relation to the outcomes of the strategy. Conclusions will be made by comparing the outcomes and answering the critical questions.

The following description was included in the evaluation data concerning the Eighth Cycle Program.

The Pittsburgh Middle School Teacher Corps Program

The Eighth Cycle Teacher Corps Program, as a one year Masters Program, embodied the collaborative efforts of the Pittsburgh Public School district (the primary contractor in this Teacher Corps project), the University of Pittsburgh instructional team (faculty from eleven departments) and representative community leaders as they worked together to plan and implement the preservice, inservice, and terminal summer phases. The preservice phase (August '73) included orientation seminars for the thirty Teacher Corps interns and six Teacher Corps team leaders. A workshop was also held for the Teacher Corps participants and the public school faculty, (hence referred to as "resident staff") who were being asked to implement the middle school organizational structure for the first time at their three Pittsburgh Public Schools in the Fall of '73. The concept of interdisciplinary teaming, introduced at the workshop, was a critical, new component of the middle school structure. Interns and resident staff were assigned to their respective teams and began to plan for the new school year.[3] Also during the summer preservice program, the six team leaders (public school teachers chosen for their experience) and two university faculty (members of the university instructional team and one, the author of this study) carefully worked with

the Professional Teaching Competencies document, internalizing the competencies, roles, and process of implementation in order to determine the implications for the new program. They decided to revise and recommend it for use during the inservice phase.

During the inservice phase (the '73-'74 school year) interns and team leaders were assigned to the three middle school sites where they worked with the resident staff and with middle school students in a variety of experiences. The Teacher Corps team leaders assumed increasing responsibility for the interns' training program, using the on-site experiences as the basis for their learning. Instruction was carried on both through modules and individual and large group interaction with members of the university personnel. At the university, eleven departments in the School of Education cooperated in all phases of the program, the faculty functioning as an interdisciplinary instructional team. The Teacher Corps project was a varying fraction of their university work load and they spent a substantial amount of that time designing modules and materials for site instruction (as mandated by the National Teacher Corps Guidelines). They were also involved in planning and decision-making at all levels, resulting in lengthy organizational meetings, but important in the collaborative process. It was at one of the first of such meetings in the early Fall that the total university instructional team reviewed and discussed the Professional Teaching Competencies document and adopted it for use in the Eighth Cycle inservice phase. The document was subsequently introduced on site to the interns who were adjusting themselves (along with the resident staff and students) to the complexities of reorganization for the new middle school environment.

The "Professional Teaching Competencies" as a Strategy

The Professional Teaching Competencies document was originally designed as a strategy for use in a component (the field experience) of a masters degree

program which focused on the development of teaching competencies as the major emphasis. In the Graduate Internship Program the Bethel Park-Pitt Summer Session served as that component. After they completed the session, MAT interns were hired by various school districts in the Pittsburgh area under special certification for the '73-'74 school year and they completed the degree program individually by attending regular content and education courses at the university. Although supervision was provided in a traditional fashion, major emphasis for the interns was not on the development of teaching competencies, but rather on the academic requirements of their various courses as well as the professional requirements of their respective schools. The Summer Session was the only time when the interns were together every day working with supportive resources who were also there every day to help them develop their teaching competencies as they taught high school students.

In contrast the Teacher Corps interns operated on six teams based on three sites and it was intended that their practicum teaching experience and their academic course work be integrated throughout the school year. Module implementation was perceived as the primary integrating factor. The Pittsburgh Public School District had agreed in its initial negotiations and proposal for the project to hire all interns who successfully completed the program. Early in the inservice phase the Professional Teaching Competencies document was introduced as the strategy for the development of teaching competencies for the practicum component. The four objectives of the strategy (page 2) were the same in the two programs and related to critical concerns of both, including: 1) mutual collaboration and dialogue among participants, 2) specification of common teaching behaviors which provides the learner with responsibility for managing resources, 3) a conceptual framework for organizing behaviors, and, 4) a developmental attitude toward growth and assessment by all participants. The following sections will

describe and contrast the outcomes of the four objectives in both programs and answer the critical questions.

Strategy Objective One: Mutual Collaboration and Dialogue

Objective: Participants in the program will develop and implement in a collaborative process a document which includes commonly-agreed upon, observable teaching behaviors for all interns irregardless of content areas.

