

AN AXIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE
MASTER TEACHER CONCEPT

By

BETTY JO MCCARTY

Bachelor of Science
Angelo State University
San Angelo, Texas
1979

Master of Education
McNeese State University
Lake Charles, Louisiana
1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1986

Thesis
1986D
M123a
cop. 2



AN AXIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE
MASTER TEACHER CONCEPT

Thesis Approved:

Russell D. Co

Thesis Adviser

Randall Ketting

Kenneth W. Clair

Thomas J. Smith

Norman N. Deusham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

The reader should be informed that the names of the actual school districts, the university and the people involved in this study have been changed to ensure anonymity.

B.J.M.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My appreciation and gratitude are extended to all those who made my study possible, to the friends and teachers, and especially my family, who supported me in this endeavor.

My sincere gratitude is expressed to the members of my committee: Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Dr. Thomas Smith, and especially to Dr. Randall Koetting for listening and encouraging me, and to Dr. Russell Dobson, my major advisor, whose understanding, support and high demands guided me throughout this project and my doctoral program.

Sincere appreciation and thanks are expressed to: Mary Lee Hailey, my daughter, whose expertise on the computer served as a real blessing to me; Sarah Hailey, my daughter, in transcribing and Mary Lee Hailey in typing; Daniel Hailey, my son, who made endless trips to the library for me; Gladys Pereles, Bobbi Sexson, and other friends, who listened and supported my efforts; and the administrators and teachers of the school districts for their cooperation and support for this research.

Special words of indebtedness and appreciation are expressed to my beloved family: Leo Branscum, whose relentless help and support provided much of the time needed for the completion of this study; my children, Mary Lee, Judy, Jay, Vickie, Kris, Paul, Daniel and Sarah, who provided

understanding about the time and effort invested in the completion of this study; my brothers and sisters, W.C. and Linda McCarty, Rayford and Jeanette Greene, Lee Mack and Vera Robertson, and Greg and Dianne Crooks for keeping the home front and encouraging me to finish this endeavor.

Finally, an appreciation beyond words are expressed to my mother, Mottice Creel McCarty, whose love, support and life have been a constant source of inspiration. An eternal indebtedness is acknowledged to my beloved father, W.C. McCarty, Sr., whose living example provided much of the encouragement needed through my process of becoming. In his loving memory this study is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Nature of this Study.	6
Assumptions of this Study	11
Education is Value-Laden	12
Values are Personal.	15
Values can be Identified	16
Organization of this Study.	21
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	22
An Issue with a History	22
Definitions of Merit Pay.	32
Master Teacher Plan as a Way to Reward Teachers	37
Motivation	46
Master Teacher as a Standard.	52
Master Teacher Plan as Means of Evaluation	60
Pros and Cons of Merit Pay.	70
Teacher Effectiveness Research.	75
Dominant Approach.	78
Token Approach	83
Ignored Approach	84
III. RESEARCH DESIGN.	88
Theory of Design.	90
Interviews	100
Research Plan	101
Site Selection	102
Entry and Role Establishment	102
Data Collection Procedures	104
Huebner's Value Framework	105
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE MASTER TEACHER PLAN.	110
Origin of Master Teacher Plan for Stanley, Wayside, and Clearwater School Districts in Oklahoma.	111
Development of Master Teacher Plan.	113
The Role of the University	114

Chapter	Page
Planning Committees	116
Presentation of Alternative Plans	118
Selection Committees	120
Selection Criteria	121
Master Teacher Application Packet. . .	123
The Master Teacher Public Hearing. . .	125
Summary.	126
Description of the Interview Data	127
Notions About the Master Teacher Plan.	127
Criteria for Selecting a Master Teacher.	139
Teachers' Performance.	142
Testing Teachers and Students.	143
Teachers.	143
Students.	146
Conception of Evaluation	150
Problems with the Plan	151
Resistance of Teachers.	159
Moral Dilemmas.	160
Interpretation and Analysis of Findings According to Huebner's Five Value Frameworks	162
Dominant Values.	163
Scientific Values	163
Technical Values.	169
Political Values.	178
Ignored Values	184
Aesthetic Values.	185
Ethical Values.	195
 V. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	 204
Summary	204
Implications.	208
Recommendations for Further Research. . . .	217
Concluding Comments	218
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.	 223
 APPENDIXES.	 239
APPENDIX A - TABLE V - TYPES OF MERIT PAY PLANS	240
APPENDIX B - CORRESPONDENCE.	242
APPENDIX C - SAMPLE INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER . . .	246

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX D - A PROPOSAL TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT A PILOT "MASTER TEACHER" PROGRAM FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA	250
APPENDIX E - THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM PRO- POSED FOR THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF CLEARWATER, STANLEY AND WAYSIDE, OKLAHOMA	260
APPENDIX F - APPLICATION AND EVALUATION FORMS FROM THE MASTER TEACHER SAMPLE PACKET	269
APPENDIX G - SUMMARY OF LGU INVOLVEMENT.	286
APPENDIX H - MINUTES	290
APPENDIX I - THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT	312
APPENDIX J - SAMPLE FIELD NOTES.	347
APPENDIX K - MEMORANDUM FROM DEAN.	357

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Gallup Poll of Teachers' Attitude Toward Merit Pay for Teachers	29
II. Gallup Poll of Teachers' and Publics' Attitude Toward Merit Pay for Teachers	30
III. Gallup Poll of Reasons Teachers Favor/Oppose Merit Pay for Teachers.	31
IV. Conventional Versus Naturalistic Inquiry	98
V. Types of Merit Pay Plans	241

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Education is sensitive to and influenced by public opinion and the changing demands in American politics. Current proposals from President Reagan, state governors, and other prominent public officials for some form of incentive pay for teachers as a means of improving public education place additional pressure on school administrators to develop some form of workable, innovative salary plan. The belief is that hopefully the incentive of increased salaries will prompt teachers into using a higher quality of educational practices with the end result being better educated students. Several recent reports such as A Nation at Risk (1983) and Twentieth Century Fund Task Force Report (1983) helped to push the merit pay/master teacher debate to the highest national level and helped to make education one of the main topics in the 1984 Presidential Campaign.

Historically, educational leaders have reacted to public and political pressure by attempting to fix whatever the press and reform proposals considered needed to be fixed in the schools. For example, in 1957 when the Soviet Union launched Sputnik I, the public was told that it was the fault of the educational system that the United States was

not first in launching an artificial earth satellite. The schools were viewed as deficient in educating the most talented of America's youth; therefore, private foundations and federal government poured money into the schools and rhetoric into the media which demanded change in the curriculum areas of science, math, foreign languages and other fields. During the 60's, however, public attention was focused on the problem of racial inequality of blacks and native Americans, environmental problems, and personal relevance of curriculum. Taken aback and a bit guilt-ridden, educators generally accepted the announcement of failure and hurriedly developed and implemented suggestions from businessmen to ameliorate present social problems.

Sykes (1983) comments,

Quality these days is the watchword in education. Swayed by test-score reports and sensational media accounts, the public suspects there has been a decline in quality, while concerns about economic productivity, a technology-driven transformation of work, and adverse comparisons of our educational system with those of the Japanese or the Russians impel a renewed interest in education from corporate executives, politicians, and foundation officers. Much of this concern falls on the quality of teaching, which is generally perceived as the heart of the matter and the source of the problem (p. 579).

It appears that professionals in education have become accustomed to the fact that reforms for the educational system are determined by public figures, the media, government studies, and organizations outside the school system. Usually, these recommendations offered simplistic answers to the complex phenomenon of schooling and the complexity of

educating children. However, simplistic the recommendation, educators hastily attempted to reform curriculum and instruction in order to bring about the improvement of education promised in these reports. Zais (1976) contends that the "pragmatic nature of the American temperament is infatuated with the desire to do anything to get the job done" (p. xi); therefore, those who make educational decisions charge ahead and make changes without really understanding the basis and nature of the educational phenomenon or the effect of these actions. Johnson (1981) states,

The majority of educationists, educational practitioners and scholars. . . are oriented toward improvement rather than understanding, action and results rather than inquiry (p. 70).

Dobson and Dobson (1981) agree with Johnson by stating,

It seems safe to establish that proponents of various philosophic camps are more concerned with finding better ways of doing what they are already doing than with raising questions as to why it is that they do what they do (p. 66).

The tendency of educators to respond to popular clamor and political pressure by implementing unexamined recommendations has resulted in what has been called the "bandwagon approach." Bandwagons, according to Biaggi (1982), are conscious efforts of a group of people to "convince themselves and others of a concept which is intended to modify a social reality by acting upon it and controlling it" (p. 3). They are the expression of the feelings of people who define reality only as a state of change without any consideration to the balance among stability and change in the social scene. The results are "programs characterized by fragmen-

tation, imbalance, transcience, caprice, and at times incoherence" (Zais, 1976, p. xi). Further, Zais points out that construction of school programs is generally conducted in a shocking, piecemeal and superficial fashion. He says,

Reforms are implemented in response to popular clamor or perceived social crisis; 'innovations' are often little more than jargon; and the whole process is influenced mainly by mere educational vogue . . . (p. xi).

In a paper titled "Problematic Aspects of School Reform," Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1981) agree that the bandwagon approach to school reform and teacher improvement has made certain aspects problematic for they are "virtually ignored" (p. 66). They identify six problematic issues:

1. A lack of well-perceived and articulated philosophic position(s) about a 'sense of purpose' for schooling the young.
2. An almost exclusive use of a technocratic-rationale in planning, designing, and implementing curriculum development and pedagogical reform.
3. An absence of an agreed upon definition of curriculum.
4. An ahistorical mentality reflected in the activity of curriculum and instruction theories and practitioners.
5. An absence of dialogue relative to a 'balanced curriculum.'
6. The language metaphors of curriculum development and instructional improvement (p. 66).

It is of utmost importance that the renewed public and political interest for quality education be channeled in positive and constructive directions that will indeed bring improvements in American education. Dobson and Dobson (1981) strongly suggest that "those who make educational decisions might well afford to spend time and effort examin-

ing the philosophic roots of critical educational issues and problems" (p. 66). They heartily recommend that,

. . .a focus be placed on developing and understanding basic systems of philosophy, as well as understanding 'linear relationships between educational points of view and day-to-day school methods, procedures, and methodology (p. 66).

They hope that this effort would result in educators demonstrating a higher level of "sophistication" and becoming "more sensitive and aware of hidden or salient biases involved in recommendations and/or pressure to subscribe to current fads and trends in education" (p. 66).

To move in the direction of lasting improvement Goodlad (1975) stresses the importance of asking different questions than reformers are currently asking ". . .not how to do what we are doing better. . .but should we be doing what we are doing at all," (p. 270). Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger (1980) state that, "if we do not know why we do what we do, then we do it poorly" (p. 2). Further, they contend,

In an age of inexhaustible ideas, the temptation has been and still is to adopt new ideas indiscriminately and apply them inappropriately. With only a superficial understanding of the basic philosophies and theories on which innovations are based, they often are implemented unwisely, and when expected results are not yielded, those innovations are rejected as hastily as first accepted (p. 2).

Neff (1975) expresses the importance of knowing our aim before adopting new ideas indiscriminately. He says,

Whether in law, in medicine, or in education, the ends to which an enterprise is geared determine the direction it takes and the basis for its evaluation. Ends without means are poor indeed; but means without ends are poorer still. The inspiration, the zest, and the excitement that are

associated with education as a noble calling come not from methods and techniques but from the values it seeks to foster. But we miss the whole purpose of education when, in the words of Santayana, we merely 'redouble our effort, having forgotten our aim' (p. 44).

The endless process of reforming public education, according to Hertzberg (1976), usually takes one of two approaches. Either the reform is "comprehensive" in the analysis and proposals for change, the reform focuses on a single aspect of education, the curriculum, the organization of the school, or the composition or nature of the school population as the key to change. The current reform effort seeks to improve education by focusing on one component--the teacher. In defining curriculum, Macdonald (1965) points out that the various discrete systems such as teaching, instruction, learning and curriculum are interrelated and when one component is affected, all are affected.

The Nature of this Study

Many educators are now acknowledging the need to view recommendations for improvements in the schools as value judgments. Macdonald (1977) believes that every educational decision is immersed in the value consideration of someone with a personal view of "what is the 'good life'?" Ubbelohde (1977) contends that any curricular endeavor is aimed at the construction of a theory of values. Robert Emans (1966) presents values as the "central core" of his conceptual framework for curriculum development. Further, he points out that other frameworks have ignored or implied

values and have stressed the influence of philosophy and beliefs but that, ". . . little consideration was given the concept of values, that which is desirable" (p. 328). Although educational programs reflect belief and philosophies and influence the selection of desirable behavior. Dobson and Dobson (1981) point out that "educational issues are a consequence of diverse conceptualizations of reality and values" (p. 66). Macdonald (1971) adds that it seems that educators incorporate the production model since it "avoids the essential value question with which one must begin" (p. 195).

The master teacher concept represents a viable piece of a current educational ideology whose value base and conceptual framework warrant close examination. Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985) stated that "before the content of any social document can claim 'value integrity' its philosophic roots must be revealed for public scrutiny" (p. 66).

Many school districts and several states have attempted to translate this concept into educational policy and programs. Pertinent to this study is the recent application of this idea into a pilot project involving three school districts in the state of Oklahoma. The pilot project is called The Master Teacher Program of the Stanley, Wayside, and Clearwater School Districts in Oklahoma. It is the purpose of this study to examine the value base of the Master Teacher Concept as applied in the pilot project. In

other words, this study will present an axiological analysis of The Master Teacher Program of the Stanley, Wayside, and Clearwater School Districts.

The study of values is the concern of one of the branches of philosophy called axiology. Axiology is the branch of philosophy that deals with values. Axiology poses the question: What is good? What should man prefer? What is really desirable? According to Zais (1976) axiological questions customarily are divided into two main categories: ethics and aesthetics. The concepts of "right and wrong, good and bad, as they apply to human conduct come under the category of ethics" (p. 119). Aesthetics is concerned with the qualities of beauty and enjoyment in human experience. Axiological studies have burned within the hearts of the greatest philosophers and the lowliest peasants since time began. Frondizi (1963) contends that,

. . .the most complicated axiological problems are debated daily in the streets, in parliament, in the cafe and in the most modest homes, although with an attitude and in a language which can hardly be called philosophical (p. 119).

Zais (1976) points out that although the definition of philosophy as "love of wisdom" conveys the impression that philosophy is engaged in only by scholars, each individual engages in philosophizing (in an informal way) as decisions are made which determine the course of one's life. A daily task of living is deciding the predominance of conflicting values. The choices one makes are an expression of value judgment. Implicit in these decisions are dispositions and

assumptions, that, when acted upon, yield a life experience that is generally superior to the one we would have had had we acted on alternative dispositions and assumptions. Zais (1976) contends that,

. . .it is not exaggeration, then, to state that philosophical assumptions about the nature of the good life play a significant role in determining how we live. Since teaching is an inescapable moral enterprise, teachers as well as all educators should be 'avid students of social and educational values' (p. 104).

He also points out,

. . . most (educators and researchers) are painfully aware that a propensity for searching inquiry into the value basis of curricular practice is not a characteristic of many professionals in education (p. 488).

Yet he continues to argue that it is these very values often unconscious and a result of "long-term enculturation, that are the most important determinants of the curriculum" (p. 488). Similarly, Smith, Stanley and Shores (1957) maintain that,

Values are involved in almost every controversy, and certainly they are involved in every act of teaching and every curriculum change. The selection of educational objectives, the materials and methods of instruction, and the administration and operation of the school necessarily require choices among values (as quoted by Zais, 1976, p. 455).

Historically, values have been ignored or have been seen as screens through which objectives and goals could pass in choosing and creating a "world for children" to learn in, to grow in and to love and for teachers to develop and work in.

The urgency of this study is found in the haste in which several master teacher plans are being presented, developed and implemented on a trial basis among individual school districts, and are also being enacted into laws by legislatures in several states. According to Dobson and Dobson (1981),

. . .whether we like it or not, decisions determining the direction of schooling seem to reflect the belief systems of those who have the power to make such decisions (p. 65).

Like these authors, this writer hopes this study will serve as a catalyst to those in power in assisting to clarify their beliefs in the Master Teacher Concept and values and ultimately to assist in determining whether "that which they advocate is really what is desired" (Dobson and Dobson, 1981, p. 65). Persons responsible for educational decisions that affect the lives of so many must deal with underlying intent (value base) as well as the content of proposals for school reform. Macdonald (1977d) claims that,

. . .many curriculum talkers and workers with a fundamentally technological orientation are not aware of their value base (thinking it to be objective and value free), nor are they aware that their values are not subject to their own control, nor do they thus show any desire to control them. It is this value-witlessness that is frightening in the technological approach, not the approach itself, since technological rationality is obviously a potential for either human good or evil (p. 15).

