Chapter 8

The Teacher Development Program

After experience and seeing the results of the traditional education programs I felt that there must be a better way. After visiting many schools and reading all the research on successful education programs I began to understand the problem. This coupled with my experiences with teachers as a principal and a trainer of teachers I began to conceptualize a different approach to education. It wasn't anything completely new as it was taking things that good teachers and schools had done and molding them into a program. The program had to be flexible enough to adjust to any learner and at the same time insure their success as far as their ability would take them. Such a program would prevent any student who was able to finish school without the ability to read and have a basic ability to do simple math and other fundamental skills. Another advantage would be that it would be ideal for schools that had many seasonal students, migrant workers, high student transfers and conducting year round programs. In such program it would encourage the use of all of the new technology, programs and instructional strategies that have been developed. In terms of subject content today the student has the world in his hands. With the computer and ipads students have almost unlimited ability to view any part of the world and know what is taking place. To take full advantage of this wonderful technology a person has to have some basic skills such as reading.

A concept may be good but unless it can be made operational it is of little value. So my problem was how to develop such a program. Relying on my clinical and administrative experience I came up with a model. The next step was to determine what was needed to make it work. Immediately I realized that there were two major obstacles, most teachers lacked the diagnostic skills and knowledge and the schools were not geared for and did not allow the freedom for such a program. It just happened that the US Office of Education was interested in programs to retrain teachers. I contacted them about my ideas for such program and they agreed to finance its development and implementation. With the aid many professionals and laymen I was able to get permission and cooperation from the university, local and state organizations. The task facing us was developing a program, training personnel and implementing it. It was a monumental task but with the help of many others and the cooperation of the various educational agencies we came up with a program. Next we had to determine if it could be incorporated into a traditional school with normal class loads. Also we wanted to know if it was economical feasible and how the achievement of the students compared with those in traditional classes.

The results of three years of the program's operation in fourteen districts and 79 schools the evidence indicated that the program could be incorporated into any education agency, that teachers had no trouble with it with a normal class load, that it was economically feasible and the students achieved significantly better than those in traditional classes. Unfortunately I think the program was ahead of time as most people saw little need for change. However, in
the thirty years since the program was developed there have been changes. There are instruments, technology, program aides that would increase the operation of this type of

program exponentially. The following information describes how the program was developed, operated and evaluated.   In the following chapters a description of two different programs where instructors from the Teacher Development were used show the versatility and the effectiveness of the Strong Instructional Model and techniques developed in the Teacher Development Program.

Teacher Development Program

In 1970 a group of local school administrators and university personnel determined through a needs assessment that a program was needed to up-grade the skills and change the attitudes of a large percent of classroom teachers and school administrators. Unless this could be done many children, especially those from low socio-economic and different ethnic and racial backgrounds, would have difficulty receiving the kind of education they needed. The problem in the South was further complicated because of a mandated desegregation of the schools. There was a need, along with the interest and desire, to correct the situation. Strong was asked to come up with a plan of action to develop and implement it.

After many meetings with local school administrators, teachers, university personnel, state officials and community leaders a plan of action was devised. Realizing that only a limited number of personnel could be trained, two acceptable approaches were identified. One approach was to select a number of teachers who were in danger of losing their job because of desegregation and the lack of necessary skills to meet the new situation. A second approach, the main thrust of the program, was to select teams of teachers from schools and school districts and train them to be resource persons to be used in Teacher Learning Centers to train other teachers in their schools and districts. (See Chart 1 in appendix) This would increase a hundred-fold the results of the time and money expended in the initial program.
The people in the community and the education institutions would develop a plan of action. It was recommended that it be competency based and that
persons could earn college credit and a degree if they desired. Credits earned in the Program would be equated required traditional classes.
        Dr. Strong was given the task structuring the program and working with local schools, university personnel and state officials to get approval to implement the program. Because it was radical departure from the traditional program it took over a year to get all parties to approve the program so that it could be developed. Approval was obtained and fortunately the US Office of Education agreed to fund the program under the Education Professions Development Act.

