IN SERVICE - SELECTED ISSUES

by Dr. Lillian Cady

During the past few years individuals and organizations have reconceptualized, rethought, re-examined, and redefined "inservice." A number of factors have caused this review and interest in those educational experiences called "inservice," "continuing education," "professional development," "retraining": (1) The declining school age population which has resulted in an increased number of senior faculty and administrators who have completed all training required for tenure, salary purposes, and certification, but must be equipped to deal with new knowledge and with emerging demands. (2) An increasing demand on the part of practitioners and their professional organizations that districts and boards as well as states provide the opportunities and resources for inservice and continuing education as part of employment contracts. (3) Recognition by training agencies, including college and universities, that inservice and continuing education are demand areas. (4) The emergence of new priorities in education for the handicapped, gifted, and bilingual students which necessitate training of a substantial number of practitioners who will be involved with such students in regular programs as well as in special programs. (5) Federal and state statutes which necessitate and in some instances almost mandate inservice training such as PL-94-142, Title IX, state law relative to affirmative action and equity.

Although the increased interest has caused much discussion and some action, certain issues exist which must be addressed before a comprehensive system of continuing education becomes a reality. Four of the most important issues are discussed below:

1. Public Policy and Resources. Policy makers in education must be committed to the notion of continuing professional development, and they must convince policy makers in legislatures and on local school boards that investing financial, human, and material resources in inservice training is essential and will have a pay off sufficient to justify the investment. The question often raised by policy makers is, "Why should the state support inservice?" "Isn't it the individual's personal, professional obligation to keep up to date?" Policy makers will require evidence that funds invested in inservice result in improved educational opportunities for pupils which increase or enhance learning.


Implicit in any definition of inservice are purposes/objectives and program parameters. This fact should be recognized; it can be limiting but it can also be useful in responding to demands for accountability. For example, if the focus of inservice in a given instance is improvement of skills and knowledge essential to one's assignment, the definition limits the needs which will be addressed and the intended outcomes are clear. Not only does the definition set focus, it also specifies the basis for determining whether the inservice activity was fruitful; that is, did the individual improve his/her skill or knowledge in the areas pre-specified?

The Superintendent of Public Instruction has adopted the following definition of inservice which was recommended by a state-wide Inservice Task Force:

A cooperatively planned program of job related activities designed to increase the competencies of K-12 school employees in the performance of their assigned responsibilities.

3. Quality Control of Content and Delivery. Inservice suffers from past activities of entrepreneurs and carpetbaggers who have contributed to mistrust of both the program and process. Some individuals and agencies with single-minded, vested interests have been more concerned about selling their product than providing or developing inservice experiences which respond to the needs of their clients.

A number of attempts are being made to monitor more closely offerings developed and delivered by agencies which are not accredited or approved by recognized state or national accrediting approval agencies. However, Washington State does not at present have laws which ensure quality control of "inservice offerings." Major concerns are: What shall be the content of inservice programs? How shall such programs be delivered - in what content and by whom? Who shall establish and monitor the standards for quality control?

4. Decision-Making re Programs. Research is making it clear that inservice programs which have the best chance of being effective are those that involve prospective participants in planning and managing their own professional development activities.

The idea of shared decision making about inservice programs has spawned the issue of governance/control of inservice. Collaborative models are proposed which give to the prospective trainee as well as interest groups definite responsibility and opportunity to participate in all facets of program development from needs assessment through evaluation.

Although the issue of governance is important, we should not be misled into believing that resolution of this issue will automatically result in effective inservice programs. Governance may be only a control or management issue, not necessarily a program content or delivery issue. We have no real evidence that shared decision making nor professional involvement, in and of themselves, will impact or change the nature and relevance of a given inservice program. The Continued on next page
FROM THE PRESIDENT

The Washington State ASCD is a significant organization! Today there is a real need for a "common cause" organization devoted to the improvement of learning. Included in the membership of the Washington State ASCD are parents, PTSA members, legislators, teachers, principals, college instructors, curriculum coordinators, directors, superintendents and school board members. All of these ASCDers have a strong interest in curriculum and learners.

Because of a change in the membership year, the Washington State ASCD Board authorized complimentary memberships to selected persons "actively involved in the education of children and youth." To date over 400 persons have accepted the invitation for a complimentary membership for 1978.

If you have not been contacted about membership, please consider this message your personal invitation for a 1978 complimentary membership. All you need to do is to write or call me. Your name will be added to the Washington State ASCD membership roster and you will receive information about the annual conference, participate in a needs assessment concerning the future scope of our organization, help elect the next officers and continue to receive Context and Conflict.

In January all members of the Washington State ASCD will receive the second questionnaire of a modified Delphi needs assessment. You will have the opportunity to help determine the scope of future programs and activities. The Washington State ASCD has the opportunity to become an even more significant voice for the educational needs of children and youth.

Dale Linebarger
P.O. Box 456
Belfair, Washington 98528
Phone: 206-275-3716

EDITOR’S COMMENTS

Context and Conflict this year will serve as a forum for a wide variety of viewpoints on a simple, focal topic for each of its issues. Some manuscripts will be solicited, but all papers will be welcomed. Writers should limit themselves to 500-1500 words, using the viewpoint of the third person.

The Editorial Board views its responsibility as seeking opinions of many on issues important to Washington educators, rather than acting as an editor with a slashing red pencil. The Board will confine its activities to: 1. determining topics for each issue, 2. determining whether manuscripts focus on that topic, and 3. minor editing for good taste.

Two more issues will be forthcoming during the 1978-79 school year. Vocational Education will be the theme for the winter issue, while the spring issue will examine the questions of "Educational Service Districts: Curriculum Leaders - Fact or Fantasy?" Deadlines for manuscripts are January 22 and April 2.

Joe Fleming
Editor

INSERVICE EDUCATION AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

by Dr. Bob Carlton

"Inservice education," a term commonly utilized and familiar to educators is suddenly an abused, confused, and maligned term. Webster defines a term as: "...a word or expression that has a precise meaning in some uses or is peculiar to a science, art, profession, or subject." Unfortunately it is increasingly clear that "inservice education" does not have a "Precise meaning" for the teaching profession. Yet, a precise meaning is an essential prerequisite to any attempt to identify the role and responsibilities of Institutions of Higher Education (I.H.E.) with respect to inservice education. Lack of a clear definition precludes an understanding of I.H.E.'s role in inservice education.

Koneck and Stein (1978) give such a definition, drawing a distinction in identification of discrete differences among the terms: Inservice, preservice, continuing, continued education, and staff development. They define these terms as follows:

Preservice teacher education is a required course of study, historically composed of a series of college or university
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quality and relevance of program content and "training" continue to be functions of the competency and caliber of human beings involved in designing and delivery of the program.

These issues as well as many others will be addressed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and his staff as attempts are made to obtain and disseminate information about inservice activities underway within the state and at the national level; to secure support and funding for inservice programs; and to provide the kinds of data essential to respond to questions about quality, delivery, incentives, and outcomes of inservice.

Dr. Lillian Cady is Director, Professional Education, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
courses and supervised field experiences, designed to prepare post secondary students for entrance into the teaching profession.

Inservice teacher education is a job-specific educational program organized to meet needs of the employer and employee within the local setting.

Continuing education is an individually determined set of experiences and/or courses selected to meet one's interests or needs.

Continued education is an organized progression of courses and/or experiences leading toward a specific goal or degree.

Staff development is a program of experiences undertaken with local district support and designed to improve the functioning of all individuals on a staff, both individually and as a group.

In addition, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Washington has identified inservice education as, "...a cooperatively planned program of job related activities designed to increase the competencies of common school certificated or classified employees in the performance of their assigned responsibilities."

Both preceding definitions of inservice education are compatible and both emphasize the fact that inservice activities must have a direct relationship to the employee's job. However, both definitions evade the problem of who makes that very significant determination. It is obvious, nevertheless, that the decision will be made by those who control the rewards and/or the finances to support inservice efforts.

It follows then that inservice needs, commitment, and financial support should be determined at the local level. Thus, it is incumbent upon the state to provide adequate financial support to every district, regardless of size, and to allow for local level control of finances for inservice. Survival or success of inservice programs should not be dependent upon I.H.E. credit or degrees as a reward.