Macdonald further contends,

There is no way theorists can avoid assuming choices of value and implying them in their work. The basic choice of communication style or cultural tool, the problems, or issues dealt with--all these concerns perceive threats to

cherished values of the theorists, and cannot be clearly formulated without acknowledgement of those values. Fundamentally, curriculum talkers (and workers) must face up to whether they are aware of the uses and values of their work and whether their values are subject to their own control (p. 15).

As noted above there is definite agreement among some educational theorists that a critical examination of values is the most crucial step in enhancing the improvement of schooling in America. Although reform efforts are a topic of national debate, the differences discussed seldom involve abstract issues or competing ideologies. As Eisner (1979) contends, the examination of underlying values is of utmost importance. He states,

It is important for those concerned with designing educational programs to see behind the issue, to go beyond the immediate controversy to penetrate the current debate in order to locate the values and premises behind the questions (p. 50).

Furthermore, the fact that curriculum development and instructional theory are fundamentally activities in expressing value judgment has been well documented (Apple, 1975; Dewey, 1966; Eisner, 1979, 1985; Giroux, Penna and Pinar, 1981; Huebner 1975a, 1975c, 1975e; Kliebard, 1975a, 1975b; Macdonald, 1977a, 1977b, 1977d; Ubbelodhe, 1977).

Assumptions of this Study

Following is a discussion of the three major assumptions on which this study is based: (1) education is heavily value-laden, (2) values are personal, and (3) values can be identified.

Education is Value-Laden

"Man is not only a 'knowing' organism, he is also a 'valuing' organism" (Morris, 1961, p. 219). Although Morris's (1961) statement is succinct and simple, the idea of education being a value-laden rather than a neutral process has not received favorable response from today's educational community. In the past, values were topics of discussion and debate. In 1918 the National Education Association (NEA) listed seven cardinal principles of education: health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure time, and ethical character. During the progressive era the appropriateness of values taught in school was a concern of discussion and debate.

However, with the institution of school management and the technocratic mode of educational development the issue of values was upstaged by a selection of goals and a concern over methods and techniques. The definition and translation of values into goals gives the illusion of neutrality which only recently has been exposed by several curriculum theorists such as Russell Dobson, Randell Koetting, Elliot Eisner, Dwayne Huebner, William Pinar, Michael Apple and others as being a mask to hide the values embedded within the framework.

Many writers and educational thinkers have voiced the opinion that education is a value-oriented enterprise and that philosophical dialogue is of utmost importance. In

fact, one of John Dewey's (1916) most famous and oft-quoted dicta expresses this insight:

If we are willing to conceive education as the process of forming fundamental dispositions, intellectual and emotional toward nature and fellow men, philosophy may even be defined as the general theory of education (p. 383).

Morris (1961) says that,

Philosophy and education are really two visions of the same activity. Both are asking 'what can we make of man?' Philosophy asks it in macrocosm-- 'man' while education asks it in microcosm-- 'men'. . . . If some value, some program, some life choice is seen to be good for man, it must somehow recommend itself ultimately as good for individual men (p. 224).

Further,

Philosophy, most especially the study of axiology, examines, analyzes, and suggests values; education 'tries them out' on men (p. 224).

In a manner of speaking, in the decisions educators make concerning programs of reform, values are exhibited and proclaimed not just for the future of today, but for the future of all mankind; in essence, the question for decision makers to ask is what kind of program can be developed to bring men to a higher expression of themselves. Societies, culture, and education are judged by their values--by what is perceived as important.

Butler (1970), in an article titled "The Role of Value Theory in Education," published in Theories of Value and Problems of Education, presents four aspects of the close relationship between education and axiology. The first refers to the "necessity for human subjects to participate

in the realization of values" in order to "achieve and enjoy them" (p. 58). Butler states:

. . . persons or societies must be actively engaged in its' actualization or they cannot possess it and enjoy it for themselves (p. 58).

Further, he contends that,

Value realization is an educative process and necessarily involves people in a growth and development which is educational at heart (p. 78).

The second aspect is the inherent characteristic of schools as the most "value-realizing institution" with the exception of religious institutions. Educational institutions are normative organizations whose members are involved because they are intrinsically motivated by the cause of the organization. He also contends that education reaches beyond socialization of students; "it reaches quite beyond this objective to conveying the society into a new orbit of value possession" (p. 59).

The third aspect is the inherent relationship between educational objectives and value theory. He states,

Any objectives proposed are an expression, consciously or unconsciously, of value judgments and the relationship forces educators to be 'throughgoing' in our value thinking (p. 60).

The last aspect of the relation of axiology to education is the value problem and decision facing the children and youth. He concludes "real, responsible reflection begins with value problems" (p. 61).

This researcher believes a study of values is important to education for the following reasons:

1. It allows educators an opportunity for self reflection.
2. Teachers explore their attitudes, aspirations, purposes, interests and behaviors.
3. Additionally, they learn to understand what some of the alternative values are that other people possess.
4. Such a process--value classification--enables educators to consciously choose a future course of action from a selection of alternatives.

Values are Personal

A recent movement in philosophy acknowledges the existence of different ways of looking at reality. This concept is best expressed in the thesis developed by Berger and Luckmann (1967) which states that reality is socially constructed, i.e., "reality" and "knowledge" are characterized by social relativity. For example, "what is 'real' to a Tibetan monk may not be 'real' to an American businessman" (p. 3). This assumption about the relativity of social knowledge has particular relevance for this study because it must be borne in mind that teachers' knowledge and administrators' knowledge is "knowledge from a certain position" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967, p. 18). The perspective--public, administrative or educative--makes a difference. In other words, this study assumes that the researcher and the various people involved will have different frames of reference and different value systems.

Values can be Identified

Rescher (1969), in his book Introduction to Value Theory, attempts to answer the questions "What are values?", "How can they be identified?" and "Why classify values?" He recognizes that the term "value" functions sometimes as a noun to designate a characteristic or quality of something and often as a verb referring to the appraising of something. Also Mulder (1983) points out that one can "analyze a conceptual model both in terms of the statement it makes about things which are valuable, and in terms of the values which were operative in its construction" (p. 8).

Rescher (1969) maintains that value subscription, for all its ambiguity, manifests itself in two "distinguishable overt modes." The first mode is the sphere of discussion and thought (inner discourse) and the second mode is overt action (behavior). He states,

In imputing a value to someone, we underwrite the expectation that its espousal will manifest itself in appropriate ways, in his reflections regarding the justification and recommendation of actions (p. 3).

Rescher feels the prime indicators of value subscription are those items which reflect the "rationalization" of aspects of a "way of life" (p. 3). The other mode of overt behavior can be viewed in two ways; people's values, he explains, function both as constraints and as stimuli. Adherence to certain values motivates a person to do certain things and omit others. The tools of inquiry can be chosen by consid-

ering these avenues of approach to the analysis of the value pattern of a person or society: one could examine what a person says "his disposition to talk" (to approve, disapprove, recommend, encourage, etc.); by "his disposition to act" by the things that are chosen as means to expend his resources of time and energy, etc.; and one could look at what is omitted (ignored) in examining possibilities of choices refused.

Some feel the classification of values is a "purely academic exercise" with apparently little practical worth. However, Rescher contends that,

One cannot begin a really coherent, well-informed discussion on any range of phenomena . . . until some at least rough classification is at hand (p. 13).

Further, he claims that "classification embodies needed distinction" and if this distinction is ignored, "confusion" will result (p. 13). Due to the inherent complexity of values and the numerous and varied facets involved, value classification can be approached from many sides. Rescher identifies six main principles for classifying values. He shows that values can be differentiated by:

1. their subscribership
2. their object items
3. the sort of benefits at issue
4. the sort of purpose at issue
5. the relationship between subscriber and beneficiary
6. the relationship of the value to other values (p. 19).

These six factors indicate "dimensions" with respect to which values can be characterized so that some of their key

features can be set out in a systematic fashion. By the use of such classification at least part of the enormous complexity of values can be reduced to orderly terms. It is, moreover, useful to heed these different dimensions of value because an awareness of the distinction that underlies them enables us to avoid invitations to confusion in value discussion.

Taylor (1970) has also suggested that values may be categorized, ". . . according to the points of view to which they belong . . ." (p. 49). Thus, according to Taylor,

In all civilized cultures there are eight points of view (or realms of value) that may be designated as 'basic'. . . The eight points of view . . . are the moral, the aesthetic, the intellectual, the religious, the economic, the political, the legal, and the point of view of etiquette or custom (p. 49).

In addition to these eight basic points of view, there are non-basic points of view which are peculiar to a particular culture or sub-culture in Taylor's analysis. The "group interest" is considered an appropriate category in assessing an organization as well as whatever basic points of view to which its purposes belong. Further, Taylor points out that there is the point of view of self-interest which,

. . . is defined by those rules of reasoning according to which an appeal to one's self interest is always relevant to the justification of a value judgment and any other appeal is always irrelevant . . . (p. 52).

Taylor (1970) presents a framework in which values can be classified according to the points of view to which they belong. He believes the conduct of a person is subject to

the value system of at least one realm and can include more. Taylor contends that evaluation from the moral point of view is "applicable to all organizations" (p. 51). He states,

To say that the moral point of view applies to all such organizations is to say that the rule of relevance which governs the reasoning of those who seek to justify value judgments, prescriptions, standards and rules within the organization are the rules of relevance that define the moral point of view (p. 52).

Further, the moral point of view is applicable because the decisions, policies and activities affect the welfare of different individuals. Taylor (1970) states,

Every culture embodies a moral code which is concerned with the welfare of the individuals in the culture; and since the activities and policies of every social organization affect, for better or worse, the welfare of at least some individuals in the culture, the culture's moral system is applicable (p. 51).

Similarly, Mulder (1983) presents a conceptual framework in which values can be classified according to questions asked, source of answers, conception of curriculum, conception of society, and conception of values.

Pertinent to this axiological analysis are Huebner's five value frameworks. Huebner (1975a) has identified five value frameworks to be used in interpreting any educational phenomenon. The first applies to technical values. "The curriculum is seen as a means to a predetermined end and can be criticized as to how well those ends are being achieved" (p. 2). In the technical framework, which is the most commonly used, learning is being appraised. A second framework applies political values. Justice and equality are concerns

within this framework--whose interests are being represented and serviced? Usually these values exist more often covertly than overtly but the persons in power within the society can be expected to seek educational reforms satisfying to themselves. Within this framework the idea that a person's worth can be judged by the influence he possesses is promoted. Thus, power and control becomes the end. A third framework applies ethical values. In this case, the focus is on the human dimension. To what extent does the reform reflect the prevailing ethical views about man and his relationship to man? Ethical values are viewed as promoting the idea that activities are life and that life's meanings are witnessed and lived in the schools. The fourth framework is an aesthetic one. Here the educational phenomenon is criticized as if it were a work of art and the values identified deal with beauty and truth. Aesthetic values tend to promote activities that are felt by and lived by children. The final framework is a scientific one, where activities are viewed as "producing new knowledge about the educational process." It might be added that this new knowledge must have an empirical base.

According to many writers, particularly the reconceptualist writers, none of these value systems is inherently evil; however, the exaggerated dependence on some to the exclusion of others means that the educational activity is viewed from a limited point of reference which, in turn, produces a distorted image.

Macdonald (1977b) views Huebner's framework as opening "the possibilities of political, aesthetic and moral talk" (p. 5). Huebner's framework, according to Lewis and Miel (1972) has been used to critique the ongoing situation in classrooms, the "flow of activity," and what is present and absent in the experiences of children in the process of schooling (p. 157). Huebner's five value frameworks was a structuring device and interpretative tool in this study.

Organization of this Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I provides an introduction for this study. It also presents the nature of the study, its assumptions, and the organization. Chapter II contains a review of the literature concerning the master teacher concept. Chapter III includes a description of the research procedures to be followed in this study. Chapter IV provides an axiological analysis of the Master Teacher Program of Stanley, Wayside, and Clearwater. The final chapter contains a summary, implications, recommendations for further research, and concluding statements of this study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An Issue With A History

The recently introduced concept of merit pay is not new to education in the United States. Although several merit pay plans have had different names, merit pay as an issue has a long tempestuous history which has considerable impact on current debates. At one time, all teachers' compensation was considered "merit pay" since teachers had to negotiate individually with a school district to determine their pay; there was no set salary schedule. Slowly, this approach was replaced by a standardized salary schedule in response to pressure to equalize the pay of elementary and secondary teachers, to equalize the pay between the sexes, and to equalize the pay between white and black teachers. Another factor that contributed to the adoption of a single salary schedule was the difference in pay between school systems that used merit pay and those which did not. During World War I, the average salaries of teachers in systems using merit pay fell below those of teachers in systems that did not use merit pay (Guttenburg, 1971).

Merit pay seems to reappear in 20 year cycles. It reached a peak in the 1920s, declined in the '30s and '40s,

and resurfaced in the 1950s. Task groups were set up to study merit pay in North Carolina, Utah, Kentucky, and Tennessee. During the 1960s, approximately ten percent of the nation's school systems had merit pay plans in effect but this percentage had dropped to 5.5 percent by 1972 (ERS, 1979). In 1975, Delaware, Florida and New York legislated plans for teachers but later abandoned them as unworkable. In 1978, Educational Research Service (ERS) studied 11,502 school systems which indicated that 4 percent had a plan in operation, 4.7 percent were considering plans and 6.4 percent had programs which were not operating. The ERS report further stated that 31.7 percent of the discontinued plans lasted one or two years, 21.6 percent of the discontinued programs lasted three or four years, and 15.1 percent had a plan that was more than 10 years old when it was discontinued.

Robinson (1979) examined the effects of merit pay plans upon 239 districts from 1908 to 1978 and found the following reasons for this failure. Forty percent of the districts stated that the administration of merit pay forced the termination of the plan. By that they meant that:

1. Plans were entirely too complicated to be administered fairly.
2. Plans were too burdensome on a limited number of administrators.
3. Plans made no difference in teaching performance.
4. Excessive record keeping was required.

5. As administration or leadership changed, so did plans.

6. Changes in school boards brought changes in plans.

7. Parents wanted children taught only by a superior teacher.

He also found that thirty-eight percent of the districts where merit pay failed stated that a merit pay plan created personnel problems of sufficient magnitude to terminate the plan:

1. Teacher morale suffered.

2. The plan created jealousy and dissension among staff members.

3. Staff charged administration with unjustified favoritism for a few teachers.

4. The plans destroyed cooperative team work and produced competition.

5. Teachers' organizations and unions opposed merit pay.

Seventeen percent of the districts with failing merit pay plans, according to Robinson, gave these financial problems as the primary reason for abandoning those plans:

1. Lack of funds to administer the plan.

2. Incentives too low to bring about changes in teaching performance.

3. Insufficient rewards for teachers to make the plan work.

4. The plan negotiated out of the budget by collective bargaining.

Other problems were mentioned:

1. Evaluation procedures were unsatisfactory.

2. It was very difficult to determine objectively who deserved merit pay.

3. The plan did not develop enough data to defend the choices made, hence charges of arbitrariness were filed.

4. Evaluators were inconsistent in their ratings.

5. Evaluators were not able to be objective, thus they were subjectively partial to a few people.

6. No satisfactory evaluation instruments were available.

7. Teachers charged evaluators with unjustified subjectivity.

8. Arbitrary cutoff points seemed illogical and the quota system froze out younger members.

9. It was impossible to find superior results or to measure any results.

A survey of school systems (30,000+ population) by Educational Research Service in 1979 indicated that 170 had merit plans in 1959, but only 33 had them in 1979. Renewed interest during the early 1980s has rekindled the debate. The linking of merit pay with state certification and recertification for public school teachers elevated the movement from an experiment to a position of considerable power in a

number of states. The media along with the various reports continues to promote the idea.

In the recent study by the National Commission on Excellence in Education entitled A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983), recommendations for the improvement of education were made, several of them dealing with incentive pay. Three of the seven recommendations on teaching were directly linked to merit-based pay and career ladders for teachers:

Recommendation 2:

Salaries for the teaching profession should be increased and should be professionally competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based. Salary, promotion, tenure, and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that includes peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and poor ones either improved or terminated (p. 30).

Recommendation 4:

School boards, administrators, and teachers should cooperate to develop career ladders for teachers that distinguish among the beginning instructor, the experienced teacher, and the master teacher (p. 30).

Recommendation 7:

Master teachers should be involved in designing teacher preparation programs and in supervising teachers during their probationary years (p. 30-31).