The Bethel Park-Pitt Program:

In past summers the program encouraged mutual collaboration and dialogue particularly among interns, master teachers and C&S supervisors in the same content areas. The subject matter faculty in secondary education usually organized the interaction of these participants. Each of the five content areas (math, science, English, social studies, and foreign language) set their own goals and evaluations, however, they met frequently, both formally and informally (over coffee) to discuss what they were about. Often, however, interns were unclear as to the relationship and responsibilities of the Curriculum and Supervision persons and the master teachers to the university program.

As it was previously noted, in 1973 the budget restriction did not provide for university faculty in the subject fields. So 12 master teachers, 11 C&S supervisor trainees, and 2 university faculty met to consider the proposed "recycling" of the resources into a new learning experience for the interns (see page 4). A small group of these participants had generated a first draft of competencies and circulated it to all participants, including interns, for revision. The total group met and gave suggestions for revising some of the competencies, expecially the "jargon" they could not understand; but for the most part they indicated that they could identify with the instructional roles (further discussion of this will continue under Objective Three). Although collaboration in

order to develop and refine the document took place in a relatively short period of time (the first week of the session) there was a great deal of concentrated energy expended by almost all participants in this process. The interns themselves asked some appropriate clarifying questions which helped shape the end product.

During the final program evaluation many interns and master teachers indicated that they had used the planning competencies in the document as guidelines for their Planning Sessions and the C&S supervisors often referred to the implementation sections when writing conference summaries for intern folders. A formal intern profile assessment was done twice during the summer, when all participants were asked to fill out the profile data sheet for intern folders and meet with the interns to discuss their responses. Final program evaluations also suggested that the document was used several times a week by participants as they talked about instructional roles and attempted to develop criteria for performance mastery levels of the behaviors. For the most part, they were not able to develop this in the short amount of time. The document had become a vehicle for participants to relate to one another and to be accountable to one another within the designed structure of the experience.

An incidental circumstance reflected the degree of value placed on the process and the document by some participants. The C&S supervisors, who were using the session as a 4 credit practicum course, developed and implemented a similar mastery model of "Supervisory Competencies" which they asked interns to assess in order to collect perceptions on their (the C&S supervisors) emerging competencies in supervision.

The Teacher Corps Program:

Collaborative effort was a major emphasis of the Teacher Corps project. The

consortium-type mutuality brought various groups together; the Pittsburgh Public School officials, university faculty from 11 departments, community leaders, resident teachers and principals, team leaders, National Teacher Corps representatives, consultants from other universities, interns and finally, the student bodies of three middle schools. When a new program such as this is emerging, it is difficult for participants to understand how the groups relate to one another and to the program goals. Thus the early meetings conducted for the purposes of planning often resulted in participants attempting to clarify their functions. Communications among the groups became a major concern in Cycle Eight generally.[4]

With so many diverse groups and participants it was impossible to involve a great many of them in the development and implementation of a document. While a variety of activities were going on during the summer preservice, the six Teacher Corps team leaders, who would be working directly with the interns daily on site, and two university faculty refined the existing document and planned for its use. None of these participants could predict the circumstances of the coming phase, nor could they imagine any of the learning experiences since the implementation of the middle school structure itself was new. In these sessions the participants decided that the existing document embodied a process and competencies that might be appropriate for the Teacher Corps Program since it had been used effectively in a previous site program. At the university meeting, the university instructional team was presented with the document and they voted to adopt it on the recommendation of the six team leaders because "they would be the ones to implement the document with the interns." The document was then introduced to the interns. They had several common questions: Are there any required competencies? Are there any instructional roles which are more valued than others that we must develop? What will be done with the results of the assessment data? The team leaders attempted

to answer the questions, however, it was assumed that they would all understand the nature of the profile data as they worked it through during the school year, since no-one knew what to expect yet.

Meanwhile, a great deal of collaborative effort was being spent by university staff in planning and writing modules for site implementation. The substantive content and objectives of the modules did not relate directly to areas of the document and at the end of the program interns indicated that they found little relationship between the competencies in the document and the content of the modules. The co-directors of the Teacher Corps project were enthusiastic about the document at the beginning of the program and encouraged its use, but they had no role in developing it. There had been no clear plan for implementation from the administration, who had so many pressing responsibilities in the emerging program. There was no clear process for evaluating intern progress consistently through the program. The results of the module work seemed to be the primary emphasis. The interns and team leaders were expecting a clear process of accountability to the central administrators and the use of the document was vaguely implied but not clearly described in that process. The interns and team leaders filled out the competency profile eight times during the school year and held conferences to discuss the results. The team leaders were careful at first to emphasize that the responses would not be used for rating interns, but rather to establish a profile of their competencies at a given period in time, in order for them to plan with the team leaders for future development. Thirteen interns indicated at the end of the program that they had used the document as guidelines. Others said they used it primarily during the assessment periods with the team leaders and seldom referred to it otherwise.