0VERVIEW
The program began in the summer of 1970 and ended in August 1973. The Program involved: a 116 classroom teachers and 170 school administrators
and 79 schools from 15 independent school districts along with a number of community people.
During the one and half years that each group of teachers was in the Program they had experiences that were specially designed to:

(1) meet their particular academic and professional needs,

(2) provide them with the background in reading and language development necessary to qualify as specialists in these areas,

(3) help them meet the objectives established by schools, state and community people,

(4) provide them with the diagnostic skills necessary to diagnose student's achievement and problems so they can prescribe the most effective strategy for the student.

(5) provide them with human interaction skills necessary to work effectively with all kinds of people,

(6) get them to re-conceptualize their role as teachers.

Several hundred interested individuals from the universities, the public schools, the government and business and community developed a list of needs and objectives for teachers and schools. See Table X in the appendix for the list of skills teachers need, basic weaknesses teachers exhibit, and what they would like the Program to do for teachers. The following data were obtained through a series of mini-institutes, workshops, conferences. It was important to include people from education, the government, and the communities.

With the cooperation of universities, US Office of Education, school districts, state officials and community groups a wide range of experiences; resources and expertise was available to the Program and participants. The first step in implementing the Program was to assemble an instructional team. Since the team wasn't limited to any set pattern, persons selected had to have the specialized expertise needed and be flexible enough to work in a unique situation. The team was composed of a core of experts in reading and language development, early childhood education, creative and child psychology and elementary education. In addition to the core personnel experts from any field needed were made available. This was extremely important. Regardless of what the learning objective or need was: qualified persons could be obtained from business, community, schools, universities or any other source. Team and participant interaction was determined by the objective and tasks to be achieved. The team normally considered eight hours as a working day. The schedule was always flexible so it could adjust to the particular condition or objective. The program was designed to last one and a half years.

The first part would be during the summer with intensive training of the participants. The second part would involve participants in their schools and classrooms where participants would use the Strong Instructional Model. In addition, the participants would be involved with classes, workshops and seminars. Whatever, a participant or the team felt they needed the program provided it.

Phase one of the Programs was obtaining and training the core team. It was critical that each team member selected understands the program's objectives and the operational model.

Each member must feel that they can accept and follow the procedure shown on Strong's instructional model.   Charts 4 and 5 illustrate the

Phase two of the program involved participant training in diagnostic-prescriptive techniques they could use working with children. The first 6 weeks of summer the participants spent most of the day learning and practicing these skills. They had to be

to demonstrate to the instructor that their performance level met the professional standard required for certification. The second 6 weeks of summer involved continued training and the use of their skills and knowledge with actual children. With cooperation of an inner city school the program offered a limited summer school program. Each participant was given a group of children of various ages and grades so they could have the experience diagnosing individual needs of students with various levels of academic achievement. Then they would have to develop a program they believed would help the student achieve the stated objective. During this process the Instruction Team would monitor and assist the participants.

Phase three of the program was using the learning model in a regular classroom.
In this phase the teachers returned to their school. There they would work with normal class load of students. Instead of the school's curriculum the teacher had the freedom to determine what skills and knowledge each student needed. Using the skills and techniques she had learned enabled her to determine the skill level and needs of each student. Knowing the functioning level of a student would help the teacher to select a strategy and materials that would most likely enable the student to achieve the objective and at the level of competency required.

The teachers were given a list of skills and knowledge that the students were to learn. The skills in each subject were on a continuum ranging from simple to complex. This made it possible to determine the student's skill level in each area and keep a record of the student's progress. Knowing the functioning level of a student would enable the teacher to know what objective and strategy would be most appropriate.

Notice the skills are on a continuum where they are listed as vertical and horizontal skills. Vertical skills range from easy to difficult with each skill dependent on the mastery of the preceding skill. The skill continuum is open ended so
those students may progress as far as their ability will take them. Student can work with materials and problems at that level or any below that level of difficulty.

Phase three of the program was important as it determined whether this type of program would work in classes in a normal school and with a normal class load. Other factors that had to be determined were:
1. Was the program economical feasible?
2. Would the teachers have the necessary resources?
3. How would the students and parent react?
4. How would it affect student achievement?
5. How would teachers cope with the new program?