The report entitled Action for Excellence (1983) by the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, formed by the Education Commission concluded:

In every state, moreover, teachers are paid according to rigid salary schedules based primarily on training and years of experience. No state, to our knowledge, has a system for reward-

ing exceptional teachers for their superior performance. The idea of extraordinary rewards for extraordinary performance, in fact--an idea which is accepted in virtually every other career field, public and private--does not apply in the field of public school teaching. The system of tenure in most school systems also makes it difficult, if not impossible, to deal with the problem of ineffective or unmotivated teachers (p. 26).

In conclusion, this Task Force report stated:

Recommendation 4:

Express a new and higher regard for teachers and for the profession of teaching. We recommend that every state and every local school district--with the fullest participation of teachers themselves--drastically improve their methods for recruiting, training and paying teachers. This improvement should begin with schedules of teacher pay that are competitive with pay in other jobs and professions It should feature financial incentives for teachers, keyed to differing responsibilities and to filling critical needs in certain subject areas. And it must go on to create extraordinary rewards for extraordinary teachers; expanded pay and recognition for teachers, not just for teaching the upper levels of seniority, but for reaching the upper levels of competence and effectiveness as well (p. 37).

Further,

We strongly recommend that each state create a 'career ladder' for teachers that will help attract and keep outstanding teachers. There should be changing levels of responsibility, pay and status for teachers as they move through their careers. . . . Finally, in addition to higher salaries, we recommend that the states and communities, the media and business leaders establish new forms of recognition to honor the contributions of teachers and to underscore publicly their crucial importance in our national life. We have in mind special scholarships, financial awards and other tributes which express the value we place upon teaching as a profession--and our appreciation for great teachers (p. 37).

According to the most recent Gallup poll in a report entitled The Gallup Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the

Public Schools (1984), American teachers oppose the idea of merit pay by a 2 to 1 ratio, 64 percent to 32 percent. This ratio is consistent across all major teacher population subgroups (Table I). The poll shows, however, that the public supports the notion of paying better teachers more, with 76 percent voting in favor of the Master Teacher Programs (Table II).

According to a Gallup poll (1984), teachers oppose merit pay for two basic reasons: (1) the difficulty of evaluating teacher performance and (2) the moral problems that merit pay might cause. About one-fourth of the teacher respondents (23%) say that it would be difficult to give a fair evaluation of teaching. Twelve percent say that administrators could not give objective evaluations, and the same percentage say that teacher merit cannot be measured objectively at all. About 12 percent of the teachers say that merit pay would create morale problems in their schools, and another 8 percent say that it would present political problems in the schools (Table III).

Guttenburg (1971) suggests that the mere fact of teacher opposition, abstracted from its practical consequences, "should have been a serious point against it" (p. 33). He contends, however, that there is a curious tendency in writings on merit pay, and in some of the actual experiments themselves, to disregard teachers' feelings and opinions.

TABLE I
 GALLUP POLL OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDE
 TOWARD MERIT PAY FOR TEACHERS

	All Teachers %	Elementary Teachers %	High School Teachers %
Favor	32	29	35
Oppose	64	67	62
No opinion	4	4	3

Source: Gallup, A. "The Gallup poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools." Phi Delta Kappan (1984).

TABLE II
TEACHER OPINION VERSUS PUBLIC OPINION
CONCERNING MERIT PAY FOR TEACHERS

	All Teachers %	U.S. Public %
Favor	32	76
Oppose	64	19
No opinion	4	5

Source: Gallup, A. "The Gallup poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools." Phi Delta Kappan (1984).

TABLE III
GALLUP POLL OF REASONS TEACHERS FAVOR/OPOSE
MERIT PAY FOR TEACHERS*

	All Teachers %	Elementary Teachers %	High School Teachers %
Oppose			
Difficult to give a fair evaluation	23	22	24
Would create problems/ morale problems	12	14	10
Administrators can't evaluate fairly	12	12	13
Political problems	8	9	7
Can't be objectively measured	12	12	12
Other	5	4	5
Favor			
Good teachers would be rewarded	25	23	27
Children would benefit	1	*	1
Other	7	6	8

(Figures add to more than 100 because of multiple answers.)
*Less than one-half of 1%.

Source: Gallup, A. "The Gallup poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools." Phi Delta Kappan (1984).

Guttenburg (1971) states,

There is a curious tendency . . . to treat teachers' opinion as little more than an obstacle to be overcome, or a wrong conclusion to be reeducated, or a superstition to be subverted or tricked. (One finds this tendency even when teachers are patently right) (pp. 33-34).

Definitions of Merit Pay

A review of the literature reveals that almost everyone interested in the subject has a different definition of what is meant by a merit pay system for teachers. Programs have been presented under many names, such as incentive pay, bonus pay, increments, career ladders and master teacher salary schedules. In the literature these names are used interchangeably. Most of the literature identifies the various master teacher programs as one type of merit pay. Some writers, however, argue that merit pay plans and master teacher plans differ. According to Klein (1983), merit pay plans are usually viewed to mean,

. . .any salary schedule for classroom teachers, whatever its plan of recognizing position, experience, and preparation may be, if it either authorizes or specifies salaries above the regular schedule to reward teachers who have been judged to be rendering superior service (p. 3).

Master teacher plans are often associated with differentiated staffing systems with both differential salaries and responsibilities (and sometimes contractual periods). Stocker (1970) quotes Roy A. Edelfelt, former Executive Secretary of the National Council on Teacher Education and

Professional Standards, as saying that such a difference does exist. He says,

Merit pay means salary differentials based on the quality of performance in situations where every teacher has a similar task and the same degree of responsibility. Differentiated staffing, on the other hand, would establish salary differentials based on differences in degree of responsibility (as quoted by Stocker, 1970, p. 2).

Differentiated staffing plans such as The Tennessee Master Teacher Plan, Texas Master Teacher Plan and Temple City, California Mentor Teacher Plan usually involve all the teachers in a district or state with teachers assigned to a hierarchy depending on assessment of performance and assignment of responsibility. On the other hand, Stocker (1970) claims that critics regard differentiated staffing, which seeks to compensate teachers according to different responsibilities that accompany these jobs, is "camouflaged merit pay of the highest order" (p. 2).

Other programs, also called master teacher plans, focus on identifying only a small percentage of teachers for special status which includes both salary differentials in the rate of pay or bonuses or the extension of the contract through an extra month or two, or some combination of these approaches. Differentiated responsibilities, often focus on serving as mentors to less experienced teachers, working in the area of inservice education, curriculum development or serving on committees that evaluate other teachers.

Master teacher programs are usually a mix of perform-

ance-based and responsibility-based systems. Master teachers are identified on the basis of "superior" job performance but are rewarded only if they assume additional duties. The first aspect clearly defines the program as merit pay system, while the second aspect primarily describes it as responsibility-based. Not just any teacher, however, is eligible to participate in the master teacher program; only superior performance allows teachers to be eligible for extra pay for extra responsibility. Brighton and Hannan (1962) state that,

. . .merit comes into the picture in the selection of teachers who apply for 12-month contract status. Only teachers who have demonstrated their superiority as classroom technicians and the ability and willingness to make a contribution in other professional areas are eligible for the longer contract (p. 40).

Hatry and Greiner (1984) draw a sharp distinction between what they term master teacher/career development programs. Their report presents two general types of master teacher/career development programs; one class "combines features of both merit pay and career ladder plans" which provides higher teacher pay grades for a combination of criteria such as performance ratings, participation in special district projects, educational credits, and longevity. Since the teacher's "primary role is still 'teaching students' and she is 'not removed' from the classroom, these writers consider this type of plan a "merit pay as well as a career development program" (p. 111).

The second approach mentioned by Hatry and Greiner (1984) emphasizes the creation of "new job positions" for teachers, jobs with "additional responsibility, "extra pay," and, perhaps, "added prestige." This class also moves teachers "away from" the instruction of students into areas such as curriculum development, teacher counseling and training, etc. They called it an "elite" program and distinguished this type from merit pay for the following reasons: (1) it is usually designed to provide a direct and relatively immediate link between performance and pay, (2) such plans do not provide a direct stimulus for improving a teacher's performance with respect to the teacher's present job (e.g. teaching students), and (3) at any given time, such programs probably provide advancement opportunities for only a small proportion of teachers (p. 113).

Hatry and Greiner (1984) claim that there are three general categories of merit pay plans: (1) salary raises are withheld from teachers judged to be rendering unsatisfactory service; (2) merit bonuses are awarded teachers judged to be rendering exceptional service; and (3) master, or career, teachers are placed on a different schedule from that used for regular teachers. However, the complexity of the issues and the lack of common definitions is demonstrated by the example of merit pay plans presented in a survey by the ERS in 1977-78. From the 113 merit pay programs reported, 11 different categories emerged (as shown in Table V, Appendix A). Plans differed substantially (both

within and between categories) in design and provision for administration and evaluation.

In addition to the 11 categories (Appendix A) found in the ERS survey, three additional kinds of differentiated pay are discussed in the professional literature as merit pay. These are extra pay awarded (1) for teaching under difficult conditions (i.e., "combat pay"), (2) for teaching in subject areas where there is a teacher shortage, such as science and mathematics, and (3) for meeting organizational goals (e.g., better teacher attendance or high student achievement).

The term "merit pay program" is not clearly defined. The following definitions have been set forth by various groups trying to describe plans by which a teacher's salary is to some extent determined by a judgment as to his/her competency. These definitions, presented by Brighton and Hannan are:

1. A subjective, qualitative judgment of a teacher, made administratively by one or more persons, with or without the participation or the knowledge of the person rated for purposes of determining salary.
2. Relating teachers' salaries to judgments of teacher competence.
3. Merit Rating is the effort to evaluate or measure more successfully the effectiveness of the performance of the teacher, with a view to rewarding excellence while avoiding overpayment to the mediocre or unsuccessful teacher.
4. Merit Rating is a systematic method of evaluating employee performance for the following purposes:
 - a. To help determine promotions, transfers, demotions, dismissals, and salaries.
 - b. To provide an analysis of strong and weak points so that employees' performance may be improved through a guidance program.

- c. To provide the personnel divisions with a yardstick to measure the effectiveness of testing, recruiting, and in-service training programs.
- 5. The evaluation of teacher techniques in the classroom applied to additional pay beyond the basic salary schedule.
- 6. Merit Rating refers to formalized systematic methods of appraising employees. Other terms frequently used to describe merit rating are: performance review, performance evaluation, service ratings, evaluation reports, and so forth (as quoted by Brighton and Hannan, 1962, pp. 1-2).

In the literature, master teacher programs are viewed as one type of merit pay. From the definitions above three themes seem important in understanding the master teacher concept. These three views of the master teacher will be discussed: master teacher as a reward, master teacher as a standard, and master teacher as a means of evaluation.

Master Teacher Plan As A Way To Reward Teachers

Some educators view a Master Teacher Plan primarily as a way to reward outstanding teachers; some see its principal function as the establishment of a set of standards for all teachers to be guided by. Still others see the Master Teacher Plan as a vehicle for establishing a set of criteria to be used in evaluating teachers' performances. As noted above in the various definitions, the idea that "superior teachers" should be rewarded dominates the master teacher literature. According to Holzberg (1974), this usually takes the form of a "monetary reward" (p. 100). Therefore,

the literature deals with reward questions such as "what kind?," "how much?," "to whom?," and "for what?"

"A reward is something of value given to a being for worthy behavior" (Guttenburg, 1971, p. 2). It doesn't have to be, of course, but more often than not, according to Guttenburg (1971), in our materialistic society, a reward consists of money, or at least, something which has "money value" (Guttenburg, 1971, p. 2). Reward, as well as incentive, is a central psychological concept used in behavior modification theory which encourages "reinforcement" of the behavior desired. In relation to reward, the author also states that, "An incentive is anything which incites a being to action or effort" (p. 15). Implicit in every true incentive is a specific action which the being is incited to perform; whether stated or not, every incentive is a stimulus to do A or B or C, or A and B and C. Educators, when they talk about incentives, often fail to mention the specific actions which the incentives are meant to incite. This omission is considered by Guttenburg (1971) to be serious because incentives have no real meaning apart from the "specific actions which they encourage" (p. 15).

Rewards and incentives are primarily concerned with the ways that individuals can be coaxed into action by external motivators. The merit salary operates on the reward theory. The linking of merit salary to the improvement of instruction, a position that is evident in most existing programs, assumes a firm relationship between motivation and monetary

reward. As a tool for improvement, reward belongs to the theory that claims that the behavior of people is a result of the forces and influences under which they come. Such a theory of "pressure from without" as a molder of behavior can be traced to behavioral psychology. Skinner's operant conditioning refers to behaviors that operate in the environment to produce certain effects. Skinner (1968) states the law of conditioning as "If the occurrences of an operant are followed by presentation of a reinforcing stimulus, the strength is increased" (p. 21). Skinner identifies two classes of reinforcers: positive and negative. He defines a positive reinforcer as "a stimulus which when added to a situation, strengthens the probability of an operant response" (p. 73). In contrast, a negative reinforcer is defined as "a stimulus which when removed from a situation, strengthens the probability of an operant response" (p. 73). Both positive and negative reinforcers increase the probability of an operant response. The basis of Skinner's theory is the predication that there are two different types of behavior: respondent and operant. Respondent behavior refers to behavior elicited by specific stimulus. Operant refers to behavior that operates in the environment to produce certain effects.

Negative reinforcement involves the removal of aversive stimuli and, either the presentation of a negative reinforc-

er or the removal of a positive one. It is assumed that punishment eliminates unwanted behavior. Skinner's primary interest has been the relationship of operants to reinforcers. Skinner's method of using reinforcement to control behavior is called behavior modification (Skinner, 1968). This concept of behavior modification has been extended into education, as well as business.

The psychological roots of many business and educational programs can be traced to Skinner's behavior psychology. These roots are often illustrated in the structure of the organization. The question of whether to organize "work," "people," or "systems" depends on fundamental assumptions in regard to the nature of work and the behavior of human beings in a work situation. In the first quarter of this century the most influential voice in managerial psychology was that of Frederick Taylor, who advocated what was called a scientific-management approach. In Taylor's view, the workers' only motivation was to make money, and hence Taylor's answer to the problem of motivating workers was a piece-work system of pay. The basic premise of the concept is grounded in the conception of human nature as found in the rational/economic man. This theory assumes that:

1. Man is primarily motivated by economic incentives and will do that which gets him the greatest economic gain.
2. Since economic **incentives** are under the control of the organization, man is essentially a passive agent to be manipulated, motivated, and controlled by the organization.

3. Man's feelings are essentially irrational and must be prevented from interfering with his rational calculation of self-interest.
4. Organizations can and must be designed in such a way as to neutralize and control man's feelings and therefore his unpredictable traits (Schein, 1970, p. 60).

If people are motivated by money, as assumed by the rational-economy theory, the manager's task is one of manipulating and motivating workers to perform their best within the limits of what they can be paid. The theory holds that workers' feelings are irrational and must be prevented from obstructing the expression of the workers' rational self-interest.

This narrow conception resembles what Douglas McGregor called Theory X. His theory is summarized by Sisk (1973) as follows:

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if he can.
2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.
3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all (p. 269).

Adherence to Theory X results in a work-centered organization with an authoritarian foundation. Sisk (1973) explains that,

Once the foundation of an organization has been laid upon the cornerstone of authority, the location of the decision-making process is determined, the organizational structure acquires certain characteristics, and the roles of the supervisor and the individual member of the organization are sharply defined (p. 269).

Theory X rests upon the assumption of complete authority as the motivating force directing the course of the organization. Authority is transmitted through a chain of commands in a linear fashion from top to bottom in order to optimize the goal of the organization which is efficient production.

The conventional view held by the educational administrator (McGregor's "Theory X") shows him/her "harnessing the energy of faculty and students so that goals and requirements of the educational system the administrator has chosen will be met" (Rogers, 1969, p. 206). The administrator envisions the goals to be met and carries out the responsibility of organizing, controlling, and modifying the variables which affect the system, including students and teachers. Since the administrator feels that,

. . .both faculty and students would be, if left to their own devices, apathetic to, or resistant to, the educational goal . . .they must be rewarded, punished, persuaded--through the use of both the carrot and the stick . . . (Rogers, 1969, p. 206).

The notions of assembly line and bureaucracy were developed rather extensively under this concept. The assembly line basically refers to division of labor. The general idea is that efficiency and productivity increase with task specialization. Under this notion, managers and workers are restricted to only part of the work on a given product. The person responsible for introducing the concept of bureaucracy was Max Weber. Weber's idea of bureaucracy is characterized by the following principles:

1. Official business is conducted on a continuous basis.
2. It is conducted in accordance with stipulated rules in an administrative agency.
3. Every official's responsibility and authority are part of a hierarchy of authority.
4. Officials and other administrative employees do not own the resources necessary for the performance of their assigned functions, but are accountable for their use of these resources (as quoted by Downs, Berg and Unkugel, 1979, p. 6).