Critical Question: To what extent did participants collaborate in order to develop and implement the document?

Although the framework and strategy of the original Professional Teaching Competencies document were conceptualized in a small task group by faculty familiar with the Bethel-Pitt program, the final version was the outcome of several small group meetings and a lengthy large group meeting, resulting in a better end product, as well as a chance for all participants to internalize the strategy. The decision-making process helped the participants to see their responsibilities in the implementation.

In the Teacher Corps Program several persons were involved in reviewing, discussing, and approving the document for use but did not see themselves responsible for its implementation at any level. (The major function of module developers was to write modules.) As the program emerged the responsibility for implementation became vague. Dialogue between interns and team leaders using the document was productive at times and at other times perfunctory. Team leaders did suggest, however, that the document served to focus their concerns directly on the development of teaching competencies during the assessment periods. They admitted that most of the daily dialogue with interns was concerned with critical school issues and crises. The document became a way to "get out of the practical, every day activities and look at the learning of the interns." Effective collaboration depended, not only on decision-making by the participants, but a clear acceptance of further responsibilities, which implied clearly-defined roles in some aspect of the implementation process.

Strategy Objective Two: Intern Responsibility for Managing Resources

Objective: Participants in the program will implement a process which encourages interns to assume responsibility for managing the resources of the program in order to develop their competency. The Professional Teaching Competencies will be provided as guidelines for the process. Assessment responses will be used primarily as profile data indicating the emerging development of the intern. Therefore emphasis should not be placed on the responses of the instrument as if they were a direct, final evaluation for purposes of grading.

The Bethel Park-Pitt Program

When the Bethel Park master teachers were asked whether they thought the interns assumed more responsibility this summer for managing their learning, ten of them answered positively and suggested that one reason for this was the change from the afternoon seminar classes to the Planning Sessions. In the past the seminars were not task-oriented sessions and for the most part the instructors set the objectives. During the Planning Sessions the interns were responsible for their own products and asked directly for help. The C&S supervisors indicated that by the end of the summer many interns were able to set goals for conferences and analyze their classroom behavior. The Area 5 competencies in the Professional Teaching Competencies provided direction for this. The interns themselves were ambivalent in their responses as to whether they perceived themselves assuming responsibility. Twenty-six interns said they used the list of competencies often to do this but many expressed regrets that they were not told more specifically what to do or how to use them. Both interns and master teachers also regretted the absence of seminars as another way to share ideas with more people.

The process of evaluation (which relates to the second part of the above objective) was confusing to some interns. They were told that their folders would be evaluated twice during the six weeks and the primary concern was whether there was evidence of continual and consistent development. Since six weeks was not

enough time to acquire a whole range of sophisticated skills, it was assumed that interns would develop different competencies and each would be assessed individually. Many interns expressed concern as to whether there were a required number of competencies and also whether they all should be able to become the Area 4 "teacher as resource" by the end of the summer. The interns seemed to have the most difficulty thinking of the competencies as profile data. The C&S persons generally had the least difficulty with the concept and the master teachers varied in their ability to do so. Five master teachers said they knew they were responding as if they were rating the interns.

One significant circumstance occurred when the university director, who was new to the program, began to evaluate the intern's folders. At first he expressed disappointment in the quality of the lesson plans included. Most interns could write primitive objectives, but many plans were written in teacher procedures and were not clearly conceptualized. Questions on quizzes and tests were often vague. He was asked to look more directly for evidence of growth in the plans from the first week to the sixth. It was then that he could begin to identify the competencies that the interns were developing on their products.

One of the concerns in a site component of a program which values the developmental set is that participants must continually come to grips with the realities of what people can and can't do in a given period of time. Predetermined criteria are not easily a part of that reality. Quality assessment becomes an elusive factor.

The Teacher Corps Program:

In a recent paper, the university co-director described the process that the Teacher Corps perceived as encouraging the interns to assume responsibility for developing their competencies as follows:[5]

> "The Teacher Corps has adopted modular instruction as the primary vehicle to develop competencies...
>
> Module instruction places major responsibility for learning on the learner. Each module contains a pretest, performance criteria, an opt-out chart, activities related to developing knowledge and skills in the module focus area, post test and demonstration contract."