This tradition of local determinism, however, is constantly eroded by pernicious centralism. As a further step in this erosion, it currently appears that the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (Chapter 28A.71.210 Inservice Training Act of 1977, Administration of Funds) will determine local inservice needs and disburse funds accordingly. However, well intentioned efforts may be, such procedures totally destroy the definition of inservice education, insofar as local determination is concerned.

Because funding is a serious problem, it is no surprise to educators that inservice needs during the past several years have been, and continue to be, determined by federal and state legislative action or O.S.P.I. endorsement and promotion of given programs. To support that conclusion, one needs but to review the Basic Education Act of 1977 (SB 960), the Student Learning Objectives Law (SB 3026), the Education for All Handicapped Law (P.L. 94-142), Evaluative Criteria and Procedures for Certificated Employee Requirements (SB 1364), O.S.P.I. promotion of Right to Read and Instructional Theory Into Practice, and the historical need for assistance with classroom discipline. (Discipline can be construed as a determination made at the local level.) Local school districts (which include the local professional association, local administrative personnel, and lay advisory committees and boards) are forced to choose between these federal or state legislated or administrative requirements.

Institutions of Higher Education (I.H.E.) can do little to influence legislative or administrative actions. They can, however, assist local districts in determining which of the mandated tasks should be allocated time and resource priority. They can assist in the design of programs and selection of personnel which will meet those needs and facilitate program implementation. As an incidental consideration, such programs may lead to credit generating courses, and those courses may be applicable to certification or degree requirements. However, such commitments can be made only on a course-by-course and institution-by-institution basis. I.H.E.'s should not be held responsible for determining inservice needs and programs. They should, however, assist in every manner possible the efforts of local districts to identify priority needs and the plans for programs to meet those needs. In this context they assume the same role as the national and/or state professional associations.

To impose requirements from outside by whatever measure - law, administrative fiat, or professional pressure - removes the fundamental principal of inservice, the principle that inservice is based on job relatedness as determined at the local level.

Degrees, credits, or certification are extrinsic, not intrinsic, needs upon which to base inservice programs. Nevertheless, these extrinsic rewards are the material contributions of most I.H.E.'s, contributions which have been utilized by local districts and local professional associations as rewards for teacher participation in most current inservice programs. Degrees, certification, and credits for salary improvement have been consistent rewards sought by local districts for inservice efforts of teachers. Since two of those rewards have traditionally been administered at the I.H.E. level, it should as come as no surprise that I.H.E.'s are criticized for not meeting inservice needs. If the federal and state legislative bodies and administrative agencies are to mandate programs, then they must provide the necessary funds to support these programs. Adequate funding of local programs will assist in removing conflicts between teachers, local districts, federal and state agencies, and the I.H.E.

While adequate funding will assist the implementation of mandated programs, the role of the I.H.E. must be further clarified with respect to all off-campus offerings for credit or program requirements. In a move to clarify the I.H.E. role, the Washington Council of Deans and Directors of Education have developed, and continue to review, guidelines which are designed to promote professional quality at the I.H.E. level. These guidelines include the following provisions:

A. That the I.H.E. be involved in the development of the course or program. This includes involvement in the determination of:
   1. Course or program objectives.
   2. Course syllabi.
   3. Contact hours.
   4. Student evaluation procedures.
   5. Qualifications of faculty.

B. That all such programs be reviewed and evaluated by a faculty committee.

C. That this committee make recommendations to the appropriate academic unit for approval or disapproval.

D. That regular faculty of the I.H.E. monitor and evaluate the course or program.

The guidelines as adopted by the W.C.D.D.E. are "guidelines not mandates." Each I.H.E. will undoubtedly, however, follow them very closely, for it is the I.H.E. that is held accountable and responsible for all courses and programs for which they grant credit or degrees. While higher education institutions are service oriented institutions, they should not impose themselves upon local districts, nor should they ignore requests for assistance. To assist in reducing confusion, several principles ought to be recognized.

1. Inservice education should not be dependent upon I.H.E. credit.
2. Upon request, institutions of higher education should help local districts to identify needs, to design programs which meet those needs, and to identify personnel to implement those programs.
3. Inservice education needs should be determined at the local district level.
4. Each local district should reserve a portion of its budget for inservice education.
5. Mandated programs requiring inservice should be accompanied by funds adequate to accomplish the task.

References
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STAFF DEVELOPMENT - SMALL SCHOOLS, ESD’S AND SPI

by Phil Reiter

Small schools have staff development problems. The basic question that needs to be examined is what can be done to help small schools alleviate their difficulties regarding staff development. What follows is a very general overview of an approach to dealing with the problem which involves the local school district, the educational service districts, and the office of the superintendent of public instruction.

Local school districts should develop a philosophical position reflecting their approach to staff development. There also needs to be a clear statement which delineates the district’s position regarding staff development as a total process and staff development in content areas. Staff development as a total process would deal with the question of training an entire staff in interpersonal skills, or in ITTP, or some other program which would benefit the entire staff and the school district. On the other hand, staff development in content areas would deal with workshops in Economics for junior high students, or elementary law programs, or P.E. in the elementary school, but might also include working with individual staff members in designing long term goals for continuing education. The importance here is that the small school begins to clarify where it wishes to go with the programs available. The clarification of this issue will allow for much easier selection when the school year starts and we are bombarded with the vast number of workshops that suddenly appear.

Staff development in small schools needs to have the commitment of the school board, the administration and the staff. In order to achieve the commitment there may be the need to resolve some issues at the bargaining table. This may be more easily handled if the district has developed both short and long term goals for the staff development program they select to pursue. I do not intend to discuss the numerous issues that might develop. However if the local school district has clearly defined its position and its goals, it might find that the bargaining issues are not that difficult, at least for small schools.

In designing staff development it is very important to keep in mind the limitations imposed on small schools. Remember that the smaller the district enrollment, the greater are the number of preparations and extra duties for staff and administration. Once the school year begins, the amount of time available for staff development is very limited not by choice, but by previous commitments or circumstances which the district cannot control, such as the number of substitutes available for releasing staff for training purposes. Once the local school district has designed its policy and established the goals, the benefits which can be derived from the educational service district and the office of the state superintendent of public instruction are supportive rather than directive.

The educational service district is regionally available to small school districts. Because of the regional distribution the geographic isolation of small schools is theoretically reduced, although in reality this is not always so.

The ESD’s could consider coordination of staff development programs, making them available either on a regional basis, state wide basis or at the local level, constantly remembering the difficulties that face small school districts.

The publishing of a calendar of inservice workshops before the school year begins would allow small school districts to plan and select in accordance with their already identified staff development program.

It would also be helpful if all workshops were identified as either skill development or of an abstract philosophical nature. So often staff goes in search of a new skill or some practical “how to” information, only to be confronted with a lengthy philosophical report which does not do much for a positive attitude toward continued staff development.

Some time soon the office of the superintendent of public instruction will realize the fantastic benefits that would derive from having a small school coordinator on their staff. A full time position would allow for program development and staff development which would be exceptionally beneficial for all concerned. The coordinator could respond to the needs of all small schools throughout the state. There could also be the availability of an information source for not only state activities, but also national activities. An SPI sponsored small school conference, yearly, drawing together representatives from district administrators and teachers, would allow for a coordinated developmental program for small schools, plus allowing for a statewide small school plan and possibly the most important, the sharing of experiences.

Phil Reiter is Superintendent, Wilson Creek School Dist.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT: A PROBLEM FOR RURAL DISTRICTS

by Merle Locke

Science has changed both the physical environment and human society so much in such a short time, that many of our attitudes, habits, and our educational institutions have become dangerously outdated. Social scientists of our day feel that because of the realities of our changing world, much of what is taught in our schools is remote and irrelevant. The question arises: have our schools and teaching staff kept pace with this phenomenon of our changing world? And, faced with these problems, how can the small remote school district hope to accomplish the gigantic task of insuring that teachers and administrators have the latest skills to assist students to be prepared to meet the demands of a changing society?