Generally, the goal of an incentive system is to promote control and maintain a certain level of behavior. Desiring to control behavior, as well as the selection of behavior to reward is a value choice.

In established merit pay policies, there are three major technical considerations. The first is the selection of criteria to determine the level or amount of competency. The second is a determination concerning the method of payment. In addition, consideration must also be given to the amount of compensation (Moore, 1984; McGuire and Thompson, 1984).

In business, additional pay for work produced in excess of a stated standard rests upon two assumptions. First, it is assumed that the worker has control over the amount of work that can be produced, and, second, that the worker will respond to the monetary incentive and earn more money by increasing his output. The second assumption leads directly to the designation of compensation based on the work produced by an incentive plan (Sisk, 1973).

Rosenholtz (1985) contends that there are eight political myths propagated when this notion of merit pay is trans-

lated to the area of education. Myth number one states "Pay teachers more, and they will teach better" (p. 348). "Those who believe this political platitude," she continues, "must also accept at least four underlying assumptions." These assumptions are:

1. Teachers find money to be the most rewarding aspect of their job.
2. Teachers can be motivated to improve by monetary incentive.
3. Teachers now withhold services from students that they would deliver if their salaries were higher.
4. Teachers have the individual capacity to improve if only they were properly motivated to do so (p. 350).

Rosenholtz (1985) presents Myth 2: "Competition among teachers for career advancement and higher pay is a sound way to improve the quality of service" (p. 350). Because most proposals of merit pay recommend quotas based on the number of teachers selected, competition among teachers for rewards is promoted. The negative consequences (intended or unintended) of competition for teachers' collegial relationships are noted almost universally in the literature. Usually the harmful effects of competition are listed as unintended effects; however, Michael Apple suggests that the trend and advantages of management/administrators to "divide and conquer" labor forces might cause one to consider that the intended result of competition is the control of the political force of teachers and their union.

Rosenholtz (1985) summarizes research on the effects of competition on collaboration. She states:

1. Competitive rewards close rather than open communication among people who work together.
2. Competition clouds comprehension of differing viewpoints.
3. Competition destroys trust among group members.
4. Encouragement among group members is substantially reduced.
5. Group problem-solving capacity is diminished.
6. Competition may lead people to frustrate their colleagues' efforts deliberately.
7. Competition will substantially thwart efforts at improvement.
8. It may accelerate professional isolation in schools and inhibit problem solving.
9. Sharing of teaching materials, methods or ideas is unlikely.
10. Teachers may conclude that success in this reward structure comes only at the price of positive collegial relations (pp. 348-352).

She contends that development of teachers' skills depends heavily on collaborative exchanges, and research on successful schools suggests that schools where gains in student learning are greatest: (1) do not isolate teachers from each other, (2) are places where professional dialogue is frequent and cooperative, (3) are places where teaching is believed to be a collective rather than an individual enterprise, (4) are places where analysis, evaluation and experimentation in concert with colleagues help teachers become more effective instructors, (5) are places where teachers interact whenever there is opportunity--in training sessions, faculty meetings, hallways, teachers' lounges and classrooms, and (6) are places where requests for, and offers of, assistance are more frequent than experience swapping (pp. 351-352).

Motivation. As stated in Chapter I, education is a normative enterprise whose members are involved because they are intrinsically motivated by the cause of the organization. Rewards for participation are recognition for service given, titles, and esteem and satisfaction from a sense of service, not money.

A major criticism of merit pay is that money is not considered a major incentive for good teaching. The evidence from the literature about pay as an incentive is inconclusive. Writers such as Casey (1975) argue that pay is a prime motivator for teachers, but the work of others would appear to question this. Research by Sergiovanni (1967) and Lortie (1975) suggests that teachers find their greatest job satisfaction not in extrinsic rewards but intrinsic rewards such as a sense of achievement in "knowing that I have reached students and they have learned" or the recognition of their colleagues and a feeling of responsibility. In a recent research update of Lortie's Dade county revisited titled "Stability and Change in a Profession: Two Decades of Teacher Attitudes, 1964-1984," the teacher's preference for intrinsic reward was still found to be higher than for extrinsic reward (Cohn et al, 1986). On the other hand, inadequate extrinsic rewards, such as pay that fails to meet basic needs, or unpleasant working conditions can result in dissatisfaction. The implications of such studies of teacher satisfaction are that once teachers feel they are receiving an adequate

income and are working in an acceptable environment they are more concerned with pursuing their profession than with seeking extra financial rewards.

Deci's (1976) study on the relationship of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards suggests that extrinsic rewards (including such considerations as fear of negative teacher evaluations) can push intrinsic rewards aside. Once workers begin to strive for extrinsic rewards, they tend to find the work itself less motivating and seek ways to do it more easily rather than better. Unnecessary criticism becomes an extrinsic motivator, while praise and assistance serve to increase intrinsic motivation. Merit pay systems, according to Deci (1976), have flaws similar to those of criticism. They replace the intrinsic motivators of collegiality, sense of efficacy (support by administrators' comments), and individually-set performance standards with the extrinsic forces of competition, a judgmental administration, and external standards. Failure to obtain extrinsic rewards, Deci found, can decrease motivation more than success in obtaining the same rewards will increase motivation.

Deci (1976) and Meyer (1975) argue that not only are merit pay plans an inadequate means of motivating employees, they may actually reduce motivation. The majority of workers feel they are among the best at their own task and would reject any evaluation or evaluator that did not give them a merit reward. At the same time, they would reject as mean-

ingless any plan that gave merit rewards to practically everyone. Once basic needs are met by wages or salary, the worker (or teacher) looks to merit pay as a means of satisfying needs for self-esteem and recognition. The paradox of merit pay plans is that those plans that truly reward superior service only threaten the naturally high self-esteem of the majority of workers (Guttenburg, 1971; Deci, 1976; ERS Report, 1983).

Deci (1976) also points out that when specific rewards are offered for specific behaviors, the intrinsic motivation for those behaviors is reduced and is replaced with a reward orientation. During this age when most teachers already feel their economic well-being threatened, adoption of a merit pay system could focus so much attention on money that many teachers would lose sight completely of their already dwindling original interest in teaching.

Guttenburg (1971) pointed out that it was important to note that incentives can be either rewards or punishments. A reward is something of value given to a being for worthy behavior. A punishment is a penalty imposed on a being for doing something wrong" (p. 1). He continues by stating that,

When a being has a reasonable expectation of a 'reward' and does not receive it--as when a teacher hears a department head praise everyone in the department but him/herself--the failure to receive a reward may reasonably be construed as a punishment, although it might not necessarily be one if the failure was not intended as a penalty for wrongdoing (pp. 1-2).

Authors of incentive systems have, it seems, deliberately confined their discussions almost entirely to the offering of rewards even though teachers, through their unions, have been candid to point out that an incentive system threatens certain among them with punishments (Guttenburg, 1971). According to Guttenburg (1971), proponents persist in framing merit pay proposals in terms of rewards only, and in terms of money strictly ". . .added to the single salary schedules" (p. 33). He states ". . .it was perfectly obvious to teachers that when some were singled out for merit pay, others were implicitly demoted" (p. 34). In the long term, he continues, merit pay had to "affect adversely the amounts of money available for the single salary schedule" (Guttenburg, 1971, p. 34).

In discussing the concept of punishment, Daresh (1985) points out that a less frequently stated justification for merit pay is that "non-receipt" of a few dollars will have the "indirect effect" of discouraging poor teachers from continuing their careers in education. He contends that something is ". . .inherently wrong with an arrangement when indirect messages are used to indicate that someone is not performing and doing the job very well" (p. 79).

A theory applicable to the merit plan idea is that of Herzberg and associates of the Psychological Service at Pittsburg (Herzberg, Manser, Snyderman, 1959) who say that money is a hygenic factor and that motivators arise from the job itself when the employee experiences feelings of self-

improvement and growth, achievement, and recognition of a job well done. These researchers found that pay, working conditions, company policy, and the quality of supervision are all part of the environment but peripheral to the job itself. When these factors are believed to be inadequate they function as "dissatisfiers."

Deci (1976) agrees with Herzberg and adds that extrinsic rewards may be harmful in that they reduce intrinsic motivation necessary to feel competent and self-directed. In discussing the equity theory, Deci (1975) points out that if a person believes his output-to-input ratio is less than that of a colleague, he will be dissatisfied and uncomfortable and will seek equity; that is, his behavior will be modified to be congruent with the reward. This theory works for both underpayment and overpayment. If the payment is greater than the person perceives equitable, the employee may attribute his motivation to work to money and not to intrinsic motivation. Thus, his intrinsic motivation may wane and he may perceive himself as working only for money. Underpayment, according to the equity theory, also affects performance. Since it is posited that a worker will give in proportion to that which s/he receives, in order to maintain a stable relationship, a worker or teacher who perceives him/herself as contributing more to a school system than is reflected in his/her salary and/or merit pay may diminish his/her performance to create that equity (Deci, 1975).

One large national study conducted by McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) found money to be a "disincentive" for teacher change. Combs (1965) found it plausible that money would not motivate the service-oriented persons. Teachers seem more likely to change when they believe the attempt will enhance their effectiveness with students (Lortie, 1975; Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger, 1980).

Klein (1984) emphasizes that the master teacher plans incorporate management's traditional reliance on extrinsic rewards and punishment and ignore motivational and human resource theorists concerning intrinsic rewards associated with a basic need to feel competent and self-determining. She states that "motivational and human resource theorists have questioned management's traditional reliance on extrinsic reward and punishment and are misapplied in education" (p. 5). Further, she suggested that these programs are "de-meaning and paternalistic" in that they emphasize workers' dependence on their supervisors/principals, create competition among workers, generate hostility, distort perception of self and others, and lessen interaction, communication and cooperation (Klein, 1983).

Another of Rosenholtz's (1985) myths, "Promotion and Incentive Pay Will Keep Good Teachers in Teaching" (p. 11), has been substantiated by Goodlad (1983b). He and his associates questioned approximately 1,300 teachers finding that most teachers entered the teaching profession because of the nature of the work itself. Those who gave up their posi-

tions did so because of personal frustration and dissatisfaction with their own teaching situation and overriding doubt about their ability to succeed with students. Money, which was not the major priority for entering teaching, ranked second in importance as a reason for leaving. Goodlad (1983) found that when teachers become disappointed with their work, pay becomes more important.

Master Teacher as a Standard

While some view the master teacher designation as a reward, others promote the concept of master teacher as a standard. Darling-Hammond and Wise (1983) emphasize the rhetoric of standardization:

Standards is education's newest buzzword. Higher standards for teachers are at the top of nearly everyone's reform list, and proposals for toughening up the teaching corps fly about like dandelion seeds in the wind. Teacher competency tests and merit pay are two of the more popular panaceas (p. 66).

Standards represent someone's notion of an "ideal" whereby all teachers are judged to see if they "measure up" to the values of those setting the standard. This criteria becomes a model or mold for teachers to change or mold themselves according to the "ideal."

The dictionary definition of standards includes two concepts: first, a set of standards is a rule (unit) for measuring to serve as a model or criterion; second, a standard is established by authority. Thus, a standard may be defined as a unit of measurement to serve as a model or cri-

terion (Sisk, 1973). Standards are the basis of the control process. Sisk (1973) states that ". . .without adequate standards, the subsequent steps of measurement and corrective action are meaningless" (p. 620).

The scope of standards, especially in business, primarily concerns, but is not limited to, establishing levels of performance for individual workers. The methods of establishing standards, however, are varied because one method cannot be applied to all areas. There are usually three methods used, according to Sisk (1973), to determine the level of expected performance. The first method is to develop statistical or normative data from sources internal and external to the organization. Another is to appraise results in the light of experience and judgment. The third is to develop engineered standards. Statistical standards, often called historical standards, are standards based on analysis of past experience; that is, data drawn from a particular organization's own records or data which reflect the experience of several similar organizations. In all of these instances, however, before a final criterion can be set, the information gained from statistical sources is combined with another factor--value judgment.

Standards set by appraisal are essentially value judgments. Chruden and Sherman (1976) point out that in the absence of standards determined by formal study and analysis, most administrators in any organization are expected to appraise the output of their subordinates in

terms of what they, as managers or administrators, believe to be a satisfactory day's work and a satisfactory product of that work. In so doing, standards are set by appraisal.

Engineered standards, so called because they are based upon an objective, quantitative analysis of a specific work situation, were developed for the measurement of machine output and for measuring output of individual workers (Chruden and Sherman, 1976; Sisk, 1973). Machine output standards are determined by mechanical design factors and represent optimum output capabilities of the equipment in normal production use. Engineered standards developed to measure the output of individual workers or a group of workers are called either time standards or time study standards. The first studies in this country using the stop watch to measure were completed by Frederick W. Taylor in 1881 at the Midvale Steel Company. Taylor introduced, along with his "Scientific Management" theory, incentive pay (Callahan, 1960; Kliebard, 1975a, 1975b; Sisk, 1973). Time study standards are now considered essential if incentive plans are to be implemented (Sisk, 1973).

Educators borrowed not only the methods of scientific management from business and industry, but the concept of incentive pay as well (Eisner, 1979, 1985; Kliebard, 1975a, 1975b). The notion of standardization has been totally incorporated into the schools and taken-for-granted (Callahan, 1960; Apple, 1983; Huebner, 1975a, 1975c; Eisner, 1985). Establishing standardized criteria is the main

thrust of the master teacher committees. Historically, educators have borrowed the three methods of business in establishing standards (Eisner, 1979, 1985; Callahan, 1960; Apple, 1983; Kliebard, 1975a, 1975b). One example of an instrument which typifies this approach is often called the trait approach. A district makes some determination of criteria that can be applied to all teachers. These criteria are most often stated in the form of traits, characteristics, styles, and behavior that constitutes what is important for a district. The criteria are locally determined and usually emerge from an evaluation committee in the form of individual preference of the members of the committee or are flagrantly borrowed from plans or instruments used by other school districts. The assumption here seems to be that a set of criteria exists that can be used to assess all teachers in a school system regardless of the multitude of contextual conditions that may exist (Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1983).

Darling-Hammond and Wise (1983) contend that it is particularly "paradoxical" that school districts, in the political sense, pride themselves on emphasizing "individual difference" while maintaining a teacher evaluation system that relies on "standardized criteria." Regardless of grade level, subject matter, ability levels of students, expertise, training, physical setting, etc., all teachers, it is assumed, can be compared on the same set of criteria. They state that the idea is "presumptuous" that anyone can iden-

tify a finite number of criteria that are so important that all teachers should be compared against them.

In establishing criteria, judgment involves not only the selection of variables, but the determination of benchmarks of excellence or standards. The use of standards involves comparisons. The comparisons may be relative--one teacher or program compared with another teacher or program. The comparison may be more absolute--the standard by which a person or program is judged may be a stated or unstated set of personal values held by the people judging (Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1983; Lortie, 1975).

In establishing a standard of master teacher in which to compare other teachers, inquiry has been conducted since the days of Socrates to determine what qualities make one teacher esteemed while another is not. A literature search reveals hundreds of studies designed to define and identify an effective teacher. During the 1920s when what has been called "the cult of efficiency" arose in which the methods of business management were applied to education in general and teaching in particular, the attempt was made to put educational practice on a scientific basis (Callahan, 1960). Hertzberg (1976) states that in pursuit of these objectives,

. . .teacher activities and teacher character, personality, values, and morals were described or analyzed; teachers were rated by observation using rating schedules; and the formulation of specific objectives as a basis for the curriculum was essayed (p. 4).

Some of these tendencies can be seen in a Carnegie study of teacher preparation edited by W. S. Learned, W. C. Bagley and others (1920). It called for,

. . .an intelligent effort . . . to check the results of the teacher's work as measured by the growth of pupils. It is in terms of such growth that the outcomes of teaching must ultimately be evaluated, and the young teacher should be accustomed from the outset to think of his work as finally measured by this standard. . . Teaching cannot be tested or evaluated in terms of the pupil's growth unless the direction and nature of the desired growth have been previously determined. There must be a definite program of attainments, so to speak, which shall be both a guide to a teacher's efforts and a standard against which to measure his achievements (p. 219).

The Commonwealth Fund, directed by Charters and Waples (1929), financed a massive Commonwealth Teaching Training Study which focused on teacher traits and teacher behaviors. Their study used the approach introduced by Taylor in Scientific Management called "job analysis" or "functional study" to determine what the professional practitioner actually does under modern conditions of practice.