(The Demonstration contract was added the following year in Cycle Nine.) The module, therefore, was considered by the interns and participants as the vehicle required by the university as an important part of their masters program. In Cycle Eight there were 14 required modules and six electives.[6] During the inservice year the modules were in the process of being developed and interns worked in them as they were completed by the university. One question in the final evaluation data prepared by the co-director for the National Teacher Corps was:[7] "Are the defined competencies in the proposal reached by Teacher Corps interns at the completion of the program?" Answer: "The defined competencies in the proposal were incorporated into modules and the 'Professional Teaching Competencies' Document. Twenty-nine interns completed the module work: thus meeting the competence requirements."

The primary emphasis for learning and evaluation was the module and as was previously mentioned, interns saw little relationship between the competencies in the document and the module content. Thus a document which at first seemed effective for helping interns develop and synthesize their competencies in a classroom setting was not consistent with the primary vehicle of instruction. By the end of Cycle Eight the project participants had recognized the incongruity of the two and attempted to design a more compatable process for the following year. The demonstration contract became one of the most important aspects of module work in Cycle Nine. Here the intern contracted with a resident teacher to demonstrate competence in the module focus area. The participants also recog-

nized that the Teaching Competencies document was adopted by them originally as an attempt to have interns "put together" many of the individual behaviors represented in the various modules as they demonstrated classroom performance. They began to redesign the document so that it would relate more closely to the individual skills represented in the modules. The new form was used in Cycle Nine.

Critical Questions: How did the interns assume responsibility for managing their own learning? Was the instrument perceived by the participants as profile data rather than as a direct final evaluation for grades?

Many of the interns in the Bethel-Ritt program requested meetings with resource people in order to get specific help. For the most part they were responsible for setting goals in Planning Sessions with master teachers and, by the end of the summer they were able to take an initiating role in supervision. Twenty-seven interns said they found the Professional Teaching Competencies useful enough for reference when they begin to teach in the fall. During the final evaluations the interns met with the resource persons in order to discuss their competence. The focus of these meetings centered on the intern's present demonstration of competence and possible future development. Responses on the document were used primarily for this purpose. During the next week after the Bethel session, the interns met individually with the director and instructional coordinator at the university in order to discuss the contents of their folders and their assessments of the summer work. There were clear indications during the meetings that interns were able to talk about their own development in relation to the products and the results of the Professional Teaching Competencies.

When Teacher Corps interns were asked how they assumed responsibility for their learning, some of them described specific incidents when they were involved with students and then they needed help and information. One example of this

occurred when a group of interns were given responsibility for establishing a learning resource center in the middle school. They used several university and school resources in order to do so. Since work in the modules was required, they did not see themselves taking an initiating role in the learning (although some interns collaborated their efforts while working the modules, often organizing ways to get them completed more efficiently in groups). The Teacher Corps interns said they were not concerned with the results of the Teaching Competencies as they related to grades. Their major concern was that they were being evaluated in order to be hired by the school district and perceived the results of the document as a way for the administrators to make those decisions.

The process of evaluation in the Bethel-Pitt program placed emphasis on development and growth. By the end of the summer the interns seemed to accept the notion that they might look honestly at what they were able to do. There was a consistency reflected in the way in which interns were encouraged to learn and the way in which they were evaluated.

Strategy Objective Three: Instructional Role as a Construct

> Objective: Participants in the program will organize and cluster behaviors so that they relate to one another by conceptualizing and practicing instructional roles which are easily understood and manageable by all participants.

The Bethel Park-Pitt Program

One of the major problems with a specified list of competencies is that the competencies are often articulated as a disconnected series of behaviors which do not relate to one another. And yet teacher educators generally agree that the way in which teachers synthesize or integrate the behaviors is most significant. Social role theory suggests that role orientation is a powerful force influencing the way humans organize their fragmented behaviors.[8] The construct of "instructional role" was used in the Professional Teaching Competencies document as one way of helping