Staff development, under the title “inservice education”, or “staff development”, has been with us ever since the time when new teachers entered the profession clutching their “normal” training certificates. For years, an occasional teachers’ institute or convention has sufficed to keep them informed on developments in their field. Today, staff development has much broader implications and is generating widespread interest and difficulty for all educators, and especially those in the small remote school district.

As educators, we are all participants in staff development at a time when fundamental issues are being resolved that will chart the course for the next decade and beyond. The crucial questions are: Who’s going to be in charge of educational staff development? And, how do small districts effectively maintain input into some type of consortium planning for staff development?

For a long time, higher education was in the driver’s seat and, through its national voice - the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education - called the tune on accreditation standards, certification, program design, curriculum, staff development, and a host of other concerns. Now, the voices of all the other partners in the education enterprise rise in dissonant chorus - the Federal Government, state legislatures, education commissions, state and local education agencies, organized teachers, citizens, and student teachers, are each demanding their say - in some cases, majority control over staff development. These agencies do have a stake in the process and there ought to be ways for them to affect what goes on - in proportion to their expertise, and in meeting the needs of the local school district. We must find ways to harness it before it distracts us all from the ultimate goal - better education. In the meantime, we’re in the middle of a power struggle. Is higher education prepared to take forceful action to maintain its initiative? Will they resign themselves to a service role in consortium local districts? Or will Educational Service Districts assume responsibility for staff development for local districts within their jurisdiction?
With preservice education credit-hour wells drying up, universities are trying to become more effective in the inservice arena. Many universities are now trying to assume a partnership role with school districts in staff development areas, focused on the identified needs of the local school district and staff members with credit provided. The "mini-sabbatical" Teacher Corps projects, the Portal School and many others are examples of special staff development programs. Without a clear understanding of governance, the small school district must assume the responsibility for either developing their own programs or working in concert with local community colleges and universities in meeting the needs of their educational program.

An expanding number of school districts, both large and small, are formally recognizing the need for local staff development efforts. The focus of control is moving rapidly from the institution of higher education to the local district, and even from the local school district to the individual school building, where principals are providing more leadership for staff development.

In concert with this shift in control is a tendency to use members of the active teaching staff, either locally or from neighboring districts, to instruct and assist their colleagues, rather than to rely on colleges and universities for expertise. Teachers feel that practicality and credibility are more easily assured if fellow practitioners conduct the staff development activity. In some cases, members of the teaching staff who are recognized as superior teachers can be specifically trained in a particular process, with the understanding that they will accept staff development responsibilities.

It is recognized that the large school systems have inservice problems. But, small, remote, isolated districts' problems are compounded by lack of leadership, lack of coordinators, trainers, etc.

The fact is, the majority of small school districts are floundering in the staff development process. It is fundamental that one does not get something for nothing. Staff development involves costs in terms of time and money for staff, materials, and facilities. Short faculty meetings lasting less than an hour after a long hard teaching day will not suffice. Staff members must be freed by whatever administrative devices are necessary, so that individuals and groups can engage in staff development activities in earnest. This means a few hours for some purposes, a day for other purposes, and a week, a month, or even a year on occasion, when the need demands it. The hourly meeting once every week for staff development purposes is as old-fashioned as a box social. Staff members, no matter how large or small the district, must be assigned staff development leadership responsibilities with high priority labels attached.

Furthermore, budgetary allocations of significant amounts to provide for release time, visiting specialists, and materials must be provided.

In spite of difficult problems and an evolutionary transition, the optimism among us believe that staff development is coming of age, and that it has the potential to contribute significantly to not only the small school setting, but to all districts, and to the realization of the dream of effective universal education.

Merle Locke is Superintendent, Royal School District, Royal City.

The federal special education mandate (P.L. 94-142) clearly speaks to the professional development of educators who are charged with the responsibility of educating handicapped children, as an established priority. Functionally, all educators are included in that concept, especially with the emphasis upon mainstreaming.

Providing inservice training to accomplish the task is problematic. Everyone dealing with special education perceives a need for help in almost every operational aspect of the program. Because of funding (VI-B) apparatus, local school boards have adopted policies which speak to all aspects of service provision and every person involved in the process. Each LEA is charged with adopting and implementing policies and procedures related to: appropriate educational programs, full educational opportunity, assessment, individual educational plan, least restrictive placement, parental involvement, confidentiality of student records, procedural protection, funding constraints, personnel development, nondiscrimination, child identification, surrogate parent, placement, parent advisory groups, and dispute resolution.

These requirements -- each an inservice topic in its own right -- are spelled out in a host of rules and regulations, and pose a variety of problems for local program managers, on the one hand, and instructional and support staff, on the other. It is essential, for instance, that all LEA personnel dealing with any given handicapped student, fully understand the due process rights of the student being considered for service, the rights of his/her parents, and the rights of the school district, from the initiation of a referral through the provision of appropriate program services. Failure to both understand and ensure procedural implementation of due process rights will continue to result in disputes, litigation and less-than-effective service provision for students in need.

Even a quick review of the Federal Register of August 23, 1977 (45 CFR, Parts 100b, 121a, 121m), and the recently revised Washington State regulations (Chapter 392-171 WAC, October 2, 1978) will clearly illustrate the scope of inservice needs for special educators, in a general sense. The problem magnifies when we continue to question "who needs what" in full spectrum. It seems obvious, however, in 1978, that high priority needs to be assigned to providing the training support needed for those educators who deal with children and their parents on a day-to-day basis -- classroom teachers. While a clear case can be made for improving technical expertise in management and support staff, as a critical/legal component, it is becoming abundantly clear that the parents of handicapped students are receiving most of their information from the classroom teacher. It seems logical, therefore, that immediate initial efforts be appropriately directed -- to providing full and accurate information to the classroom teacher who provides the daily services for handicapped students and is the major information source for the student's parents. Teachers need to know a great deal very soon about all legal rights and responsibilities, program/service availability, and local district policies and procedures which affect their daily lives and bear upon the information they give others.

The need, again, is clear, the solutions are not. If the mandate is to be implemented, special educators, and general educators trying to accommodate special needs, must be provided a full comprehensive inservice training program which will impact local services delivery systems to the extent that the job can be done.

Dr. Gary Snow is Director of Special Education, ESD 105, Yakima.
THE ROLE OF THE INDEPENDENT INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION INSERVICE

by Dr. W. D. Rearick

By definition and by legislative decision, pre-service and inservice teacher education requires the partnership of institutions of higher education, school districts and professional education associations. To work out this philosophy requires consideration of some general guidelines by which all of the partners must function and a clear understanding of the role of higher education as one of the participants. The role of independent higher education can then be stated in terms of these general guidelines and the general pattern applicable to all of higher education.

At least five considerations must go into the decision making process for development of pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula. (1) The Washington state constitutional and legislative requirements provide a significant set of parameters. (2) The specific certification requirements enacted by the Washington State Board of Education complement these in greater detail. (3) When teachers and district administrative personnel define the needs which teachers have to be more effective in the classroom, a sometimes complementary (and sometimes contradictory) set of criteria also comes into play. (4) When teachers, parents, administrators and the learners themselves are consulted about what teachers need in order to respond to the needs of the learners, still another set of considerations comes into play. (5) As new knowledge is unlocked and revealed, emerging intellectual discoveries provide still another dimension against which teacher education curricula must be examined.

The Instructional Theory Into Practice Workshops which are being conducted in Washington state, illustrate the interplay of these several sets of criteria. As the legislature seeks greater accountability for expenditures of educational dollars, we find teachers looking for ways by which they can measure their own professional competence. Simultaneously, we discover that learners need greater motivation to learn in the classroom after spending excessive hours before television sets, whose programmers have applied millions of dollars of marketing research to get children to coax their parents into buying the sponsors' products. When Dr. Madeline Hunter of UCLA published the results of her efforts to translate the jargon of educational psychology into usable classroom principles and procedures, we were provided with a collection of "new" instructional theory that could be practiced by teachers to meet the needs of the legislative accountability, teacher perceived needs for their own development and the perceived needs of learners. Thus, Instructional Theory Into Practice workshops emerged through cooperative planning among higher education institutions, school districts and professional associations, as an integral part of both pre-service and in-service teacher education.