The first study identified "traits" of character and personality of teachers deemed desirable by persons they felt "qualified to designate the significant traits of teachers" (p. 52). The list of those "best qualified" included forty-one administrators, and only two professors of education. The result was a list of 83 traits arranged alphabetically. Next, the study of teacher behaviors resulted in a bigger list; 1,001 teacher activities were categorized under seven divisions. In the search for a

standard in order to reward teachers, Brighton and Hannan (1962) have pointed out that since an "empirical basis for performance-based teaching does not exist" it is natural for list-makers to fall back on previous lists of what teachers are doing or lists of opinions of what teachers ought to be doing. Barr (1938) comments,

Excellent as these earlier check lists are, they represent in most instances merely abbreviated statements of the author's own opinion of what constitutes good teaching and do not necessarily supply valid and reliable criteria of teaching success (p. 391).

The product model of establishing standards has generated controversy as to the use of student performance as the measure of school and teacher effectiveness. Feldvebel (1980) states that since researchers cannot prove that any one method, style, or process of teaching is superior, all that educators feel that all they can do is "go by result." The emphasis, therefore, is not on the methods or processes, but on results. Instruments for assessing the results consist usually of student growth as assessed on instruments such as norm-referenced (standardized) and criterion-referenced tests (Eisner, 1979; Feldvebel, 1980).

Most common criteria used to assess teachers are input criteria such as knowledge of subject and preparation, followed by output (result-oriented) criteria including student test scores, attendance and behavior. The ERS Report (1983) stated that 39 of the responding school districts used input type criteria, such as knowledge of sub-

ject or class preparation. Sixteen districts used output or result-oriented criteria, such as student attendance and student behavior, and eight districts used student test score results. Twelve districts used criteria such as teacher attendance, ability to communicate and work with peers, involvement in professional activities, involvement in extracurricular activities, preparation of goals, or length of service in the district. These criteria were not used exclusively. Many districts used combinations of criteria, and some districts used both input and output types. Cross (1984) emphasizes that,

. . .the school reform movement of the 80's focuses primarily on mechanical solutions imposed from the top and implemented quickly. Tight control and careful specifications may define minimal standards, but they may also stifle the spirit of innovation and experimentation that researchers are finding so essential to excellent organizations (p. 170).

Darling-Hammond and Wise (1983) agree with Cross, adding that,

. . .teacher input is largely missing from competency testing plans and from many merit pay proposals. A number of the reforms that have been designed to upgrade standards for both students and teachers consist of standards applied to teachers rather than by teachers. The process of defining what constitutes good teaching content and methods has increasingly been wrested from teachers and is instead conducted by policymakers. The result is a bureaucratic conception of teaching reflected in policies that prescribe educational processes and outcomes to be implemented by teacher-bureaucrats (p. 68).

Sisk (1973) explains that in the control process there is an intermediate step between the first step which is establishing standards and the final phase of the process,

the taking of corrective action. The middle step is that of measuring current performances. To a degree, the problems of measurement are defined and sometimes partially solved by the manner in which standards are described. The appropriateness of corrective action, the end point of the control process, is dependent almost exclusively upon the kind of information received. Information intended to measure and describe current performances can be evaluated by considering the following five aspects: (1) timeliness of information, (2) appropriate units of measurement, (3) reliability of information, (4) validity of information and, (5) channeling of information to proper authority (Sisk, 1973).

There are two major reasons why controls, especially compensation (budget, salary), are commonly regarded as pressure devices. First, controls are standards of performance which are set up so they will be difficult but attainable. Second, it is expected that the amount of effort expended by an individual in attaining a standard is somewhat greater than the amount he would expend if there were no standard (Sisk, 1973; Chruden and Sherman, 1976).

Master Teacher Plan As

Means Of Evaluation

The master teacher designation is viewed as a reward, a standard, and evaluation. Evaluation is defined in Webster's Dictionary as a mode to "determine or fix the value, significance or worth of, usually by careful appraisal and

study." To evaluate means to find the worth of something" (1975, p. 395). The conception of evaluation in the literature is closely tied to the conception of improvement. In fact, the explicit aim of evaluation is "to safeguard and improve the quality of instruction received by students" (McGreal, 1983, p. vii). As a means for fulfilling this major purpose, Bolton (1973) lists the following specific functions of teacher evaluation:

1. To improve teaching through the identification of ways to change teaching systems, teaching environments, or teaching behaviors;
2. To supply information that will lead to the modification of assignments, such as placements in other positions, promotions, and terminations;
3. To protect students from incompetence, and teachers from unprofessional administrators;
4. To reward superior performance;
5. To validate the school system's teacher selection process;
6. To provide a basis for teachers' career planning and professional development.

In an article in The Elementary School Journal, Darling-Hammond (1986) asserts that the following features represent the common and unchanged aspects of teacher evaluation systems which are central to a bureaucratic conception of teaching. She states that:

1. Evaluation is designed and conducted chiefly by administrators;

2. Ratings are based on a few inspections of classroom activities;
3. Standardized checklists based on standardized criteria are used to record generic teacher behaviors and to derive ratings (which, on a three- or five-point scale, are intended to reflect relative performance);
4. All teachers are evaluated on a common schedule (generally once a year) using the common instrument and uniform procedures;
5. This standardized process is intended to serve simultaneously as the primary vehicle for discussions of individual teaching practice, for professional development guidance, and for personal decision making (p. 532).

The most frequently mentioned complaint against master teacher plans for teachers, according to the ERS survey (1979), is the evaluation process. Three major issues are presented in the literature concerning evaluation: standards, evaluators, and purposes.

The criteria objections revolve around the questions "What is superior teaching and how is it to be measured?" and "Are there measurement instruments available that are valid and reliable?" Because there is little agreement on the definition of effective teaching and what qualities constitute exemplary teaching, there is little consensus on whether or not superior teaching can accurately be measured. Researchers have encountered so many problems in evaluating teachers that some feel it is not a productive area of inquiry (ERS, 1979, 1983; Bolton, 1973; McGreal, 1983; McGuire and Thompson, 1984). In addition, Barber & Klein (1983) contend that "developing a teacher evaluation system is time consuming, costly, and difficult to accomplish" (p. 93). Although research in the area of teaching effectiveness does

suggest that some teaching behaviors (such as academic learning time, direct instruction, and good classroom management) increase student achievement in acquiring specific skills, the research is not conclusive. The question of what to measure and what to assess depends on who is asked.

The question of how teaching should be measured also leads to disagreement. Research has shown that observation techniques, even when used by trained persons who are conscientious about their task, produce inconsistent results. It has been well documented that different observers have given the same teacher a wide range of ratings (McDowell, 1971; Worth, 1961).

One avenue of teacher evaluation that is proposed by several states (and local districts) to evaluate beginning teachers is a performance assessment of specific competencies through carefully constructed measures such as Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI). It measures 14 teaching competencies related to classroom procedures, interpersonal skills, and teacher developed materials through observation, review of materials, and interviews. Statistical interpretations of the information gleaned from the TPAI are used to determine a teacher's strengths and weaknesses. Feedback from the assessment is used to improve teaching performance. Three states (Georgia, Oklahoma, and Florida) are currently using performance tests for certification, and two others (South Carolina and Arizona) are field-testing performance instruments.

Advocates of such performance appraisal systems feel that these measures offer an objective (as well as reliable and valid) means of judging teaching competency. The level of effort and expertise that have gone into instrument development and the training of those who assess teachers are stressed. Advocates feel that this type of performance evaluation should be used to evaluate all teachers and can be used to identify those who deserve rewards.

Critics of the assessment of performance competencies argue that the value of such systems has not been proven and point out that creation of an instrument does not guarantee that the right teacher qualities are being measured (Eisner, 1979, 1985; Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger, 1980; Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1985). Such systems, critics maintain, force teachers to instruct in standardized ways, erasing teacher creativity. If master teacher programs are to be successful, however, teachers and evaluators are encouraged to reach consensus on the qualities that compromise good teaching as well as on how such characteristics are best measured (Nash, 1973; Darling-Hammond, 1986; Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1983).

McDowell (1971) states that the one area that still seems to cause the greatest apprehension on the part of teachers is the question of the validity and reliability of the rating procedures that might be used. The experiment reported by Worth (1961) is still frequently used as an illustration of the problem that teachers perceive to exist:

. . .sixty-five principals, participants in Alberta's 1961 Short Course for Principals, were placed in a test situation in which they were required to rate one specific teacher's performance. The subjects 'visited,' via kinescope, the classroom of Miss Eugenia Walenski, a grade one teacher. The visit lasted about fifteen minutes, just long enough for the observation of one complete lesson. Following the visit, each administrator made an independent appraisal of the teacher. . . .the spread of opinion (on a seven-point rating scale) with respect to Miss Walenski's performance was considerable, ranging from 'EXCEPTIONAL: demonstrates a high level of professional skills' to 'DOUBTFUL: has not demonstrated suitability for teaching.' Interestingly, sixty-nine percent of the principals evaluated her as generally satisfactory or better while twenty-six percent appraised her as doubtful, weak or barely satisfactory (Worth, 1961, pp. 2-3).

The inquiry as to the evaluators is an understandable objection. Questions asked are "Who is to do the evaluating?" and "How can it be insured that the activities in the classroom are perceived and interpreted accurately?" The area that has been ignored in consideration of who is to do the evaluation are the values of those evaluating and of the evaluant (Swender, 1985).

Teachers are very concerned about who evaluates them. Obviously, whoever evaluates should be fair and trained in evaluation methods; however, teachers also desire evaluators who are intimately acquainted with classroom activities and problems. Teachers frequently complain about administrators or outsiders (e.g., higher education professors) who may annually visit the classroom and may not interpret accurately what they see (Darling-Hammond, 1986; ERS Report, 1983). Such persons, they feel, are not qualified to evaluate their teaching because they are so far removed from the classroom.

An approach that has been introduced as a possible answer is the use of teams composed of administrators and teachers who are well-trained and are from more than one school. In some places, the evaluators (or a percentage of them) are chosen by the local collective bargaining group. Some individuals maintain that peer assessment is the only kind of evaluation that will be fully accepted by teachers. Bell (1984) argues that it has worked well in higher education and should be extended to public schools at the lower levels.

Questions concerning the purpose of evaluation are considered most important. One such question is "Are the evaluation results intended to improve instruction, or to reward or punish the teachers?" Teachers are most likely to accept the need for evaluation when it is used to help them to improve their instruction rather than to reward or punish them. According to Sergiovanni (1982), the clinical supervision concept, in which a supervisor acting in a collegial manner supplies ongoing feedback on teaching behavior and provides suggestions for instructional improvement, is an approach to supervision and evaluation that some teachers accept (Sergiovanni, 1982, 1983).

It has been noted in the ERS reports (1979, 1983) that evaluation evokes mistrust among teachers because of a conflict in the purpose of evaluation. Teachers usually feel a need for feedback on how they are doing and they can see the function of evaluation as developmental or formative. On the other hand, administrators are faced with demands for

accountability and must make decisions about the promotion, retention, and termination of teachers. Therefore, they use evaluation as a tool to judge the net worth of a teacher's performance--which is summative evaluation. Summative evaluation philosophy, theory, and practice are as follows:

1. Philosophy - individuals achieve excellence only if supervised or evaluated by others.
2. Theory - evaluation is done to improve the performance of the social system; reward or punishment should be decided externally.
3. Practice - evaluate the product of instruction as well as the process and the person (Barber and Klein, 1983, p. 248).

Evaluation is built on several assumptions:

1. The district must identify and adopt clear standards for teaching (job description).
2. Teaching is a science which can be measurable, identified and observed (Barber and Klein, 1983, p. 248).

The master teacher concept's major emphasis appears to be on summative evaluation. The major purpose of evaluation is to make judgments about people as to their effectiveness in a work situation. Wanting teachers to be effective is a reasonable expectation, but the methods in determining effectiveness become problematic (Dobson, Dobson, and Kesinger, 1980; Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1981). The emphasis tends to be on providing teachers a statement of where they stand or how they compare with others, rather than on descriptions of the kind of things they are doing and how that data might be used to enhance or improve their performance. Evaluation to improve education is viewed as formative or descriptive which focuses on what to do rather than judgment or summation, which focuses on how one teach-

er's performance compares with that of another (Darling-Hammond, 1986; Barber and Klein, 1983).

According to the ERS report (1983), the most common reasons given for discontinuing merit pay programs were (1) unsatisfactory evaluation procedures; (2) administrative problems; (3) staff dissension; and (4) lack of funds. Issues that dominate the debate are (1) evaluation; (2) dollar motivation; (3) priority of intrinsic rewards; and (4) effects on self-esteem. The issue of objectivity in evaluation was viewed as a dominant problem. The same report stated that performance ratings are not always fair, objective, or consistent.

There is a great deal of confusion in the areas of teacher evaluation/merit pay. Barber and Klein (1983) say that after making virtually hundreds of phone calls and reading hundreds of pieces of literature about teacher evaluation in an attempt to understand the issues surrounding it, one comes away with several somewhat "schizophrenic thoughts" (p. 13). These are:

1. There does not appear to be any consistent systematic development of teacher evaluation systems by any agency that should be responsible for the development of those systems. Phi Delta Kappa's CEDR center has tried over the past seven years to coordinate the development of teacher evaluation systems, strategies and methodologies, but thus far has not produced exemplary products suggesting how such systems should be developed.
2. It seems that, even though it is possible to develop a successful teacher evaluation system, every school system in the country will have to do it in its own way. No one seems to be able to take a successful system developed in one place and apply it intact to

- another school district. In essence, each district will have to negotiate the terms in either contract form or some other format.
3. It seems that only a very few (10 to 15) teacher evaluation systems have been developed that have a reward and/or punishment component and/or a merit pay component that has lasted for two years without major alterations.
 4. Teacher evaluation systems seem to be promoted by educators to keep the public or the state happy. If left alone, educators develop teacher evaluation systems that assist teachers in self improvement, not merit pay plans.
 5. Teacher evaluation to assist teachers in learning new skills is obviously a good idea. Attempting to include punitive or even rewarding components into a system designed to improve teaching performance seems inevitably (with few exceptions) to cause the system to fail.
 6. It is far more expensive and time-consuming to develop a personnel evaluation system than almost anyone realized when they started out to do so (p. 14).

In addition, teachers found several types of policies that are counterproductive to classroom teaching:

1. Curriculum and testing policies that limit what can be taught and how.
2. Policies that create paperwork and divert teachers' energies from teaching work.
3. Policies that de-professionalize teaching by excluding teachers' judgment about what constitutes appropriate teaching and learning (such as mechanistic teacher evaluation practices, unidimensional student placement and promotion policies, and bureaucratic decisions about program design) (Barber and Klein, 1983, p. 68).

Greene (1985a, 1985b, 1985c) notes how education in general and evaluation in particular is increasingly affected by the language of technology. The "technicist" mode of thinking, according to Maxine Greene, insists that all of the actions having to do with teaching and learning are susceptible to measurement, testing, and experimental

controls (1985a, 1985b, 1985c). This results in what Maxine Greene and Elliot Eisner call "miseducation." Training, rather than education, is taking place.

Pros and Cons of Merit Pay

There are several hundred pieces of literature discussing the notion of merit pay. The concept is viewed as a reward, a standard and a means of evaluation. In the literature the debate between the advantages and disadvantages of these plans continues.

Arguments used in favor of merit pay programs for teachers include:

1. Monetary incentives motivate teachers to excel.
2. Monetary incentives help attract and retain good teachers.
3. Monetary incentives create conditions that are similar to other professions where professionals are paid what they are worth.
4. Monetary incentives keep teachers in the classroom rather than forcing them into administrative positions for more pay.
5. Merit pay programs set high educational expectations/standards.
6. Merit pay plans have been successful when properly developed.
7. The public is willing to support higher teaching salaries when they know salaries are tied to performance.
8. The majority of the public supports merit pay (as demonstrated by opinion polls).
9. Monetary incentives can be linked to career ladder concepts encouraging professional development (ERS, 1979, p. 32).

Stauffer and Withers (1958) presented the following list of factors favoring merit pay:

1. Teaching will be improved.
2. The professionalization of the teachers' calling will result.

3. Teachers will be motivated to improve.
4. The supply of teachers will be increased.
5. The communities' respect for teachers will be improved.
6. The value of the salary paid teachers will be increased.
7. Teachers will receive rewards more commensurate with their training and skills.
8. Teacher rating plans will increase the amount of money that the public will invest in education.
9. Snap judgments by supervisors are eliminated.
10. Such policies emphasize good personnel administration.
11. Teacher self-evaluation will be increased.
12. Incompetency is discouraged.
13. Professional status is raised.
14. Tenure increases the importance of evaluation (pp. 214-28).

McDowell, in an address delivered to the Western Canada Educational Administrators' Conference at Banff on October 9, 1971, summarizes the major points in the merit rating controversy as follows. The pro's are:

1. Teachers differ in their ability and efficiency; their salaries should be related to these differences.
2. Merit increments provide an incentive and a reward for superior service.
3. If we can rate for promotion and tenure we can rate for salaries.
4. Industry uses merit rating; education can do the same.
5. The public is willing to pay high salaries only to those who deserve them.
6. Only through merit rating can teachers attain professional status.
7. Merit rating will improve instruction.
8. Merit rating will reward those who deserve recognition.
9. Merit rating will stimulate administrators to be more concerned with the efficiency of their teachers.
10. Merit rating will be well worth the additional cost, for it will ensure that money is being wisely spent (p. 6).