the participants think about the interrelationships of skills such as planning, implementation and evaluation for specific instructional purposes. When the participants were refining the competencies associated with each role, they indicated that they could, as a matter of fact, easily identify the various roles and further suggested that for them there were certain behaviors that distinguished one role from another. The Area 1 "teacher as imparter of information" was clearly defined. Area 2 "teacher as director of learning activities" seemed to describe large group instruction in which all students were concerned with the same content and process. Surprisingly, the participants agreed that it was not crucial for the "teacher as director of activities" to write behavioral objectives, since many experienced teachers who use this as their major instructional role do not write behavioral objectives. Although they said this was not necessarily the most desirable position for a teacher education program, if the program was serious about the developmental nature of teaching skills it would recognize the realities. They further pointed out that, in the past, interns were often able to plan appropriate activities first and, from this competence, begin to identify behavioral objectives from the activities. However, the "teacher as designer and manager of learning tasks," it was agreed, must be able to write objectives and evaluation as a part of the designing process. The concept of "student learning tasks" in the Area 3 competencies implies that the teacher can structure and describe learning experiences from the students' point of view and write them clearly in student terms. (The "activities" of the Area 2 instructional role are often written in teacher terms.) The evaluation processes are described differently in each role. "Evaluation strategies" and "on-going evaluation" imply a variety of methods appropriate to the instruction and learning reflected in the particular role. The most unfamiliar role for the Bethel participants was that of the Area 4 "teacher as designer and resource for the process of 'learning how to learn.'" They said that the competencies were clear and

understandable but they expressed doubt that public school students could plan for their own learning sufficiently to justify the role. They agreed to include it, however ideal as it seemed, as a possible future role for teachers.

At the end of the program the master teachers and C&S supervisors indicated that the most valuable aspect of the role construct was that it provided a way for them to think about multiple instructional roles. Many suggested that in the past they had conceived of a singular role for the "ideal" teacher which they hoped the interns would begin to achieve. The possibility that a teacher might develop a "repertoire of instructional roles" based on learning outcomes had implication for supervision. This had not occurred to many C&S supervisor-trainees before. For them it became a tangible way to accept and give value to various teaching methods. It provided a framework to begin to articulate the repertoire.

The multiple role approach was also useful for interns. When they were given the Professional Teaching Competencies at the beginning of the program, they expressed concern as to whether there were required competencies and roles most valued by the program. By the end of the summer they had internalized the notion that they should continue to refine the roles and add to their own repertoire. This was really what the program valued most.

The Teacher Corps Program

The six area roles which the Professional Teaching Competencies represented seemed generalizable and recognizable enough for middle school instruction. This concern was raised at the Teacher Corps university team meeting in the Fall when the document was discussed for adoption. The members generally agreed that the roles were described in such a way as to relate to the instruction from kindergarten to college. Since none of the participants knew what new roles would emerge from the middle school reorganization, the existing six seemed appropriate. At

the end of the program it became clear that there was an assumption in the document that needed to be examined for future programs. The instructional roles assume that the teacher is responsible for a large number of students (from 25 to 100) and specific subject matter over a given period of time. For the most part the Teacher Corps interns did not have these conditions as a setting in which to practice the behaviors of the role construct. They worked with students in tutorial experiences, in small groups, in diagnostic sessions and in resource centers. Generally they did not assume full responsibility for the learning of large groups of students, but rather supplemented the work of the resident teachers. (In some instances the resident teachers gave the intern full responsibility for classroom instruction, but there was little opportunity for continuity of subject matter over a long period of time.) When the period for assessment came, the interns often had difficulty relating their practice to the competencies. For instance, emphasis in their practice was placed on the role of tutor and also the role of diagnostician, neither of which the Professional Teaching Competencies reflected.

However, the participants found that the "instructional role" construct itself was useful and when they redesigned the document for Cycle Nine, they attempted to specify roles which the interns might practice more directly as a part of their program experience. In reviewing the data and handouts from the Teacher Corps project recently, the author of this study found a paper, entitled "Middle School Terminology Defined," prepared by the Middle School Director of the Pittsburgh Public School in 1972. One item was listed as follows:[9]

Modification of Teachers Role

> Preservice and in-service training would be designed to assist the teacher in assuming the role of team member, facilitator, resource manager, advisory, rather than imparter of knowledge.

Critical Question: Is "instructional role" a viable construct for organizing behaviors so that the participants can understand and observe the results?

Results from both programs indicate that "instructional role" is a viable construct for organizing and clustering behaviors. The multiple role approach was most useful to the Bethel participants. But the experiences in the Teacher Corps program emphasized the need for teacher educators to carefully examine the training setting and describe roles as they are reflected in the experience, if instructional role is used as a referent.

In any case, the construct of instructional role holds promise for the possibility of establishing links between teacher behavior and pupil behavior. It is very difficult to assess the connections between the verbal behavior of teachers and the cognitive behavior of his/her students. On the other hand, educators may be able to examine and describe behaviors related to instructional roles and complementary behaviors related to learning roles in order to begin to examine how the roles are interrelated. As we observe more closely the outcomes of the interrelated roles we might be able to better describe effective instruction. The limitation of the Professional Teaching Competencies document is that it does not take into account the complementary learning roles of the students, therefore it cannot make any assumptions about the effectiveness of the instructional roles represented. It can only describe instructional roles as they are now observed in the various teaching/learning experiences.

