1976

An Investigation of Competencies Needed by Teachers of the Mildly Handicapped as Perceived by a Consortium of Iowa Special Educators

Harriet M. Healy
University of Northern Iowa

AN INVESTIGATION OF COMPETENCIES NEEDED BY TEACHERS OF THE MILDLY HANDICAPPED AS PERCEIVED BY A CONSORTIUM OF IOWA SPECIAL EDUCATORS

An Abstract of a Thesis

Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

by

Harriet M. Healy

July 1976

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF COMPETENCIES NEEDED
BY TEACHERS OF THE MILDLY HANDICAPPED AS PERCEIVED
BY A CONSORTIUM OF IOWA SPECIAL EDUCATORS

by

Harriet M. Healy

A major purpose of this study was to subject the University of Northern Iowa's special education competencies to a consortium rating for determination of the relative importance of each competency for teachers of the mildly handicapped. A secondary purpose of this study was to determine the generic nature of these competencies.

The subjects involved in the study included Iowa special education teacher trainers; Area Education Agency directors and consultants for multi-disability programs; and special education teachers in multi-disability settings.

A questionnaire employing a forced ranking procedure was mailed to each subject. The results of the ranking were used to determine the mean of each competency and to identify the top one-third in the ranking. A Chi-square goodness of fit test was used to determine the agreement, across the consortium, on the relative importance of the competencies. The generic applicability of the competencies was determined by Chi-square goodness of fit tests applied to teacher raters across instructional settings and functional levels of children taught.

The top one-third (11) of the competencies from the mean ranking (highest mean first) were: (1) individualize materials, (b) match

materials and equipment to short term goals, (c) employ a variety of remedial techniques, (d) sequence tasks, (e) administer standardized and teacher made tests, (f) communicate with parents regarding pupil needs, (g) identify strong and weak learning modes, (h) provide success experiences for pupils, (i) select and design evaluation systems, (j) communicate pupil needs to other professionals, and (k) implement an instructional management system to coordinate curricular, motivational and evaluation systems.

There was agreement across the consortium on seven of the competencies in the top one-third. After analysis by Chi-square, the four competencies rejected at the .05 level of significance were: (a) provide objectives to meet short terms goals, (b) identify strong and weak learning modes, (c) provide success experiences for pupils, and (d) communicate pupil needs to other professionals. Teachers appeared to perceive these competencies more important than did teacher trainers. There also appeared to be more agreement between teachers and AEA personnel than between these various public school personnel and teacher trainers.

A Chi-square goodness of fit test across instructional settings of teacher raters revealed agreement on 30 of the 33 competencies (rejection level .05). A Chi-square goodness of fit test across functioning level of children taught indicated agreement on 29 of the 33 competencies (rejection level .05).

In conclusion, the respondents ranked a variety of teacher skills as important yet showed a tendency to consider instruction (curricular) skills as most important. The disagreement, across the consortium, on the relative importance of competencies appeared to be largely between

teachers and teacher trainers. The majority of the competencies appear to be generic across instructional settings and functioning level of children taught.

AN INVESTIGATION OF COMPETENCIES NEEDED BY TEACHERS OF THE MILDLY HANDICAPPED AS PERCEIVED BY A CONSORTIUM OF IOWA SPECIAL EDUCATORS

A Thesis

Submitted

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

by

Harriet M. Healy

July 1976

This Study by: Harriet M. Healy

Entitled: AN INVESTIGATION OF COMPETENCIES NEEDED BY TEACHERS OF THE MILDLY HANDICAPPED AS PERCEIVED BY A CONSORTIUM OF IOWA SPECIAL EDUCATORS

has been approved as meeting the thesis requirement for the Degree of Specialist in Education.

Lee Courtnage

7-22-76
Date

Chairman, Thesis Committee

Norman L. McCumsey

7/22/76
Date

Member, Thesis Committee

Susan Stainback

7/22/76
Date

Member, Thesis Committee

Upon recommendation of the Thesis Committee, accepted by

H. Ray Hoops

Dean of the Graduate College

July 30, 1976
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to my committee, Dr. Lee Courtnage, Dr. Susan Stainback, and Dr. Norman McCumsey. Their contributions and encouragement were invaluable to the completion of this thesis.

I also wish to thank my typist, Mrs. William Peterson and especially my family for their constant support and patience.

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF COMPETENCIES NEEDED
BY TEACHERS OF THE MILDLY HANDICAPPED AS PERCEIVED
BY A CONSORTIUM OF IOWA SPECIAL EDUCATORS

by

Harriet M. Healy

A major purpose of this study was to subject the University of Northern Iowa's special education competencies to a consortium rating for determination of the relative importance of each competency for teachers of the mildly handicapped. A secondary purpose of this study was to determine the generic nature of these competencies.

The subjects involved in the study included Iowa special education teacher trainers; Area Education Agency directors and consultants for multi-disability programs; and special education teachers in multi-disability settings.

A questionnaire employing a forced ranking procedure was mailed to each subject. The results of the ranking were used to determine the mean of each competency and to identify the top one-third in the ranking. A Chi-square goodness of fit test was used to determine the agreement across the consortium, on the relative importance of the competencies. The generic applicability of the competencies was determined by Chi-square goodness of fit tests applied to teacher raters across instructional settings and functional levels of children taught.

The top one-third (11) of the competencies from the mean ranking (highest mean first) were: (a) individualize materials, (b) match materials and equipment to short term goals, (c) employ a variety of remedial techniques, (d) sequence tasks, (e) administer standardized and teacher made tests, (f) communicate with parents regarding pupil needs, (g) identify strong and weak learning modes, (h) provide success exper-

iences for pupils, (i) select and design evaluation systems, (j) communicate pupil needs to other professionals, and (k) implement an instructional management system to coordinate curricular, motivational and evaluation systems.

There was agreement across the consortium on seven of the competencies in the top one-third. After analysis by Chi-square, the four competencies rejected at the .05 level of significance were: (a) provide objectives to meet short term goals, (b) identify strong and weak learning modes, (c) provide success experiences for pupils, and (d) communicate pupil needs to other professionals. Teachers appeared to perceive these competencies more important than did teacher trainers. There also appeared to be more agreement between teachers and AEA personnel than between these various public school personnel and teacher trainers.

A Chi-square goodness of fit test across instructional settings of teacher raters revealed agreement on 30 of the 33 competencies (rejection level .05). A Chi-square goodness of fit test across functioning level of children taught indicated agreement on 29 of the 33 competencies (rejection level .05).

In conclusion, the respondents ranked a variety of teacher skills as important yet showed a tendency to consider instruction (curricular) skills as most important. The disagreement, across the consortium, on the relative importance of competencies appeared to be largely between teachers and teacher trainers. The majority of the competencies appear to be generic across instructional settings and functioning level of children taught.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

LIST OF APPENDICES

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The issue of categorization (labeling) of mildly handicapped school age children traditionally considered to be educable mentally retarded (EMR), emotionally disturbed (ED), and learning disabled (LD), is of concern to many special educators. The efficacy of special class placement for these handicapped children has been seriously challenged by special educators because it fosters categorization and has not proven to result in significant growth in student achievement.

Studies indicate that the mildly handicapped, placed in regular classes, tend to achieve as well or surpass those placed in special classes (Dunn, 1968; Goldstein, Moss & Jordan, 1965; Johnson, 1962; Lilly, 1970). Consequently, the placement of mildly handicapped children in special classes and the subsequent labeling may result in irreparable damage. Goffman (1963) expresses concern that the handicapped individual, so labeled, will begin to perceive himself in the negative terms implied by the label. Labeling may also cause negative teacher attitudes. These attitudes may affect teacher behavior toward the child to such a degree that they foster rather than minimize the handicapping condition (Combs & Harper, 1967).

There is a nationwide movement to provide equal educational opportunities to all handicapped persons. Court-ordered remedial solutions

include holding the educational systems accountable for eliminating exclusion policies and practicing unjustified categorization or labeling of children. Some court decisions are meant to insure that the handicapped have access to appropriate programming. The implications of these decisions are that both quantity and quality of public school programming for the handicapped should be improved (Turnbull, 1975).

These attempts to be accountable for providing appropriate programming for the mildly handicapped have frequently led to public school adoption of mainstreaming policies as advocated by Dunn (1963) and Reger (Note 1). In 1974 the Iowa Department of Public Instruction (Note 2) issued a policy statement on mainstreaming; it expresses concern regarding generalized over-reaction to problems, such as labeling, which occur with traditional self-contained programs. It also stated that all service models should be available to all children as indicated. In essence the policy statement made clear that no one service model be considered as best. Education should be responsive to the special instructional and social needs of the mildly handicapped and should provide a variety of alternative program models such as those described in the cascade of service model (Reynolds, 1972) and the cascade of educational services (Deno, 1970).

The Iowa Department of Public Instruction Rules of Special Education (1975) described a variety of service models (instructional programs) ranging from public school regular classes through special schools. Models pertinent to the mildly handicapped are the self-contained special class setting, the special class with integration (part time special class

setting) and the resource and itinerant setting. In addition to guidelines for alternative service models, the Rules of Special Education also indicate that several models may be operated on a multi-disability concept which de-emphasizes traditional labeling as EMR, ED, and LD.

Because these less traditional programming models for mildly handicapped children are advocated by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, it is necessary to insure that teacher attitudes and skills are appropriate and adequate to meet the demands. Two innovative approaches in teacher training, which are gaining popularity and reflect a marked departure from traditional teacher training, have implications for those teachers who will teach the mildly handicapped.

The first is a multi-categorical teacher training approach. It focuses on specific instructional skills and emphasizes the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and procedures to assess and remediate all learners. Children are considered as individuals and as such are all different on a continuum that encompases all learners (Courtnage, Brady, Suroski, and Schmid, 1975). The multi-categorical approach can be further clarified by examining what Reynolds and Balow (1972) call decision variables. Decision variables are those which identify positive alternative instructional systems; there is no implication that handicapping conditions do not exist or that all can be prevented. The decision variables approach provides a framework in which teachers can learn and subsequently employ a variety of methods and curriculum for children with varied learning problems.

The second is a competency or performance-based teacher training approach. It focuses on specifying in advance what goals a trainee must

achieve and demonstrate in performance. The essentials of a performance or competency based program are:

1. Competencies (knowledges, skills, behaviors) to be demonstrated by the student are derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles; stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies; and made public in advance.

2. Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies; explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions and made public in advance.

3. Assessment of the student's competency uses his performance as the primary source of evidence; takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behavior; and strives for objectivity.

4. The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency rather than by time or course completion.

5. The instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of competencies specified [(Elam, 1971, pp. 6-7)].

An essential initial element of a competency or performance-based program is the identification of competencies (teaching skills) to be demonstrated. This is basic to the teacher training program since both instruction and assessment of the trainee must relate directly to the competencies. The literature abounds with lists of competen-

cies, but there is little evidence that many initial identification procedures have been conducted with the thoroughness that this procedure demands.

Several educators have addressed themselves to the difficulty in identifying teacher competencies. Lindsey (1973) suggests that initial identification is not only difficult, but that there is still little agreement on goals. Therefore, to arrive at generic or essential competencies, continued evaluation and correction are necessary. Clarke (1971) reviewed the competencies identified by nine federally funded regular elementary model programs to determine skills necessary for teachers. He discovered that the nine programs identified quite different teaching skills due to explicit, yet divergent philosophies and guesses about schools of the future.

Houston (1973) outlines five procedures that are currently being employed to identify teacher competencies:

1. The course translation procedure takes current course offerings and restates the goals as behavioral objectives. (While little or no actual reconstruction of courses or reconceptualizing of goals occurs, this procedure is expedient and therefore widely employed).

2. The task analysis procedure generally follows the procedure of defining roles and through observation of teachers in these roles, task lists of competencies are drawn which are perceived to be most relevant to the roles.

3. The product or fulfillment of learner needs procedure measures the consequences of certain teacher behaviors on the learner. It

attempts to identify those competencies which appear to meet the goals set down for the learner.

4. The needs assessment procedure is based on the assumption that a knowledge of society's needs will provide the basis for establishing competencies teachers need in order to prepare children to cope in society.

5. The theoretical position procedure logically deduces teacher preparation goals from theory about learning. This procedure allows for even greater specificity of goals.

There is evidence that some of the procedures present problems which are, as yet, unresolved. The product or fulfillment of needs procedure implies that an attempt be made to validate teacher cometencies as they relate to student achievement. These attempts have been generally inconclusive. Rosenshire (1970) points out the difficulty of controlling variables and the paucity of well designated studies. Heath and Neilson (1974) analyzed Rosenshire's research on validation of competencies and concluded that an empirical basis for performance-based teacher education is non-existent, due in part to shallow and unclear operational definitions of teacher behaviors and weakness in most research designs.

Regarding the needs assessment procedure, Houston (1973) concluded that this is an important consideration when defining competencies, but implementation of this procedure may not be possible as critical societal needs change before the competencies can be implemented. In addition, still unknown societal needs may make future teacher roles and training needs difficult to predict (Dodl, 1973).

A careful examination of the five procedures described by Houston

(1973) reveals that some procedures appear to rely heavily on a theoretical and research expertise which is generally to be found among those special educators involved in teacher training while others appear to rely heavily on expertise generally found in the public school personnel actively involved in teaching or supervising the teaching of handicapped children.

A method for the identification and assessment of the most appropriate competencies to be employed in a performance-based teacher training program which was not considered by Houston (1973) may provide some resolution to the difficulties encountered in present identification and assessment procedures. Several educators advocated a consortium of teacher trainers and public school personnel to identify, assess, or delimit competencies. Dodl (1973) suggests that competency based teacher education implies, by definition, that the decision-making base be broadened. Dodl states that teacher training programs should base their decisions about what competencies to teach on the probability that those competencies will prepare the trainee to function successfully in the market place, the public schools. In order to maximize the probability of success it appears necessary to include public school personnel in the competency identification and assessment process.

Public school personnel are in constant close contact with handicapped pupils, their parents, and the community. Because of this reality base, their contribution to identification and assessment of teacher competencies is closely related to role and function (Lindsey, 1973).

Rosner and Kay (1974) point out some obvious advantages to developing a close relationship between teacher educators and the public schools.

Public schools are needed to provide settings and public school personnel are needed to provide expertise under a performance-based model. The involvement of the schools in the competency identification process will require greater cooperativeness from the public schools. Such cooperativeness should help increase the quality of the trainees experience.

In addition to broadening the decision-making base, a consortium can provide a means of delimiting competencies to a manageable number. The number of competencies any one teacher training program can cover is a major problem, because a great number of teacher competencies can be identified depending upon various perceptions of what a teacher's functions are (Eham and Okey, 1974).

Although there is a proliferation of competency lists, few have been derived or verified by a consortium which would combine the theoretical and research expertise of the teacher trainer with the reality based expertise of public school personnel and the public school goals. Effenbein (1972) did a comparative study on thirteen performance-based training programs, one of which included special education students. The study indicates that only four collaborated with public school personnel in developing objectives or competencies.

Multi-categorical performance-based training of teachers is perceived by some special educators to be one viable solution to the criticism surrounding the quality of programming for the mildly handicapped. This type of program operates in the Division of Special Education at the University of Northern Iowa (UNI). Since it is a multi-categorical performance-based program, it must identify those comeptencies necessary to produce teachers with demonstrated skills and knowledges which focus

on promoting desirable learning in children exhibiting a variety of educational needs (Courtnage, Brady, Suroski and Schmid, 1975).

Few studies on teacher competencies indicate which are most likely to promote teaching skills needed to provide quality service to children who are mildly handicapped. Until there is more conclusive empirical evidence on which teacher competencies appear to be most valid, those in teacher training may maximize the probability of preparing competent teachers by broadening the base of decision for identifying, assessing, and delimiting essential competencies.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to subject those competencies generally incorporated in the University of Northern Iowa multi-categorical, performance-based special education teacher training program to a consortium for a ranking of their relative importance.

The consortium consisted of Iowa special education teacher trainers, public school teachers of the mildly handicapped in multi-disability settings, and Area Education Agency special education directors and consultants for multi-disability programs.

The results of this study will be used to determine which competencies contained in the UNI training program were perceived by the consortium as most important for teachers of the mildly handicapped. In order to accomplish this, the following questions will be examined:

1. In general, which UNI competencies are ranked as very important by all the raters?

2. Which UNI competencies generally ranked as very important were ranked as very important by all three groups in the consortium?

3. What competencies were ranked as very important by the raters that are not included in the UNI competency list?

In addition, the results of the teacher subject ratings will be used to determine the generic nature of the UNI competencies. In order to accomplish this, the following questions will be examined:

1. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teachers in different instructional programs?

2. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teachers with pupils functioning at different levels?

3. Teachers were asked to indicate which competencies they currently possess, and whether those competencies have been acquired by preservice training, in-service training, or teaching experience.

Definition of Terms

CONSORTIUM: State of Iowa Special Education teacher trainers, special education teachers in multi-disability programs, and Area Education Agency personnel (AEA directors and consultants for multi-disability programs).

FUNCTIONING LEVELS OF HANDICAPPED PUPIL(S) (Courtnage, Brady, Suroski, and Schmid, 1975): Cognitive, social and personal developmental levels which include:

Preacademic (readiness)

Primary (initial skill acquisition)

Intermediate (continued skill acquisition and/or remediations)

Secondary (continued acquisition and/or remediation and prevocational and vocational training)

IOWA AREA EDUCATION AGENCIES: Fifteen geographical divisions within

the State of Iowa, mandated by Iowa law, which develop policy and provide special education programs and services to local school districts within their respective confines (DPI Rules of Special Education, (1974).

MILDLY HANDICAPPED: . . . those children traditionally labeled as educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, behaviorally disordered, educationally handicapped, learning disabled, or brain injured . . . " (Lilly, 1970).

SPECIAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS OR SERVICE MODELS SERVING THE MILDLY HANDICAPPED (Rules of Special Education, 1974):

Self-contained special class - A setting providing instruction to pupils with similar special educational needs in academic subjects on a full-time basis.

Special class with integration - A setting providing instruction to pupils with similar special educational needs in academic subjects on a part-time basis.

Resource teaching program - A setting to provide pupils in regular class settings with special education in specific skill areas on a part-time basis.

Itinerant program - Special education instructional services provided to pupils in three or more attendance centers by the same special educator.

Multi-disability program - Certain special education programs or service models which include children from two or more disability classifications.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL (Rules of Special Education, 1974):

AEA special education directors - Handicapped pupil(s) advo-

cates who are responsible for implementation and evaluation of programming and services for those pupils requiring special education.

Consultants - Specialists in instructional programming who provide on-going supervising support and evaluation of programs for children requiring special education.

Teachers - Those engaged in direct instructional interaction with those children requiring special education.

TEACHER TRAINERS: Those institution of higher learning faculty members whose major function is pre-service teacher training.

TEACHER COMPETENCIES: Descriptions of functional abilities which teachers or teachers in training will be able to perform in order to produce desired results in learners being taught (Dodl, 1973).

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The concept of mainstreaming the mildly handicapped, stemming from the concern over the negative effects of categorization (labeling) of children as educable mentally retarded (EMR), emotionally disabled (ED), or learning disabled (LD), has led to a variety of instructional programming models in the public schools. In order to insure that teachers, once trained, can adapt to a variety of instructional models and a variety of learners, educators are closely examining what competencies teacher need and what training procedures are necessary to insure competence.

The review of literature examines studies regarding teacher competencies, grouped in four major areas: University of Northern Iowa special education teacher competencies, regular and special education training program competencies, categorical and multi-categorical competencies, and instructional model competencies.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA SPECIAL EDUCATION COMPETENCIES

Courtnage, Brady, Suroski and Schmid (1975) describe the UNI multi-categorical performance-based program as having elected to prepare teachers with the instructional and management skills to teach children traditionally considered mentally retarded, emotionally disabled and learning disabled. The focus of the undergraduate

program is on the competencies necessary to diagnose, prescribe, implement and evaluate teaching strategies matched to pupil characteristics and needs. The graduate program expands the skill acquisition of teachers by including interdisciplinary skills required of instructional and support personnel.

Expanding on the prescriptive teaching model of Peter (1972), a model for the UNI program was developed. The UNI model integrates didactics with practica. The model components are: (a) instructional methods (including diagnostics, task sequencing, selection and preparation of curriculum, and methods of presenting curriculum); (b) educational management (including motivational techniques, behavior modification procedures, educational organization, communication skills, evaluation procedures, discipline strategies and sensitivity to the effective domain); (c) experience practica (including sequentially more demanding interaction with handicapped pupils, parents, other professionals and the community.) The model encourages individualization of teaching strategies and styles; it emphasizes demonstrated competence of both instructional and management skills. It states that both the theoretical knowledge and specific understandings of instructional and management components are prerequisites to effective performance (Courtnage, Brady, Suroski and Schmid, 1975).

The UNI program contains three phases. Phase I of the program requires that the trainee demonstrate competence in programming for one handicapped child. Competence is demonstrated by successfully performing 17 major instructional and management criteria. Phase II of the program requires demonstrated competence in group (classroom) programming with handicapped children, and 12 major criteria must be

successfully met (Northern Iowa Instructional Laboratory Progress Report, Note 3). Phase III requires that the trainee demonstrate competence in interdisciplinary settings on 12 major criteria. The criteria in each phase of the program are broken into sub-criteria to provide specific guidelines for performance and for evaluation of performance. The emphasis on competence in interaction situations allows for measurement of competence by both teacher performance of required procedures and more importantly, by pupil outcome. For a complete list of criteria and sub-criteria, see Appendix A.

Frequent internal evaluation of the effectiveness of the competencies and the criteria is provided by measuring the trainees ability to apply generally accepted teaching procedures and by the amount of desired behavioral change in the handicapped pupil(s) being taught (Northern Iowa Instructional Laboratory Progress Report, Note 2). In addition the competencies are evaluated for their appropriateness and applicability in various teaching situations (Northern Iowa Instructional Laboratory Report, Note 2). A survey on the effectiveness of the total program, which can be considered to reflect the quality of graduates competence, was completed by Ortega (Note 4). The *results of the survey indicated that building principals* perceived graduates of the UNI Special Education training program as above average teachers. UNI trainees who have completed both Phase I and Phase II were perceived to be more competent than those who completed only Phase I.

REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAM COMPETENCIES

The competencies described in this section are those suggested or already incorporated in teacher training programs, particularly those that are performance-based. Only the final study discusses competencies specific to special education but the literature reviewed is considered important because of the emphasis on generic skills and/or performance-based teacher training.

Popham (Note 5) suggests what he calls a "low-density program", which includes a few broad competencies rather than many specific competencies. He proposes objectives which state what will happen to students as a result of what teachers do, but the process of arriving at that desired pre-determined outcome is of lesser importance. Fewer competencies allow for the development of individual teaching styles yet systematic conceptualizing of a plan to promote desirable change in learners can be implemented. In order to accomplish this, three minimal competencies are proposed. The first is that teachers will be able to achieve pre-specified instructional objectives with a variety of learners. In order to accomplish this the teacher must understand tested instructional methods and must choose which tactics are personally most effective. Some type of assessment skill is necessary (e.g. pre-test -- post-test) to determine whether the desired outcome has been reached. The second competency is that the teacher must be able to select or design instructional objectives which are sound and appropriate and can thus be defended as reasonable goals. The third competency is that the teacher be able to detect the unanticipated effects of instruction.

Orlosky (Note 6) states that any teacher training program must have properly delineated competencies if teachers are to be held accountable for pupil outcome. The three broad areas in which a teacher must be competent are:

1. The ability to observe and identify the cues provided by the child with whom the teacher works. The teacher must be able to perceive events he encounters in order to cope and to classify pupil behaviors into meaningful categories for interpretation and diagnosis.

2. The ability to match these perceptions with known instructional and pedagogical concepts.

3. The ability to apply instructional techniques to situations as he perceives them.

Frieder (1970) described six major teaching functions which go to make up the teaching act. The functions are: (a) formulation of objectives, (b) diagnosis of learner needs, (c) prescription of learner materials, (d) instruction, (e) motivation, and (f) evaluation.

Okey and Brown (Note 7) developed a scheme for organizing teacher competencies for a performance-based teacher training program. The competencies were devised by: (a) polling teachers, principals, and supervisors, (b) utlizing already prepared lists of teacher competencies, (c) observing experienced teachers at work, and (d) from analyzing the teaching act as described by Frieder (1970). Orey and Brown identified 37 competency clusters and grouped them into three experience levels (beginning teacher, experienced teacher, and master teacher). An example of the difference in expectations for the various teaching levels regarding formulation of objectives is: (a) beginning teachers will select and write objectives in the cognitive, affective and

psychomotor areas, (b) experienced teachers will write objectives based on Bloom's taxonomy and on affective and psychomotor taxonomies, and (c) master teachers will sequence objectives.

As part of the performance-based teacher training program at Brooklyn College (Note 8), the following desired outcomes in teacher behavior were identified: The ability to (a) understand and work with children and youth by demonstrating understanding of child development, (b) diagnose a variety of learner styles and learner strengths and weaknesses, (c) utilize diagnostic information in subsequent teaching, (d) relate out of school environment to in school learning, (e) plan individualized instruction, (f) plan and develop curriculum related to developmental growth and social environment, (g) teach communication skills effectively, (h) establish a school environment that enhances identity development of children, and (i) work as part of a diverse teaching team.

Weber State College developed an individualized competency-based teacher training program. The program makes a distinction between competencies necessary for regular elementary and secondary teachers. However, an examination of course requirements include introductory field experience, growth and development training, evaluation, motivational and instructional techniques, and classroom management. The total program contains approximately 70 modules. In combination these 70 modules incorporate nearly 300 specific behavioral objectives. The objectives, as stated, allow for competencies to be demonstrated by peer and micro teaching, tutoring, and classroom teaching (Burke, 1972).

The University of Georgia has clustered teacher competencies

under two broad categories, generic and enabling. Generic competencies are applicable to all teachers and are readily observable. They include specific teaching tasks and the teachers' affective behavior. Specifically, the generic competencies include such skills as determining pupil instructional needs, planning for individuals and groups, and accepting pupils' ideas even when different from the teacher's. Enabling competencies are those knowledges and attributes prerequisite to effective performance of generic competencies. These prerequisites include such things as knowledge of subject matter to be taught, philosophical and sociological influences on learning, skills in problem solving and decision making, and knowledge of the teaching process (Shearron and Johnson, 1973).

Columbia University, Department of Special Education, requires the following competencies of teachers in training during student teaching practicum: (a) the ability to analyze individual or group behaviors and develop strategies to alter critical social and academic behaviors, (b) the ability to develop and employ informal diagnostic techniques, (c) the ability to develop instruction programs based on diagnostics, (d) the ability to implement instructional programs, and (e) the ability to evaluate the success or failure of instructional programs (Flegenheimer, H., Note 9).

In summary, this review of literature indicates that the competencies suggested as generic in nature and perceived to be important are specific. It suggests that teachers must possess some diagnostic skills, a variety of approaches and materials for individualizing teaching, an ability to evaluate pupil progress, and an ability to specify in advance what desired pupil outcomes will be. In order to

do this teachers must have an understanding of how to select and/or write instructional objectives based on diagnostic measures and knowledge of child development matched to known effective methods of instruction and proven materials.

CATEGORICAL AND MULTI-CATEGORICAL COMPETENCIES

The competencies described in this section are those delineated in studies and opinions as important for teachers of the mildly handicapped, specifically the educable mentally retarded, the emotionally disabled and the learning disabled. Two studies on multi-categorical competencies are also included:

Competencies for Teachers of the Educable Mentally Retarded

The mentally retarded are those children which would be part of the general category "mental disability", a term indicating deficits in adaptive behaviors for meeting environmental demands and intellectual functioning greater than one standard deviation below the mean on a reliable I.Q. test (Rules for Special Education, 1974).

In 1957, the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare Office of Education commissioned a study on teachers of children who are mentally retarded (Mackie, W., Williams, H. M. and Dunn, L. M., 1957). Fulfilling one major focus of the study, the committee identified 134 specific competencies as being important for teachers of the mentally retarded.

The committee then conferred with specialists in the field of mental retardation, drawing up a list of knowledges, skills and abilities which were pre-tested by 25 teachers and other school leaders.

A final inquiry form was compiled from the two sources and contained 100 items which were rated for their relative importance by teachers considered superior by various state departments of education. Although the selection was to contain a quota of teachers from day and residential schools and teachers of "educable" as well as "trainable" children, the returns were largely from teachers of the "educable" or mildly retarded in day school settings. Competencies rated were placed in rank order and were also clustered. Within certain clusters various patterns appeared. In the cluster identified as understanding the retarded child, knowledge of intellectual, social, and emotional characteristics ranked high if the knowledges were not too technical and related to practical classroom application rather than causation. In the clusters identified as curriculum and methods and materials, ability to teach "core" curriculum, plan cooperative integrated school programs, and provide physical education, language, health, social and daily living experiences ranked high, compared to the ability to teach spelling, arts and crafts, and music. In the cluster identified as orientation in special education, the ability to differentiate between social and emotional maladjustment and mental retardation ranked high, but understanding the multiple handicapped ranked low. In the cluster identified as interpersonal relationship, counseling ranked high when related to personal as opposed to vocational problems. Also ranking high was interpretation of children's problems when between teacher/child, teacher/parents, and teacher/other school professionals. Ranking low was interpersonal relationships with national professional organizations and vocational teams. In the cluster identified as administrative and legal skills, the competencies ranked generally low.

Hamerlynck, Martin and Rolland (1968) discovered, as part of a pilot program to train teachers in observing classroom behaviors, that a teacher of secondary EMR's perceived no children in her group as exhibiting problematic behaviors yet when the children were observed by trained teams, four of the 14 class members spent only 45% of their time in task-oriented behavior. The authors concluded that since the non-task oriented behaviors tended to be non-disruptive, they went unobserved, and that teachers need to learn observational techniques that focus in on behaviors such as eye contact, attending, and task completion. This would provide the teacher more exact information of causal relationships between environment and actual task behaviors. Well defined observations of behaviors, when and where they occur, provide important clues to the trained teacher observer in order to modify the environment.

A study conducted by Meyen and Carr (1970) investigated, as part of a comprehensive identification process of in-service needs, specific problems of instruction encountered by teachers of the mentally retarded. The authors noted that regardless of variables such as levels of professional training and amount of variety of teaching experience, certain instructional tasks generally tended to be considered the most difficult. Of the variables noted, the most significant proved to be age level of student taught, and even that variable did not affect the consistency of perceived difficulties to any great extent. Relative difficulty or ease of instruction was considered from three dimensions: (a) method, (b) appropriateness of task for age level of child, and (c) availability of materials and student experiences. The most difficult areas were seatwork activities, reading methods, and reading materials and activities.

A more recent study by Auttonen (Note 10) included a survey of building principals responsible for EMR classrooms and of teacher trainers preparing teachers for EMR. It was conducted to determine specific values placed on competencies related to the EMR teacher's role. Basic descriptors or competencies were derived from the survey data, and subsequently, the perceptions of these two groups (principals and teacher educators) were compared to the perceptions of a group of EMR teachers as to which competencies were the most essential.

Building principals valued and rated understanding of historical and socio-cultural implications of mental retardation appreciably higher than did teachers and teacher trainers. Principals and teacher trainers valued and rated understanding of behavior growth and development higher than did the teachers. Teacher trainers rated knowledge of curriculum and methodology higher than did principals and teachers. Practica experiences with EMR children were valued and rated extremely high by principals and teacher trainers, but teachers gave them a low rating. All three groups ranked as moderately important knowledge of measurement and evaluation techniques.

Teacher competencies given the highest value and rating by all three groups were:

1. Making program revisions contributing to the functional development of the EMR child.

2. Planning appropriate individualized yet comprehensive instructional programs and developing and/or adapting the necessary materials, particularly in the basic skills.

3. Planning and providing for the social development of EMR pupils.

4. Providing the EMR pupils with pre-vocational information and skills and systematically developing work habits and attitudes in EMR pupils.

In addition to the survey studies regarding competencies needed for teachers of the mentally retarded, the following position statements regarding these teachers were presented in a panel chaired by Harold Fields, New York Board of Education (1953). The panel included a teacher of the EMR, a vice president of the National Association for Retarded Citizens, a special education teacher trainer, a school psychologist, and an editor of the American Journal of Mental Deficiency.

The panel indicated that teachers should understand the children's characteristics and accept them; have a thorough understanding of objectives of a sound program; be able to relate effectively with pupils, other school personnel, and parents; be willing and able to seek help from all available resources; have specialized skill in planning and organizing; be well trained in growth and development and the subject matter to be taught; be original and creative in motivational techniques; be satisfied with realistic progress; be able to counsel children to accept their capabilities and limitations; and finally be able to train the child in social adjustment and economic usefulness.

In addition the panel indicated that the EMR teacher needs special qualifications and wholesome characteristics. Qualifications include: (a) acceptance of the retarded child as an individual, (b) ability to relate to children, (c) ability to accept the child as he is, and to subordinate subject matter to the child's needs, (d) be experienced in teaching normal children before assuming responsibilities for children with special needs, and (e) interest and understanding of basic

problems such as socio-economic levels. Wholesome characteristics include: (a) patience, (b) sense of humor, (c) good personal hygiene, (d) tact, (e) vitality, (f) personal appearance, and (g) basic stability.

Some conclusions can be reached from these studies and related literature regarding EMR teachers. The teachers tended to value and rank higher those knowledges and skills that were theoretical. They had little concern regarding causation but much concern regarding remedial and/or instructional procedures appropriate to specific learning patterns perceived to be common to EMR children. In other words, theory was considered important only as it related to symptomotology which affected instructional goals and procedures.

Both early and later studies indicate that ability to individualize program design and to implement those programs is very important. "Core" curriculum courses and development of social skills is considered important in all cases and often considered difficult. The more recent studies reviewed indicate a greater concern for developing work habits and pre-vocational and vocational skills. In other words, later studies indicate that teachers now appear to be more concerned with total programming and less isolationistic about their functions in the total educational program.

Competencies for Teachers of the Emotionally Disabled

The emotionally disabled child is one which exhibits behavior in the school setting which interfers with the learning process, interpersonal relationships, and personal adjustment and thus requires special programs and services (Rules of Special Education, 1974).

Mackie, Kvaraceus and Williams (1957) conducted a study on competencies needed for teachers of the socially and emotionally maladjusted. Commissioned by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, it was similar in design to the Mackie study reported in the section on mental retardation.

The teachers ranked understanding of the child's behavior very high, especially knowledge and understanding of home and community conditions of their students. They ranked broad social and cultural causes much less important. The teachers also rated knowledge of normal behavior and differences between normal and abnormal behavior very important.

The teachers deemed personal counseling of the students very important, including vocational and life goals as well as immediate problems. They perceived curriculum to be important if individualized and pupil centered. They considered it more important to assist the child in personal adjustment and to provide success experiences than to insist that all curricular goals be met.

They ranked on a lower level competencies related to an ability to administer projective and other psychological tests. They ranked even lower administrative ability, legal knowledge, and research skills.

Because the respondents in this study were largely from day school settings as opposed to residential or special psychiatric settings, they tended to rank high items which dealt with social inadequacy rather than severe emotional disturbances, and they considered skills which were therapeutic relatively unimportant.

A study conducted by Dorward (1963) compared the competency ratings made by teachers of ED in residential and day settings with those made by regular class teachers. The competencies subjected to the rating

were those from the Mackie, Kvaraceus and Williams (1957) study. Regular class teachers tended to rate the competencies originally percieved to be vital to teachers of the emotionally disturbed as important, or more important, than did the residential and special day class teachers of the emotionally disturbed. Only two competencies were considered more important by special class teachers than regular class teachers: (a) the ability to accept violent pupils and (b) the ability to work on clinical teams.