Higher education has traditionally accepted its role as researcher. This function is needed to provide focus on the needs of teachers, the needs of learners, the extension and refinement of knowledge in the various disciplines of learning, and to investigate and report on pedagogy that is effective. Perhaps higher education has been less concerned with the translation of that research into practical application, but nevertheless it has recognized the continuing need for publishing research findings, by insisting on such publication as evidence of faculty growth and development. It is the belief of this writer that translation of research findings is an appropriate and essential role for higher education and is also persuasive salesmanship to teachers, school districts and the legislature that research findings should be translated into practical application.

Another role of higher education in partnership for teacher education is that of being responsive to the efforts of the other partners in the enterprise by accrediting their efforts. Since this responsiveness cannot be conducted in a vacuum, higher education should be in the business of continuing and inservice education of district curriculum leaders—the persons who develop and operate district programs for teachers. Although this has been perceived as part of its master's and doctoral degree programs, higher education has done little to take to the districts such an inservice offering for inservice personnel. Similarly, higher education has a responsibility to consult with districts for mapping their strategies for continuous education. Too frequently in the past, higher education has designed its curriculum without seeking the input of district personnel who are on the firing line for educational needs assessment.

To come full circle, higher education needs then to evaluate the effectiveness of pre-service and in-service programs through its research arm, and feed those results back into the system for revision and modification of existing programs. Although higher education generally dislikes the analogy, its role as a partner in teacher education has most of the characteristics of any other service oriented business.

Independent higher education, in part because of its almost total dependence upon revenues outside the state tax structure, has found itself in the unique position of taking leadership and being responsive to programs proposed by both the school districts and professional associations. The traditional role that suggests by inference, at least, that the best learning takes place on the university campus with university oriented professionals, has given way to a recognition that quality teacher education is frequently well provided by practicing professionals in the field. When university-based professionals sit down with district-based professionals, it is possible for them to jointly identify the needs of teachers and the needs of learners, and relate those needs to the emerging intellectual discoveries of the various disciplines.

At a recent meeting initiated by Seattle Pacific University, school district curriculum coordinators, principals, teachers, and university professors in the humanities, jointly described their perceptions of appropriate content about the nature of writing and about the nature of teaching writing. They were working to design a teacher education pre-service and in-service program that will make a difference in how children and young people write. Such cooperation only a few years ago would have been considered anathema by the university community and suspect by school district personnel. Today it is accepted as an appropriate point of beginnings for partners in the teacher education enterprise.

Independent higher education has the role of demonstrating responsive, cooperative partnership in teacher education. It has the responsibility to substantiate that such cooperation yields responsible quality in-service programs. It has the responsibility to offer such programs at lowest possible costs to teachers and school districts. The role of independent higher education in teacher education inservice continues to be the role that independent education has frequently played in the past: demonstrating that a dual system of education produces a stronger educational product in both public and private sectors.

Dr. W. D. Rearick is Dean of Academic Development, Seattle Pacific University.

DEVELOPING INSERVICE PROGRAMS

by Dennis Ray

School districts throughout the state are faced with an ever increasing need for a variety of staff training programs. Some of these needs are the result of responsibilities imposed upon the districts from outside agencies such as the State Board of Education (i.e. student learning objectives) and the legislature (i.e. work skills/career education). In addition, local districts are discovering the value of utilizing inservice education to strengthen educational programs and strategies. An obvious example of this is the Instructional Theory Into Practice programs being offered in many school districts throughout the state.
Meeting this increased need for staff development programs at the local level presents special problems for small and middle sized school districts. Such districts are not large enough to support staff personnel whose assignment is primarily the organizing and conducting of training programs. Such districts can seldom budget sufficient funds to contract with outside individuals or agencies to provide the needed services. Therefore, it becomes the responsibility of the members of the administrative team to organize, plan and conduct the staff development programs. When undertaken with enthusiasm, commitment and vigor, such programs can result in excellent opportunities for the improvement of the quality of education in the district.

District Administration

Superintendents and other district administrators have a tendency to talk a great deal about inservice education but to involve themselves in such programs either very little or not at all. If the programs are to operate to the optimum benefit of the district, there must be a demonstrated commitment to its success on the part of the Superintendent and the other members of the administrative team. Such a commitment must be demonstrated through the allocation of dollars and time to the program. Unless the district leadership is willing to budget a significant amount of money and to commit a considerable quantity of time, their own and others, inservice training will continue to be regarded as only a “paper priority” by the remainder of the staff.

District administrators can further enhance the inservice program by direct involvement in the program. The optimum way in which this can be accomplished is by their personally conducting programs for which they either possess or can develop the necessary expertise. In addition to demonstrating commitment at the highest level, this approach can develop maximum credibility with the staff by demonstrating the skills for which they were selected to hold leadership roles. The opportunity to develop rapport and mutual respect among members of the organization is perhaps at its greatest when the parties are mutually involved in such a professional growth activity.

Building Principals

Much has been written about the importance of the principal in determining the educational climate and program within the individual school. Nowhere is this more demonstratively true than in the inservice education program. Without the wholehearted support and enthusiasm of the building principal, such a program has little chance for success. The principal, more than any other individual, controls the “operational priorities” of the building. By what he says and what he doesn’t say, by what he does and what he doesn’t do, the principal determines what the role of inservice education will be. Their commitment to the program, therefore, is essential if the program is to be a success.

Principals, like all individuals, respond more positively and have more commitment to decisions and programs which they had a part in shaping. Therefore, as much as possible, the inservice program should reflect the feelings and attitudes of the principals regarding the needs of the district and the staff. Programs with this type of a base of support, whether conducted at the district or the building level, will enjoy the greatest chance of success.

When a decision to develop and conduct an inservice program is made without the involvement of the building principals, other steps must be taken to develop their commitment to its success. A careful and thorough explanation of the rationale for the program, its relationship to legal requirements and/or its essentiality to the achievement of district goals can all assist in developing this commitment. Additionally, having building principals participate in and, when appropriate, conduct workshop sessions can play an important role in this process.

The means by which a commitment of the building principals is developed will vary from individual to individual and from program to program. However, such a commitment is critical. To proceed in the implementation of an inservice program without this support will seriously jeopardize its chance for success.

Staff

Staff commitment to the goals of the inservice program is, of course, a third important component. Ideally, such a commitment would be the result of staff participation in the setting of priorities and the developing of programs to be included in the inservice effort. Certainly, a considerable portion of the inservice budget should be devoted to addressing staff needs and concerns. However, situations will invariably develop where the administrative team perceives a program to be essential to the district’s operation and that commitment is not shared by the teaching staff. Many districts faced this situation in meeting the Student Learning Objectives Law enacted by the state legislature. It is in such a situation that the attitudes and capabilities of the administrative team will spell success or failure for the program. Staff perception of the district leadership’s commitment and concern for the improvement of the education program will be a crucial factor in their receptiveness to having a program “laid on them”.

Budget

Developing a budget for inservice education can be approached from two separate avenues. The first and most logical approach to this problem is to identify the activities to be included in the program, determine the resulting costs to the district and budget the necessary amounts in the appropriate categories. The second approach, theoretically less sound but with many practical advantages, is to determine the base amount which the district is willing to spend on inservice education and then develop programs to best utilize the funds.

Most administrators, board members and the general public would agree that three percent of the total budget is not an unreasonable amount to spend on the development of the professional abilities of the staff. However, such an amount would be considerably more than most school districts have traditionally spent on staff training. Perhaps this is an area in which providing adequate funding on building a program to utilize the dollars has significant advantages over more accepted budgetary procedures.

Summary

Conducting an inservice program without the luxury of specialized personnel and outside consultant assistance can present special problems. As in most problem situations, however, unique opportunities can also be derived. If the administrative team truly places staff development at or near the top of their priorities, a healthy and valuable process can result. If it continues to be a program component which we pay only lip service to and demonstrate no true commitment, then inservice education will continue to be viewed with a jaundiced eye by staff members and administrators alike.

Dennis Ray is Assistant Supt., Eastmont School District.