Strategy Objective Four: Mastery Model of Evaluation

Objective: The participants will conceptualize a developmental set which suggests that interns are at various levels of mastery of stated teaching skills by using a mastery model for assessment of competencies based on the concept, "Stages of Mastery."

The Bethel-Pitt Program

Since the Professional Teaching Competencies document was designed as a strategy for developing teaching competencies rather than a research instrument for measuring teaching behaviors, it was important to find an assessment system

which was consistent with the purposes and values in the strategy itself. An attempt was made to find an alternative to the traditional rating scale which suggests the unsatisfactory/satisfactory or weakness/strength mode as a basis. This negative/positive rating approach is not necessarily conducive to helping the students look honestly at what they are doing (it often implies that they should be doing something they are not) nor is it useful information for identifying future growth.

The "Stages of Mastery"[10] concept (see page 9) was adopted for the document for two reasons: 1) It provided an alternative to the negative/positive rating and would articulate the notion of levels of development of skills. 2) It would provide a model for teachers to begin to consider a version of mastery learning[11] for their own pupils.

Mastery learning, as it was modified for the Bethel-Pitt program, included the assumption that the interns could develop teaching competencies: if the expectations of the program were described and the Professional Teaching Competencies provided as guidelines; if interns were helped with on-going feedback; if time was not the critical factor to achieve mastery; and if clear criterion were established jointly by the intern and staff. In a program which values the elements of the developmental process of learning, as well as quality achievement and mastery of skills, it was difficult for some participants at first to reconcile these. The program did not specify required competencies nor predetermined criteria at the beginning; but, it did specify that interns would develop new skills consistently, and move toward a level of mastery which was identified and demonstrated in planning sessions and classroom implementation. On-going feedback and periodic assessment provided an emerging set of criteria and skills which were discussed frequently so that interns could determine "how they were doing." Time was not the critical factor to achieve mastery, in that all interns were not expected to

develop the same skills at the same time. The term, "mastery" itself was elusive to participants. The Stages of Mastery code indicated that level 4, Demonstration, was the appropriate "mastery" level. But it was important to convey to all participants the recognition that because teaching skills are complex, the teacher continues to refine and integrate new behaviors. It is difficult to think of a teaching behavior as an isolated skill to be mastered, but rather as a skill to be integrated with other behaviors as one continues to add to an emerging sense of competence. (The level 5, Maintenance, was an attempt to indicate further growth.)

For the most part interns and staff were not able to design and specify criterion for measuring teaching behaviors with the precision of the scientist. Some (especially science and math participants) did attempt to do so. The others were satisfied to observe and discuss the assessment levels as they perceived them to be and give reasons for their decisions.

During the final program evaluation all participants were asked whether they used the Stages of Mastery as a rating scale or as a means to identify levels of development. Five (out of twelve) master teachers said they used it as a rating, eleven (of thirty) interns also said they did and all eleven C&S supervisors indicated that they did not use it as a rating. Four C&S supervisors reported later, that they had used the Professional Teaching Competencies document the following year in their own school district with teachers and supervisors.

The Teacher Corps Program

The Teacher Corps interns generally viewed the process of evaluation as a direct decision making one which would be used for determining whether they would be hired by the Pittsburgh Public School system after they completed the program. When they were asked whether they used the Stages of Mastery as a rating, twenty-five (out of twenty-nine) interns said they had. Results on their individual profiles showed a high percentage of level 4 and 5 responses for most interns.

During interviews some interns suggested that they viewed the numbers in the code as if they related to a typical grade scale, that is: 0 = F, 1 = D, 5 = A. There was strong indication that the interns and team leaders had not been able to internalize the concept, Stages of Mastery, since for the most part they had used the 0 - 5 as a rating scale.

An interesting note: One school district which began to use the Professional Teaching Competencies document with teachers had changed the coding system so that the staff did not use the numerical code suggested. They decided to use the words, Non-Readiness, Readiness, Development, Practice, Demonstration, and Maintenance in order to identify the levels of development. This makes a great deal of sense; the author wonders why it had not been done sooner and strongly recommends a new coding system be used without numbers.

> Critical Question: Were the participants able to internalize the developmental concept by using the Stages of Mastery as it was intended?