Several demonstratable skills and knowledges were considered vital by all the raters. The skills include:

1. The ability to interpret the child's educational problems and needs to parents.

2. The ability to keep and evaluate anecdotal records and to interpret I.Q. and achievement test results.

3. The ability to employ classroom organization and management techniques such as invidivualization for ultimate expectations regardless of extreme aggressiveness or withdrawal.

4. The ability to reject unexceptable behavior without rejecting the child and to give positive verbal praise for success, no matter how minute.

5. The ability to devise means of communicating progress and improvement to the child (both verbal and non-verbal).

The knowledges include:

1. The distinction between enotional disturbance and mental retardation.

2. The characteristics of withdrawn and acting out children.

3. The symptomotology which indicates more serious problems.

4. The variety of instructional materials and procedures available.

5. The technical publications and research in the field of education of emotionally disturbed children.

In a recent study the 88 competencies from the original Mackie Study were presented to 47 teachers of the emotionally disturbed in a midwestern state for assessment (Bullock, 1971). In this study the teachers ranked only 12 competencies as very important as compared to 20 in the Mackie Study. Only five of the 12 were ranked very important in both studies. Included were (a) understanding and knowledge of the advantage of providing success experience to the child, for relieving tension in the classroom, (b) promoting mental health, (c) providing flexible programming and scheduling for individual adjustment and development, (d) developing pupil "self-control", and (e) evaluating identical demands of children.

The other seven competencies considered important in the Mackie Study but very important by this group of raters were: (a) knowledge of the psychology of varied handicapping conditions, (b) knowledge of basic human physical and psychological needs, (c) knowledge of curriculum and teaching methods for the normal child, (d) ability to tolerate asocial behavior toward authority, yet establish "limits" of control, (e) ability to work cooperatively with other professionals and (f) ability to teach remedial reading. Bullock concluded that training programs should consider that teachers of emotionally disturbed children need a thorough knowledge of behavioral principles and their applica-

tion for managing disturbed children. They also need a thorough understanding of all types of exceptionality as well as normality.

A proposal which requires training in eight areas for teachers of children who are emotionally disturbed has been suggested by Rabinow (1960). Teachers should possess: (a) knowledge of psychosocial growth and personality structure of the disturbed child, (b) an understanding of projective findings and knowledge of the nature and relationship of learning disability to emotional disturbance in order to employ techniques to diagnose and remediate the learning problem, (c) an understanding of social and cultural conflicts and their effect on emotional growth, (d) knowledge of various social and legal agencies and the regulations for disturbed children, (e) the ability to read and write records and generally communicate with other professionals, (f) an analytic understanding of group structure and interaction, (g) mastered skills in teaching practical arts, and (h) a year of carefully supervised practicum with both withdrawn and aggressive children.

Hewett (1966) described seven competencies needed by teachers of the emotionally disturbed. Listed in order of their importance as he perceived them, the teacher must demonstrate: (a) objectivity by developing a questioning educational attitude toward teaching backed by knowledge of normal and deviant development, (b) flexibility by adjusting to carefully assessed academic and emotional needs of pupils, (c) an ability to set structural limits within a consistent and realistic framework of social and academic boundaries from which the child can operate, (d) resourcefulness by allowing for unique and creative programming, which is highly individualized, multi-sensory, and reality based, (e) ability to select

and assess social reinforcement which shapes acceptable social behavior, (f) curricular expertise to institute appropriate remedial procedures in the basic skill areas, and (g) an intellectual model which fosters good study habits and enrichment skills. The author is careful to point out that the hierarchy is helpful in looking at competencies, but the competencies overlap in many instances and thus must be viewed collectively because they are interdependent.

In conclusion both the early and later studies and opinion papers tend to emphasize the generic nature of competencies needed for teaching the emotionally disturbed. The exceptions appear to be the ability to accept deviance in children and to understand other professionals functions in order to work as a team member with psychologists, counselors, and social workers.

Competencies for Teachers of the Learning Disabled

Learning disabilities indicate a pupil's inability to learn in keeping with his potential. Even though deficiencies displayed by pupils are not primarily due to sensory deprivation, mental disabilities, severe emotional disabilities, or a different language spoken in the home; special education programs and services are considered necessary for educational progress (Rules of Special Education, 1974).

Bannytyne (1968), in describing a team approach to diagnosing and prescribing for the learnind disabled, implies that the teacher must be able to work cooperatively with psychologists, doctors, speech therapists, and social workers. The teacher must be able to interpret test data and engage in on-going daily diagnostic techniques. In other words, the teacher must be familiar with a variety of formal and informal tests. He

further advocates a thorough understanding of and ability to use task analysis in remediating diagnosed deficits.

Mann (1968) suggests that teachers of the learning disabled should have background in elementary and/or special education. The content of a training program should contain three broad areas: (a) theory, (b) developmental skills in diagnosis and remedial methodology, and (c) opportunities to synthesize theory and methods through observation and supervised experiences with children. The teacher, once trained, should possess the following competencies: (a) diagnostic skills, (b) ability to design prescriptive programs, (c) knowledge of other disciplines such as medicine, social work, and psychology, (d) ability to be an effective member of a diagnostic team, (e) ability to function as an academic therapist, (f) ability to counsel both the child and the parents, and (g) an understanding of the community, its role and resources.

Haring, Reid, and Baeber (1969) emphasize that training for teachers of the learning disabled should outline specific competencies or criteria, giving examples of observable and measurable objectives in use in one such training program. In this program, the teacher must be able to assess child performance academically, socially, verbally and physically. Assessment includes the establishment of observing, recording, and analyzing behaviors, in order to determine the child's activity preferences and task efficiency. In addition the teacher must be able to acquire functional knowledge of instructional materials, plan a well sequenced program for the child, and execute these skills with one child or groups of children.

According to Rappaport (1970) the most effective teacher of the

learning disabled child is one who has a firm understanding of child development. This understanding should emphasize ego development in general and functional systems for learning development in particular. The teacher must also be flexible, yet productive, in a relatively new, uncertain area of teaching, and be able to work cooperatively as a team member with other professionals.

In conclusion, the competencies for teachers of the learning disabled most frequently reflected in the opinion papers are concerned with the ability to work in a team approach with a wide variety of professionals. In addition, the teacher should have a knowledge of child development, a strong background in both formal and informal diagnostic tools, and a wide variety of remedial methods and materials.

Multi-Categorical Competencies

Herr (1976) compiled a list of teaching competencies derived largely from the Mackie Studies on competencies for EMR and ED and from polling teacher trainers. He subjected them for rating to elementary teachers of educable mentally retarded in a self-contained setting, and to elementary teachers of the emotionally disturbed and learning disabled in both self-contained and resource settings. The majority (81%) of the 180 competencies rated were perceived to be important to all groups in the study. The competencies rated in that study included specific teaching skills and pre-requisite knowledges and understandings. The author concluded that certain specific teaching skills, such as the ability to administer and interpret diagnostic tests and to employ a variety of remedial techniques, especially in core curriculum, appeared to be multi-categorical. In addition, he determined that certain knowledges and understandings, such as

the conceptual and neurological development of children, the differences between the normal and the abnormal, and the causes of academic and social inadequacy, also appeared to be multi-categorical.

In order to determine generic competencies for a non-categorical teacher training program, Buchanan (Note 11) asked a consortium of special education teachers, administrators, and teacher trainers for their perceptions regarding what special education teachers do and what special education teachers ought to do. Thirty-eight competencies were analyzed by comparing the real and ideal perceptions of the consortium. Thirty-three items were ranked as important or ideal. Of the 33 competencies, seven were considered ideal but rarely practiced, three of the seven competencies related to skills necessary to develop cooperation between special educators and regular class teachers, and four competencies related to direct service skills for determination of appropriate programming and the use of task analysis.

In conclusion, studies and related literature on the competencies for teachers of the EMR, ED, LD, and these categories in combination (multi-categorical) all emphasize the importance of skills for individualizing instruction. All teachers of the mildly handicapped were expected to be able to diagnose learner needs and provide a variety of methods and materials in teaching "core" curriculum. In addition EMR and ED teachers should provide opportunities for children to develop social and work skills. Both ED and LD teachers should possess interdisciplinary professional skills.

INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL COMPETENCIES

Competencies described in this section are those necessary for special education teachers in roles other than the traditional self-contained special class.

The clinical teacher is one such role. A clinical teacher is both a diagnostician and an instructional specialist. According to Schwartz (1967) the competencies needed by such a teacher are an understanding of medical, psychological, and social deviations in human growth and development and of community resources to render support services. In addition, the teacher must be able to utilize support services; plan and conduct a remedial program; select appropriate materials, technical equipment and techniques to carry out remediation; and evaluate student progress. Thus, the clinical teacher must not only be able to diagnose and remediate behavior and learning disorders, but must also be committed to an interdisciplinary approach and be able to work effectively with physicians, psychologists, social workers, and other professionals.

In a later description of the clinical teacher, Schwartz (1971) synthesized the common competencies he perceived necessary for teachers of the mildly disturbed, retarded, and learning disabled child. The three major competency clusters were: (a) the ability to identify individual pupil entry levels, learner characteristics, and desired outcomes; (b) the ability to individualize instruction and match the task to the learner, and (c) the ability to evaluate pupil performance and curriculum effectiveness.

Included in cluster 1 are such skills as the ability to employ observational techniques, to administer and interpret norm and criteria

reference tests, and to summarize data and write pupil profiles containing prescription, preferred learning styles, and resource strategies. Included in cluster 2 are such skills as selecting appropriate instructional objectives, individualizing instruction, and providing motivational contingencies. Included in cluster 3 are such skills as the ability to assess, analyze, and report the effectiveness of the instruction and to specify needed revisions and additions.

A second role, the educational diagnostician, as described by Prouty and Prillman (1967) must be competent to recognize and evaluate children's learning potential and to employ a variety of educational methods. While the role was proposed to insure that diagnosis of the educationally handicapped take place in the classroom rather than the clinic, the teacher would be expected to engage in experimental teaching once a diagnosis was made.

Lilly (1971) proposed a third type of special educator, a teacher who is an instructional specialist for the mildly handicapped. The person thus trained is a generalist and the competencies needed must be stated in functional terms. The major role of this specialist is to convey the skills that he/she has to regular classroom teachers in order to facilitate the successful programming for the mildly handicapped in the regular classroom. Necessary skills for this instructional specialist include: (a) diagnosing problems in academic skill areas, (b) specifying individual and small group remedial programs, (c) using behavior management procedures including group and individual reinforcement patterms, and (d) working successfully with regular class teachers.

Haring (1971) described still another role, a resource teacher, who

works directly with handicapped children and is able to train the regular class teacher to systematically provide special procedures and instructional materials for the handicapped in their classes. Such resource teachers should be trained to pinpoint observable target behaviors, to count and accurately record (chart) behaviors as to frequency and trends or patterns, and to change behavior by manipulating environmental events preceding and subsequent to the behaviors. Haring considers it crucial that teachers know how to arrange environmental conditions in such a way as to bring about and maintain or strengthen desired behaviors. The teacher must be knowledgeable in instructional techniques to evoke desired behaviors and in reinforcement techniques to maintain the behaviors.

Fox (Note 12) described a final role, the consulting teacher who assists the regular teacher in arranging the environment of the classroom to provide handicapped pupils an opportunity to meet educational objectives in a regular class. In order to do this, the consulting teacher must be competent (a) to modify handicapped learners' behavior by applying reinforcement scheduling, and errorless discrimination and to help parents and teachers to carry out these behavior modification techniques; (b) to develop individualized sequential curriculum (particularily math and language arts), which must include pupils entering skill levels, specified objectives, selection of appropriate materials, and evaluation of pupil progress; and (c) to evaluate, adapt, and apply research to the handicapped learner.

In conclusion, all the competencies described in this section have been proposed for special teachers in specific roles and all imply spe-

cialized training. The literature also suggests that the diagnostic, remedial, and evaluative skills possessed by the specialist can and should be taught to the regular class teacher. The only skill specific to the specialist appears to be the ability to work effectively with regular classroom teachers in order that they eventually acquire specialized skills and are thus able to effectively program for the mildly handicapped. It seems reasonable to presume that the authors forsee that some diagnostic and remedial procedures should continue to be provided by specialists because regular class teachers serve relatively large numbers of children.

CONCLUSIONS

The most frequently mentioned teacher skill in all the studies and opinion papers reviewed can be broadly stated as the ability to individualize the educational process regardless of the child's handicapping condition. In order to accomplish this most important skill, five sub-skills are described in various ways by various studies and authors.

The first of these sub-skills can be described as diagnostic ability. Studies indicated and opinions suggested a need to be able to administer and/or interpret formal and informal diagnostic tests, to use observational techniques, and to compare normal and abnormal cognitive and emotional growth and development.

The second sub-skill can be described as the ability to prescribe individualized programs derived from a knowledge of how various children learn (based on theory, test results, and observed behavior data); and specific instructional techniques selected and analyzed from among a variety of materials and methods. The prescriptions or instructional

objectives most frequently perceived as important were related to: (a) "core" curriculum, (b) social adjustment, (c) the development of study, work and/or vocational habits and skills, and (d) personal hygiene and mental health.

The third sub-skill, less frequently mentioned yet considered important, was the ability to evaluate pupil progress and to communicate this progress in some way to pupils, parents, and other professionals. There was some emphasis on teachers being able to assess the affectiveness of their own strategies as well as the progress of their pupils.

The fourth sub-skill, again less frequently mentioned yet considered important, was the ability to motivate pupils and to manage and control the learning environment in order to maximize the probability of pupils reaching desired goals.

The fifth sub-skill, the ability to work as a member of a professional team, was considered very important for teachers of ED, LD, and for teachers assuming roles in less traditional settings.

The most frequently mentioned teacher knowledges were understanding learner characteristics of children who deviate emotionally, intellectually, and socially from the norm; understanding social and cultural conditions which have an important impact on learning; and understanding the roles of other professionals in the handicapped child's educational program.

Many other attributes, which were often called competencies, were studied or discussed in the literature, but they more properly should be called desirable characteristics. These characteristics included such qualities as vitality, objectivity, clarity, flexibility, cooper-

ativeness, and knowledge of self. Because these qualities cannot be measured without agreement on definition, they should not be labeled as competencies.

Chapter III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this investigation was to subject the competencies included in the University of Northern Iowa (UNI) Special Education teacher training program to ranking by a consortium in order to determine the relative importance of each competency. The consortium consisted of State of Iowa special education teacher trainers; special education teachers in multi-disability settings; and Area Education Agency (AEA) directors and consultants for multi-disability programs. A secondary purpose was to determine competence applicability across teacher subject roles and functioning level of pupils taught. A third purpose was to consider teacher perceptions of competencies possessed and how they were acquired.

Population

The first group in the consortium, the teacher trainer subjects, included 33 faculty members from the eight institutions of higher learning in the State of Iowa that currently train special education teachers. Only those faculty members whose major function is the training of special education teachers were included.

The second group in the consortium, the State of Iowa public school teacher subjects included 189 teachers in multi-disability settings, these teachers provide direct instructional services to pupils who could

be variously categorized as EMR, ED, and LD. The respondents instruct in resource or itinerant programs, in special class with integration programs, or in self-contained special programs. The teachers have pupils functioning at the preacademic, primary, intermediate or secondary levels.

The AEA personnel, the third group in the consortium, included the 15 AEA special education directors and the four AEA consultants for multi-disability programs. These AEA directors and consultants are responsible for the quality of programming within their respective jurisdiction. Sampling procedures were not employed since the entire population of subjects were included in the study.

Procedures

First, in order to have a concensus on the relative importance of the competencies in the UNI special education teacher training program, it was necessary to subject the competencies to the population described for their ranking. Secondly, to determine the generic qualities of the UNI competencies, it was necessary to compare the rankings of the teachers in various educational settings and to compare the rankings of teachers with differing functional levels of children. Third, to determine the current number of competencies that teachers possess and where they were acquired, it was necessary to analyze teacher responses concerning their perceptions of their current level of competence and whether they perceived that competence was acquired in pre-service, in-service, or teaching experience.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

An instrument was devised for ranking the UNI competencies. Since all competencies could be perceived as important, the ranking instrument forced respondents to categorize competencies as very important, of less importance, least important, not important, or don't choose to rank. To insure that the perceptions reflected the relative importance of the various competencies, the respondents were asked to place no more than 11 competencies in any one category. The respondents were also asked to add any competencies they perceived as important which did not appear on the UNI competency list. (See Appendix B.)

The UNI competency list included a composite of the 17 criteria and sub-criteria in Phase I (tutorial practicum) and the 12 criteria and sub-criteria in Phase II (classroom practicum). This Phase I and II composite includes diagnostic, evaluative, curricular, and behavior management skills; a total of 21 teaching skills. The final 12 competencies on the list are Phase III interdisciplinary skills.

The 33 competencies have face validity in that they are stated in such a way as to include all those skills the UNI special education trainee must demonstrate in interaction with handicapped pupil(s), other professionals, parents, and the community. The intent of what the trainee will be able to demonstrate is intact, and only the specific terminology generated in the University setting has been translated into more generally understood educational terminology. Underlying understandings and knowledges are provided in instructional components of the program and are necessary prerequisites to performing the competencies as stated.

The instrument and the competency list was mailed along with a cover letter and sampling imformation form to the raters in the consor-

tium in Spring 1976. Enclosed in each envelope was a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. After a period of two weeks a second letter was mailed to non-respondents. No further attempt was made to solicit responses.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the data was based on the responses to the questions stated in the purpose of the study:

1. In general, which UNI competencies are ranked as very important by all the raters?

2. Which UNI competencies generally ranked as very important were ranked as very important by all three groups in the consortium?