WEA–IMPROVING TEACHING THROUGH TRAINING

by Bob Pickles

It has been obvious to industry for many years that investing in the knowledge and skills of employees is the only way to meet the changing work needs. Job performance is dependent on knowledge and skills that are current and sharp. In education, we have been dependent upon two sources for creating the leadership or knowledge base for keeping abreast of the times. The first has been the new teacher with fresh ideas to be tested. With today's low or non-existent vacancy rate, there is not the annual wave of enthusiasm brought with youth. And, in fact, those who do get hired have probably had to be more tradition-oriented than those of the past. The second source of new ideas has been from teachers being motivated to return to school for salary credits. With many districts approaching 50% of their teachers at salary maximums, this incentive is also greatly reduced.

Continued on next page
What is meant by "inservice," "staff development" or "training" has been the subject of many papers or articles. From any perspective, this debate often clouds the real issue of teachers needing help. If a teacher has a personal desire for self improvement, if a school district has specific curricular goals, or if evaluation of a current program or teacher indicates specific kinds of training would be beneficial, then assistance in encouraging the teacher to receive training should lead to more effective teaching. A commitment to life long learning must be a part of teaching.

The WEA believe the quality and quantity of opportunities for inservice can be greatly increased and better incentives provided for teachers. Approximately 8,000 Washington teachers were surveyed in 1976 by WEA on a computerized instructional needs assessment. The needs assessment used a discrepancy model to ask the differences between "what is" and "what should be." Statements like "District inservice education meets my needs" and "Teacher needs determine the inservice education program showed a high discrepancy between "what is" and "what should be." Teachers not only consistently indicated a high level of dissatisfaction with current programs, but interpretation of the data would also indicate very little expectation of anything better.

In 1974, WEA participated actively in a statewide conference with many organizations and universities in an attempt to determine how inservice programs could be better planned and delivered. As a result of the conference and other activities, WEA supported the formation of an official state Office of Education Task Force to provide a state posture and leadership for better inservice training programs. This resulted in the current legislation and a continuing awareness by various education groups of inservice needs.

However, two thrusts by WEA have probably done more to create the "catalytic" role towards better inservice than any other. WEA is sponsoring a number of college credit and non-credit education workshops. These have been sponsored by WEA based on identified teacher needs. Extensive promotion has been undertaken. Some programs have provided training in large groups, some in small groups, some in conference format and some via television. Teachers have responded positively to all delivery systems when they have received quality offerings. WEA now receives many calls asking what will we sponsor next, when and where.

Some of the drawbacks of this approach are that WEA can only be a catalyst through program offerings on a statewide basis. Building-centered and district-centered programs can do much more to focus on individual teacher needs. WEA has provided resource persons to assist in special building-centered or district-centered programs. Assistance can and has been provided with establishment of inservice design procedures as well as topical presentations in such things as School Climate, Discipline, Child Abuse, Gifted Student Education, Career Education and Mainstreaming. It is obvious that if teachers are involved in design and selection of programs at the building or district level, even more needs are met.

Building-centered inservice programs were piloted under a grant from NEA in both the Bellingham and Port Angeles School Districts beginning in 1973. Though many ideas have changed and modifications have been made, programs that are building-centered are continuing. The Lake Washington School District Plan is modeled after the Port Angeles program. A NEA publication "Teacher Designed Reform in Inservice Education" describes the activities at the Port Angeles and Bellingham sites.

WEA also has a grant to develop an extensive multicultural training program. The program will address minimal teaching competencies in multicultural education consistent with the goals of basic education and develop local peer training capability in multicultural education throughout the state of Washington. The focus is to eliminate both race and sex bias in education. Districts participating in the pilot development are: Wilson Creek, North Shore, Kent and Tacoma.

Teacher centers are the second most exciting catalytic event in teacher inservice. Inservice managed by a majority of classroom teachers should meet real needs and raise teacher expectations. Eleven grants were submitted from Washington for federal funds with Washington getting three of sixty grants awarded nationally. WEA took and will continue to take an active role in promoting the "Teacher Center" as a means of developing positive learning experiences for teachers.

Staff development is a very logical process. However, it takes commitment to build -- or allow -- a comprehensive program. It is not a college course, a workshop or a speaker. It means identifying specific skill, knowledge or attitudinal needs, finding the resource program or persons to meet the needs or developing a new program, committing the time and dollars to make the program work and evaluating the program to redesign future activities. The process is simple, but expensive in time and money. Some school districts have started to buy teacher time for training, pay for tuition, recruit special speakers and provide leadership through committees with teacher involvement, to identify needs and design programs. These commitments are a start in the right direction.

Research indicates very significantly that a thorough program of teacher involvement is necessary for inservice goals to be achieved. Need, as related to a realistic classroom atmosphere or conditions, must exist and be clearly understood by both the teacher who is receiving the inservice and the "expert" who is delivering. Need is not only content, but attitudinal, training site and time can meet either extrinsic or intrinsic needs. WEA has as inservice needs assessment document which attempts to clarify some of these issues. This is being modified and used by several local education associations.

Inservice takes commitment. Time, money and involvement are aids towards success and indicators of commitment. More and more local education associations are working towards assuring good inservice programs. Is there a good functioning "Staff Development Council" with a majority being the inservice recipients -- teachers? Are district funds provided for support? Are programs planned for the school day or other desirable times and are facilities conducive to learning? These items will appear more and more on the bargaining table. Hopefully, the outcomes will assure good collaborative processes and ensure quality inservice programs.

WEA SPONSORED INSERVICE PROGRAMS

Through a system of task forces on topics like Gifted Education, Mainstreaming, Discipline, Child Abuse and School Climate, WEA provides resources to work both with faculties and to speak to public groups. It is our desire to create a better awareness of school needs. For information, contact WEA, 510 5th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104 or call Bob Pickles at 206 622-1810.

WEA also sponsors a number of college courses to meet identified teacher needs. Last year, over four thousand teachers participated and the evaluations have been excellent. For 1978, WEA is sponsoring the following programs to date:

1. Project T.E.A.C.H.
A five credit class on discipline and communication techniques. This course was commercially developed and is based on research into practices of teachers rated as highly successful. The class develops very specific teaching skills. Eighteen teachers across the state are trained to offer this program.

"Coping With Stress"
Dr. Bill Maynard offers this for either 1 or 2 credits. Practical ideas for classroom teachers, administrators and support personnel are provided. Sites are scheduled around the state.

"Discipline Without Tears"
Dr. Charles LaBounty From Hamline University in Minnesota provides a wealth of practical ideas for classroom management. Dr. LaBounty will appear in Washington to teach eight courses this year.

"Mainstreaming - PL 94-142"
This is a practical three credit course for all classroom teachers on implementing the new federal "education for all" legislation. The course was developed by teachers under a grant from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
The University of Washington is offering the program through nine instructors across the state.

"WEA Potpourri of Instructional Issues"

A class to bring teachers awareness of a number of current instructional issues and provide assistance in getting help to solve their identified problems. This is taught by WEA Second Vice President Bob Pickles.

SOURCES:
Staff Development and School Change; Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin and David D. Marsh; authors; September 1978, published by Teacher College Record.
Rethinking Inservice Education; Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson; authors; Copyright 1975, published by the National Education Association.
Teacher-Designed Reform in Inservice Education; Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson; authors; January 1977, published by the National Education Association.
Implications of Research for Effective Inservice Education; William W. Wilen and Richard Kindsvatter; authors; April 1978, Heldref Publications.

Bob Pickles is serving his fourth year as WEA Second Vice President. His primary role has been to develop the WEA instruction program. This has focused on inservice education and how cooperative endeavors can better meet teacher-student needs.

Bob is on leave from the Enumclaw School District where he spent 10 years teaching elementary and junior high school.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT: THE HOW AND THE WHY
by Dr. John Costello

As director of staff and program development in the Lake Washington School District, one of my primary responsibilities is to design and implement a program of growth and development for the 1500 staff members. The job has been both challenging and rewarding and I would like to share some of my thoughts with you on this subject.

THE LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Lake Washington School District serves about 17,400 students in the two cities of Redmond and Kirkland and an unincorporated area called Juanita. It lies on the eastern shore of Lake Washington, about 15 minutes from downtown Seattle, and covers about 76 square miles. It is a sprawling, rather homogeneous (only about 4.5% of the students are members of minority groups) suburban district which is fast outgrowing its 50-year history as a vacation area for city dwellers across the lake.