Arguments used against merit programs for teachers include:

1. Over a period of time, all programs tried have proven unsuccessful.
2. Thus far, it has not been possible to measure teacher competence accurately; likewise, it is difficult to judge equal or significant merit.
3. Morale, working relationships, and other psychological problems are too complex for simple answers; merit programs develop attitudes that are negative and competitive when they should be positive and cooperative.
4. Rating and gathering evidence for rating takes a lot more time than the benefits derived warrant; it takes time that administrators and supervision staffs would use to help teachers.
5. Working conditions need improving before emphasis is placed on performance and will attract better teachers.
6. Young teachers are often denied competence ratings because of 'full quotas' on merit levels, which discourages candidates from entering the field.
7. Merit regulations too frequently stereotype the teacher to standards and discourage creative teaching.
8. It is more important to recruit and train desirable people than to penalize those not so desirable.
9. Besides interfering with supervisory relationships, merit ratings increase teachers' workloads, and they are heavy enough already.
10. It is more important that the general level of teaching be raised than that a few be rewarded; in-service education programs get far better results than merit or bonus programs.
11. Industry usually makes "merit" or "bonus" awards on the basis of quantity and not quality.
12. Industry, except in sales work, has largely given up bonus and merit incentives and is adopting in-service training and providing better working conditions to get better production.
13. Experience has shown that communities soon reject merit plans after they get them.
14. Public interest is influenced more by lack of information on what the school is doing or by population and socio-economic conditions than by genuine concern about improving teacher quality.
15. Teachers, like other groups of people, represent a normal cross section of ability.
16. Merit programs too frequently presuppose that all improvement comes through changing the teachers.

17. The development of professional training, more intensive teacher recruiting, and more efficient use of competent research develop better teaching more rapidly and at less cost than any punishment or reward system (California Board of Education, 1957, pp. 4-6).

Stauffer and Withers (1958) stated the following disadvantages of merit pay:

1. Increases hostility between teachers, administrators, and supervisors.
2. Costs more to initiate and implement than it is worth.
3. Teaching cannot be measured mathematically.
4. Teachers will be less willing to help each other.
5. All teachers cannot be measured by the same yardstick.
6. Rating will result in a form of class distinction within the teaching profession.
7. Rating will not necessarily increase the economic status of teachers.
8. The system is difficult to administer.
9. Will not eliminate the poor teacher.
10. Will not increase the supply of good teachers.
11. Good teaching cannot be measured accurately.
12. Lowers morale.
13. Produces conformity (pp. 214-218).

The ERS (1979) contained the following listing of disadvantages of merit pay:

1. In practice, merit plans have failed.
2. Monetary incentives create negative competition and morale problems in schools.
3. Teachers are not motivated by money.
4. Evaluation of performance consumes time and monetary resources that could be better used elsewhere.
5. Evaluation of teacher performance is subjective; the best teachers do not get the extra pay.
6. Monetary incentives stereotype teaching standards and do not encourage teaching creatively.
7. Monetary pay is self-perpetuating; the same teachers get the rewards year after year.
8. Merit pay creates administrative problems because parents do not want children in the classes of non-merit teachers.

9. Concentration on merit performance ratings may cause teachers to avoid other important educational objectives.
10. The correlation between good teaching and college preparation or experience is as great or greater than the correlation between good teaching and merit pay.
11. It is not possible to objectively evaluate good teaching with valid, reliable measures.
12. Quotas set for merit pay are often full, creating morale problems.
13. The majority of teachers do not favor merit pay.
14. Incompetent teachers are better eliminated by pre-service screening and proper supervision of beginning teachers than through merit pay plans.
15. The emphasis in a school system should be on helping all teachers to become better, rather than on rewarding a few teachers.
16. Merit pay is not favored by collective bargaining units.
17. Merit pay isolates teachers from administrators.
18. Rating some teachers superior harms the self-concepts of other teachers and may decrease their efforts in teaching.
19. Single salary schedules do more to further educational goals than does merit pay (ERS, 1979, p. 33).

McDowell (1971) summarized the major points of the disadvantages as follows:

1. Differences in teaching efficiency cannot at present be measured with sufficient accuracy for determining salaries.
2. Merit rating destroys cooperative staff teamwork.
3. Our rating methods are too crude to distinguish among fine gradations of teaching efficiency.
4. Industry and education are not analogous: teaching is an art.
5. The public will reject a plan in which only a fraction of its children are taught by superior teachers.
6. We should seek to improve all teachers, not merely to reward those who appear to excel.
7. Merit rating may improve the efficiency of some teachers, but will have an adverse effect on many others.

8. Merit rating will cause bitterness and disillusionment.
9. Merit rating will hinder effective supervision.
10. The additional cost of merit rating can be more profitably used in improving the efficiency of the entire staff (p. 6).

Teacher Effectiveness Research

Master teacher programs attempt to identify "excellent" teachers. Pertinent to this study is the research concerning teacher effectiveness. A good definition of effective teaching has been sought since man first began communicating information to his fellowman and others sought to evaluate this process of communication called teaching. The continuous debate (well documented in the Talmud and the Apology) concerning the character and quality of teaching reveals the difficulty of describing teaching as a profession and the difficulty of explaining why some teachers are esteemed while others are persecuted. Biddle (1964) states that "we do not know how to define, prepare for, or measure teacher competence" (p. 3). Further, he states that we have to agree upon the effects we want a teacher to produce in the classroom before an adequate definition of teacher competence is possible (Biddle, 1964). During a career of research on teaching effectiveness, A.S. Barr acknowledged that "teaching is a very complex activity" which continues to require intensive study (1952, p. 380). After an analysis of 39 research studies, he revealed the following:

1. No satisfactory plan can be used by personnel offices to make judgments of teacher effectiveness.
2. Little has been done in evaluating in-classroom responsibilities of the teacher.
3. Concern chiefly has been for general merit, although we expect teachers to have special or differentiated abilities.
4. Teaching effectiveness has been treated as something apart from the situations giving rise to it.
5. Much of the research seems to proceed as if qualities of good teaching resided entirely in the teachers and not in relationships with others (as quoted by Brighton and Hannan, 1962, p. 28).

Elliot Eisner contends that teaching is portrayed as an art by those wanting to maintain the autonomy of the teacher. Teaching is defined as a science by those who prefer to analyze it, generalize it, predict and control it. It is interesting to note that this thirst after a definition of good teaching and compulsion to capture teaching and pin it down is suffered by politicians, bureaucrats, scholars, administrators, supervisors, everyone it seems, but teachers.

It has been suggested by Broudy (1977) that those who thirst after a definition of good teaching are administrators who would like to rate their teachers on merit and need some sort of objective support for doing so; teacher training institutions, accrediting and certification agencies and, of course, teachers of teachers and various supervisors who have to make judgments about the quality of teaching and also in need of such a definition. It is reasonable to want teachers to be competent but designing the means to determine teacher effectiveness and competency becomes problematic (Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1981).

In seeking an explanation of what constitutes an effective teacher, a definition eludes the pursuer. Biddle and Ellena, 1964) state that often, a teacher is thought of simultaneously in various roles such as:

1. A director of learning.
2. A friend and counselor of pupils.
3. A member of a group of professional persons.
4. A citizen participating in various community activities (p. 3).

These authors question whether a teacher is to be judged for competency against each of these simultaneously (Biddle and Ellena, 1964). Research does seem to be saying that teacher effectiveness is not the clearly defined quality that many would have us believe. It matters not whether teaching is viewed as an art or a science or a combination of the two by researchers; after a thorough review of the literature, research indicates that the art of teaching is one of the most complex human phenomena that we are privileged to study (Lortie, 1975; Biddle and Ellena, 1964; Eisner, 1985).

It is somewhat easier to understand the difficulty in defining an effective teacher when one realizes that one problematic aspect of education is the lack of a well perceived and articulated philosophical position(s) about a "sense of purpose" for schooling the young (Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1981, p. 6). The philosophical position one takes influences how one views the students, the teachers, the education process and the curriculum. If a consensus among decision-makers cannot be reached concerning the purpose of schooling and a definition of curriculum, it is

understandable to see how difficult it would be to reach an agreement on a definition of an effective teacher.

Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985) concluded that "during the past two decades, three different approaches to the study of teaching effectiveness have been established" (p. 77). The three approaches were called the dominant, token, and ignored research approaches. These educators agree with the other reconceptualist writers that education historically and currently dominating the field reflects a technical rationale. They also noted that "research efforts receiving token attention cluster around what is commonly referred to as humanity teaching." The last approach mentioned as "an almost totally ignored area of research can be appropriately labeled person-centered teaching" (p. 77).

The Dominant Approach

The dominant approach to the study of research effectiveness has its philosophical roots in logical positivism, its psychological roots in behaviorism and its methods in empiricism. The main concern of this approach is the improvement of the effectiveness of teaching within the framework of the current bureaucratic structure of schooling.

Looking historically backward, one finds the roots of the dominant approach can be traced to the early 1920s when scientism and scientific techniques from business and industry began to emerge in the literature relative to education-

al theory and practice. About the same time administrative positions began to be viewed as appropriate for schools. However, these positions held limited authority. In an attempt to gain autonomy in their position, school administrators, according to Kliebard (1975b), "simply reacted to the influence of the scientific management movement in industry by interpolating those methods to the management of schools" (p. 55). To gain prestige and influence public opinion, managers of schools "took pride in adopting the vocabulary and techniques of industry to school administration" (Kliebard, 1975b, p. 55). In adopting the language and techniques of the scientific management era, school administrators gained some autonomy.

The dominant approach is dedicated to improving teacher effectiveness within the framework of the current institutional structure of schooling. Pinar (1975a) states that "85-95% of workers in current fields share a perspective either tied or closely related to dominant technocratic rationality" (pp. 5-11). Instructional methodologies and pupil achievement, teacher characteristics, teacher effectiveness, and teacher behaviors as related to pupil achievement are also aspects of this approach (Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1985).

Cubberly deftly summarizes the dominant managerial perspective of curriculum:

Every manufacturing establishment that turns out a standard product or series of products of any kind maintains a force of efficiency experts to study methods of procedure and to measure and test the

output of its works. Such men ultimately bring the manufacturing establishment large returns by introducing improvements in process and procedures and in training the workmen to produce larger and better output. Our schools are, in a sense, factories in which raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life. The specifications for manufacturing come from the demands of twentieth-century civilization, and it is the business of the school to build its pupils according to the specifications laid down. This demands good tools, specialized machinery, continuous measurement of production to see if it works according to specifications, the elimination of waste in manufacturing, and a large variety in the output (Cubberly, in Kliebard, 1975b, p. 52).

In discussing the industrial metaphor, Eisner (1983) contends that the image of school as a factory set the tone for American education that is still with us. His criticism of this approach to education concerns the fact that personal creativity on the teacher's part diminishes in the pursuit for the "one best method" that scientific management of education would prescribe. Swender (1985) quotes Eisner as saying:

Unlike automobiles rolling down an assembly line where an additive model works fairly well, (interaction effects are small), the children a classroom teacher deals with are unique configurations that change over time. Unlike electrons or billiard balls, students have ambitions and purposes and refuse to be treated as lumps of clay or sheets of steel passively awaiting the impact of a scientifically based teaching technology that provides little or no scope in its assumptions for what the students make of all of this. Our roles as teachers are closer to those of negotiators than to puppeteers or engineers. And even when we succeed in shaping our students' surfaces, unless we touch their souls we will be locked out of their lives. Much of contemporary education in both the public school and the university seldom gets more than skin deep (p. 13).

Eisner also points to the preoccupation with standardized outcomes (the testing movement), the breakdown of complex tasks into microunits of meaningless behavior, and the neutral scientific language, all of which are negative consequences of the dominant approach (Eisner, 1979, 1985).

Apple (1979) criticized several aspects of this scientific approach; in particular, he criticized the behavioral objectives movement which he felt strove toward reducing student action to "specifiable forms of overt behavior so that the educator can have certitude of outcome" (p. 109). Apple (1983) mentions the process of deskilling teachers which involves the atrophy of skills "essential to the craft of working with children" (p. 256). He noted that external personnel often made decisions concerning the content of classroom material without having had any contact with the students to be directly affected by this "prepackaged" teaching. After deskilling of teachers has taken place, Apple (1983) contends that teachers undergo a process of reskilling. This process involves the substitution of the management skills of control and the ideological vision of measurement.

Other educators such as Rogers (1983) have also criticized the dominant approach to teaching effectiveness research. Rogers perceived eight negative characteristics of this approach:

1. The teacher is the possessor of knowledge, the student the expected recipient. Other means of verbal intellectual instruction are the

- major methods of getting knowledge into the recipient.
2. The examination measures the extent to which the student has received it.
 3. The teacher is the possessor of power, the student the one who obeys.
 4. Rule by authority is the accepted policy in the classroom.
 5. Trust is at a minimum.
 6. The subjects (students) are best governed by being kept in an intermittent or constant state of fear.
 7. Democracy and its values are ignored and scorned in practice.
 8. There is no place for the whole person in the educational system, only for his/her intellect (pp. 185-187).

This dominant approach has resulted in what Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985) called the "one model America." These authors argue that the methods and the language of teaching effectiveness and teacher competency research is subtly promoting a technical political ideology, and the efforts of this research activity serve to perpetuate a set of "myths" relative to the teaching experience. The three myths are: the "universal teacher," the "xerox model," and the "role access model" (Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1985, p. 57). The myth of the "universal teacher" recognizes the existence of one model of teaching effectiveness or teacher competency. The "xerox model" of teacher education presupposes the fact that all teachers have similar needs, abilities, and aspirations, a theory that refutes the possibility of individualism. The final myth of interest in this study is that of the role access model. In it, a static concept of personality is reflected. Teachers are seen to be improving themselves if they can increase the number of role behaviors performed (Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1985).

ers, valid procedures and findings were ensured, they believed. The source of authority for them was the scientific method, effectively applied (p. 2).

Philosophers desiring to make philosophy scientific met in Vienna in 1923 and spawned the school of Logical Positivism. These scholars strongly held that natural science methods could and should be used to study human beings. Laws derived from the understanding of classical physics came to be applied in social sciences. There are at least four aspects of the scientific method (based on cause and effect) that have been regarded as unassailable from the time of Newton until the 1927 Copenhagen Conference. Tranel (1981), in his article "A Lesson from the Physicist," presents the four aspects of the scientific method:

1. The Observer Position. This held that the best way to arrive at sure knowledge is to study the object one wishes to know about from a removed and uninvolved position, that is to say, one must be 'objective' in making observations. The greater the objectivity of observation, the more 'scientific' and certain will be the knowledge obtained from the study.
2. Measurement. True scientists should be able to measure their observations with a high degree of accuracy in order for them to be credible.
3. Predictability. From their measurements, the scientists should be able to make predictions about the future behavior of the object of observation.
4. Absolute Certainty. These predictions, which are called 'scientific knowledge,' can be made with absolute certainty. If they turn out to be false, it is only because the original observations were defective (p. 425).

These aspects of the scientific method were considered to produce absolute certitude of knowledge because they were

based on the heretofore unchallengeable principle of cause and effect (p. 425).

The reality contrived from positivistic tradition included humans as well. Logical positivists assumed that knowledge about natural phenomena is the same as knowledge about human phenomena.

They believed symbolic logic could be used to construct and rigorously order such systems and that through a process of reductionism, propositions could be deduced from more general or law-like ones to a point where the deductions became observation statements directly linked to the real world. These statements could then be tested through controlled research designs. Through the use of such systems and natural science methods, logical positivists incorporated into their theories logic and quantification, on the one hand, and the idea that theoretically deduced propositions can only be confirmed through experience, on the other. Major outcomes of inquiry, as they saw it, were general 'laws which could explain and predict natural and human events' (Culbertson, 1981, p. 2).

So dominant is the orientation toward positivistic scientism that even though Heisenberg's uncertainty principle in 1929 shattered the classical model, the implications of the new model have even yet barely begun to permeate the social science community.

In the scientific framework presented by Huebner (1975a), "truth" consists of a naive acceptance of the Newtonian World View, in which everything is determined, everything is quantifiable, every cause has an effect, every question a correct answer. In this universe there are no uncertainties and no "open" system.

Culbertson (1981) also points out that logical positi-

vists are famous for their use of "Occam's razor" to cut off certain areas of study from inquiry. More specifically, they concluded that,

. . . 'metaphysical,' theological, and ethical questions should be eliminated as foci for scholarly inquiry. Since they maintain that such questions could not be addressed through natural science methods (i.e., controlled observation) they reached a strongly held view that the questions were meaningless (p. 2).