Although some interns and master teachers in the Bethel-Pitt program indicated that they had difficulty with the concept of levels of mastery, for the most part the participants in the program were able to relate to the developmental process to some degree. There were several aspects of the program which supported the developmental notion; the C&S supervisors and master teachers themselves had bought into the process. The feedback and final evaluation of the interns were consistent with the notion.

However, the overriding concern for being hired seemed to be one significant factor in the Teacher Corps program which discouraged a developmental set. In any case the Teacher Corps interns were not able to use the Stages of Mastery as it was intended. It may be that a profile assessment which is used for critical decision making such as hiring, tenure and salary may not, by its very nature, encourage the attitudes necessary for emphasis on the developmental process.

Summary

An attempt has been made to summarize the nature of the two intern programs and significant events of each in order to describe the outcomes of the four objectives included in the strategy of the Professional Teaching Competencies. The descriptions indicate clearly that the two programs were very different--the number of support personnel and subsequent degree of workload commitment; the difference in field site conditions (one, a high school suburban summer setting, the other, a middle school urban school year); the maturity of each program (one, terminating after 13 summers, the other, beginning its first year). One might question the wisdom of making any sound observations, considering the extent of the differences. Yet by looking closely at the strategy and the document in both programs, it is possible to identify some critical elements.

The Professional Teaching Competencies was designed for the Bethel-Pitt program and, for the most part, was effective as a strategy in the program it was intended for. It was subsequently adopted for the Teacher Corps Program. The outcomes suggest that the Teacher Corps staff responsible for its adoption were unable to look closely enough at the components of that program in order to determine specifically what the document would be used for and how it would be implemented. There were some assumptions but not a clearly designed structure. This problem surfaced during a preliminary review of Cycle Eight by the National Teacher Corps. It seemed there had been no role designated for a program development specialist, therefore no single person was responsible for designing, implementing and monitoring the program components. The role of program developer was created and filled in Cycle Nine.

Another critical element, the interns' own learning attitudes, was highlighted by comparing the two programs. The Bethel-Pitt program had, as a high value priority, the belief that interns should manage their own learning and internalize a set

of attitudes which encourage continual growth and development beyond the limits of the program. It was designed to facilitate that priority and the participants, for the most part, bought into it. With the summer setting as the experience, the supportive atmosphere allowed the staff to nurture the development of the interns and still challenge them continually with feedback and new information. Interns, in turn, challenged the staff who also acknowledged that they were developing new skills. At the end of the summer one intern noted that the Area 4 competencies (page 13) were actually more appropriate for the intern in the role of student than in the role of instructor, since that was the role of the staff during the experience.

The Teacher Corps planners also indicated that they valued the developmental process, but the expendiencies of the urban school setting and the various forces which acted upon the interns and staff during the school year could not provide the degree of support and challenge needed to nurture the student-initiated learning style. Interns were busy meeting the expectations of the school, the university, the students, the community and various individuals. The advantage of this kind of teacher education, however, is that interns develop sophisticated coping skills and those who survive best are the ones with a high tolerance for ambiguity.

Thus teachers in a large public school setting may need survival and coping skills before they can feel secure enough to look closely at their own learning style and evaluate their competence realistically. The implications of this, however, suggest that teacher educators and administrators cannot expect teachers to do anything very different with their own pupils. They have few alternative models for learning.

The Professional Teaching Competencies as a Strategy

The purpose of the study was to suggest the effectiveness and limitations of the Professional Teaching Competencies as a strategy for developing teaching compe-

tencies. The strategy included four objectives (page 2). In both programs the document was a vehicle for mutual collaboration, and especially in the Bethel-Pitt program, it provided a common vocabulary and instructional role construct for the dialogue. The role orientation, itself, as a way of organizing behaviors, was effective in both programs, although the existing instructional roles need more additions and refinement. The multiple role approach seemed to be especially useful to the supervisors and the notion of a "repertoire of instructional roles" provided another perspective for thinking about the nature of the teaching/learning experience.

The mastery model of evaluation was effective in the Bethel-Pitt program, but was generally not effective in the Teacher Corps Program. The Stages of Mastery Code was used in order to establish an intern profile indicating that they were at various levels of development of new skills. It was not intended to be a rating system. The Teacher Corps interns and staff began to use it as a rating, perhaps in part because the numbers in the code (page 9) might easily suggest a rating scale. However, the interns were in a public school setting which encouraged rating as a primary way to evaluate students.