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM
The following agreements were agreed on by state, university and local education bodies.
1. Participants in the university could attain credit through the Teacher Development Program. They did this by achieving the required level of competence required for the academic courses.
2. Participants working towards a degree were required to take and pass all examinations the university required.
.
3. Participants in the local schools were given the freedom to determine the

learning objective, the strategy, materials and time needed for each student.
4. Participants would keep accurate records of what they did and the results.
5. School officials would provide the teacher with any resources that were available in the district.
6. The Teacher Development instructional team had the freedom to work with the teachers who were participating in the Program.
7. The Teacher Development Program would provide the participating teachers with any materials or help they wanted and that were not available in the district.

After the agreements were signed a proposal was made to US Office of Education to fund and support the program. Approval and funding was obtained and the program was started.

Step one was selecting an instructional team. Since the program was unique it required persons who were s flexible creative and had the necessary skills and knowledge. It was decided that the core instruction team would consist of specialists in reading and language arts, childhood development, elementary education and a psychologist who had testing and creativity skills and knowledge...

This team would be supplemented by experts and specialists from any subject or field needed. These individuals could come from industry, the community, the government, education agencies or any other source. A national search was conducted to find personnel that fit the requirements of the program. After the team was selected the objectives improving of the program were finalized.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES
A. General Purpose and Objectives
The primary objective of the program was to develop a program to help instructors develop skills which would enable them be more effective in helping students improve their achievement.

Other objectives were to explore and test new strategies for education at the university and elementary school levels. Analysis of the educational structure and instructional practices indicated the greatest needs that were within the scope of the Teacher Development Program were selected. Teachers, supervisors, principals, superintendents, school board members and university professors, business and community leaders were invited to participate in a workshop to develop goals and objectives to improve teachers and education. Lunch and a stipend were given to the participants as they spent most a day working on the project. Since there were over a hundred people in the workshop they were divided into small groups so they could brain storm and discuss the subject. The groups presented their lists to the total body which finally came up with three lists of objectives for the program. They ranked the items on a scale of 1 to 10 with least important to most important. List one was Specific Skills that Teachers Need. List two was Basic Weakness that Teachers Exhibit. List three was Things I Would Like to See the Teacher Development Program do for Teachers. Using the Delphi technique these recommendations were sent to school principals and P.T.A presidents. They were asked to distribute them to their members for their recommendations and evaluation. The response was not very good, but persons responding tended to agree with the recommendations and ranking.

The following factors were selected as being the most critical: the reconceptualization of the role of a teacher; the individualization of instruction; a better understanding and working relationship between teachers, students, and adults of different ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds; and the reorganization of universities' teacher education programs.

B Primary Objectives of the Program Were:
1. To develop teachers who had the knowledge and skills to do educational diagnosis - especially in the area of reading
2. To help teachers develop the breadth and depth of knowledge of content, skills, materials and instructional programs which they would need to formulate a program to meet the student's academic needs. These needs would be determined by diagnostic evaluation of the student's academic achievement.
3. To help teachers develop human interaction and communication skills that is necessary to work effectively with students, colleagues, and parents.
4. To facilitate inter-cultural and racial understandings and working relationships.
5. To help teachers understand individualized instruction process and use it with classes that has large numbers of students of different ethnic and socio-economic groups.
6. To develop resource persons for schools and districts to use in their in-service education and teacher learning center;
7. To help teachers who had been displaced or were likely to be displaced because of desegregation so they may be competitive for a teaching position or eligible for a new position.
8. To expand the teacher education program with other education agencies and L.E.A.'s.
9. To make it possible for those teachers who want to earn a Master of Education.
C. Specific Objectives
1. The program was designed to improve the teacher's:
a. knowledge in content areas
b. skills in these content areas
c. teaching proficiency in these areas
d. ability to use the diagnostic and prescriptive method of teaching
e. knowledge and understanding of self-concept and its effect upon the learner or individual
f. understanding of the black culture and other cultures in this region
g. knowledge of materials available to use with other cultural groups and where to find such material
h. ability to analyze and use teaching techniques (example – interaction analysis and micro teaching)
i. ability to work with adults of different races and socio-economic backgrounds
j. ability to work in team situations
k. ability to organize and direct in-service programs for other teachers
l. use of new educational program techniques and media
m. ability to serve as an instructional leader