While the district has had a consistently good record of achievement for an "east side suburb," which includes the wealthier districts of Bellevue and Mercer Island, it has had four or five stormy years, several superintendents, and much confusion over the roles of both board and superintendent. Administrators have felt pulled in several directions, unsure of their roles and somewhat rudderless.

This situation changed during the 1977-78 school year. The new superintendent, Dr. L.E. Scarff firmly believed "that every person in this district wants to do the best job and be the best possible person." Further, that "the purpose of staff development in the Lake Washington School District is to assist the many good people in our organization to become great, and the great ones to become even greater."

This was not just an impressive statement but a mandate from the superintendent, supported by a budget of nearly $750,000.00 between July 1977 and August 1979.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT 1977-1979

In August and September of 1977 a staff needs assessment was conducted to determine areas where staff members desired growth opportunities. As this information was gathered it became evident that a six part multicomponent program would best serve the needs of our staff. The next section of this paper is an overview of the 1977-78 program. Each component will be followed by a brief description of 1978-79 program:

OVERVIEW

Last year classroom teachers spent an average of 40 hours in staff development training programs. Administrators spent nearly 120 hours in training, and non-teaching staff members averaged about 12 hours during the school year. The district is committed to developing excellence in our schools by developing our most precious resource - human potential. Through staff development all school district personnel may participate in programs to strengthen existing skills and learn new ones.

The Lake Washington School District has made considerable progress in overall staff development during the 1977-78 school year. As we move forward, we want to capitalize on these gains while adding to this program. It is our belief that we will become a more outstanding school district when we have offered each staff member the opportunity for further growth and development.

The following tables show the growth seminars conducted, numbers of participants with hours spent in each program:

TABLE I
CERTIFIED STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>HOURS/ PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Instruction Theory</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced ITIP</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Supervision</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Effectiveness</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Image</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Career Stress</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Classroom Control</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff School Unity</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II
ADMINISTRATOR'S GROWTH PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>HOURS/ PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Effectiveness</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Perceiver Training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Effectiveness</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Growth Seminar</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III
CLASSIFIED STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>HOURS/ PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Image</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Training in Communications Skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Workshop in Time Management</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid Training for Custodians</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Drivers' Seminar in Conflict Management</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

I. Teacher Development

Instructional Theory Into Practice (ITIP) is the focus of the district's teacher development program. Although the district has been engaged in this project since 1975, it is now a central part of our teacher staff development program. Table IV below shows the sequence of growth in this program.

Continued on next page
TABLE IV  
INSTRUCTIONAL THEORY INTO PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>INSTRUCTORS</th>
<th>SCHOOLS REPRESENTED</th>
<th>NO. OF HOURS PER PARTICIPANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Out of Dist.</td>
<td>3 elem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>6 elem., 3 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>2 Full Time</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Dist. Staff</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Dist. Staff</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: A copy of the Lake Washington School District five year plan for ITIP can be obtained from the Lake Washington School District by writing John F. Costello, Director of Staff and Curriculum Development.

While a large number of teachers were trained in the 1977-78 school year in the basic ITIP program, the emphasis for this year will be on classroom follow-up and continued training for our district training team.

II. CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

This program is an effort to continue the KIDS (Keeping Instructional Development Systematic) project to increase the effectiveness of the basic education program in language arts, mathematics and reading while complying with the Student Learning Objective Law of 1976. This was accomplished last year by offering our building level administrators and classroom teachers a developmental program in the identification, construction, and in-service of the objectives in each of these curriculum areas. The objectives in staff development in language arts and math were piloted in the buildings while a team of teachers further refined the reading objectives.

For this year, workshops in late summer and fall updated building administrators and teachers on the KIDS program, and presented first-drafted and revised curriculum materials in the three subject areas. The workshops also trained participants in using the KIDS management/record-keeping system. Emphasis will focus on teacher and administrator training to insure the success of this program.

III. INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLSTAFF DEVELOPMENT

The district's 26 schools have developed and implemented staff development programs to fit the individual and group needs of each staff. These programs were planned by the staff in each school, assisted by the principal and central office administrators. Areas of focus this year were:

- Teacher Effectiveness Training
- Positive Image Building
- Conflict Resolutions Skills
- How to Manage Career Stress
- Positive School Climate

These and other areas will be further developed during the 1978-79 school year.

NOTE: An allocation of $1500.00 per school was made to fund this project.

IV. ADMINISTRATOR DEVELOPMENT

Improving administrative leadership is a vital part of staff development. The goal is to assure the highest quality of leadership from the administrators in the Lake Washington School District. This is being accomplished by offering our administrators a series of seminars in:

- Human Effectiveness Training
- Administrative Effectiveness
- Conducting a Needs Assessment
- SRI (Selective Research Inc.)

Workshops on studying outstanding administrators and selecting staff.

In addition to these growth opportunities, examples of seminars to be offered during the 1978-79 school year are:

- Time Management
- Planning and Problem Solving
- Stress and Conflict Management
- Principles of Management
- Clinical Supervision in ITIP
- Teacher Perceiver Academy (SRI)

V. SCHOOL BOARD DEVELOPMENT

Board members recognize that personal growth and continued learning are essential to effective board membership. School board developmental programs are provided through workshops and seminars.

In early summer of 1978 an intensive three-day seminar was held with the superintendent and the school board for the purpose of increasing the ability of the board to work in concert with the superintendent and administration. The session produced:

- Goals for Lake Washington School District
- Board-Administration Operating principles
- Operating principles for Administrators

VI. CLASSIFIED STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Support staff effectiveness relates closely to overall district effectiveness. With this thought in mind the intent of this component is to increase the overall effectiveness of the classified personnel in Lake Washington School District by offering a series of growth opportunities to the classified staff. In 1977, these growth opportunities include:

- Human Effectiveness Training
- Secretarial Training in Communication Skills
- Bus Driver Effectiveness Training
- First Aid for Custodians
- Boiler Care and Maintenance

This year a series of growth seminars will be available in the Classified Staff Development portion of the District Staff Development Catalog that will contain additional offerings. These will include, but will not be limited to:

- Telephone Communications
- Combine Work and Leisure
- Effective Interpersonal Relations
- Office Procedure Refreshers (typewriting, filing, and retrieving, office machines and business math)
- Secretarial (shorthand, transcription, bookkeeping)
- Accounting
- School Law
- Business Writing
- Conversational Spanish
- Training for School Aides

In addition, classified staff members can select offerings from General Growth Portion of the catalog.

VII. GENERAL GROWTH

After assessing the 1977 staff development programs, a need was indicated for additional growth opportunities to staff, board and community. To meet that need a new and major part of the overall staff development program was developed which emphasizes internal expertise – plus help from other education agencies, business, and industry – for staff development activities. It is seen as a way to reach not only all categories of school district employees, but also School Board and citizen members of the community.

Planning is now complete. We analyzed staff development needs of employees, identified and contacted resource agencies and individuals – including colleges and universities, district employees with special skills, and local business and industry figures – and provided special training for local staff as facilitators.

A portion of this component will offer growth opportunities for counselors, psychologists, teachers of handicapped children, librarians, and other specialists. Offerings for Vocational Education staff members will also be included.

CONCLUSION

The Lake Washington School District has committed time (Tables I, II, III & IV) and dollars (nearly $750,000 in two years) to support its belief that helping people grow and improve will make our district an outstanding one.
We have made considerable gains in overall people development during the 1977-78 school year and as we move forward into the 1978-79 school year we intend to capitalize on these gains while adding further to this program. It is our firm belief that the quality of our educational program is a direct result of the quality of the people serving the students of this district.

With great people, we will be a great district and be able to enrich the lives of the students we teach.

'Scarr, L. E. "Staff Development: Recipe for Growth" Unpublished Article - Page 2 (October 1978)

*5750,000. is equivalent to 1.1% of the total district budget for years 1977-79.

Dr. John Costello is Director of Staff and Program Development, Lake Washington School District.

EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR

PURPOSE:
Washington State Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development wants to recognize outstanding educators who promote quality education in the State of Washington as evidenced by their contributions toward comprehensive programs and the improvement of instruction which results in effective and efficient student learning.