3. What competencies were ranked as very important by the raters that are not included in the UNI competency list?

4. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teachers in different instructional programs?

5. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teachers with pupils functioning at different levels?

6. Teachers were asked to indicate which competencies they currently possess, and whether those competencies have been acquired by pre-service training, in-service training, or teaching experience.

Analysis was accomplished by means of a cross tabulation. The analysis was done through the Computer Services Center at the University of Northern Iowa.

Each of the 33 competencies had a possibility of being ranked very important (numerical value 4), of less importance (numerical value 3), least important (numerical value 2), not important (numerical value 1),

or no ranking (rank deleted and no numerical value assigned). A mean ranking from all raters was computed on each competency. In order to analyze the data the following procedures were employed:

1. Based on the mean rankings of all raters, the 11 competencies in the top one-third were identified.

2. A Chi-square goodness of fit test was used to determine which competencies with the highest mean ranking from all raters had agreement across all three groups in the consortium.

3. To identify additional competencies included by the raters, a list of these competencies was compiled.

4. To examine the generic nature of the UNI competencies, teacher rated data was subjected to Chi-square goodness of fit tests across instructional program types and functioning level of children taught.

5. For each of the 33 competencies, percentages were reported on the number of teachers possessing the competency, and the number of teachers who acquired the competency by pre-service, in-service, and teaching experience.

Chapter IV

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Introduction

This investigation was undertaken in order to determine the agreement of a consortium of Iowa special educators regarding the relative importance of competencies for teachers of the mildly handicapped. Mean rankings of all raters were determined and agreement across the consortium groups was obtained by subjecting the rankings to a Chi-square goodness of fit test. The generic quality of the competencies was also investigated by subjecting the special education teacher rankings to Chi-square goodness of fit tests across types of instructional settings and functioning level of children taught. Additional perceptions were obtained from the teacher raters regarding acquisition of competencies (how many were acquired and whether they were acquired through pre-service, in-service or teaching experience).

The competencies used in the study were those incorporated in the University of Northern Iowa's multi-categorical performance-based special education teacher training program. The consortium used for ranking consisted of Iowa special education teacher trainers, Area Education Agency (AEA) directors and consultants of multi-disability programs, and teachers of the mildly handicapped in multi-disability settings.

The total population included 250 educators. The total return was 178 or 71%. Fourteen returns did not meet the criteria for inclusion

in the study thus the number of useable returns was 164 or 66%. The teacher trainer population included 33 individuals with a total of 22 returning their questionnaires (67%). The AEA population included 19 directors and consultants with a total of 18 returns (95%). Three AEA returns had to be deleted thus 15 were used (79%). The teacher population included 198 practicing teachers with a total of 138 returns (70%). Eleven returns were deleted and 127 used (64%).

Responses were received from six of the eight Iowa teacher training institutions having special education training programs. All of the AEA consultants responded and 18 of the 19 AEA directors returned their questionnaires. Response received from teachers was generally distributed statewide. AEA's 7 and 10 had the largest number of multi-disability instructional settings and accounted for 57% of the teacher responses. However, questionnaires were received from teachers in 13 of the 15 areas within the state.

Presentation of Findings

The presentation of findings is organized into three major sections. Section 1 includes the mean rankings of the top third of UNI competencies, the agreement across the consortium on the top third, and additional competencies the raters included. Section 2 contains the results of the generic qualities of the competencies across instructional settings and functioning levels of children taught. Section 3 contains teacher perceptions of how competence was acquired.

Section 1

To determine which teacher competencies were perceived by the en-

tire population as most important for teachers of the mildly handicapped and the agreement on the relative importance of the competencies between consortium groups, the following questions were answered:

Question 1. In general, which UNI competencies were ranked as very important by all the raters?

The mean rankings of all raters was obtained and the 11 competencies or the top third were identified and can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

MEAN RANKING OF TOP ONE THIRD OF UNI TEACHER COMPETENCIES

Competency Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
12	3.494	.886
10	3.457	.688
11	3.457	.863
9	3.420	.794
3	3.370	.977
27	3.315	.895
4	3.272	1.052
19	3.219	.970
6	3.105	1.067
23	3.086	.880
15	3.086	1.006

The mean rankings as shown in Table 1 represent the raters perceptions obtained through a forced ranking procedure. The respondents could rank a maximum of 11 competencies as most important, a maximum of 11 as less important, a maximum of 11 as least important, a maximum

of 11 as not important, and a maximum of 11 could be placed in a column entitled, don't choose to rank. Competencies rated very important were assigned a numerical value of four, less important a numerical value of three, and least important a numerical value of one. Those competencies which were placed in the don't choose to rank column or were omitted completely had no numerical value assigned.

The UNI competencies with the highest mean ranking (in order of ranked importance, highest first) represent the top third of the ranking and are:

Competency 12: Modify and/or design instructional materials when indicated, for specific individual pupil(s) needs.

Competency 10: Provide appropriate instructional materials and equipment to meet short-term objectives.

Competency 11: Employ a variety of remedial techniques, as indicated, for core curriculum (e.g. reading, math, language, and writing).

Competency 9: Sequence tasks to move from simple to complex and/or concrete to abstract as indicated.

Competency 3: Establish pupils specific skill levels by administering appropriate diagnostic tests (standardized and teacher made).

Competency 27: Appropriately interact and communicate with parents regarding pupil assessment, programming and evaluation (verbal and written).

Competency 4: Identify strong and weak learning modes by observation and diagnostic testing (e.g. visual, auditory, kinesthetic).

Competency 19: Modify expectations, when indicated, to provide success experiences for pupil(s).

Competency 6: Select and design on-going evaluation systems which provide feedback of pupil(s) progress toward an objective.

Competency 23: Communicate pupils needs and progress effectively to other professionals (verbal and written).

Competency 15: Implement an instructional management system which coordinates curriculum, motivation and evaluation to maximize pupil(s) progress.

The UNI competencies which fell in the middle third (in continued order of ranked importance) are:

Competency 16: Provide appropriate teacher approach(es) to promote optimum interaction with pupil(s) (e.g. firm kindness, active friendliness, matter of fact).

Competency 20: Provide appropriate intervention procedure(s) when pupil(s) are manifesting undesired behaviors.

Competency 13: Provide appropriate method(s) of presenting materials (e.g. demonstration, explanation, command).

Competency 14: Verify effectiveness of objective(s), material(s), and method(s) by evaluation of pupil(s) movement toward desired objective.

Competency 7: Prescribe and behaviorally state long-term social, academic, and work/study objective(s) (include what pupils will do, under what conditions and criteria for success).

Competency 18: Select and provide appropriate motivational procedures to increase quantity and quality of desired pupil(s) behaviors.

Competency 2: Determine critical (major) problem behaviors by analysis of observational data.

Competency 17: Provide a variety of behavior management procedures to get and maintain individual and group control.

Competency 5: Design and execute pre-tests which measure pupil(s) entry level for a specific objective or goal.

Competency 25: Participate in interdisciplinary staffings, analyze the staffing content, and draw appropriate inferences and conclusions.

Competency 1: Execute appropriate observational techniques to describe frequency and duration of pupil(s) behaviors (desirable and undesirable) and group interactions (pupil/teacher, pupil/peer).

The UNI competencies which fell in the bottom third (in continued order of ranked importance) are:

Competency 8: Describe the sequential components of desired long-term objective(s) by identifying the steps in each social, academic and work/study goal.

Competency 28: Actively seek and be receptive to services provided by support personnel to enhance pupil(s) educational program.

Competency 31: Demonstrate ethical professional behavior concerning the teaching/learning situation with handicapped pupils when interacting with other professionals, parents, pupils, and the public.

Competency 26: Provide effective counseling and guidance to handicapped pupils as indicated.

Competency 21: Verify effectiveness of motivational and intervention procedures as indicated by increase or decrease in desired pupil behaviors.

Competency 29: Select referral sources appropriate to pupil(s)

need, implement the referral process, and evaluate the results.

Competency 24: Demonstrate the processes of analysis, organization, integration, and evaluation when implementing a special education program within a specific school building.

Competency 22: Demonstrate appropriate methods for management of para-professionals and volunteers to develop an effective teaching team.

Competency 32: Demonstrate an applied knowledge of the rules and regulations and legalities of working with handicapped pupils.

Competency 33: Assess, design, conduct, and evaluate a formal in-service training program within the school setting.

Competency 30: Design, conduct and evaluate a presentation of an educational program to a local public or service organization.

Question 2. Which UNI competencies ranked as very important were ranked as very important by all three groups in the consortia?

A Chi-square goodness of fit test was used to determine which competencies with the highest mean ranking from all raters had agreement across all three consortium groups. The results of this non-parametric procedure can be found in Table 2.

The Chi-square results reported in Table 2 were obtained by calculating the expected ranking agreement between the three groups as compared to the actual ranking agreement between the three groups. Choices for ranking were very important, less important, least important, not important and no rank on each competency. The maximum degree of freedom (eight) represents number of groups (three) - one times the number of choices (five) - one. Where there are six degrees of freedom none of the raters from any of the three groups ranked those particular competencies as Not Important, thus those calculations were based on four choices.

Table 2

CHI-SQUARE GOODNESS OF FIT COMPARING THE
TOP THIRD OF UNI COMPETENCIES ACROSS CONSORTIA

Competency Number	Degrees of Freedom	Chi-Square	Significance*
12	6	3.32993	.7664
10	6	14.79818	.0219
11	6	4.85843	.5621
9	8	5.05269	.7519
3	8	4.69671	.7894
27	6	6.65639	.3535
4	6	15.64866	.0158
19	8	17.33669	.0268
6	6	3.47454	.7474
23	8	26.60654	.0008
15	8	12.06392	.1484

*rejection level .05

Based on a rejection level of .05 evidence from Table 2 indicates agreement across consortia on competencies 12, 11, 9, 3, 27, 6 and 15. There was disagreement across consortia on competencies 10, 4, 19 and 23.

Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 will illustrate disagreement on competencies 10, 4, 19 and 23 respectively. The tables will represent, by percent, the distribution of rankings from each of the three groups which fell in each of the categories.

Table 3 indicates that the majority of teachers and AEA personnel

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 10
PROVIDE APPROPRIATE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS TO MEET
SHORT TERM OBJECTIVE(S)

	Teachers	Teacher Trainers	AEA
No Rank	0%	0%	6.7%
Least Important	6.4%	9.1%	13.3%
Less Important	35.2%	54.5%	26.7%
Most Important	58.4%	36.4%	53.3%

ranked the competency as Most Important. The majority of the teacher trainers ranked the competency as Less Important.

Table 4

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 4
IDENTIFY STRONG AND WEAK LEARNING MODES BY OBSERVATION
AND DIAGNOSTIC TESTING (e.g. VISUAL, AUDITORY, KINESTHETIC)

	Teachers	Teacher Trainers	AEA
No Rank	5.6%	4.5%	0%
Least Important	9.6%	36.4%	33.3%
Less Important	22.4%	18.2%	26.7%
Most Important	62.4%	40.9%	40.0%

Table 4 indicates that the majority of the teachers ranked the competency as Most Important. Less than 50% of teacher trainer and AEA personnel ranked the competency as Most Important. In addition, almost as many teacher trainers and AEA personnel ranked the competency Least

Important as ranked it Most Important while only 9% of the teachers ranked it as Least Important.

Table 5 indicates that the majority of teachers ranked the competency as Most Important. In addition 10% more AEA personnel ranked it Most Important as did teacher trainers. Teacher trainers ratings were quite divided with the greatest percentages falling in the Less Important category. Almost as many AEA personnel ranked the competency Least Important as ranked it Most Important with few rankings in the Less Important category.

Table 5

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 19
MODIFY EXPECTATIONS, WHEN INDICATED, TO PROVIDE
SUCCESS EXPERIENCES FOR PUPIL(S)

	Teachers	Teacher Trainers	AEA
No Rank	1.6%	9.1%	13.3%
Not Important	.8%	0%	0%
Least Important	10.4%	22.7%	33.3%
Less Important	35.2%	36.4%	13.3%
Most Important	52.0%	31.8%	40.0%

Table 6 indicates that half of the teacher trainers ranked the competency as Least Important and only 4.5% ranked it as Most Important. More teachers ranked the competency Less Important than ranked it Most Important. More AEA personnel ranked the competency Most Important than ranked it Less or Least Important.

Table 6

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 23
COMMUNICATE PUPILS NEEDS AND PROGRESS EFFECTIVELY
TO OTHER PROFESSIONALS (VERBAL AND WRITTEN)

	Teachers	Teacher Trainers	AEA
No Rank	1.6%	4.5%	6.7%
Not Important	.8%	0%	0%
Least Important	11.2%	50.0%	26.7%
Less Important	46.4%	40.9%	26.7%
Most Important	40.0%	4.5%	40.0%

Question 3. What competencies were ranked as very important by the raters that are not included in the UNI competency list?

No additional competencies were included in the overall mean rankings. Seventeen respondents listed additional competencies and only three respondents chose to include their own competencies in the Very Important column. The competencies included in the Very Important column are as follows:

1. Develop individual personal relationships with children.

2. Establish an organized system of record keeping with precise, accurate detail and punctuality in reporting.

3. Participate as an effective member of the building staff and district staff to the end that the total educational services to the community are best served.

4. Provide a classroom environment that enhances the total mental health of the pupils served.

5. Keep self at high level of competency in knowledge of the curriculum content appropriate for children served.

The most frequently mentioned additional competencies which the respondents chose not to rank were: (a) establish rapport and/or a 'helping' attitude toward children, (b) knowledge of new methods and materials, and (c) work effectively with regular class teachers, other professionals, and parents.

Section 2

To determine the generic nature of all the UNI competencies, the following questions were answered:

Question 1. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teachers in different instructional settings?

A Chi-square goodness of fit test was used to determine the agreement among teacher raters across instructional settings. The results of this non-parametric procedure can be found in Table 7.

The Chi-square results reported in Table 7 were obtained by calculating the expected agreement between teacher raters in three types of instructional settings as compared to the actual agreement between the teacher raters in the three groups. The instructional settings were: (a) resource N(108), (b) special class with integration N(4), and (c) self-contained special class N(12). The variance in degrees of freedom is again the result of no raters ranking certain competencies Not Important with the exception of competency 10 where both Not Important and No Ranking were omitted.

Based on a rejection level of .05, Table 7 indicates agreement by teacher raters across instructional settings on all but three competen-

Table 7

CHI-SQUARE GOODNESS OF FIT COMPARING TEACHER RATERS ACROSS INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING

Competency Number	Mean Rank	Degree of Freedom	Chi-Square	Significance*
12	3.494	6	7.25463	.2979
10	3.457	4	.91330	.9226
11	3.438	6	10.46090	.1065
9	3.420	8	8.07702	.4260
3	3.370	6	14.69748	.0227
27	3.315	6	9.15382	.1651
4	3.272	6	6.75716	.3439
19	3.216	8	5.44867	.7087
6	3.105	6	4.80099	.5696
23	3.086	8	16.06313	.0415
15	3.086	8	9.08783	.3349
16	3.068	8	1.80881	.9863
20	3.043	8	6.66487	.5732
13	3.000	8	4.57223	.8022
14	3.000	6	8.42744	.2084
7	2.994	6	5.31836	.5037
18	2.981	8	6.16448	.6288
2	2.907	8	9.46905	.3043
17	2.877	8	6.02689	.6442
5	2.821	8	3.40475	.0965
25	2.753	8	6.26247	.6197
1	2.704	8	4.17791	.8407
8	2.660	8	11.91051	.1552
28	2.623	8	11.77340	.1616
31	2.568	8	5.03344	.7540
26	2.531	8	4.70627	.7885
21	2.377	8	11.08136	.1971
29	2.179	8	3.61840	.8898
24	2.160	8	5.99196	.6481
22	2.117	8	17.95778	.0215
32	2.074	8	10.27993	.2459
33	1.981	8	10.27849	.2460
30	1.759	8	6.91207	.5570

*rejection level .05

cies. There was disagreement on competencies 3, 23 and 22 (listed in order of ranked order of importance). Competency 23, ranked tenth, was near the rejection level.

Tables 8, 9 and 10 will illustrate disagreement on competencies 3, 23 and 22 respectively. The tables will represent, by percentages, the distribution of rankings from teachers in each of the three instructional settings which fell in each of the categories.

Table 8 indicates that the majority of teachers in resource and special class with integration settings rated Competency 3 Most Important. Teachers in self-contained special classes ranked the competency as Less Important than did teachers in the other two groups. As many self-contained teachers ranked it Least Important as ranked it Most Important.

Table 8

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 3
ESTABLISH PUPIL(S) SPECIFIC SKILL LEVELS BY ADMINISTERING
APPROPRIATE DIAGNOSTIC TESTS (STANDARDIZED AND TEACHER MADE)

	Resource	Special/ Integration	Self- Contained
No Rank	3.7%	0%	16.7%
Least Important	7.4%	25%	33.3%
Less Important	22.2%	0%	16.7%
Most Important	66.7%	75%	33.3%

Table 9 indicates that more of the raters in all three groups ranked Competency 23 Less Important and no teachers in special class with integration ranked it as Most Important. Special class and self-

contained class teachers ranked it more frequently Least Important than did resource teachers.

Table 9

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 23
COMMUNICATE PUPILS NEEDS AND PROGRESS EFFECTIVELY
TO OTHER PROFESSIONALS (VERBAL AND WRITTEN)

	Resource	Special/ Integration	Self-Contained
No Rank	1.9%	0%	0%
Not Important	0%	0%	8.3%
Least Important	9.3%	25%	25.0%
Less Important	45.4%	75%	41.7%
Most Important	43.5%	0%	25.0%

Table 10 indicates that the majority of resource teachers ranked Competency 22 as Least Important while the majority of the other groups ranked it higher (Less Important).