n. knowledge of and use of research and experimentation in their programs
o. skill in the use of diagnostic instruments for individual and group analysis
2. To work with other education agencies such as departments and schools at T.S.U and other universities, as well as local schools to improve teacher education.
3. To develop a competency based education program for colleges and universities'.
4. To get teachers to re-conceptualize their attitude and role. Teachers were encouraged to see themselves as facilitators of learning.
5. To get teachers to recognize that each learner is an individual with his own needs and rate of development and growth.
6. To improve learning opportunities by individualizing instructions for all children.
7. To enable teachers to work effectively with different racial, cultural or socioeconomic groups in:
a. understanding their cultural or social background
b. knowing how to work with these groups
c. accepting differences
The Teacher Development Program was officially terminated in 1973 but
the Director of the Program continued to work with the participants pursuing a degree. He also served as a consultant for school systems wanting to implement an objective diagnostic prescriptive education program.
Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Evaluation of the Program
General Findings and Conclusions
A careful study and analysis of the basic research data from the program appears
to warrant the following findings and conclusions about the education programs in public schools and in institutions of higher learning. It is not intended to say these findings or conclusions will apply to all teachers or school systems. The findings and conclusions of this program were based upon a large and fairly representative sample of teachers and schools. There were fourteen independent public school districts and nearly a half million students involved in the program. The racial composition of the schools ranged from an almost all black, all white, or all Mexican American to almost every possible mixture of these groups. (See Tables I and II in Appendix) In addition these schools represented every possible socioeconomic level, from low inner city to rich suburban areas. (See Figures 1, 2 and 3 in Appendix) The study also included different types of schools such as inner city, suburban, rural, and small town schools (See Chart 2.)
The composition of teachers in the program reflected the racial composition of most school's teaching staffs. The ratios are not the same as would normally be found since the program worked with teachers who for the most part taught educationally or culturally deprived students. Therefore, the program had a higher percent of black teachers. It is important to remember the primary purpose of the program was development not research, even though the research turned out to be an important by-product.
The racial composition of the Teacher Development participants was 61 percent black, 38 percent white, and 1 percent Mexican American. Today the percent of Mexican American teacher most likely would be higher. (See Figures 4, 5 and 6 in Appendix.) Both male and female teachers were included in the program (See Figure 5 in Appendix B). The majority of these teachers taught in elementary grades although there were a

few who taught in junior high and senior high schools. The teachers' ages ranged from twenty years to fifty years. (See Figure 7 in Appendix.)

As the data shows, the base upon which the following findings and conclusions evolved was large and comprehensive in terms of professional education.

(1) The average teacher lacks the skills to accurately diagnose individual learning patterns, problems or progress.

(2) The average professional educator is very reluctant to admit they don't know something. (College and public school.)

(3) Teachers complain about their role and the system, but are basically satisfied with it.

(4) Educators, in general, will change only when forced to change.

(5) Most in-service skill development programs for teachers are a waste of time. Teachers usually learn little from short sessions and when they do they seldom use the learning unless the system is altered to encourage and reward them to use it.

(6) The re-conceptualization of the role of the educator is necessary to effectuate change in their instructional behavior.

(7) Teachers, when allowed the freedom to determine objectives, methods, and materials and are held accountable for their decisions will produce a better learning situation and their students will show higher achievement results. (See Tables III through VIII.)

(8) Teachers learned the skills necessary on how to the modify behavior of student s in the affective and cognitive areas.

(9) The participants achieved most of the basic objectives of the Teacher Development Program.

(10) Results indicated this approach to education, both at the higher education and public levels, is more effective than programs now in use.

(11) Administrators associated with the Teacher Development Program liked it. (See Table IX in Appendix)

(12) Administrators felt that the Program was effective in improving interracial relations. (See Table IX in Appendix)

(13) Administrators felt that the program prepared the teacher to work with and develop individualized instructional programs. (See Table IX, Appendix)

(14) Teachers can be taught to be more fluent, flexible and original in their thinking and problem solving. (See Chart 2 in Appendix)

(15) Teacher education programs can be competency based and not confined to traditional courses and programs.