ELIGIBILITY:
Any individual actively involved in education of children and youth - including teacher, administrators, support personnel, or parents from the public or private sector - may be nominated. (No Board member of WSASCD is eligible for selection.)

SELECTION CRITERIA:
The nominee should have demonstrated:

a) professional, intellectual and personal integrity.
b) leadership in effective education (nature and scope of contribution).
c) concern for students and fellow educators.
d) knowledge in the field of education.
e) socio-cultural responsibility and involvement.

METHOD OF RECOGNITION:
1) The winner(s) will receive special recognition and an engraved plaque at the February 9-10 WSASCD Annual Conference in Spokane. Their local superintendent will be notified and press release(s) will be sent to their area newspaper(s) and "Your Public Schools."

2) Additional selected nominees will receive certificates of recognition via their local superintendents. Press release(s) will be sent to their area newspaper(s).

3) All nominees will receive the portfolio of materials assembled for their nomination by their colleagues.

NOMINATION PROCEDURE:
Please submit, for each nominee, a nomination portfolio which clearly addresses the selection criteria and includes:
a) entry form on reverse of this page.
b) letter of nomination.
c) supporting data including at least 3 letters of support.
d) possible press release of approximately 200 words (picture optional);

Nominations must be received by 4:00 p.m., January 15, 1979 to be considered.
Submit to:  
WSASCD  
c/o Peggy O'Connor  
Fife School District No. 417  
5602 - 20th Street East  
Tacoma, Washington 98424

ENTRY FORM
1979 WSASCD Educator of the Year Award

Name of Nominee ____________________________

Phone __________________ Address ______________

Current Position: ____________________________

Previous Positions: (include dates) ____________________________

Professional Affiliations: ____________________________

Summary Statement: (Considering the selection criteria, please briefly highlight the nominee's contributions and your reason for his/her nomination)

Name of Nominator(s) __________________ Position __________________ Phone __________________
continuing education and the state university

by Dr. Howard Johnson

Much has been written in recent years of the trend toward lifelong learning. Evidence that this concept is a reality is found in the "graying" student population here at the University of Washington and elsewhere. In 1975, less than 30 percent of the college enrollees in the United States were over 22 years of age; by 1974, this figure had climbed to 50 percent. Just in the past four years at the University of Washington, the regular undergraduate and graduate enrollments thirty years and older have increased from 13 to 16 percent of the total. These figures exclude the large increases in continuing education programs which are, of course, dominated by older students. Some of this change toward an older student population here at the University of Washington has been a result of conscious effort to reduce emphasis in undergraduate programs, thus avoiding undesirable competition with other state colleges and universities. Some of the shift can also be attributed to non-credit and non-career oriented programs such as the Summer Alumni College. A great part of the enrollment shift both here at the University of Washington and elsewhere must, however, be attributed to broad societal factors which are leading career people from all walks of life to an involvement in continued learning. According to the most recent Gallup poll of public attitudes toward schools, 41 percent of those adults surveyed said they would be interested in taking adult education courses or training. When applied to the total population, this results in 60 million people potentially interested in extended education programs.

This push for extended and lifelong learning goes beyond the university or college classroom setting and is being carried out in retreat centers, factories, and even commuter cars and boats. While public universities have not in any sense led this move toward more varied learning settings and purposes, their very survival has depended upon a recognition that programs must be changed in ways which match reality as viewed by the larger society. My intent in this brief statement on the continuing education role of a large state university is to examine parts of this reality as viewed by the larger society, including educators, and to describe the implications of this reality view for departments of education. Specific focus will be given to the professional development of teachers and administrators working in our public schools and to the university's role in assuring their initial and continuing success as professionals.

REALITY FOR EDUCATORS IN THE 1980's AND BEYOND

Several societal trends are likely to impinge on educators in the years ahead. One of these trends is a lessening importance of advanced degrees and certificates for those seeking work. The large number of unemployed but highly educated persons is ample evidence of this trend. Acquisition of an advanced degree is simply not sufficient to assure employment, at least not in the field of education. So also is the removal of certificate requirements for school superintendents in a number of states an indication of this greater separation of formal education and the working world. This matter of relation between education and the employment was clearly one of the key issues in the Griggs vs. Duke Power Company case of 1971. In this case, the U.S. Supreme Court decided that tests and diplomas required for entry to a particular position must bear a close relationship to the demands of the position. When this relationship cannot be established, the test or diploma itself is suspect. Writing for the majority in the case, Chief Justice Berger argues:

The facts of this case demonstrate the inadequacy of broad and general testing devices as well as the infirmity of using diplomas or degrees as fixed measures of capabi-

However, the concept of competency gained momentum in the 1980s as a way to address these concerns. Competency-based education emphasized the ability to demonstrate mastery of specific skills and knowledge, rather than simply accumulating credits or degrees. This approach allowed for more flexible and individualized learning experiences, catering to the diverse needs of adult learners.

Certainly, this reasoning has encouraged those involved in training programs in education at both undergraduate and graduate levels to move toward a higher specification of competencies, at least in those situations where degrees and/or certificates are still considered essential for employment. It is interesting that this increased specification of competencies occurs at a time when many are raising serious questions about lack of precision in educational technology (i.e., questions about the degree to which we know which organizational and teaching approaches actually work best). These questions at least caution us that we must constantly guard against rigid specification and testing of the incommensurable as we proceed in the development of professional training and development programs.

A second societal trend having great impact on professional development programs is the increased specialization within the schooling enterprise. Over the past ten years, the number of specialists working in the field of education has expanded considerably. Particularly in the urban and suburban areas, we have in recent years added specialist teachers for the gifted and handicapped areas, evaluation specialists to assist in measuring attainment of certain federal and state mandates, and a considerable number of administrative, legal and finance personnel to deal with increasing demands of negotiations, fiscal management, and conflict resolution. This increased specialization within the profession has called for greater specialization and individualization in the design of training programs. It also suggests the application of a broader range of university resources to those training programs.

This leads directly to perhaps the most important of the societal trends which will impact on training in the years ahead. This is career mobility, which seems very much a part of our immediate future. Resulting in part from worker disillusionment with a lack of challenge in the working world (which as it advances technologically tends to become more mechanistic), and in part from that innate human quest for variety in life, we see increasing numbers of people pursuing multiple careers. Frederic Jacobs, Director of Harvard's Program in Professional Education, describes the trend as follows:

We are moving toward a period of serial or multiple careers, toward a time when it will be commonplace to have, for example, two 20-year rather than one 40-year career. This will result from changes in pension laws, from the genetically intellectually and emotionally mobile society, from the inevitable obsolescence of a technologically directed society, and from the disquiet of a society easily bored. These several trends -- separation of school and employment markets, increased specialization in the schooling enterprise, and increased mobility -- call for change in the overall delivery of services to professional educators. Institutions of higher education are attempting to address these needs and must be prepared to make even more changes in the years ahead.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The trends examined above call for new thrusts in professional development. As one of society's major resources, colleges and universities have a definite role to play. With the recent decline in birth rates and expected reduction in numbers at the preserve undergraduate level, society is shifting demands placed on higher education. Large state universities, like the University of Washington, are beginning to adjust to this changing demand. We turn now to a brief examination of the more promising of these adjustments:

1. Competency Specifications in Pre-Service Programs

With increasing demands for accountability in education and the dictates of court cases such as mentioned in the previous section, many efforts to spell out in much more specific terms the competencies required for meeting professional certification requirements. The eleven characteristics and generic skills developed as part
of the field-based teacher certification program at the University of Washington is one example of this kind of development work. Similar specification of competencies has been developed for pre-service administrative training programs. While these competencies are still checked largely as part of course requirements, the procedures for establishing in lieu of experiences and demonstrated competency are clearly communicated to students.

2. Greater Involvement of Successful Practitioners

With the increasing specialization and career mobility mentioned earlier, it is absolutely essential that successful practitioners of these specializations become directly involved in both the planning and delivery of training programs for educators. No single group of college-trained teachers can possibly keep abreast of all the many specialty developments within today's education profession, and the first-hand exposure to successful techniques and processes is demanded by the more mature students, who may be training for a second, or even third, specialization within the profession.