The language that was used in discussing such issues as ethics and values can be seen to express the contempt for this type of inquiry. Culbertson (1981) states,

Their disdain for inquiry on such questions is reflected in the terms 'intellectual junkpiles' and 'linguistic morasses' which they use to describe past inquiries of this type (p. 2).

From the school of Logical Positivism and from this perspective, came "value-free science" and the "is-ought dichotomy," which characterizes the conventional methodology. The world view presented by the new quantum theory of physics has discredited the very fundamental assumptions of the classical model. The basic "building block of matter," the atom, has been discovered to be anything but that. On the level of subatomic particles, matter cannot be said to exist but can only show the tendency to exist. Subatomic particles present themselves sometimes as particles, sometimes as waves. Rather than operating according to fixed laws that can be discovered through objective observation tests and measurement, all experience of the subatomic particles are dependent upon the observer relationship. On this level, cause/effect and predictability are defunct. Rather

a view emerges of a dynamic cosmos in which all things are interconnected and the observer is one who must be included in an essential way. Costa (1984) comments that,

Einstein thrust us into viewing the world as relative and probabilistic. As a result, modern quantum scientists no longer search for the ultimate particle. Instead, the emphasis is on structure, process, and interaction between a number of elementary particles and processes that may well be infinite (p. 198).

The uncertainty principle undermined the inviolable position that the principle of cause and effect had held by demonstrating in physics that the observer is by no means in the best position to arrive at certain and objective knowledge because, in the very act of observing, the object of observation is distorted, thus rendering spurious the observation and the resultant knowledge as well. If this is so in the world of physics, and especially with regard to the behavior of physical objects, it takes no great effort of the imagination to see how much more true it would be in the world of human uniqueness. As Curran (1977) points out:

The misleading element, however, is that such precise prediction, in the more complicated and less precise world of personal concerns, provides an oversimplified system of operation. What works in astronomy does not work in the human condition in so simple a way. Nor, as Heisenberg pointed out, does it really work in the divergent data of physics itself (p. 62).

Guba points out that the natural mode of inquiry differs from the conventional mode of scientific inquiry which is traditionally approved and utilized in educational re-

search. The essential philosophy of naturalistic inquiry is phenomenological; i.e., the investigator seeks to understand phenomena from the actors' own frame of reference. The purpose of naturalistic inquiry is the discovery of phenomena whose empirical elaboration and testing may be worthwhile whereas conventional inquiry is generally designed to verify and test ideas previously discovered. Positivist theory views reality as stable, similar, and objective while naturalist theory views reality as dynamic, multi-layered, and comprehensible from multiple perspectives.

Another distinction concerns the nature of the research design. The positivist enters the situation with a fixed, preordinate design which generally calls for manipulation of a select number of key variables and complete control of other variables. The naturalist, on the other hand, seeks to view the situation from the actors' frame of reference and thus limits a priori assumptions. Acknowledging that the investigation is emergent, the naturalist invites interference from previously unobserved variables in order to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the total situation.

A final distinction concerns the role of values in inquiry. The customary presupposition of rationalists is that their inquiry is value-free, that is, the data is guaranteed by the methodology to be purely empirical; that is, they transcend the values of both inquiries and respond-

ents. Naturalists, on the other hand, presuppose that inquiry is inevitably grounded in the value system that characterizes the enquirer, the respondent, the paradigm chosen, the substantive theory selected and the social and conceptual context. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that values cannot be set aside, methodologically controlled, or eliminated. Table IV taken from Guba (1978) highlights the major differences between the positivist or scientific form of inquiry and the naturalistic paradigm.

Naturalistic inquiry is one form of qualitative research, i.e., research which produces descriptive data, such as people's written and spoken words or accounts of observable behavior. The phenomenologist's main concern is with understanding human behavior from the actor's own frame of reference . . . to understand how the world is experienced. Essentially, the naturalistic inquirer's model is ethnography or field research. Ethnography focuses on more than naturalistic setting and ecological interrelatedness of events in that setting. Its specific role is to discover the meaning these events have for the person(s) under study.

Rist (1979) likens the naturalistic researcher to a "learner," one who puts himself in the position of another or "taking the role of the other" to learn that culture from "within the framework of the participants" (p. 20). The ethnographer constantly seeks to be taught and uses a variety of techniques through which to learn. Spradley (1979) summarized this understanding of ethnography when he said,

TABLE IV
CONVENTIONAL VERSUS NATURALISTIC INQUIRY

VALUE	CONVENTIONAL	NATURALISTIC
Philosophy	Positivism	Phenomenological
Paradigm	Experimental	Investigative journalism
Purpose	Verification	Discovery
Stance	Reductionist	Expansionist
Design	Preordinate/Fixed	Emergent
Style	Intervention	Selection
Reality	Singular	Multiple
Value	Singular	Pluralistic
Setting	Laboratory	Nature
Context	Unrelated	Relevant
Conditions	Controlled	Invited Interference
Treatment	Stable	Molar
Methods	Inter-Subject Agreement	Factually Confirmable

Source: E.G. Guba, "Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry. Monograph Series, No. 8 (1978).

"Rather than studying people, ethnography means learning from people" (p. 3). This qualitative method is preferred for this study as self will be a prime data collection instrument (Combs, 1977; Guba, 1982).

Ethnography can be better understood in the context of anthropology, of which it is a major research tool. Anthropology, or the "study of man," "holds up a great mirror to man and lets him look at himself in his infinite variety" (Kluckhohn, 1955, p. 2). Due to the variety of persons, anthropology is necessarily a cross-cultural and comparative discipline and each culture case studied by anthropologists is revealed as "one variety of human behavior among many possibilities" (Spindler, 1963, p. 12). For this reason an anthropological approach to research in values is especially appropriate.

Studies by Kitwood and Smithers (1975) and Kitwood (1976) suggested the need for idiographic research of values, i.e., study of individuals in the concrete reality of daily life. Methods rooted in anthropology are used to provide the approach Kitwood is urging since anthropological research contributes to what Spindler (1963) called "configurative thinking," i.e., "interrelating phenomena that may otherwise never be perceived as functionally interdependent" (p. 11). The discipline is characterized by "the tacit acceptance of the theory of multiple causation in the macrocosmic social sphere" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967, p. 7). In

brief, field research is characterized by an exploratory, descriptive, process-oriented, and holistic approach to the study of a culture.

Interviews

Observing someone's behavior in a naturalistic setting does not necessarily ensure insight into the meaning of behavior. Therefore, personal interviews assume great importance, for it is only in such a context that the meaning of the emotion or the action can be discovered and described. It cannot be known what persons are thinking unless they choose to share their thoughts, but it is equally apparent that the importance of language used needs to be assessed. Spradley (1979) observes:

As ethnographers have increasingly undertaken research in our society, the necessity of studying native language is frequently ignored. In part, this neglect occurs because informants appear to use a language identical to that spoken by the ethnographer. But such is not the case. Semantic differences exist and they have profound influence on ethnographic research (p. 18).

To gain a deeper understanding into the meanings involved, the native language is used throughout interviewing, and native language forms a large part of the description to convey these meanings. Naturalistic researchers try to avoid translating information into their own language.

Reciprocal research design constitutes another important aspect of this study. Patti Lather (1984) defines reciprocity as correspondingly powerful give and take, and mutuality in the negotiation of meaning and power. It

operates on two primary levels ". . .the reciprocity between researcher and researched and that between data and theory" (p. 10). During the interviews the researcher gave "feedback" to respondents of how the data is viewed as a means to stymie "rape" models of research and for the purpose of checking descriptive and interpretive validity (Lather, 1984).

Research Plan

The researcher worked as a graduate assistant in the Land Grant University Education Extension office which participated in an advisory resource capacity to the three school districts implementing the master teacher plan.

The researcher traveled to each of the school districts to attend the committee meetings during the writing of the Master Teacher Plan. The researcher also traveled to each of the school districts for the purpose of conducting interviews, collecting written sources and observing the school system implementing the master teacher program.

All information was given and recorded with a promise of anonymity. In accordance with ethnographic research procedures, the following three procedural issues will be discussed:

1. Site selection
2. Entry and establishment of the researcher's role
3. Data collection procedures

Site Selection

The sites for this study were three small rural school districts located in western Oklahoma. These sites were selected because these three school districts in Oklahoma were currently developing and implementing the Master Teacher Program as a pilot program for the 1984-85 school year. The school districts are Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside. Each of the school districts is considered rural as each is primarily agricultural in its economy.

The first school system, Clearwater, is the largest of the three school districts with a population of 5,000, and a kindergarten through twelfth grade student body of 1,205. The school district employs two principals and 88 teachers.

The second school district, Wayside, has a population of 4,000, with a kindergarten through twelfth grade student body of 966. The school district employs three principals and 80 teachers.

The third school district, Stanley, is the smallest, with a population of 1,500 and a kindergarten through twelfth grade student body of 500. The school district employs two principals and 43 teachers.

Entry and Role Establishment

The researcher followed guidelines provided by the school district for entry. In addition, the researcher had previously met the members of the Master Teacher Plan Com-

mittee in January, 1984, during the second luncheon meeting in Wayside, and along with other staff members from the Land Grant university, attended all four of the other planning meetings as well as the public hearing held in Oklahoma City.

Prior to visiting the school and interviewing, the researcher sent official letters to the Superintendent of Schools in the three districts asking permission to conduct a research study (Appendix B). Permission was given to use any written materials, "Minutes of the Master Teacher Planning Committee" (Appendix I), "A Proposal to Plan and Implement a Pilot 'Master Teacher' Program for the State of Oklahoma" (Appendix D), "The Master Teacher Program Proposed for the School Districts of Clearwater, Stanley and Wayside, Oklahoma" (Appendix E), and "The Master Teacher Evaluation Report" (Appendix I). Permission was given to visit each school to observe and conduct interviews.

At each of the three, the researcher was introduced to the faculty and students as a doctoral student conducting research on the master teacher program. The selection of teachers to be interviewed was determined by their availability and based on their willingness to participate. All information was given and recorded with a promise of anonymity.

Data Collection Procedures

Documentary sources for study included a "Report on the Review of the Literature Pertaining to the Master Teacher Concept," the "Master Teacher Progress Evaluation Report," prepared by the Land Grant university, the "Minutes of the Planning Committee Meetings," the "Master Teacher Program Application Packet," the "Master Teacher Proposal" submitted by the Master Teacher Planning Committee for the Stanley, Wayside and Clearwater school districts, a "Proposal to Plan and Implement a Pilot 'Master Teacher' Program for the State of Oklahoma," a "Survey of District Teachers and Administrators" conducted in Stanley and Wayside regarding the Master Teacher Program, and a packet of materials and personal notes collected by the researcher during the committee process.

Informal interviews were conducted with each of the superintendents in the three school districts, the principals in each of the systems, the seven master teachers, non-master teachers, and committee members from each of the districts. Of the seven master teachers selected in the three districts, the one master teacher in Clearwater had moved out of state and was interviewed by telephone. The six other master teachers were interviewed during the visits to the school sites. Each superintendent and each principal in each district was interviewed. The interviews of non-master teachers were conducted formally and informally.

Each of the superintendents and each of the principals was interviewed in his/her respective offices. The teachers were interviewed at various sites. The teachers were formally interviewed in their classrooms during break, in the counselor's office (borrowed for privacy), in an empty conference room or classroom, and informally in the teacher's lounge, in the principal's office, and on the school grounds.

The researcher's data base included written notes taken during the committee meeting, a personal journal, and taped and written notes taken at every interview. The tape recorder was used to record responses, perceptions and observations of the researcher about the visits, interviews, school system and community. Notes and interviews were later transcribed from the tapes. The transcribed notes were then analyzed and categorized as to perception concerning the development and implementation process. The multi-instrument approach in naturalistic inquiry was used in treating the data. Triangulation of data was accomplished by gathering information from various sources. An audit trail was kept.

Huebner's Value Framework

As indicated in Chapter I, the five value frameworks presented by Huebner (1975a) will be an interpretive tool for the axiological analysis of the Master Teacher Concept. The first value framework considered was the scientific.

Scientific values may be broadly designated as promoting activities which produce new knowledge having an empirical base.

Huebner (1975a) explains that social science educators have borrowed the language of the natural sciences which in turn shapes the thoughts, questions, methods of inquiry, and values of the scientist. In describing and defining man, the scientist would point to his success with observation, classification, hypothesis formation, and experimentation, which aids him in understanding, predicting, and controlling human phenomena. The primary objectives of science are to predict and control. The objectives of prediction rest on the assumption of determinism, the doctrine that all events have sufficient causes. Huebner (1975a) contends that educators have almost unanimously adopted this language which reduces "mysteries to problems," "doubt to error," and "unknowable to yet-to-be discoverables" (p. 220). "The educator cannot deal with 'uncertainty' and 'ambiguity,'" argues Huebner, "because his language is selected from the symbol system of the social scientists and psychologists" (p. 220). Further, he states that educators assume that "all human behavior is caused or has purpose," and consequently his "educational activities must be goal oriented" (p. 220).

From the perspective of the scientific framework the acquisition of knowledge is viewed as being the primary purpose for the existence of educational institutions.

Thus, intellectual stimulation is stressed. The purpose of education is viewed as future oriented. Man is to apply knowledge in order to control the environment for the "improvement" of mankind. Through acquisition of knowledge man can learn more and more about how to control his environment and how to use the forces of nature to his advantage.

The second value framework mentioned by Huebner is called technical. Technical values are seen as an ideology almost totally engrossed with activities that produce defined ends, usually in the form of predetermined behavior. Three major aspects of the technocratic perspective are: objectivity, bits of matter, and predefined goals. Mazza (1982) expanded these three concepts into the following statements that represent assumptions of technological rationality:

1. The objectification of phenomena:
Reality exists independently of the interpretation and construction of the knower.
Corollary assumption: The social scientist should describe reality objectively, i.e., as a disinterested neutral observer.
2. The fragmentation of reality:
Reality can be divided into discrete elements; the sum of the discrete elements equals the whole.
3. The predetermination of goals:
The social atmosphere should act to achieve certainty of outcomes (p. 23).

"All educational activities are valued politically" (Huebner, 1975a, p. 221). The third category, political valuing, exists more often covertly than overtly. Huebner explains that education entails conceptualization of power and control. It is not the purpose of this study to go into

details concerning the debate over the plan and the role of federal, state and local power in the educational endeavor. It is acknowledged that various groups vie for political influence.

Two concepts of the political mode, influence and power, will be considered in this study. Dwayne Huebner contends that this framework exists because educators have a position of power and control. One influences others directly or indirectly through the manipulation of resources. Political values tend to exist more often covertly than overtly. This ideology tends to promote the idea that a person's worth can be judged by his/her influence. Power and control become the end.

The fourth framework, aesthetic values, when not ignored, tends to promote activities that are felt and lived by children. In this category, educational activity may be valued in terms of its sense of "wholeness of balance, of design and of integrity, and its sense of peace and contentment" (Huebner, 1975a, p. 227). Educational activity is not valued for its utilitarian purposes but for itself--for the meaning it possesses for the individual. The meaninglessness and routine of a mechanistic world order is contrasted by the possible vitality and significance of life symbolized by the excitement, fervor and community of educational activity. Thus, educational activity can symbolize the meanings felt and lived by educators.

The fifth framework presented by Huebner (1975a) is the ethical category. In this category educational activity is viewed as man encountering man. Here the concern is not with educational functional utility but with the "quality" of the experience per se. The encounter is not used to "produce change, to enhance prestige, to identify new knowledge or to be symbolic of something else; the encounter is; in it life is revealed and lived" (p. 227). Huebner further suggested that education is a moral encounter and if educators are to talk about school in moral terms, concepts such as justice, service and vitality need to be utilized. For schooling to be moral, the following must be considered:

1. Be just in the treatment of ideas and just in the treatment of children in school;
2. Serve students rather than compel them to fit into ordained programs;
3. Be vital, everchanging rather than static, bureaucratic, routinized (as quoted by Macdonald, 1965, p. 30).

Ethical values are viewed as promoting the idea that activities are life and that life's meanings are witnessed and lived in the classroom.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE MASTER TEACHER PLAN

The first section of this chapter introduces the Master Teacher Plan for the Stanley, Wayside, and Clearwater School Districts of Oklahoma. It provides a description of the origin and development of the plan in these school districts. The second section of the chapter describes the results of the interviews with teachers and administrators in relation to their perception of the Master Teacher Plan in their school system. The third section analyzes the Master Teacher Concept according to the five value frameworks presented by Dwayne Huebner.