(16) Direct involvement with children is necessary for the most effective results. (In fact, it is questionable whether any real change will take place if this involvement does not occur.)

(17) The school administrators are the key persons to make a program work. Without their cooperation and their support no program or change can be successful over an extended period of time.

(18) Most school systems and administrators are not ready or prepared to alter the basic structure of their operation or system in order to allow teachers the freedom and support they must have to improve education for all learners.

(19) School administrators and teachers must re-conceptualize their role from being a

dispenser of knowledge to that of a facilitator of learning.

(20) Most, but not all, teachers can be effective in an individualized instructional program.

(21) Teachers can be changed in both cognitive and affective areas with the right kind of a program.

(22) The Teacher Development Program model provides a feasible (in terms of cost and resources) teacher education program for training in-service teachers. Although, it has not been tested at the pre-teacher training level it should be equally effective at this level.

(23) External evaluations rated the Teacher Development Program high in terms of program success and as an exemplary model. (See "Excerpts from evaluation report by Human Affairs Research Incorporate, 1972, Appendix)

(24) Teachers can become more creative if they are given the right training and environment.

Data-Collection Procedures and Instruments Used

Data used, or referred to, in this study were collected by observation, questionnaires, rating forms, standardized and specially designed tests and interviews. Pupil achievement data were obtained by the use of a control and experimental matched group design. Students were matched according to the following factors: age, socioeconomic level, intelligence quotient, and pre-reading (standardized) test scores. Comparisons were made on the basis of post reading scores.

The attitudinal changes in teachers were determined by (1) observations and ratings by the Teacher Development staff; (2) ratings by school administrators and (3) ratings of self by teachers. The affective thinking and action changes of teachers was measured by) observations and ratings by the Teacher Development staff and (2) Torrance's Test of Creativity in areas of fluency, flexibility and originality. The teachers' change in skill development was measured by pre and post test on specific skills or cognitive elements.

Skill utilization was determined by classroom visitation and observation.

The school administrators' attitude toward the program and their evaluation of the program were obtained through (1) an evaluation questionnaires, (2) interviews, and (3) observations and discussion in a series of mini-institutes.

The feasibility of the program in the public school system was determined by having the teachers work in a regular classroom with a normal complement of pupils. Careful observation of actions, procedures, and types of material needed and supplied were recorded.

One year after teacher had left the program the attitudes and feelings toward the program was measured by the use of questionnaires and interviews.

The following data is based upon a random sample of 39 teachers who completed the Teacher Development Program and who have worked in same school district a year or more after completing the program.

1. Number of teachers in same position: 18 (45%)
2. Number of teachers moved into a new position: 21 (54%)
3. Type of position now held in the school district:

Position Number
General Teacher 17

Reading Specialist 12
Principal or Assistant Principal 3
Resource Facilitator 4
Director Special Education 1
Diagnostician 1
Community College Instructor l
Total 39
4. Do you feel the school district is making use of your
specialized training? YES 18 (46%) NO 21(54%)
5. Major problems that the Teacher Development Teachers
perceive as obstacles preventing the development of
individualized instructional programs within their school
or district.
Problems and Number of Teachers
Lack of understanding of the process and needs
by the **Administration** 30
Teachers' attitude 10
Lack of support and help 7
Too much conformity and too many guidelines 6
Too many inadequately trained staff personnel
Directing activities 5
No problems 2
Indifference 1
Refusal to use trained personnel 1
In addition to our local evaluation the US Office of Education employed an out of state
firm, HUMAN AFFAIRS RESEARCH INC. to evaluate the Teacher Development
10
Program. The following are excerpts from the Human Affairs Research, Inc.'s
evaluation report they submitted to the US Office of Education.
The Teacher Development Program's approach is "important since it
means that teachers are not expected to complete their training in
one calendar year. Indeed, since the program is highly
individualized in its approach, participants have maximum opportunity
to succeed.
Rather than having the usual success/failure system, the Institute
permits teacher-participants either the grade of "B" or
"Incomplete". Those who do not work on an acceptable level continue
to work on the material until they reach an appropriate level of
proficiency and then go on to more advanced work.
If the system is successful, it may prove to be a model not only
for poverty programs but for graduate work. A serious problem, of
course, is that some teachers may enroll in an Institute who lack
the qualities necessary to succeed academically and the 15-month
Institute program may not allow enough time to correct these
deficiencies.
There is evidence that the project has had an impact on the existing
teacher training program at Texas Southern University. The Dean of