Recent funding directed to establishment of teacher centers here in Washington State and nationally is perhaps a response to our inability to involve practicing teachers effectively in institutions of higher education. While this movement also reflects the power struggle over control of at least part of the continuing education movement, it is unfortunate that we find it necessary to set up entirely new institutions to handle a function which could well have fallen within the role of existing higher education institutions. Hopefully, adjustments in programs at the colleges and universities, including more extensive involvement of practitioners in both the design and conduct of programs, can avoid unnecessary overlap in other professional development programs.

3. Increased Use of the Workshop and Retreat Formats

Particularly for practicing educators who are busily engaged in a professional role and who desire an intensive exposure to new dimension or experience, the workshop of anything from two days to two weeks duration is much more attractive than the late afternoon class twice a week. It not only provides for a short-term and intensive exposure to the subject of interest, but it is removed from the many interruptions of the more traditional classroom mode.

The workshop is also an ideal format for the above mentioned involvement of successful practitioners. Just this past summer, I had the fortunate experience of working with three practicing business officials in conducting a workshop designed to give educators a better facility with the data processing and financial management aspects of their jobs. Both the business officials and those of us working full time on the college staff profited from the experience; and, for the students who were looking for a mid-career refresher on new technologies in administration, it proved to be a very useful and real experience. Just this fall the state universities in Washington State became involved collectively with the Washington Association of School Administrators in offering a series of two-day workshops for their membership. University personnel and practicing administrators worked together in both planning and conducting these workshop sessions. The format fits well with the needs of practicing professionals who are interested in short-term involvement with new ideas, and in interacting with people who have had first-hand experience with the subject under consideration.

If support of this more varied instructional format is to become a reality at the University of Washington, we must realign staff members away from conventional class formats for at least part of their teaching load, and find ways to remove current restrictions limiting graduate studies to the main campus locations. Some progress is being made in both fronts, but more will need to be made if we are to address the desires of professionals for a more portable program of study. Advanced educational television and computer technologies will no doubt aid in achieving this desired flexibility.

4. More Attention to Structured Internships

The dual thrust of greater work specialization and desire for real life experiences highlights the importance of internships as means of advanced professional development. For those persons desiring a career shift or change within education, the internship may be the only way to receive the type of specialized training needed. Even at the preservice level, the internship, if properly structured, provides useful opportunities for trying out concepts and skills addressed in course or seminar experiences on campus. Whether in teaching or administrative roles, the internship must be more than an opportunity to observe others. The opportunity for direct responsibilities must be carefully structured into the internship if it is to help the candidate prepare for a next career step. Such direct responsibility roles are also necessary in making reasoned judgments as to the candidate's readiness to assume that next career step.

Each of the adjustments as described above presents certain problems for the institution of higher education. Most have been resisted by those who are reluctant to give up the more traditional procedures and instructional formats. The involvement in non-credit workshops and district-specific training programs, in particular, have presented problems to the university, which so often gets its money based upon the generation of conventional student credit hours. The existence of "easy credit" course and/or credential programs operated by some institutions, both within and outside our State, has done nothing to reduce antagonism toward certain of the adjustments suggested in this paper. It is ironic that at the very time legislatures across the country are demanding greater accountability in delivery of common school programs they seem, on the whole, to be unconcerned about the quality of continuing education programs for educators.

Even within our own State of Washington, we need to more carefully design programs in ways which assure accomplishment of the competencies and skills as specified. All too often, we list and publish an elaborate set of competencies in precise terms and then proceed to certify students on the basis of attending a certain number of lecture or workshop sessions which provide minimal opportunity to practice the specified competencies.

At the inservice level, we have known to offer as credit experiences a mere discussion of topics of interest without any real guarantee of increased knowledge and skill on the part of participants. While I would be the first to admit that the informal sharing of experiences plays an important part in the continuing growth of practicing educators, such sharing should involve credit only in those situations where a definite evidence of growth in skill and/or knowledge can be demonstrated. Since much of this continuing education experience occurs at public expense or at least on public service time, to conduct training sessions without this kind of check for skill or knowledge gains is, in my judgement, a misuse of public funds.

The above caution about offering credits without some reasonable check on professional growth is not to be seen as placing a tight limit on domains in which the training can and should be offered. Quite the contrary, it seems reasonable to me (but not necessarily to the public generally) that those involved in training for administrative positions in the public schools should have the broadest training possible. Because school administrators are working in an area without an exacting technology, and because they must communicate effectively with a wide range of persons, their professional roles will likely be enhanced by understandings in a
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wide variety of disciplines other than teaching, counselling, and administration. The superintendent who has interests and training in poetry and philosophy may be just as effective in dealing with the emotions of a grievance or strike situation as one who is trained extensively in curriculum development or business management. That public funds should be used to support these broader intellectual experiences may be questioned by some; however, it is my opinion that if such experiences can be shown to increase knowledge and/or skill in an area giving additional depth to the professional role, it should be considered a legitimate part of our mission as a university involved in improving the operation of schools.

The thoughts presented in this paper are intended to give the reader some vision of adjustments being made to accommodate demands for continuing education by practicing educators. If these demands are not addressed in reasonable fashion by the colleges and universities, we are likely to see an entirely new set of institutions filling the gap. The funding just this year of a number of teacher centers is ample testimony to this possibility. Greater flexibility in instructional formats along with greater efforts to involve practitioners in both program development and delivery are minimal steps in the right direction. Most important of all is an attitude which recognizes the advanced maturity of our students and particularly those embarking on second and third career options. We must accept these people as resources in our workshops and classrooms and learn to use these resources in improving the performance of professionals working in all aspects of the educational enterprise. In this period of enrollment decline at the undergraduate level, the professional development or continuing education area represents a great opportunity for our colleges and universities. Society is clearly expecting more, rather than less, from higher education, and we must be prepared to accept this challenge.


Dr. Howard Johnson, Associate Professor of Education, University of Washington.

CONFLICT

by Jeff Keuss

As I was reading the recent issue of the March PHI DELTA KAPPAN magazine recently, I was concerned as I noticed the editorial tone of two articles in that issue. The articles were entitled "The Teacher: An Endangered Species" and "A Teacher Calls It Quits." Both articles seem to have notes of despair and such words popped out of the printed page as, "...underworked, overpaid, money-grabbing public school teachers...," and so I felt that a positive response was due.

Three quarters of a century ago, Alfred North Whitehead wrote in his Aims of Education, "When one considers in its length and in its breadth the importance of...the education of the nation's young, the broken lives, the defeated hopes, the national failures, which result from the frivolous inertia with which it is treated, it is difficult to restrain within oneself a savage rage."

You and I must never lose that sense of rage. Whatever is good in our educational system--and there is much that is--it is not good enough. In the language of a few years ago, too frequently we have let everything "hang out." This is a formula for misery and chaos. No lasting satisfactions in life come without discipline, without application, without moral standards, without hard work. When we make school easy, when we turn it into an entertainment center, with endless options, we distort the very meaning of education and earn our kids' contempt in the process.

For the sake of the future quality of life of your youngsters, for the future health of our society, let's run tighter ships. This does not mean a return to the three R's as the sole concern of education. It does mean higher standards in everything we teach and respect. The only people I look back upon with elemental love and reverence are those who made me apply myself - who told me the truth when I wrote badly, or figured improperly, or analyzed sloppily.

I leave you with a true story of an illiterate young woman from Mississippi who was being taught by a battle-axe-type social worker in Syracuse, New York a few years ago. A friend of mine, who is a sociologist, watched a segment of the tutorial. The social worker, "Write an "A"! The woman struggled and struggled and handed over the paper with the barely recognizable letter on it.

"Terrible!" The old battle axe said, "Do it again!"

Poor woman tried again. This painful episode was repeated four or five times. The sensitive sociologist winced every time the social worker yelled "Do it again!"

When the tutorial was over, the young woman came up to the sociologist pointing at the tutor, said, "That's the best friend I have. She make me do it all myself!"

The teacher's tone of voice may have been unnecessarily impervious, but the demands she made of her pupil were informed by what Lionel Trilling once called the "most loving of all relationships" -- the act of helping another human being to learn.

Jeff Keuss is Administrative Assistant, ESD 121, Seattle
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