Table 10
DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 22
DEMONSTRATE APPROPRIATE METHODS FOR MANAGEMENT
OF PARAPROFESSIONALS AND VOLUNTEERS TO
DEVELOP AN EFFECTIVE TEACHING TEAM

	Resource	Special/ Integration	Self-Contained
No Rank	9.3%	25%	8.3%
Not Important	6.5%	0%	0%
Least Important	63.9%	25%	25.0%
Less Important	14.8%	50%	41.7%
Most Important	5.6%	0%	25.0%

Question 2. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teachers with pupils functioning at different levels?

A Chi-square goodness of fit test was used to determine the agreement among teacher raters across functioning levels of children taught. The results can be found in Table 11.

The Chi-square results reported in Table 11 were obtained by calculating the expected agreement between raters with children functioning at four levels or a combination of levels as compared to the actual agreement of teacher raters in the five groups. The functioning levels were: (a) preacademic N(16), (b) primary N(43), (c) intermediate N(18), (d) secondary N(21), and (e) combined N(27). The variance in degrees of freedom is the result of no raters ranking certain competencies Not Important. On Competency 10 no raters chose either Not Important or No Rank.

With a rejection level of .05, Table 11 indicates agreement by teacher raters across functioning level of children taught, on all but three competencies. There is disagreement regarding competencies 11, 17 and 22. In addition competencies 33 and 18 are near the rejection level.

Tables 12, 13 and 14 will illustrate disagreement on competencies 11, 17 and 22 respectively. The tables will represent, by percentages, the distribution of teachers with children in each of the five functioning levels which fell in each of the categories.

Table 11

CHI-SQUARE GOODNESS OF FIT COMPARING TEACHER RATERS ACROSS FUNCTIONING LEVELS

	Competency Number	Mean Rank	Degree of Freedom	Chi-square	Significance*
top one-third	12	3.494	12	12.03353	.4430
	10	3.457	8	7.35416	.4989
	11	3.438	12	21.80672	.0397
	9	3.420	16	16.18709	.4400
	3	3.370	16	17.78963	.3364
	27	3.315	12	13.20329	.3544
	4	3.272	12	12.39219	.4147
	19	3.216	16	11.86177	.7534
	6	3.105	12	16.31091	.1774
	23	3.086	16	24.03716	.0887
	15	3.086	16	19.75101	.2316
middle one-third	16	3.068	16	12.59321	.7022
	20	3.043	16	14.73947	.5438
	13	3.000	16	17.70329	.3416
	14	3.000	12	8.31865	.7598
	7	2.994	12	15.48042	.2162
	18	2.981	16	26.96945	.0418
	2	2.907	16	19.71489	.2333
	17	2.877	16	34.38676	.0048
	5	2.821	16	23.01865	.1132
	25	2.753	16	19.83482	.2278
	1	2.704	16	12.52363	.7072
bottom one-third	8	2.660	16	12.98061	.6742
	28	2.623	16	21.33641	.1659
	31	2.568	16	11.54167	.7749
	26	2.531	16	17.51363	.3531
	21	2.377	16	12.30521	.7227
	29	2.179	16	19.59048	.2392
	24	2.160	16	6.64185	.9796
	22	2.117	16	41.41736	.0005
	32	2.074	16	12.98709	.6737
	33	1.981	16	18.18964	.3129
	30	1.759	16	10.66132	.8299

*rejection level .05

Table 12

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 11
EMPLOY A VARIETY OF REMEDIAL TECHNIQUES,
AS INDICATED, FOR CORE CURRICULUM
(e.g. READING, MATH, LANGUAGE, AND WRITING)

	Combined	Pre-Ac	Primary	Intermediate	Secondary
No Rank	3.7%	6.3%	0%	5.6%	0%
Least Important	3.7%	25.0%	7.0%	11.1%	4.8%
Less Important	22.2%	50.0%	23.3%	11.1%	10.0%
Most Important	70.4%	18.8%	69.8%	72.2%	76.2%

Table 12 indicates teachers of children functioning at the pre-academic level generally ranked Competency 11 Less Important while the majority of the other four teacher groups considered it Most Important.

Table 13

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 17
PROVIDE A VARIETY OF BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
TO GET AND MAINTAIN INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP CONTROL

	Combined	Pre-Ac	Primary	Intermediate	Secondary
No Rank	3.7%	6.3%	7.0%	16.7%	9.5%
Not Important	3.7%	0%	0%	0%	4.8%
Least Important	33.7%	6.3%	11.6%	11.1%	42.9%
Less Important	22.2%	75.0%	51.2%	22.2%	33.3%
Most Important	37.0%	12.5%	30.2%	50.0%	9.5%

Table 13 indicates general disagreement regarding Competency 16. More teachers of intermediate level children ranked it Most Important than did teachers of the other functioning levels. Teachers of the pre-academic generally considered the competency Less Important as did half of the primary teachers. It was considered Least Important by more secondary teachers than any other group and the teachers with combinations of functioning levels were rather equally divided in their rankings.

Table 14 indicates that the majority of the teachers from all functioning levels, except pre-academic, ranked Competency 22 Least Important. Those teachers with children functioning at the pre-academic level considered it generally more important with half their rankings in the Less Important category and a fourth in the Most Important category.

Table 14

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS FOR COMPETENCY 22
DEMONSTRATE APPROPRIATE METHODS FOR MANAGEMENT
OF PARAPROFESSIONALS AND VOLUNTEERS TO
DEVELOP AN EFFECTIVE TEACHING TEAM

	Combined	Pre-Ac	Primary	Intermediate	Secondary
No Rank	11.1%	6.3%	2.3%	27.8%	9.5%
Not Important	7.4%	0%	4.7%	11.1%	4.3%
Least Important	74.1%	18.8%	67.4%	50.0%	57.1%
Less Important	3.7%	50.0%	23.3%	11.1%	14.3%
Most Important	3.7%	25.0%	2.3%	0%	14.3%

Section 3

The teachers were asked to indicate which of the UNI competencies they have acquired and which they have not acquired. They were also asked to indicate whether competencies were acquired by pre-service, in-service, or teaching experience. Table 15 indicates, in percentages, the teachers perceptions regarding acquisition of competencies and how competence was most frequently acquired.

There was a high correspondence between a competency being highly ranked and being perceived as acquired. Only two competencies (conduct an in-service and present an educational program to a local organization) were perceived as not acquired by more than 50% of the teachers and they ranked 32 and 33. The majority of the competencies were perceived as being most frequently acquired through teaching experience. Eight competencies were perceived as being acquired more frequently in in-service and are (a) use observational techniques, (b) analyze observed behavior, (c) administer standardized and teacher made tests, (d) identify strong and weak learning modes, (e) prescribe long term goals, (f) analyze tasks, (g) sequence tasks, and (h) use behavior management to get control.

Table 15
ACQUISITION OF UNI COMPETENCIES

Competency Number	Competency Rank	Not Acquired	Pre-Service	In-Service	Teaching Experience	Combination
1	22	9.6%	60.8%	5.6%	16.0%	8.0%
2	18	11.2%	53.6%	3.2%	22.4%	9.6%
3	5	7.2%	49.6%	8.8%	23.2%	11.2%
4	7	12.0%	40.0%	5.6%	36.0%	6.4%
5	20	14.4%	35.2%	8.0%	36.0%	6.4%
6	9	17.6%	23.2%	8.8%	44.0%	6.4%
7	16	11.2%	59.2%	7.2%	13.6%	8.8%
8	23	20.0%	50.4%	8.0%	12.8%	8.8%
9	4	5.6%	42.4%	6.4%	34.4%	11.2%
10	2	4.8%	23.2%	8.0%	54.4%	9.6%
11	3	7.2%	28.0%	5.6%	42.4%	16.8%
12	1	5.6%	13.6%	7.2%	68.0%	5.6%
13	14	6.4%	28.0%	4.0%	54.4%	7.2%
14	15	9.6%	30.4%	5.6%	48.0%	6.4%
15	11	10.4%	36.8%	6.4%	40.0%	6.4%
16	12	4.8%	24.0%	2.4%	61.6%	7.2%
17	19	7.2%	40.0%	4.8%	36.8%	11.2%
18	17	7.2%	20.8%	4.0%	54.4%	13.6%
19	8	5.6%	17.6%	4.8%	65.6%	6.4%
20	13	9.6%	23.2%	7.2%	47.2%	12.8%
21	27	14.4%	33.6%	6.4%	38.4%	7.2%
22	30	41.6%	8.0%	5.6%	42.4%	2.4%
23	10	8.0%	11.2%	9.6%	64.8%	6.4%
24	29	38.4%	14.4%	7.2%	33.6%	6.4%
25	21	8.8%	12.8%	8.8%	61.6%	8.0%
26	26	29.6%	6.4%	7.2%	53.6%	3.2%
27	6	5.6%	10.4%	5.6%	70.4%	8.0%
28	24	10.4%	8.8%	18.4%	58.4%	4.0%
29	28	13.6%	9.6%	17.6%	54.4%	4.8%
30	33	57.6%	7.2%	7.2%	24.0%	4.0%
31	25	7.2%	17.6%	2.4%	63.2%	9.6%
32	31	21.6%	17.6%	17.6%	33.6%	9.6%
33	32	60.8%	9.6%	6.4%	18.4%	4.8%

*Combinations include: pre-service + in-service, in-service + teaching, pre-service + teaching, and all categories. An examination of the possible combinations reveals that the majority of the combinations reported were pre-service + teaching.

Summary

Table 16 indicates summary data on the 33 UNI competencies. The data includes competencies, by number, in rank order, from highest to lowest. The table indicates (by simple yes or no) which competencies had agreement across the consortium of Iowa special education teacher trainers, AEA personnel, and teachers in multi-disability settings. The table indicates (by simple yes or no) the generic applicability across teacher raters by instructional setting and functioning level of child taught. Finally, the table illustrates which competencies were more frequently acquired by pre-service and which by teaching experience.

Table 16

SUMMARY OF DATA ON 33 UNI SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER COMPETENCIES

	Competency	Consortia*		Instructional Setting*		Functioning Level*		Pre-Service	Teaching Experience
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Top one-third	12	X		X		X			X
	10		X	X		X			X
	11	X		X			X		X
	9	X		X		X		X	
	3	X			X	X		X	
	27	X		X		X			X
	4		X	X		X		X	
	19		X	X		X			X
	6	X		X		X			X
	23		X		X	X			X
	15	X		X		X			X
Middle one-third	16	X		X		X			X
	20	X		X		X			X
	13	X		X		X			X
	14	X		X		X			X
	7	X		X		X		X	
	18	X		X		X			X
	2		X	X		X		X	
	17	X		X			X		X
	5	X		X		X		X	
	25	X		X		X			X
	1	X		X		X		X	
Bottom one-third	8	X		X		X		X	
	28	X		X		X			X
	31	X		X		X			X
	26	X		X		X			X
	21	X		X		X			X
	29	X		X		X			X
	24	X		X		X			X
	22	X			X		X		X
	32	X		X		X			X
	33	X		X		X			X
	30	X		X		X			X

*Agreement across consortia, instructional setting and functioning level was determined by Chi-square goodness of fit test.

Chapter V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Concern over categorization (labeling) and questionable placement practices has led to a variety of instructional models (Reynolds, 1962; Deno, 1970) for mildly handicapped children. This movement away from traditional categories (educable mentally retarded, emotionally disabled, and learning disabled) and away from traditional placement (the self-contained special class) requires that teachers of the mildly handicapped be able to construct programs for a variety of handicapped children in a variety of instructional settings.

In response to the need for teachers who can develop and continue the necessary programs, special education teacher trainers are adopting less traditional approaches. The University of Northern Iowa has combined two less traditional approaches to establish a multi-categorical, performance-based special education training program. Essential to this program is a statement of well defined competencies which delineate those skills necessary for a teacher to construct programs for a variety of handicapped children.

Identification, assessment and delimitation of teacher competencies has posed special problems for a number of years (Houston, 1973; Dodl, 1975; Eham and Okey, 1974). Attempts to validate teacher competencies have been inconclusive and as a result no empirical basis is

available regarding which competencies are essential (Heath and Neilson, 1974). Because of these difficulties, a consortium approach to the identification, assessment, and delimitation of competencies, suggested by Dodl (1973), Lindsey (1973) and Rosner and Kay (1974) should increase the probability that the most appropriate competencies are delimited. It appears desirable that the consortium consist of teacher trainers and public school personnel. This kind of consortium combines the theoretical and research oriented teacher trainers' perceptions with the reality based public school personnel perceptions.

Purpose

The major purpose of this study was to subject UNI's competencies to a consortium of Iowa special educators in order to rank the relative importance of each competency for teachers of the mildly handicapped. In order to do this, the following questions were examined:

1. In general, which UNI competencies are ranked as very important by all raters?

2. Which UNI competencies generally ranked as very important were ranked as very important by all three groups in the consortium?

3. What competencies were ranked as very important by the raters that are not included in the UNI competency list?

A secondary purpose of the study was to determine the generic nature of the UNI competencies. In order to do this, the following questions were examined:

1. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teachers in different instructional settings?

2. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teach-

ers with pupils functioning at different levels?

3. Teachers were asked to indicate which competencies they currently possess, and whether those competencies have been acquired by preservice training, in-service training, or teaching experience.

Subjects and Setting

The subjects involved in the study included Iowa special education teacher trainers, Area Education Agency (AEA) directors and consultants for multi-disability programs, and special education teachers in multi-disability settings. The entire population of each group involved in the consortium was contacted. There were 33 teacher trainers, 19 AEA personnel, and 198 teachers for a total of 250 subjects. The total number of subjects who responded was 178 or 71%. The total number of usable responses was 164 or 66%. The percentage of each group follows: (a) teacher trainers - 67% (including responses from teacher trainers in six of the eight special education teacher training institutions), (b) AEA - 79% (including 14 of the 15 areas), and (c) teachers - 64% (including responses from teachers in 13 of the 15 AEA's).

Instrumentation and Procedures

An instrument was designed that employs a forced ranking procedure. The instrument, a list containing 33 UNI competencies, and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, was mailed to each subject.

There were five possible categories in which to rank the UNI competencies. The categories were: (a) Most Important, (b) Less Important, (c) Least Important, (d) Not Important, and (e) Don't Choose to Rank.

The subjects could rank as few competencies as they wished in any one category, but could place no more than eleven competencies in any one category. Subjects were also provided an opportunity to list competencies they perceived as important which were not included in the UNI competency list.

In addition to the ranking procedure, which all three groups of the consortium were asked to complete, the members of the teaching group were requested to indicate which competencies they perceived themselves as having and whether competence was acquired through pre-service, in-service, or teaching experience.

Analysis and Results

Mean rankings of all raters were obtained on each of the 33 UNI competencies. In addition, the 11 competencies in the top one-third were identified.

The four competencies with the highest mean rank relate to instructional (curricular) skills. In order (the highest mean first) the competencies were: (a) individualize materials, (b) match materials and equipment to short term goals, (c) use a variety of remedial techniques, and (d) sequence tasks.

The 5th and 7th ranked competencies relate to diagnostic skills. These were: (a) administer standardized and teacher made tests, and (b) identify strong and weak learning modes.

The remaining competencies in the top one-third of the ranking involve a variety of other skills. The remaining competencies were: (a) communicate pupil needs to parents (ranked 6th), (b) provide success experiences for pupils (ranked 8th), (c) design evaluation systems (rank-

ed 9th), (d) communicate pupils needs to other professionals (ranked 10th), and (e) provide an instructional management system which coordinates curriculum, motivation and evaluation procedures (ranked 11th).

A Chi-square goodness of fit test was used to determine which competencies with the highest mean rank (the top one-third) had agreement across all three educator groups of the consortium. There was agreement on the relative importance of (a) individualizing materials, (b) using a variety of remedial techniques, (c) sequencing tasks, (d) administering diagnostic tests, (e) communicating with parents, (f) evaluating, and (g) implementing an instructional management system. The competencies ranked 2nd, 7th, 8th, and 10th were rejected at the .05 level of significance. The competencies rejected were: (a) match materials and equipment to short term goals, (b) identify strong and weak learning modes, (c) provide success experiences for children, and (d) communicate pupils needs to other professionals; respectively.

Five additional competencies that did not appear in the UNI list were added to the ranking by the respondents. The competencies added were related to teacher/pupil interaction, precise record keeping, school building and school district interaction skills, and continuing education.

A Chi-square goodness of fit test was used to determine the generic nature of competencies as perceived by teachers in different instructional settings (resource or itinerant, special class with integration, and self-contained special class). There was agreement on the relative importance of the competencies by teacher raters across instructional setting on 30 competencies. The competencies ranked 5th, 10th, and 30th were rejected at the .05 level of significance. The competencies reject-

ed were: (a) administer standard and teacher made tests, (b) communicate pupils needs to other professionals, and (c) manage paraprofessionals and volunteers, respectively.

A Chi-square goodness of fit test was used to determine the generic nature of competencies as perceived by teachers of children at different functioning levels (pre-academic, primary, intermediate, secondary, and combined levels). There was agreement on the relative importance of competencies by teacher raters across functioning level of children taught on 29 competencies. The competencies ranked 3rd, 17th, 19th and 30th were rejected at the .05 level of significance. The competencies rejected were: (a) employ a variety of remedial techniques for 'core' curriculum, (b) provide motivational procedures, (c) provide behavior management procedures, and (d) manage para-professionals and volunteers, respectively.

Percentages regarding the acquisition of all 33 competencies and how competence was acquired indicate that 25 competencies were perceived by the teachers as having been more frequently acquired in teaching experience. Those more frequently acquired in pre-service were: (a) use of observational techniques, (b) analyze observed data to determine critical problems, (c) administer standardized and teacher made tests, (d) identify strong and weak learning modes, (e) prescribe and behaviorally state long term goals, (f) analyze tasks, (g) sequence tasks, and (h) provide appropriate teacher approaches.

Discussions and Conclusions

The separate discussion on each question is based on data generated by analyzing the responses to the questionnaire. Conclusions combine

the various the various findings and focus on implications for teachers of the mildly handicapped.