the School of Education stated that, as a result of the project, the school is committed to developing competency -based programs in all aspects of teacher training. Furthermore, the involvement of the project with the Houston Public Schools and adjacent school districts has led the Dean to revise the student teaching program, so that larger numbers of faculty members are involved in supervision. The teamwork approach of the staff in relation to the development and implementation of the project is exemplary. The project director is a model agent of change with unusual enthusiasm, drive and commitment, whose modus operandi has been emulated by the entire, staff.
Recommendations: There are no recommendations which would serve to significantly improve this project. It should be noted herein."

How to implement The Teacher Development Program

The following plan of action is to be used in implementing the Teacher Development Program in an elementary school. However with some modifications the plan could be used with any group. It is advisable that the school district or education agency work with a university to develop the training team if the university will allow the team to operate as the Texas Southern Universities did with the Teacher Development Program. If the university will not nor cannot then the school district or agency should create its own training team. In the beginning the district should try to get the best people in the country who are specialist in the required area. (See Step 5 Team makeup}

Step 1. Select a school or education system in which the central and local administration is willing to support and participate fully in the program.

Step 2. Meet with parents and community groups to explain the program and secure their support.

Step 3. Select or develop a prototype school, preferable in an urban area or a large school district:

A. The school should include grades 1 through 6, but may include 7 and 8. Techniques effective at this level will also be effective at higher levels.

B. All teaching positions are open and teachers or instructional personnel must apply and be selected for these positions.

C. School should have a diverse student population, but it isn't mandatory.

D. Select a building that will permit the maximum freedom of movement.

E. Classrooms should be self-contained or with team oriented groups so that the teacher can control the instructional time for an individual.

Step 4. Select instructional personnel

A. All administrative and teaching positions are open.

B. Qualifications and commitments for full time instructional positions

1. Be a certified if it is a legal requirement for the position. (Ancillary personnel with the needed skills or knowledge can and should be used when needed).

2. Agree to the requirements and conditions of the Program.

3. Have a good academic background.

4. Have a record of success in the past.

5. Have an open mind.

6. Have a good attitude.

7. Be flexible and willing to change.

8. Be able to work independently and with a team.

9. Agree to participate in summer training program and all workshops and in-service education programs during the year.

10. Select at least 2 persons who are fluent in English and Spanish.

C. If possible, select a multi-racial and a multi-lingual staff.

D. Qualifications for administrative personnel.

1. Be certified for the position if it is a legal requirement for the position.

2. Meet the same basic requirements (Step 2B-1-9) as instructional personnel.

3. Be able to work with people.

E. Selection process (For schools}

1. Program Director and superintendent will select the administrative staff.

2. Program Director and principal, along with any persons they select, will select instructional and ancillary personnel.

3. Positions will be advertised and be filled by local personnel, if there are enough qualified personnel, according to the Program's guidelines.

F. The basic contract will be for one calendar year.

G. Salaries will be negotiated.

Step 5. Personnel training and development program.

A. Program participants, teachers and administrators must agree to attend and successfully complete a summer training program.

1. Program participants will be full time personnel and will agree to work as many hours as necessary to complete the requirements of the Program.

2. Program participants will agree to work at any assigned task and/or place assigned.

3. All educational expenses for the training will be paid by the participant's school district or education agency.

B. Program training personnel will be composed of:

1. Program Director, individual responsible for all phases of the training program and program personnel.

2. Basic instructional team which will consist of:

   a. Program director

   b. A reading specialist and if desired a math specialist.

   c. Child development
   d. A psychologist (with expertise in testing and creative thinking).

   d. A curriculum and instructional specialist. (with research knowledge and skills),

   e. Specialized ancillary personnel as needed.

C. Program

   Phase 1.