The Professional Teaching Competencies was designed as a strategy for developing teaching competencies, not as an instrument for measuring teching behaviors. The limitation, therefore, is that it cannot make any assumptions or draw conclusions concerning the effectiveness of the teaching competencies as they relate to learning outcomes. It only describes instructional roles as they are now manifest. It is not a research instrument. The major implication of this is as follows: if the above distinction is not clear to all participants in a teacher education program, they may begin to use the document as if it were something it was never intended to be. The articulation of the strategy for any given competency instrument

is critical for all participants involved with it.

Statements of "Teaching Competencies"

There was reference in the introduction of this study to activities by the Pennsylvania Department of Education for encouraging educators to initiate behavioral competency studies. Educators all over the state have generated professional teaching competencies (see reference Note 1) and continue to do so. Perhaps the time is approaching for teacher educators to think carefully about the nature of a given list of competencies. Examples of the kinds of questions one can begin to ask are:

1. Is it a broad, generalizable list of competencies that all professional teachers should eventually develop at some point in their careers (and when)?

2. Is it a limited, realistic list for a particular teacher education program for a relatively short period of development? If so does the program have experiences designed for students to practice the competencies? Can participants recognize the limitations and see beyond the limits of the training program and the list?

3. Is it a list of competencies for evaluation and research which is examining learning outcomes as its major purpose?

Most important, a list of competencies is a useful, but fragmented description of what teachers do or ought to do. It will remain fragmented and vague unless a clear strategy and rationale are developed in concert with the list and internalized by those who use it.

NOTES

1. Pa CBTE Handbook: A Resource for Developing Competnecy Based Teacher Education Programs. Edited by Sam Craig, Bureau of Academic Programs, Pennsylvania Department of Education. On June 3, 1973 over 350 educators met in Lock Haven, Pa. to compile an interim inventory of competencies to be used for state guidelines from a list of 50,000 previously generated competency statements.

2. Peter A. Soderbergh, "What You Should Know About the Graduate Internship Program," mimeographed handbook for applicants, University of Pittsburgh, June 1973.

3. Kathryn Atman, "Final Evaluation of Cycle Eight Teacher Corps Middle School Project," mimeographed document, University of Pittsburgh, 1974.

4. Kathryn Atman, "Final Evaluation of Cycle Eight Teacher Corps." In one section Dr. Atman states: page 6, 7.
"Major lessons learned during the Cycle Eight Project are the need for a consistent, coherent management system, which was apparent. This includes needs assessment, careful planning, consistent implementation, and clear communication. Of equal importance was the need for positive working relationships with all concerned; principals, resident staff, Board of Education, university personnel and Teacher Corps personnel. Collaborative decision making must be a tangible force working throughout the program. This can come about only when there is a democratic base of operations where communication lines are kept open."

5. Kathryn Atman, "CBTE: Whither To? How Far? and Why?" an unpublished paper delivered January 29, 1975, to a symposium in the Division of Specialized Professional Development, University of Pittsburgh, page 12.

6. In the final evaluation data, the titles of modules were listed as follows: Required: Middle School Task Force; Behavioral Objectives; Taxonomy of Questioning; Phrasing of Questioning; Special Education; Team Effectiveness; Reading; Test Construction; Individualized Instruction; Career Education; Supervision: Preplanning; Supervision: Self/Peer; Psychomotor Education; Professional Relations.

Electives: Games and Simulation; Value Clarification; Concept Development; The Self Theory and the Transescent; Piaget's Developmental Theory; Designing Instructional Modules.

7. Kathryn Atman, "Final Evaluation of Cycle Eight Teacher Corps Project," page 16.

8. Theodore R. Sarbin and Vernon L. Allen, "Role Theory" in G. Lindzy and E. Aronson, (eds.) Handbook of Social Psychology, (2nd ed.) Vol. I, Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1968, pages 488-576. See also, Bruce Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas (eds.) Role Theory: Concepts and Research, New York, Wiley, 1966.

9. Alma B. Evans, "Middle School Terminology Defined," mimeographed paper presented to Pittsburgh Public School middle school teachers, July 10, 1972.

10. Robert G. Dilts, "Development and Application of a Cognitive Verb List to Facilitate Analysis of Mathematics Textbooks." Unpublished dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1970, pages 26-29. In his dissertation Dilts presents the concept, "Stages of Mastery" as it evolved during his research.

11. There are now many versions of mastery learning in existence, many in subject areas with concrete, specifically sequenced skills, and many with emphasis on systematic and pre-designed instruction. See James H. Block (ed.) Mastery Learning, Theory and Practice New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971: also J. Block (ed.) Schools, Society and Mastery Learning, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.