Question 1. In general, which UNI competencies are ranked as important by all the raters?

The competencies ranked in the top one-third were representative because instructional, diagnostic, evaluative, management, and interdisciplinary skills were included. However, the raters tended to consider instructional (curricular) skills as most important. This tendency is particularily evident in a comparison of the relative importance of instructional skills with motivational and disciplinary skills. The four competencies with the highest mean rank were specific instructional skills; no specific management skills ranked in the top one-third. There was also a tendency to choose skills concerned with immediate pupil needs. This tendency was exemplified by short term objectives being considered relatively more important than long term objectives. It is also exemplified by the fact that interdisciplinary skills, with far reaching and long term implications, were generally ranked in the bottom third.

Comparing the perceptions of the subjects in the present study with the findings in the review of literature, there is agreement in regard to the importance of teachers being able to individualize instruction, use a variety of remedial techniques, and employ some kind of diagnostic procedure. Communication of specific pupil needs to parents and other professionals were ranked in the top third in the present study and were also considered important in the literature review.

The literature review stressed the need for teachers to be highly skilled interdisciplinary team members, particularly in the sections

related to the emotionally disabled, the learning disabled, and specific roles of teachers. However, such competencies as participating in interdisciplinary team staffings, actively seeking support services, and selecting appropriate referral sources were ranked, by the respondents, in the middle or bottom third. It may be that the forced ranking led the raters to choose direct educational service skills as being more properly the teacher's main concern and interdisciplinary skills more necessary for consultants and other support personnel. This perception of the role of the teacher may also explain the lack of importance placed on counseling skills by the raters.

The literature reviewed generally emphasized the need to be able to prescribe objectives in behavioral terms and to effectively employ observational techniques. In the present study, competencies related to these skills ranked 16th and 22nd, respectively. Apparently, the raters did not attach the same degree of importance to these skills as did the studies and other related literature.

Question 2. Which UNI competencies ranked as Very Important by the raters were ranked as Very Important by all three groups in the consortium?

The less important a competency was considered by all the raters, the more agreement was noted. Five competencies were rejected at the .05 level when a Chi-square goodness of fit was calculated and four of the five rejected were in the top third. These four competencies related to: (a) matching materials and equipment to short term goals, (b) identifying strong and weak learning modes, (c) providing success experiences for pupils, and (d) communicating pupils needs to other profess-

ionals. The other competency rejected ranked in the middle third and related to the analysis of observed behavior to determine critical problems. This was considered Most Important by over 70% of the teacher trainers and by 26% of the teachers. In each case, the most apparent disagreement was between teachers and teacher trainers. Teachers and AEA personnel appeared to be in agreement on all but two competencies. This general agreement among public school personnel as compared to public school personnel and teacher trainers lends support to assessment by a consortium in order to combine perceptions. It should be noted that few raters chose to rank competencies as Not Important thus results appear to reflect a priority in perceptions rather than a rejection of the various competencies by certain groups.

Question 3. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teachers in different instructional settings?

The 33 competencies appear to be relatively generic across instructional setting. Communicating pupil needs to other professionals would, of necessity, be more important to resource teachers than to teachers in the other two groups. Because the pupils spend part of their school day with other teachers and may be in resource settings for only a small portion of the hours spent in school. A resource teacher's effecitveness will, in all probability, be determined by her ability to coordinate efforts with the regular class teacher(s). There was a comparative lack of importance attributed to diagnostic testing skills by teachers in self-contained classes compared to the apparent importance attributed to the skill by the other two groups. It may be that teachers in self-contained settings spend the majority of their time in instruction and

teachers in the other two settings spend relatively equal amounts of time in diagnosing and instructing.

Question 4. Are there differences in how competencies are ranked by teachers with pupils functioning at different levels?

Teachers of pre-academic pupils did not appear to consider the use of remedial techniques for core curriculum as important as did teachers of children functioning at higher levels. This could be attributed to goals being less academic oriented at the pre-academic level. The discrepancy in ranking of motivational procedures and behavior management techniques to gain group control is probably due to philosophical differences in the raters, since there was considerable ranking diversity within groups as well as between groups.

Question 5. Which competencies do teachers perceive themselves as having, and if acquired, was it by pre-service, in-service or teacher training?

Teachers generally perceived themselves as having all but the two lowest ranked competencies (applied knowledge of special education rules and ability to conduct in-service programs). It is significant that few competencies were perceived as having been acquired more frequently through pre-service than through teaching experience. It would appear that teacher training programs should consider more direct interaction with pupils, parents, and other professionals during the training period, if competence is to be acquired at the pre-service level.

In conclusion, it appears that Iowa special educators regard instructional skills as most important for teachers of the mildly handicapped. A representative sample of a variety of other teaching skills was also con-

sidered important. Although there was general agreement regarding the generic applicability of the UNI competencies for the mildly handicapped, there was enough disagreement across the consortium to consider a broad decision making base important in determining a priority list of competencies essential for teachers of the mildly handicapped. It appears that the majority of UNI competencies are considered important and therefore essential to teachers of the mildly handicapped.

Limitations of the Study

1. The total percent of response, generally representative within each group of the consortium was 66%. A greater response, particularily from teachers and teacher trainers, may have resulted in some difference in the results of the overall mean rankings and the agreement across the consortium concerning the relative importance of the competencies.

2. Employing a forced ranking procedure may have significantly decreased the number of responses since many raters indicated they found it difficult and time consuming to respond to the questionnaire.

3. The study was limited to the state of Iowa; thus findings cannot be generalized to other states.

4. There was a paucity of published research available regarding competencies generic to all teachers of the mildly handicapped.

5. There is no reliability data available. The format and length of the instrument indicated that it was not feasible to obtain reliability data.

Implications for Further Research

In the following section, recommendations are included for addi-

tional investigations of competencies for the mildly handicapped:

1. A replication of this study should be made beyond the state of Iowa. This would provide more generalization of results.

2. The effects of teachers philosophical orientation, amount of training, and amount of teaching experience should be studied in relationship to perceptions regarding the relative importance of teacher competencies for the mildly handicapped.

3. Further determinations regarding the generic applicablity of UNI competencies should be made by comparing the rating of competencies for the mildly handicapped by teachers of the EMR, the ED, and the LD.

4. An investigation of the perceptions of recent UNI graduates regarding the relative importance of UNI's competencies would provide further insight into which competencies are most essential. The data could also be used to determine if there are significant differences in the mean rankings of respondents from the present study which included teachers trained in other institutions.

5. Information needs to be gathered regarding the efficacy of identification of competencies by a consortium. Since this is a time consuming process it would be valuable to know whether special educators perceive the results worth the effort.

Reference Notes

1. Reger, R. Special classes for students classified as educable mentally retarded. Presented at the Council for Exceptional Children Convention, Chicago, Illinois, April 24, 1970.

2. Position statement on mainstreaming. State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction Special Education Division, February, 1974.

3. Northern Iowa instructional laboratory progress report. Division of Special Education, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1975.

4. Ortega, J. The effects of a performance-based training program on subsequent teacher effectiveness. Unpublished Ed.S. thesis, University of Northern Iowa, 1975.

5. Popham, W. J. Identification and assessment of minimal competencies for objectives-oriented teacher education programs. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Education Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1973.

6. Orlosky, D. E. Teacher competencies to do what? Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1973.

7. Okey, J. R. and Brown, J. L. Competencies for performance-based teacher training. Washington, D.C.: United State Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1972.

8. Performance-based undergraduate program for the education of teachers at Brooklyn College. Presented to the American Association of

College of Teacher Education for consideration for the 1973 Distinguished Achievement Awards, 1972.

9. Flegenheimer, H. TE 3690-3691 course outline, student teaching practicum. Department of Special Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. Unpublished Council for Exceptional Children Convention Handout, 1976.

10. Anttonen, J. Competencies requisite for teachers of educable mentally retarded as perceived by building principals, teacher trainers, and special class teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1972.

11. Buchanan, M. The identification and validation of special education competence for non-categorical teacher preparation programs. Summary of unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1976.

12. Fox, W. Consulting teacher program. In L. Schwartz, A. Oserof, H. Druker and R. Schwartz (Eds.), Innovative non-categorical and interrelated projects in the education of the handicapped. Proceedings of the Special Study Institute sponsored by Bureau of the Education of the Handicapped, Bureau for Educational Personnel, U.S. Office of Education, 1972.

References

Balow, B. The emotionally and socially handicapped. Review of Educational Research, 1966, 36, 120-130.

Bannatyne, A. Diagnosing learning disabilities and writing remedial prescriptions. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1968, 1, 242; 249.

Bullock, L. M. and Whelan, R. J. Competencies needed by teachers of the ED and socially maladjusted: A comparison. Exceptional Child, March 1971, 37(7), 485-489.

Burke, C. The individualized competency based system of teacher education at Weber State College. PBTE Series: No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, March 1972.

Clarke, S. Designs for programs of teacher education. In B. O. Smith (Ed.), Research in teacher education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1971.

Combs, R. H. and Harper, J. L. Effects of labels on attitudes of educators toward handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1967, 33, 399-404.

Courtnage, L., Brady, R., Suroski, A., and Schmid, R. Preparing competent teachers: A non-categorical competency-based teacher training model for special education. Focus on Exceptional Children, 1975, 7, 6-12.

Deno, E. N. Special education as developmental capital. Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 229-240.

Dodl, N. R. Selecting competency outcomes for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, Fall 1973, 24(3), 194-199.

Dorward, B. A comparison of the competencies for regular classroom teachers and teachers of emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1963, 30, 67-75.

Dunn, L. Special education for the mildly retarded . . . is much of it justifiable? Exceptional Children, 1968, 35(1), 5-24.

Effenbein, I. M. Performance-based teacher education programs: A comparative description. PBTE Series: No. 8. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, October, 1972.

Eham, L. H. and Okey, J. R. Attempts at competency-based teachers education. Viewpoints, 1974, 50(5), 49-62.

Elam, S. Performance-based teacher education: What is the state of the art? PBTE Series: No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1971.

Fields, H. Who makes the best teacher of mentally retarded children? American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1953, 58, 251-267.

Freider, B. Motivator: Least developed of teacher roles. Educational Technology, 1970, 10, 28-36.

Goldstein, H., Moss, J. W., and Jordon, L. J. The efficacy of special class training on the development of mentally retarded children. Cooperative Research Project 619. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1965.

Goffman, E. Stigma: Notes on the management of a spoiled identity. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Hamerlynck, L. A., Martin, J. W., and Rolland, J. C. Systematic observation of behavior: A primary teaching skill. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1968, 3, 39-42.

Haring, N. G. A strategy for the training of resource teachers for handicapped children. In M. C. Reynolds and M. D. Davis (Eds.), Exceptional children in regular classrooms. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Department of Audio-Visual Extension, 1971.

Haring, N. G., Reid, W. R., and Baeber, J. D. Professional preparation for education of children with learning disabilities. In Minimal brain dysfunction in children. Public Health Service Publication of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969, 31-43.

Heath, R. W. and Nielson, M. A. The research basis for performance-based teacher education. Review of Educational Research, 1974, 44, 463-484.

Herr, D. E., Ed.D.; Algozzine, R. F., Ph.D.; and Heuchert, M., Ph.D. Competencies of teachers of the mildly handicapped. The Journal of Special Education, Spring 1976, 10(1), 97-106.

Hewett, F. M. A hierarchy of competencies for teachers of emotionally handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1966, 33, 7-12.

Houston, W. Designing competency-based instructional systems. Journal of Teacher Education, Fall 1973, 24(3), 200-204.

Johnson, G. O. Special education for the mentally handicapped--A paradox. Exceptional Children, 1962, 19, 62-69.

Lilly, M. S. A training base model for special education. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 745-749.

Lilly, M. S. Special education: A teapot in a tempest. Exceptional Children, 1970, 35, 43-49.

Lindsey, M. Performance-based teacher education: Examination of a slogan. Journal of Teacher Education, Fall 1973, 24(3), 180-186.

Mackie, R. P., Kvaraceus, W. C. and Williams, H. M. Teachers of children who are socially and emotionally maladjusted. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Government Printing Office, 1957.

Mackie, R. P., Williams, H. M. and Dunn, L. M. Teachers of children who are mentally retarded. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957.

Mann, P. H. Learning disabilities: A critical need for trained teachers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1968, 2, 87-93.

Martin, E. W. Individualism and behaviorism as future trends in educating handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 517-525.

McKenzie, H. S., Egner, A. N., Knight, M. F., Perelman, P. F., Sneider, R. E., and Garvin, R. S. Training consulting teachers to assist elementary teachers in the management and education of handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 137-145.

Meyen, E. L. and Carr, D. L. Teacher-perceived instructional problems: Indicators of training needs for teacher of the educable mentally retarded. Journal of Special Education, 1970, 4, 105-114.

Peter, Laurence, J. Individual instruction. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.

Prouty, R. W. and Prillman, D. Educational diagnosis. Virginia Journal of Education, 1967, 61, 10-12.

Rabinow, B. A training program for teachers of the emotionally disturbed and the socially maladjusted. Exceptional Children, 1960, 26, 287-293.

Rappaport, S. R. Teacher effectiveness for children with learning disorders. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1970, 3, 75-83.

Reynolds, M. C. and Balow, B. Categories and variables in special education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 357-366.

Rosner, B. and Kay, P. M. Will the promise of C/PBTE be fulfilled? Phi Delat Kappan, 1974, 55, 290-295.

Rossenshine, B. Interpretive study of teaching behaviors related to student achievement, final report. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Research and Development, 1970.

Rules of special education. Des Moines, Iowa: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1974.

Shearron, G. F. and Johnson, C. E. A CBTE program in action: University of Georgia. Journal of Teacher Education, Fall 1973, 24(3), 187-193.

Schwartz, L. A clinical teacher model of interrelated areas of special education. Exceptional Children, 1971, 565-572.

Schwartz, L. Preparation of the clinical teacher for special education: 1866-1966. Exceptional Children, 1967, 34, 117-124.

Turnbull, H. R., III. Accountability: An overview of the impact of litigation on professionals. Exceptional Children, 1975, 41, 427-432.

APPENDIX A

UNI PHASE I AND II CRITERIA AND SUB-CRITERIA

1. Interview parent and record clear statement of problems from parent's viewpoint. Weight = 3%
   Week 3

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Effective interview procedure by trainee	4	1-logically sequenced 1-lead toward specificity 1-completed before interview 1-make available to supervisor	Form 1B	22:170
b. State relevant and useful problem(s)	2	1-relevant, does it appear to be a problem 1-useful for modification	child's problem on Form 1A and all of Form 1B	22:174
c. State behaviorally	2	1-observable and measurable 1-conditions-where and when occur	child's problem on Form 1A	22:170
d. Completed form	1	1-all blanks filled in including parent signature	Form 1A and 1B	22:192
e. Return on time	1	1-by predetermined date	date on top of Form 1A	22:192

2. **Interview teacher and record a clear statement of the problem from the teacher's point of view. Weight = 3%**
Week 4

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. **Interviewing procedure by trainee**	4	1-logical sequencing 1-lead to specificity 1-completed before interview 1-make available to supervisor	Form 3B	22:170
b. **State relevant and useful problem(s)**	2	1-relevant, does it appear to be a problem 1-useful for modification	summary of interview with teacher on Form 3A and Form 3B	22:174
c. **State behaviorally**	2	1-observable and measurable 1-conditions-where and when occur	summary of interview with teacher on Form 3A	22:170
d. **Summary of collected information-parent and teacher interview**	2	1-consistencies 1-inconsistencies	Form 3B	22:170

3. Based on data collected and from observations, demonstrate ability to identify critical behavior by recording appropriate base rates under specified conditions. Weight = 5%
Week 4

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Observe and record behaviors of pupil	2	1-time period stated 1-list what see	Form 3C	22:170
b. State critical behaviors from all data collected	3	1-problems frequently noted in data collected 1-critical behaviors to be observed 1-how critical behaviors determined from problems	Form 3C description of behavior on Form 3A Form 3C	Combination
c. State critical behavior(s) behaviorally	2	1-observable and measurable 1-conditions-where and when occur	description of behavior on Form 3A description of behavior on Form 3A	22:170
d. Identify critical behavior(s) as deficit of interfering	1	1-correctly identify each behavior	type of behavior on Form 3A	22:170
e. Record critical behaviors	2	1-record 1-appropriate observation technique	duration and frequency on Form 3A duration and frequency on Form 3A	22:170

4. Observe and record base rates of pupil's behavior in the normal environment. Weight = 3%
Week 4

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Count and record total of frequency of observed critical behavior	1	1-record correctly	record total frequency on Form 3A	22:170
b. Compute base rate	2	1-correct interval 1-correct computation of base rate frequency	base rate on Form 3A	22:170
c. Explanation of measurement technique and reason chosen	4	2-measurement technique 2-why a particular technique was chosen	base rate on Form 3A Form 3D	22:170
d. Critical determination	3	1-appear critical or not (after counted observation) 2-why	Form 3D Form 3D	22:174

5. Observe and identify appropriate behaviors manifested in the normal environment. Weight = 1%
Week 4

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. List appropriate elicitors	3	3-list 3 elicitors (1 point each)	identification of elicitor on Form 3A	22:174 and 22:170
b. List behaviors	3	3-list 3 behaviors (1 point each)	appropriate behavior response on Form 3A	22:170
c. Behavior related to sequential observation	1	1-does relate or not	Forms 3A and 3C	22:170
d. Appropriateness of relationship	3	3-that elicitor is applicable to appropriate behavior observed (1 point per set)	identification of elicitors and appropriate behavioral response on Form 3A	22:170

6. Identify appropriate high-probability reinforcers which could be used in the tutorial setting. Weight = 1%
Week 4

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. List potential reinforcers (observed or inferred)	4	4-listing 4 reinforcers (1 per reinforcer)	high probability reinforcers on Form 3A	22:170
b. Source of reinforcer information	4	4-state whether observed or inferred and, if needed, reasons	Form 3E	22:170
c. Complete and return on time	2	1-completed 1-returned on time	Form 3A Form 3A	22:192