   1. Review, introduction, and mastery of:

      a. Learning theory and practice

      b. Testing theory, development and techniques

      c. Diagnostic procedures and record keeping

      d. Instructional strategies and programs

      e. Instructional materials, equipment, and technology

      f. Curriculum development

      g. Evaluation techniques

      h. Basic and applied research techniques

i. Managerial and human relations skills

Phase 2.

I. Training of personnel and application of an objective diagnostic -prescriptive educational program.

a. A six weeks summer school will be implemented and operated by the Program's participants who will attend seminars half of the day and work with children the other half.

b. A participant will work with six to ten students of varying grade levels, grades 1 through 8.

c. Participants will determine the academic functioning level of each student in the areas of reading and math using learned diagnostic procedures.

d. Participants will determine specific skill or knowledge the student needs to increase his skill or knowledge in a subject.

e. Participants will develop a program for the student which will enable the student to master the given objective.

f. Participants will evaluate the student's achievement of the objective. If successful, a new objective will be selected and the process is

repeated. If the student is unsuccessful the teacher will select another strategy for the student. This process will continue until the student masters the objective or it is determined that a less difficult objective needed. (See Strong's Instructional Model)

g. Participants will be supervised and assisted in all operations by the Program's Instructional Team.

h. Daily seminars will be conducted with the participants to help them assess their performance and to assist them in their task by introducing new programs, materials and strategies.

Step 6. Implementing the Program into a traditional school.

A. Participants in the prototype school will be assigned a class of students and they will begin the education year utilizing Strong's Model. The program's professional staff will supervise and assist the participants in all aspects of the educational operations during school year.

B. Participants will decide what a student needs and will be responsible for the student's

progress.

C. Teachers will determine the functioning level of achievement for each student in the subjects they teach. A profile of the student's achievement will be made and distributed to the student; other teachers that works with the student and to the parents.

D. The teacher will determine what objective the student needs to learn and will decide the course of action which is best to facilitate the student's mastery of the objective.

E. Basic academic objectives will be those objectives for which the school has adopted and assumed responsibility. These objectives will be listed on a continuum from simple to complex. They should constitute approximately twenty to thirty percent of the education program. Teachers and students must have the freedom to develop other objectives to achieve the goals adopted by the school. Each teacher, kindergarten through high school, will have a copy of all the objectives in every subject required by the school. These objectives will be available to students, parents and other interested parties.

F. Teachers will maintain up to date files on each individual. These files will show: the functioning level of the student in each subject, and what objective he is working on and the strategies and materials the teacher has prescribed. Also, included will be the results of the effectiveness of the strategy in helping the student to achieve his objective.

I. Teachers will be encouraged to use: teaching assistants -peer students, upper grade students, teacher- aids, student-teachers, parents and persons from the community.

2. Technology - computers, A.V. equipment, television, etc.

3. Wide range of educational programs, materials, books, techniques and self developed programs.

4. Innovative approaches.

5. Resources available from the school, district, universities and governmental agencies and the community.

J. The district will provide the prototype school's personnel with:

1. Needed instructional materials and equipment.

2. Research information requested.

3. Resource personnel and training requested.

4. Up- to date information on new programs, learning materials and techniques.

Step 7. Implementing the Program into the system

A. Select 3 to 5 persons from the initial program who have demonstrated leadership qualities, understanding of the Program and who are able to work successfully with the Program.

B. Assign these persons as trainers, working with the program's instructional team, to train the teachers in the 3 to 6 new schools that will implement the program the second year. Using the multiplier approach, even large districts can implement this type of program in all of its schools with well trained personnel in a few years.

It is important that every step of the stratagem be followed as attitudes and concepts as well as skills must be developed. In the experimental study it took almost a year for the teachers to master the skills and fully accept the new approach. This is not surprising, considering that most of the teachers and principals had to re-conceptualize their concepts of teaching and administration.

It is desirable that the prototype school be continued and used as a vanguard school for developing and testing new ideas and concepts. If the stratagem is followed the diagnostic-prescriptive program should be self-sustaining.

This model illustrates how thorough the interaction of these various group most critical objectives is determined for the schools. It also illustrates the procedure that instructors would follow. Using the experiences, data, and strategies learned from the Teacher Development Program a new program was developed. It is called the Objective, Diagnostic, Prescriptive Education Program. It is based on the Strong's model which is illustrated below.