7. While holding conditions constant, explore possible reinforcers to determine appropriate beginning reinforcers.
Weight = 5%
Week 5

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Select appropriate elicitor	2	1-following appropriate level (assumed instruction) 1-related to critical area	elicitor exploration rating on Form 4A task on Form 4A and 3D	22:174
b. Establish range of potential reinforcers	6	1-recording 1-appropriateness (rationale for choice) 1-holding situations constant 1-sufficient range of types (at least 2 types in the effective range) 1-what reinforcer contingent upon 1-specify reinforcers	reinforcer on Form 4A Form 4B Form 4B reinforcer exploration reinforcers on Form 4A and 4B Form 4B Form 4B	22:170
c. Evaluation of reinforcers explored	2	1-record 1-effectiveness indications	Reinforcer exploration rating on Form 4A Form 4C	22:170

8. Organize appropriate eliciting materials and establish pupil's entering behaviors and skills. Weight = 5%
Week 6

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Select eliciting material	5	1-record	on Form 4A	22:174 and 22:170
		1-related to critical area	elicitors on Form 4A and Form 3D	
		1-holding conditions constant	Form 4C	
		1-appropriate sequencing	elicitor exploration on Form 4A and Form 4C	
		1-starting level appropriateness (based on all data collected to date)	Form 4C	
b. Determining material level	2	1-record level	elicitor exploration on Form 4A	22:174
		1-completeness of scope	elicitor exploration on Form 4A	
c. Evaluation of elicitors	3	1-record rating	elicitor exploration on Form 4A	22:174
		1-logical in relation to level	elicitor exploration rating compared to level on Form 4A	
		1-consistent with all exploration findings. Students need to base this exploration on findings from parent, teacher and critical deficits counted.	Form 4A rating and Form 4C level of performance	

9. Write appropriate terminal behavior reflecting diagnostic findings. Must Pass. Weight = 10%
Week 6

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
Terminal Objective				
a. State Behaviorally	2	2-observable and measurable	terminal objective on Form 4A	22:170
b. State appropriate behavior	2	1-related to a critical area 1-reasonable expectation in terms of present functioning level in critical areas	terminal objective on Form 4A terminal objective and elicitor exploration on Form 4A	22:174
c. State expected level of pupil performance	3	1-behavior criteria specifically stated 1-level of acceptance 1-criteria expected related directly to prior behavior and must be appropriate	terminal objective on Form 4A terminal objective on Form 4A terminal objective on Form 4A and observation on Form 3A	22:170
d. State conditions and reinforcement contingencies	2	1-appropriateness of conditions 1-appropriateness of reinforcement contingencies (reasonableness, teacher involvement, etc.) For classroom, must be appropriate to classroom system	terminal objective on Form 4A terminal objective on Form 4A	22:170
e. Complete and return record on time	1	1-complete and return on time	Form 4A	22:192

10. Prescribe appropriate enroute objectives reflecting pupil's current level of functioning and ability to progress.
Weight = 10%
Weeks 7 - 14

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. State enroute objectives behaviorally	3	1-observable and measurable 1-conditions-where and when occur & reinforcer schedule 1-level of acceptable behavior	enroute objective on Form 5A Form 5A enroute objectives on Form 5A	22:170
* b. State first enroute that appropriately establishes entering behavior	2	1-appropriateness of starting point 1-appropriateness of task duration	Form 3A and 5A Form 4B and 5A	22:174
c. Enroute objective development	5	2-difficulty level of enroute criteria based on previous teaching period evaluation 1-appropriate amount of change (too much or too little) 1-task appropriateness 1-movement toward the terminal objective (reflected when appropriate on both elicitor and reinforcer sections)	Form 5A Form 5A Form 5A Form 5A	22:174

* These two points applicable to first teaching session only. Subsequently points added to 4C (4 and 5).

11. Prescribe eliciting material, methods of presentation and consistent approach appropriate to achieving enroute objectives with pupil. Weight = 10%
Weeks 7 - 14

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibilit
a. Appropriateness of materials used	4	1-appropriate to learner modes (vis., tac., kin., motor and auditory)	Form 5A	22:174
		1-appropriate time duration	Form 5A material and total diagnostic finding	
		1-level of performance meets child's needs as relates to progress	Form 5A Form 5A-material and behavior record	
		1-appropriate interest level	Form 5A-material and total diagnostic findings	
b. Appropriate type and amount of material used	2	1-appropriate amount to cover teaching session	Form 5A-material	22:174
		1-range of different types of materials	Form 5A-material	
c. Appropriate sequence of presentation of materials	2	1-appropriate difficulty level (eg. concrete to abstract)	Form 5A-level	22:174
		1-final eliciting activity measures enroute as stated		
d. Method of presentation appropriate to pupils	2	1-appropriate selection based on child's response	Form 5A-method of presentation and behavior record	22:170
		1-match to material		

12. Prescribe contingency management program which effectively motivates pupil and develops increasingly more adaptable levels of motivation. Weight = 10%
Weeks 7 - 14

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Prescribe management program which reflects diagnostic findings	4	1-use appropriate reinforcers	Form 5A-reinforcers and Form 4A reinforcer exploration	22:170
		1-appropriate scheduling use	Form 5A-reinforcers and behavior record	
		1-adjustment of scheduling for advances or regression in the prescription	Form 5A-contingency and behavior record	
		1-evidence of dealing with previously stated interfering behaviors	Form 5A-reinforcers and interfering behavior	
b. Consistent approach to pupil	2	2-appropriate to previous B/R indications and original assessment findings	Form 5A-C/A and B/R	22:170
c. Development of contingencies	3	1-state contingencies	Form 5A-contingencies	22:170
		1-appropriate to changes in progress	Form 5A-contingencies	
		1-assessment of reinforcement total of reinforcement received correspond with contingency as stated		
d. Complete and return records on time	1	1-complete and return on time	Form 5A total and date	22:192

13. Execute prescribed program for pupil (See 11, 12, and 13.) Weight = 15%
Weeks 7 - 14

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Complete and make available prescribed daily teaching program to NIIL supervisor	1	1-complete forms before teaching session and have completed form available for supervisor	Form 5A-total observation	22:192
b. Teach in a manner that reflects prescribed enroute objectives	4	1-exhibit mode of presentation stated 1-exhibit consistent approach stated 1-deliver stated contingency system 1-use materials stated	observation observation observation observation	22:174
c. Use eliciting materials and methods of presentation prescribed on teaching records appropriately	2	1-method of presentation appropriate to response of child 1-eliciting material appropriate to behavioral response of child(difficulty level, duration)	observation	
d. Accurately evaluate and record he correct responses, the reinforcers delivered and the interfering behaviors.	3	1-assess child's behavior in regard to interfering behavior 2- correct repsonses and number of reinforcers is accurately evaluated and recorded by comparing number of correct responses and reinforcers to number possible	observation and interfering behavior on Form 5A observation and Form 5A reinforcers	22:170

14. Obtain and accurately record base rates which provide evaluation of pupil progress in the normal environment.
Weight = 1%
Week 15

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Duplicate counts taken during observation period	3	1-critical behavior previously stated and recorded	Form 6A and 3A description of behavior	22:170
		1-correctly label as deficit or interfering	Form 6A-type of behavior	
		1-record duration of time	Form 6A-duration	
b. Duplicate conditions of counts taken during observation period	3	1-counts during similar activities	Form 6A and 3A	22:170
		1-same duration of time	Form 6A and 3A	
		1-same observation technique	Form 6A and 3A	
c. Compute base rates correctly	3	1-record total frequency	Form 6A-total frequency	22:170
		1-compute on same interval as previously used	Form 6A and 3A terminal rate	
		1-correctly compute total base rate	Form 6A-frequency and terminal rate	
d. Indicate in margin significant changes in behaviors counted	1	1-trainee record own judgment of change-significant or not	Form 6A-record margin	22:170

15. **Evaluate child's progress and make further recommendations.** Weight = 3%
Week 15

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Determine and record entering and terminating skill levels	5	1-record skill area identified in terminal objective 1-beginning level corresponding to previous data collected 1-ending level corresponding to previous data collected 1-compute progress correctly 1-compute per cent of movement toward terminal	Form 4A-terminal objective and 6A academic progress subject Form 3A, Form 4A and 6A academic progress beginning level Form 6A academic progress ending level and final enroute Form 5A Form 6A-academic progress Form 6A-academic progress	22:174
b. Evaluate pupil progress in relation to the terminal objective	1	1-record on bar graph corresponding to percent of progress toward terminal	Form 6A-terminal behavior rating	22:170
c. Recommend further programming for pupil		1-state behaviorally 1-sequentially state the next step needed	Form 6A-recommendations Form 6A-recommendations	22:174
d. Complete and return form	2	1-complete 1-turn in by predetermined date	Form 6A Form 6A	22:192

16. Summarize procedural and progress information. Weight = 5%
Week 15

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Final parent interview	3	1-record interview	Form 7A	22:170
		1-critical behavior development in home (progress, no change, regress)	Form 7A	
		1-concommittant development of other behaviors noted by parents	Form 7A	
b. Final teacher interview	3	1-logical sequence of interview	Form 7B	22:170
		1-critical behavior development in school (progress, no change, regress)	Form 7B	
		1-concomittant development of other behaviors noted by teachers	Form 7B	
c. Summary report (3 copies) (Typed and grammatically correct)	4	1-statement of entering and exiting levels of critical behaviors	Form 8A	22:174
		1-statement of remedial procedures employed	Form 8A	22:174
		1-parent and teacher comments concerning progress	Form 8A	22:170
		1-recommendations (The above four areas should be stated in terminology understandable and appropriate to the recipient.)	Form 8A	22:174

17. Communication, coordination and professionalism of trainee (one point removed per category when formal complaint is written by the individual listed). Weight = 10%
Weeks 3 - 15

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibilit
a. Communication with parents and teachers	3	Progress Reports 1-correct in substance 1-clearly and neatly stated 1-grammatically correct	parent form	22:170
b. Communication with university supervisors	3	1.5 -demonstrate adaptability to remedial suggestions 1.5 -clarity and neatness of forms	observation	22:170
c. Univeristy input faculty and laboratory personnel	4	1-seminar attendance 1-meeting scheduled appointments (child, parent, and teacher) 1-cooperativeness 1-degree of independence and maturity	observation	

1. Observe and behaviorally state the procedures within the assigned group practicum setting. Weight = 5%
   Week 3 of Semester
   Week 2 of Practicum
   Date _____

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Classroom objectives as related by teacher	2	1-summarize interviews	Form B and teacher interview procedures sheet (B-1)	22:171
		1-state relevant behavioral goals	Form B	22:171
b. Record classroom schedule as observed during practicum	1	1-record accurately	Form B and lab assistants observation	22:192
c. Explain teachers elicitor delivery system	3	1-types of elicitors, material commands etc. 1-method of presentation 1-match types of elicitors to M/P	Form B and lab assistants observation	22:171
d. Explain teachers reinforcement delivery system	2	1-type of reinforcer(s) used 1-contingent upon what?	Form B and lab assistants observation	22:171
e. Explain teachers evaluation system	2	1-types of records kept 1-teacher expectations approximations? mastery?	Form B and lab assistants observation	22:171

2. Observe and record behavior patterns of pupil and teacher/peer interactions. Weight = 10%
Weeks 3 - 6 of Practicum (8 required) (Note - In some pre-ac and/or severe and profound settings other techniques may be employed.)
Date _____

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Using the key, observe and record behavior patterns of students. Record teacher and peer interaction to each student behavior recorded.	5	1-record pupil behavior	Form C	22:171
		1-record teacher reaction subsequent to behavior	Form C	22:171
		1-record peer reaction subsequent to behavior	Form C	22:171
		1-record type of material used (mode)		
		1-record M/P used		
b. Total behaviors and interactions of teacher and peer	3	1-total number of each type of behavior	Form C (column at bottom of counts form)	22:171
		1-total teacher and peer reaction to each type of behavior	Form C (column at bottom of counts form)	
		1-total method of presentation and eliciting materials to each type of behavior	Form C1 (totals row)	
c. Chart percent of S.B. and percent of R on graph of above collected baseline data	1	.5-chart percent of SB	Form G-1	22:171
		.5-chart percent of R		
d. Record vital information on behavior observation record	1	.5-record date and time span of observation	Form C	22:171
		.5-record pupils names in consistent order	Form C	

3. For a maximum of six students in the assigned group analyze the patterns of behavior and diagnostic information for each individual child. Weight = 15%

Date _____ Analysis - End of Practicum Week 6 - after 8 observations

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. On each child, identify those eliciting events which appear appropriate or inappropriate as indicated by patterns of behavior after 8 counts	2.5	1 -From 80 counts, identify those materials which appear to increase desirable behavior .5-From 80 counts, identify those materials which appear to increase undesirable behavior (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify those methods of presentation that appear to increase desirable behavior (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify those methods of presentations which appear to increase undesirable behaviors (if none, state none)	Form C and C1 (behavior counts)	22:180's
b. On each child identify those subsequent events (teacher and peer, positive and negative reactions) which appear appropriate or inappropriate as indicated by behavior patterns after 8 counts	2.5	1 -From 80 counts, identify teacher reactions (R, A, I, P) that appear to increase desired behavior (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify teacher reactions (R, A, I, P) that appear to increase undesirable behavior (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify peer reactions that appear to increase desired behaviors (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify those peer reactions that appear to increase undesirable behaviors (if none, state none)	Form C	22:171

3. Continued

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
c. Based on continual data collection techniques,* analyze diagnostic information on each child *this can be trainee administered or obtained from existing records and classroom interactions	5	.5-General information e.g. child's records, teacher comments, general health, visual and hearing status, medications	Daily Log C-1	22:171 22:180's
		.5-Physical, social and language developmental level (estimates	Daily Log C-1	22:171 22:180's
		4-Definitive present academic functioning levels		
		a. severe/profound and preac e.g. cognitive, social, language, motor	Developmental scale results and informal evaluations Daily Log C-1	22:180
		b. primary-process and/or academic task or skill levels e.g. reading, math, writing, spelling, or processes/ abilities	Formal and informal test results Daily Log C-1	22:180
		c. intermediate-entry levels e.g. reading, math, writing	Formal and informal test results Daily Log C-1	22:180
		d. secondary-entry level e.g. functional, reading, writing, math skills, pre-vocational skills, vocational skills	Formal and informal test results Daily Log C-1	22:180

4. Analysis of group patterns of behaviors and implications for group programming. Weight = 10%

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Identify those eliciting events which appear appropriate or inappropriate for the majority as indicated by group patterns of behavior after 8 counts	2	.5-From 80 counts, identify those materials and/or activities which appear to increase group desirable behavior .5-From 80 counts, identify those materials and/or activities which appear to increase group undesirable behavior (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify those methods of presentation that appear to increase group desirable behavior (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify those methods of presentation which appear to increase group undesirable behaviors (if none, state none)	Eight C Forms and C-2	22:180
b. Identify those subsequent events which appear appropriate or inappropriate for the majority as indicated by group patterns of behavior after 8 counts	2	.5-From 80 counts, identify teacher reactions (R, A, I, P) that appear to increase group desired behavior (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify teacher reactions (R, A, I, P) that appear to increase group undesirable behavior (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify peer reactions that appear to increase group desired behaviors (if none, state none) .5-From 80 counts, identify those peer reactions that appear to increase group undesirable behaviors (if none, state none)		22:171

4. continued

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
c. Based on counts and other diagnostic techniques summarize data collected	3	1-appropriate modes and materials 1-appropriate method of presentation 1-note significant individual adjustments (if none, state none	8 counts C-1 and C-2	22:171 and 22:180
d. State implications for group programming	3	2-appropriate teacher management techniques 1-note significant individual adjustments	8 counts C-1 and C-2	22:171 and 22:180

5. Develop first coordinated lessons terminal and pre-test. (Rated by classroom teacher and 180 staff person.)
   Weight = 7%
   Week 7
   Date _____

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Select area of instruction appropriate to group practicum setting and needs of children. (Rated by supervising teacher.)	3	3 points-trainee assess needs and developed idea and plan independently 2 points-plan and/or refinement needed minor teacher assistance 1 point-plan and/or refinement needed substantial teacher assistance	Initial format (tentative terminal)	22:180's and supervising teacher
b. Write appropriate terminal objective	3.5	1.25-objective appropriate in substance (terminal reflects intent of teaching)	E-1	22:180's
		1.25-objective clearly, precisely, and behaviorally stated	E-1	22:180's
		.75-objective based on observation, informal diagnostics, and/or formal diagnostics of group to be taught	E-1 and C Form analysis and pre-test results	22:180's
		.25-criteria level and condition appropriate to assessment findings	E-1 and C Form analysis	22:180's
c. Design and execute pre-test	3.5	1-differentiation between pre-test and diagnostics indicated	E-1 and C Form analysis	22:180's
		1-measures terminal	E-1	22:180's
		.25-designed so post-test can also be administered for accurate evaluation of progress	E-1	22:180's
		.25-pre-test format and procedure clearly described	E-1	22:180's
		.75-pre-test accurately/precisely executed and reported and interpreted	E-1	22:180's
		.25-responsive to time line		22:192 and 22:180's

5. Continued

Additional Rating:

1. Terminal and pre-test independently developed with appropriate substance and wording.
2. Substance of terminal and pre-test intact but wording of terminal or pre-test needed refinement.
3. Substance of terminal and pre-test intact but wording of both needed refinement.
4. Wording appropriate but substance of terminal or pre-test needed refinement.
5. Substance of terminal or pre-test needed refinement while wording of one or the other also needed refinement.
6. Wording of both terminal and pre-test needed refinement but substance of only one needed refinement.
7. Wording appropriate but substance of terminal and pre-test needed refinement.
8. Substance of terminal and pre-test needed refinement and wording of one or the other also needed refinement.
9. Terminal and pre-test developed with inappropriate substance and wording.

6. Based on approved terminal objective develop an instructional plan leading to your terminal objective (at least 4 samples of your teaching must be written on E-2 forms - others must be stated in log plan.
   Weight = 5%
   Week 8
   Date _____

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Develop and state enroutes related to terminal	3	1-state behaviorally	E-2	22:180's
		1-first enroute reflect entering behavior of majority of group as measured by pre-test	E-1 and E-2	22:180's
		1-subsequent enroutes move sequentially toward terminal in a manner reflective of optimum of learning for majority of the group or individual needs of students	E-2 and Log	22:180's
b. Develop and list materials appropriate for each lesson	4	1-materials appropriate to optimal learning mode for majority or each student	E-2 and C Form analysis	22:180's
		1-sufficient quantity and/or variety listed to reach days objective	E-2	22:180's
		1-properly sequenced (e.g. concrete to abstract)	E-2	22:180's
		1-evidence of individualization materials if indicated	E-2 and pre-test results	22:180's
c. Develop and state method of presentation	.5	.5-appropriate to materials and optimum learning mode	E-2 and C Form analysis	22:180's
d. Develop and state appropriate management system	2.5	1-design appropriate to setting and majority of group	E-2's and C Form analysis	22:171
		1-design clearly states what reinforcer is contingent upon	E-2	22:171
		.5-evidence of individualized planning if indicated (e.g. dealing with frequently noted interfering behaviors)	E-2 and C Form analysis	22:171

7. Execute first coordinated lessons. (Your teaching will be observed four times.)
Weight = 9%
Week 8 Date _____

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Articulate eliciting materials	5	.5-method of presentation as stated (demonstrate provide, etc.)	E-2 and observation sheets	22";80's
		.5-method of presentation appropriate to each activity	E-2 and observation	22:180's
		1-move from concrete to abstract and/or activity to activity	E-2 and observation	22:180's
		1-individualize as needed	E-2, observation and subsequent daily evaluation results	22:180
		1-delivery of material reflects the intent of enroute	E-2 and observation	22:180's
		1-quality and quantity of materials provided opportunity for generalization of enroute concept	E-2 and observation	22:180's
b. Maintain classroom and/or small group control during coordinated lessons	5	1-delivery of reinforcers is consistent with contingency management system as stated	observation	22:171
		1-acceptable level of student behavior maintained with majority of group	E-2 (behavior counts)	22:171
		1-evidence of individualized delivery of management procedures if indicated	observation	22:171
		1-recognition of interfering behaviors if it occurs during execution of enroute	E-2 and observation	22:171
		1-appropriate intervention of interfering behaviors is well timed and effective	E-2 and observation	22:171

8. Evaluation of first coordinated lesson.
   Weight = 4%
   Week 8 -------- Date _____

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Daily group evaluation e.g. permanent product, frequency tally's, duration	4	2-evidence of group progress toward days objective 1-effectiveness indications of elicitors for majority of group 1-effectiveness indications of management for majority of group	E-2's (counts) and/or separate paper	22:171 and 22:180's
b. Daily individual	4	2-evidence of individual progress toward days objective 1-effectiveness indications of elicitors for individuals 1-effectiveness of management system for each individual	E-2's (counts) and/or separate paper	22:171 and 22:180's
c. Final evaluation of coordinated lesson	2	1-administer post-test holding pre-test condisiont constant .5-chart student behavior and level of reinforcement .5-evaluated progress toward terminal	E-3	22:171 and 22:180's

9. Develop 2nd coordinated lessons terminal and pre-test. (Rated by classroom teacher and 180 staff person.)
Weight = 10%
Week 10
Date _____

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Select area of instruction appropriate to group practicum setting and needs of children. (Rated by supervising teacher.)	3	3 points-trainee assess needs and developed idea and plan independently 2 points-plan and/or refinement needed minor teacher assistance 1 point-plan and/or refinement needed substantial teacher assistance	Initial format (tentative terminal)	22:180's and supervising teacher
b. Write appropriate terminal objective	3.5	1.25-objective appropriate in substance (terminal reflects intent of teaching)	F -1	22:180's
		1.25-objective clearly, precisely, and behaviorally stated	F -1	22:180's
		.75-objective based on observation, informal diagnostics, and/or formal diagnostics of group to be taught	F -1 and C Form analysis and pre-test results	22:180's
		.25-criteria level and condition appropriate to assessment findings	F -1 and C Form analysis	22:180's
c. Design and execute pre-test	3.5	1-differentiation between pre-test and diagnostics indicated	F -1 and C Form analysis	22:180's
		1-measures terminal	F -1	22:180's
		.25-designed so post-test can also be administered for accurate evaluation of progress	F -1	22:180's
		.25-pre-test format and procedure clearly described	F -1	22:180's
		.75-pre-test accurately/precisely executed and reported and interpreted	F -1	22:180's
		.25-responsive to time line		22:192 and 22:180's

9. Continued

Additional Rating:

1. Terminal and pre-test independently developed with appropriate substance and wording.
2. Substance of terminal and pre-test intact but wording of terminal or pre-test needed refinement.
3. Substance of terminal and pre-test intact but wording of both needed refinement.
4. Wording appropriate but substance of terminal or pre-test needed refinement.
5. Substance of terminal or pre-test needed refinement while wording of one or the other also needed refinement.
6. Wording of both terminal and pre-test needed refinement but substance of only one needed refinement.
7. Wording appropriate but substance of terminal and pre-test needed refinement.
8. Substance of terminal and pre-test needed refinement and wording of one or the other also needed refinement.
9. Terminal and pre-test developed with inappropriate substance and wording.

10. Based on approved terminal objective develop an instructional plan leading to your terminal objective (at least 4 samples of your teaching must be written on F-2 forms - others must be stated in log plan.

118 Weight = 7%
Week 11 -----
Date _____

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibilit
a. Develop and state enroutes related to terminal	3	1-state behaviorally	F -2	22:180's
		1-first enroute reflect entering behavior of majority of group as measured by pre-test	F -1 and F -2	22:180's
		1-subsequent enroutes move sequentially toward terminal in a manner reflective of optimum of learning for majority of the group or individual needs of students	F -2 and Log	22:180's
b. Develop and list materials appropriate for each lesson	4	1-materials appropriate to optimal learning mode for majority or each student	F -2 and C Form analysis	22:180's
		1-sufficient quantity and/or variety listed to reach days objective	F -2	22:180's
		1-properly sequenced (e.g. concrete to abstract)	F -2	22:180's
		1-evidence of individualization materials if indicated	F -2 and pre-test results	22:180's
c. Develop and state method of presentation	.5	.5-appropriate to materials and optimum learning mode	F -2 and C Form analysis	22:180's
d. Develop and state appropriate management system	2.5	1-design appropriate to setting and majority of group	F -2's and C Form analysis	22:171
		1-design clearly states what reinforcer is contingent upon	F -2	22:171
		.5-evidence of individualized planning if indicated (e.g. dealing with frequently noted interfering behaviors)	F -2 and C Form analysis	22:171

11. Execute 2nd coordinated lessons. (Your teaching will be observed four times.)
Weight = 12%
Week 11 ------ Date _____

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Articulate eliciting materials	5	.5-method of presentation as stated (demonstrate provide, etc.)	F-2 and observation sheets	22";80's
		.5-method of presentation appropriate to each activity	F-2 and observation	22:180's
		1-move from concrete to abstract and/or activity to activity	F-2 and observation	22:180's
		1-individualize as needed	F-2, observation and subsequent daily evaluation results	22:180
		1-delivery of material reflects the intent of enroute	F-2 and observation	22:180's
		1-quality and quantity of materials provided opportunity for generalization of enroute concept	F-2 and observation	22:180's
b. Maintain classroom and/or small group control during coordinated lessons	5	1-delivery of reinforcers is consistent with contingency management system as stated	observation	22:171
		1-acceptable level of student behavior maintained with majority of group	F-2 (behavior counts)	22:171
		1-evidence of individualized delivery of management procedures if indicated	observation	22:171
		1-recognition of interfering behaviors if it occurs during execution of enroute	F-2 and observation	22:171
		1-appropriate intervention of interfering behaviors is well timed and effective	F-2 and observation	22:171

12. Evaluation of 2nd coordinated lesson.
Weight = 6%
Week -------- Date _____

120

Subcriteria	Credit	Breakdown	Evaluation Source	Input Responsibility
a. Daily group evaluation e.g. permanent product, frequency tally's, duration	4	2-evidence of group progress toward days objective 1-effectiveness indications of elicitors for majority of group 1-effectiveness indications of management for majority of group	F-2's (counts) and/or separate paper	22:171 and 22:180's
b. Daily individual	4	2-evidence of individual progress toward days objective 1-effectiveness indications of elicitors for individuals 1-effectiveness of management system for each individual	F-2's (counts) and/or separate paper	22:171 and 22:180's
c. Final evaluation of coordinated lesson	2	1-administer post-test holding pre-test condisiont constant .5-chart student behavior and level of reinforcement .5-evaluated progress toward terminal	F-3	22:171 and 22:180's

APPENDIX B

UNI COMPETENCY LIST AND RANKING

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA · Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AREA 319-273-6061

April 16, 1976

Dear Special Educator:

The special education teacher training program at the University of Northern Iowa is both multi-categorical and performance based in nature. Essential to such a program are clearly defined competencies which reflect what teachers will do with a variety of handicapped children in a variety of teaching roles. The literature regarding performance based teacher training indicates that both teacher trainers and special educators in the field be included in the process of deciding which competencies are most necessary for special education teachers.

To broaden the decision making base in regard to teacher competencies and to be responsive to current needs, Iowa teacher trainers, special education teachers, and AEA personnel are being asked for their perceptions of the relative importance of competencies for teachers of the mildly handicapped.

The competencies you are being asked to rank are incorporated in the University of Northern Iowa Special Education performance-based teacher training program and this study is being conducted with the approval of the Division of Special Education.

Please reply to the survey in full. Your perceptions are vital if a final list of competencies is to be truly representative of the thinking of both teacher trainers and special educators in the field.

Enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. We look forward to hearing from you within 10 days.

Sincerely,

Harriet Healy, Instructor
Division of Special Education
University of Northern Iowa

Lee Courtnage, Ed.D.
Director
Division of Special Education
University of Northern Iowa

mjp

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
SPECIAL EDUCATION
TEACHER COMPETENCIES

COMPETENCY NUMBER	The teacher will be able to demonstrate the ability to:
1.	Execute appropriate observational techniques to describe frequency and duration of pupil(s) behaviors (desirable and undesirable) and group interactions (pupil/teacher, pupil/peer).
2.	Determine critical (major) problem behaviors by analysis of observational data.
3.	Establish pupil(s) specific skill levels by administering appropriate diagnostic tests (standardized and teacher made).
4.	Identify strong and weak learning modes by observation and diagnostic testing (e.g. visual, auditory, kinesthetic).
5.	Design and execute pretests which measure pupil(s) entry level for a specific objective or goal.
6.	Select and design on-going evaluation systems which provide feedback of pupil(s) progress toward an objective.
7.	Prescribe and behaviorally state long-term social, academic, and work/study objective(s) (include what pupil(s) will do, under what conditions, and criteria for success).
8.	Describe the sequential components of desired long-term objective(s) by identifying the steps in each social, academic and work/study task.
9.	Sequence tasks to move from simple to complex and/or concrete to abstract, as indicated.
10.	Provide appropriate instructional materials and equipment to meet short-term objective(s).
11.	Employ a variety of remedial techniques, as indicated, for core curriculum (e.g. reading, math, language, and writing).
12.	Modify and/or design instructional materials, when indicated, for specific individual pupil(s) needs.
13.	Provide appropriate method(s) of presenting materials (e.g. demonstration, explanation, command).
14.	Verify effectiveness of objective(s), material(s), and method(s) by evaluation of pupil(s) movement toward desired objective.
15.	Implement an instructional management system which coordinates curriculum, motivation and evaluation to maximize pupil(s) progress.
16.	Provide appropriate teacher approach(es) to promote optimum interaction with pupil(s) (e.g. firm kindness, active friendliness, matter of fact).
17.	Provide a variety of behavior management procedures to get and maintain individual and group control.
18.	Select and provide appropriate motivational procedures to increase quantity and quality of desired pupil(s) behaviors.
19.	Modify expectations, when indicated, to provide success experiences for pupil(s).
20.	Provide appropriate intervention procedure(s) when pupil(s) are manifesting undesired behaviors.
21.	Verify effectiveness of motivational and intervention procedures as indicated by increase or decrease in desired pupil behaviors.
22.	Demonstrate appropriate methods for management of paraprofessionals and volunteers to develop an effective teaching team.
23.	Communicate pupils needs and progress effectively to other professionals (verbal and written).
24.	Demonstrate the processes of analysis, organization, integration, and evaluation when implementing a special education program within a specific school building.
25.	Participate in interdisciplinary staffings, analyze the staffing content, and draw appropriate inferences and conclusions.
26.	Provide effective counseling and guidance to handicapped pupils as indicated.
27.	Appropriately interact and communicate with parents regarding pupil assessment, programming and evaluation (verbal and written).
28.	Actively seek and be receptive to services provided by support personnel to enhance handicapped pupil(s) educational program.
29.	Select referal sources appropriate to pupil(s) need, implement the referal process, and evaluate the results.
30.	Design, conduct and evaluate a presentation of an educational program to a local public or service organization.
31.	Demonstrate ethical professional behavior concerning the teaching/learning situation with handicapped pupils when interacting with other professionals, parents, pupils, and the public.
32.	Demonstrate an applied knowledge of the rules and regulations and legalities of working with handicapped pupils.
33.	Assess, design, conduct, and evaluate a formal inservice training program within the school setting.

TEACHER TRAINERS

1. Teacher Training Institution _____
2. Present Position _____
3. Number of Years in Present Position _____
4. Number of Years in Training Special Education Teachers _____
5. Highest Degree Held _____

DIRECTIONS

1. Please read the enclosed list of competencies.
2. Add any additional competencies you feel are important at the bottom of this page.
3. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies (including your own) as very important.
4. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies (including your own) as less important.
5. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies (including your own) as least important.
6. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies as not important.
7. Place those you do not wish to rank in the last column and state your reason on the back of this page.

COMPETENCY RANKINGS

VERY IMPORTANT (Competency Number)	**LESS** IMPORTANT (Competency Number)	**LEAST** IMPORTANT (Competency Number)	NO IMPORTANCE (Competency Number)	**DON'T** CHOOSE TO RANK (Competency Number)

ADDITIONAL COMPETENCIES YOU PERCEIVE AS IMPORTANT

34.	_____
35.	_____
36.	_____

AREA EDUCATION AGENCY PERSONNEL

1. Present Position _____

2. AEA Number _____

3. Number of Years in Special Education:
   Teacher _____
   Consultant _____
   Administrator _____
   TOTAL _____

4. Highest Degree Held _____

5. Number of State Department of Iowa Endorsements and Approvals held (indicate whether temporary or permanent).

_____

DIRECTIONS

1. Please read the enclosed list of competencies.
2. Add any additional competencies you feel are important at the bottom of this page.
3. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies (including your own) as very important.
4. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies (including your own) as less important.
5. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies (including your own) as least important.
6. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies as not important.
7. Place those you do not wish to rank in the last column and state your reason on the back of this page.

COMPETENCY RANKINGS

VERY IMPORTANT (Competency Number)	LESS IMPORTANT (Competency Number)	LEAST IMPORTANT (Competency Number)	NO IMPORTANCE (Competency Number)	DON'T CHOOSE TO RANK (Competency Number)

ADDITIONAL COMPETENCIES YOU PERCEIVE AS IMPORTANT

34.	
35.	
36.	

SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS SURVEY

1. AEA _____

2. School _____

3. Instructional Setting (check one):

   Resource or Itinerant _____

   Special Class with Integration _____

   Self-Contained Special Class _____

4. Functioning Level of Children (check one):

   Pre-Academic _____ Intermediate _____

   Primary _____ Secondary _____

5. Number of Years Teaching Experience:

   Regular _____

   Special Education _____

   TOTAL _____

6. Highest Degree Held _____ Teacher Training Institution _____

7. Iowa Endorsements and Approvals (indicate whether temporary or permanent: _____

   _____

   _____

(OVER)

DIRECTIONS

1. Please read the enclosed list of competencies.
2. Add any additional competencies you feel are important at the bottom of this page.
3. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies (including your own) as very important.
4. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies (including your own) as less important.
5. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies (including your own) as least important.
6. Rank a maximum of 11 competencies as not important.
7. Place those you do not wish to rank in the last column and state your reason on the back of this page.

COMPETENCY RANKINGS

VERY IMPORTANT (Competency Number)	LESS IMPORTANT (Competency Number)	LEAST IMPORTANT (Competency Number)	NO IMPORTANCE (Competency Number)	DON'T CHOOSE TO RANK (Competency Number)

DIRECTIONS

Please indicate whether you perceive yourself as having the UNI competencies you have ranked. If so, was competence acquired mainly through pre-service (teacher training), in-service, or teaching experience.

COMPETENCY NUMBER	Acquired Not	ACQUIRED Service	Pre-Service	In-Service Experience	Teaching	COMPETENCY NUMBER	Acquired Not	ACQUIRED Service	Pre-Service	In-Service Experience	Teaching	COMPETENCY NUMBER	Acquired Not	ACQUIRED Service	Pre-Service	In-Service Experience	Teaching
1						13						25					
2						14						26					
3						15						27					
4						16						28					
5						17						29					
6						18						30					
7						19						31					
8						20						32					
9						21						33					
10						22						34					
11						23						35					
12						24						36					

ADDITIONAL COMPETENCIES YOU PERCEIVE AS IMPORTANT

34.	
35.	
36.	