The recent move toward innovative merit pay plans for teachers is considered the "latest" in a series of movements in educational research and policy making. A pattern has emerged from earlier innovative movements, and it consists of three phases. First, there is a period of time in which merit pay is presented as an answer to the current problems plaguing the school. Then follow pilot projects in various school districts and the reports on their status. During this time proponents and opponents argue in various journals the pros and cons of the concepts. In the final phase, researchers and policy makers observe various experimental

plans to decide whether the concept is feasible or whether more problems have been created than solved. All of this happens within the space of several years, and then researchers and practitioners move on to examine solutions to other immediate problems currently identified in the schools.

This cycle is not unique in policy making; however, it leaves many questions unasked or never fully tested and assessed. Often, the failure of a concept is attributed to lack of communication on other technical problems associated with human relations. Competition for power and a different value orientation as sources of conflict receive much less attention. Value congruency or value conflict with educational leaders in a school setting is seldom questioned. The present analysis is designed to fill this gap.

Origin of Master Teacher Plan for
Stanley, Wayside, and Clearwater
School Districts in Oklahoma

In 1982, the superintendent of the Stanley school system, attended a national convention of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) in Atlantic City. Terrel Bell, then Secretary of Education, was the AASA's primary speaker. Bell, a staunch supporter of merit pay, suggested in his speech that a differentiated staffing plan similar to the ones operating in colleges could be estab-

lished and implemented in the public school system. Instead of the ranking of the teachers as professors, assistant professors, the ranking would include master teachers, assistant teachers, and career teachers. Bell (1984) states,

Salaries for the teaching profession should be increased and should be professionally competitive, market-sensitive, and performance based. . . . Based upon my own knowledge of how the academic rank system functions in higher education, and based upon my experience in elementary and secondary education . . . board of education should establish not less than three steps on a career ladder for teachers (p. 41).

In 1983, the Master Teacher Program for the Stanley, Wayside, and Clearwater school districts grew out of a cycle of interest in merit pay that occurred in the early 1980's, and out of the interest of the three superintendents of these school districts in finding a better way to reward teachers. The superintendents were looking for a program that would provide answers to three questions:

1. How do I select and hire better teachers than I presently have?
2. How do I reward those who produce what I want?
3. How do I 'eliminate' those who do not?

Because of the recent reports, the national attention of the press to education, and the public insistence on accountability, the superintendent at Stanley felt that the "time of incentive pay had come." He said that he and the superintendent of Clearwater had attended the AASA convention and both felt that "differentiated staffing is going to happen so we need to do something." After returning home

from the conference the two superintendents discussed the idea with the superintendent of the Wayside school system; "From that simple conversation, the concept was born" interview).

Development of Master Teacher Plan

The three superintendents did not feel that they had the research expertise to develop a career-ladder/master teacher plan. Therefore, the three superintendents went to Land Grant University (LGU) and approached the director at the Office of Education Extension with their ideas. They requested the involvement of the university in researching and developing a master teacher program for their school districts.

The Education Extension Office agreed to help write a proposal for a three-year pilot program. The superintendents then went to the Oklahoma Legislature to gain support and funds for the pilot project. On July 1, 1983, the Oklahoma legislature awarded a grant through the Oklahoma State Department of Education to fund an initial year of research and planning for the development of a program centered around the master teacher concept. During the 1983-84 school year the initial grant was used to conduct the research, establish the three district committees, formulate the criteria/proposal, and finalize the implementation during the 1984-85 school year. A second grant was secured for the

implementation of the master teacher pilot program for the 1985-86 school year.

The Role of the University

The university functioned as consultant in the pilot project. In the first year, persons employed through the Education Extension Office gathered information, ideas, and perspectives, and also advised the planning committee on a system of communication regarding the project. A graduate assistant's major responsibility involved a comprehensive review of the literature on various master teacher-type plans. Representatives of other school districts and states (such as Tennessee and Florida) which were currently operating master teacher-type plans were contacted. Staff members at the United States Department of Education provided the names of other districts/states which were also exploring the establishment of a master teacher plan. The services of a faculty member from the Applied Behavioral Sciences in Education Department (ABSED) were engaged for consultation and evaluation of the program.

During this review of literature, the doctoral student felt that the initial charge was to review the literature to study the "possibility of implementing a system of incentive pay" (interview). Basing his opinion on the study of numerous documents, research reports, position papers, and extensive conversation with various school personnel where the plans were or had been in operation, he concluded that no

existing system of performance-based incentive pay would work in the public schools and he felt none could be recommended. Also, he was convinced that efforts to implement a plan would probably do more harm than good. Furthermore, according to his findings, most plans did not state explicitly their philosophical and value bases. Because of his findings and the fear of compromising his own values, he resigned. Another doctoral student (an Education Administration major who had just completed the doctoral program) was employed to finish the review of the literature. On January 3, 1984, this researcher was employed by the Education Extension Office and attended all the meetings of the Master Teacher Plan Committee as well as the public hearing.

On September 1, 1983, the staff of the Education Extension Office met with members of the College of Education faculty to discuss the master teacher pilot project, and to explain the university's involvement. The faculty was asked for suggestions and guidance on how best to serve the needs of the districts as they designed and implemented their "innovative (and potentially controversial) pilot master teacher program" in Oklahoma.

The meeting centered on those aspects that were controversial, with some of the faculty expressing skepticism and suggesting that the Education Extension Office proceed with caution. This caution was again emphasized in a memorandum dated June 30, 1983, from the Dean of the College of Educa-

tion (Appendix K). He asserted that since the master teacher concept is generally misunderstood and viewed as a code for "merit pay" the university should clearly define its support role and communicate this role to the public.

He states,

I have reviewed the Proposal for a Pilot Master Teacher Program in cooperation with the cities of [Wayside, Stanley and Clearwater]. As you know, the master teacher concept is generally misunderstood and viewed as a code for 'merit pay.' Thus, the way we communicate what we are attempting to facilitate in the communities should be carefully developed and communicated. Similarly, our support role should be clearly defined (Appendix K).

He also suggested that possibly a student other than a graduate student in Educational Administration be employed for the literature search. He states,

On page 3, I note that the Proposal suggests that a faculty member and graduate student in Educational Administration will be employed for 12 months for 25 percent and 50 percent respectively, etc. We should leave the appropriate department and specific faculty person to be used in a project of this sort open. That is, I am not sure that the best qualified person in the College to do this kind of literature search and analysis would necessarily come from Educational Administration (Appendix K).

Planning Committees

Each of the three superintendents established a master teacher planning committee from his local school district. Each asked for volunteers interested in the master teacher concept to serve on the local committee. The committees included volunteers and appointees. Each represented various

constituencies from that district and none was identical in makeup with any of the others. No minorities were represented on the committees and all the administrators in the three districts were male.

Clearwater's committee included nine teachers, one school librarian, one principal, one school patron, one school board member, and the superintendent. Stanley's committee had two teachers, one school patron, one school board member, and the superintendent. Five teachers, one principal, two school patrons, and the superintendent composed Wayside's committee.

The the three school districts' committees combined made up the Master Teacher Planning Committee. The 28 members met together five times: on November 28, 1983 in Wayside; January 26, 1984 in Wayside; February 9, 1984 in Stanley; February 16, 1984 in Clearwater and February 29, 1984 in Stanley (Minutes, Appendix H). Before each of the full committee meetings, district-level meetings were held so that local members of the committee could discuss with other teachers, patrons, and administrators in the district the various aspects and issues regarding the master teacher program that would be considered and presented to the full committee. Meetings were held within each school district to encourage suggestions and to elicit comments and ideas from as many people as possible. The committees from each school district met separately to discuss and debate differ-

ent concepts of what was wanted or acceptable in a master teacher plan for their local district.

During the public hearings within each school district, these various ideas were presented, debated, discussed and revised. Slowly, each committee within each district began to conceive its own idea of a master teacher plan.

Presentation of Alternative Plans. On January 26, 1984, the Master Teacher Planning Committee met and each district committee presented its plan beginning with the representative from Clearwater. This school district envisioned a three step plan so most teachers could participate rather than be excluded from an elite teaching group. Instead of a "leap" from teacher to master teacher, the plan called for three steps set up in such a way that, as the teacher qualified or met criteria for each step, the teacher would be assured of promotion. This type of plan, they felt, secured some sense of autonomy for the teacher, since s/he would have a self-check list and know exactly what was required to move from one step to the next (Minutes, Appendix H).

The Master Teacher Evaluation (or Selection) Committee was to serve in a different way. Essentially, the committee was to be responsible for ensuring that all sources in the packet were correct and that all the required forms were turned in. The committee was not to be responsible for judging a teacher "excellent," "good," or "bad." It wanted to change from requiring a master's degree to requiring the

equivalent hours in course work. Examples were given of teachers wanting to take courses in subject matter or other areas of interest rather than being forced to take certain courses for a master's degree. Clearwater expressed its teachers' concerns about having a person or group of people invade their classrooms to observe instruction for a few minutes and then make a judgment as to whether they were "excellent" teachers, "good" teachers, or "bad" teachers according to the "gospel of that particular observer."

The representative from the state department present at the meeting felt that the "step" plan looked too much like a modified present-day pay schedule. She emphasized that the legislature would not pass this type of plan. Thus, many of the fears, concerns, and individual examples given by Clearwater members were thought about briefly, then discarded as the task of preparing a document for the legislature took preeminence. One committee member commented, "the committee members have to be more concerned with what the legislature will pass than with what teachers want in a master teacher plan."

The members from Stanley and Wayside were in agreement on a one-step plan of selecting and designating a master teacher rather than the step-ladder that Clearwater presented. One member commented, "We [Stanley and Wayside] felt that the charge of the committee was to develop a plan to identify master teachers."

During each of the meetings the administrators tried to have the members reach consensus on the criteria and type of plan. Selecting criteria or proposing a plan was determined by majority rule with each school district having one vote. The vote was two to one in favor of a one step plan, with Clearwater voting against it (Minutes, Appendix H). Some members from the Clearwater school district chose to discontinue participation as a result of the disagreement and a strong belief in the "step plan." Several of the participants from Clearwater school district indicated there was a lot of compromise. As a result, their school's representation was narrowed to one administrative representative and one teacher representative who were willing to continue to participate with the other districts.

The Master Teacher Planning Committee established Master Teacher Evaluation (Selection) Committees. These committees would be responsible for evaluating and selecting candidates for the designation of master teacher.

Selection Committees

The Selection Committee for a district was composed entirely of members from the other school districts. The Clearwater Selection Committee included four Stanley representatives (the superintendent, a school board member and two teachers), and four Wayside representatives (a principal, a central office administrator, a teacher, and a parent). The selection committee for Stanley included the

Wayside personnel (listed above) and four representatives from Clearwater (a principal, two teachers, and a school board member). Wayside's committee included the Stanley and Clearwater representatives previously listed. A list of the members of each of the three Selection Committees was included in the application packet furnished to each interested teacher.

Selection Criteria

Each of the criteria for selection as a master teacher, specified in the Master Teacher Program Plan, was assigned a rating by the Master Teacher Program Committee. A point system was developed with a maximum of 200 points. The criteria believed by the committee to be of highest importance were: demonstrated outstanding oral and written communication skills; at least above-average student growth; applicant's responses on the self-evaluation instrument and its completion by the applicant's principal; and the portfolio of teaching materials submitted by the applicant (Appendix E).

Those criteria deemed of secondary importance included: interview with the applicant; interview with the applicant's principal; completion of a questionnaire by three of the applicant's colleagues and by three school patrons or parents; classroom observation; and professional activities. The criterion dealing with participation in community and

civic affairs was considered less significant than the other criteria (Appendix E).

Although there was no attempt to define an effective teacher or master teacher, using the criteria for selection, a definition of a master teacher emerged for the committee. The following six criteria were viewed as basic requirements to establish eligibility for consideration. A candidate must:

- (1) Be a classroom teacher holding standard certification who is employed full-time with the district, and who spends a minimum of three periods each day in the classroom;
- (2) Have been awarded tenure by the district in which he/she is employed;
- (3) Have seven years of full-time professional experience;
- (4) Have earned at least a master's degree;
- (5) Have demonstrated knowledge of appropriate subject matter through satisfactory achievement in the core battery and in the appropriate subject area test (where available) of the National Teacher Examinations; satisfactory achievement will be defined as scoring at or above the standard score nearest the mean, with adjustment of the score as local test data becomes available (Appendix E).

In addition, to qualify, the teacher must:

- (6) Be appointed by the local Board of Education.
- (7) Have the capability and willingness to assume additional duties to be agreed upon by the Master Teacher and the district. These duties would span the regular school year and would also include a minimum of two weeks' employment during the summer (Appendix E).

During the first year of the program, many applicants did not have access to test scores which compared student achievement at the beginning and the end of the year; therefore, it was anticipated that in the first year many appli-

cants would be limited to submitting or describing to the committee "other measures" of above-average student growth. The committee accepted and evaluated these measures on an individual basis. It was assumed that in the future, as more districts undertook testing programs which furnished both beginning-year and ending-year data, more applicants would be able to submit standardized achievement and/or criterion-referenced test data as well as "other measures" of student growth for the committee's review.

Classroom observation was not to be a part of the selection process in the first year of implementation because applications from teachers would not be due until July. In subsequent years, the program's timeline would call for receipt of applications in ample time to arrange for the classroom observations. Furthermore, to facilitate the collection of material for presenting information about teacher performance a master teacher sampling packet was developed.

Master Teacher Application Packet

The Master Teacher Selection Committee used a master teacher application packet to collect the required information concerning the applicant. In the three Oklahoma school districts a series of forms served to orient and organize the selection. The forms can be found in Appendix F. Form A contains a record of the teacher's basic educa-

tional training, including degrees received, certification held, National Teacher Examination score, and educational experience (number of years of service and tenure with the local school system). Form A also includes a list of the persons completing questionnaires for and evaluation of the applicant.

Form B constitutes a record of the teacher's "Professional Judgment," which includes an assessment of the teacher's knowledge of teaching and learning principles as well as linguistic and analytical skills.

Form C is regarded as the most important by the administrators and the evaluation committee alike. Form C is a collection of "materials" the teacher submits as "evidence" of "above-average student growth." After the first year, the committee assumes "this evidence" will be in the form of pre-test and post-test scores.

Forms D and E provide a record of the evaluation of "teaching performance and classroom practice." Part I of the forms presents a 5-point scale of certain teaching competencies. Form D is a "Self-Evaluation Instrument" and Form E is a "Principal's Evaluation" of the same competencies. No checklists are on the second section on Forms D and E. Instead, the principal/teacher summarizes competencies and provides concrete examples on a blank space on the form. Additional pages with comments may be attached by either the teacher or principal.

Forms F and G record evaluations of the teacher by a colleague, patron, or parent. The forms are similar to Forms D and E with Part I consisting of a five-point scale and Part II consisting of a narrative.

Form H is a record of "significant experience, organizations, and services" in which the teacher has been involved. It records the type of experience and the nature of the teacher's participation and his/her relationship to "professional growth and/or classroom performance." One principal pointed out that the teacher needs to begin a "portfolio" and add information each time he/she is involved in a "significant experience."

Form I is a record of the results of the observations conducted by the evaluation committee. It is on this form that evaluators summarize the results of their observations and conferences with teachers. This form consists of a five-point checklist. The evaluator simply summarizes the results of the observation and conference on a blank space on the second part of the form. There was not enough time for classroom observation the first year, but this aspect is considered by administrators and the evaluation committee as a major element in the sampling process.

The Master Teacher Public Hearing

On March 14, 1984, a public hearing was held in Oklahoma City to present the Stanley, Wayside, and Clearwater Master Teacher Program developed and approved by the Master

Teacher Planning committee. Other than the committee members, five administrators and one state department representative were present. No teachers were present (other than committee members) and no representatives from any teacher associations.

Although the Education Extension office claimed that the public hearing had been announced and invitations sent out, the Oklahoma Education Association representative stated that the Association wasn't aware of the meeting, and therefore, a representative did not attend. During the interviews with teachers from each of the three school districts, they commented that the meeting was held while school was in session, therefore, none attended. One teacher stated, "If you will notice, most public hearings are held during school hours when teachers cannot attend."

Summary

Finally, the Master Teacher Program developed by and for the Stanley, Wayside and Clearwater school districts in Oklahoma may be described as a one-step incentive plan providing bonuses of \$6,000 per year per teacher (in addition to any across-the-board cost-of-living increases on the salary schedule). The plan covers classroom teachers that teach three classes per day. The plan provides that designation of an individual teacher as "master teacher" will depend on performance-based criteria (Appendix E).

Designation as master teacher is determined at the end of the school year, and awards are distributed the following school year. Announcement of the recipients of the bonuses has been somewhat low-key to date. Although the committee did not formally establish a quota, the budget limits the number of teachers to be chosen to no more than twenty teachers.

Description of the Interview Data

This study acquired a life of its own during the interview process. The categories for the analysis of interview data were determined as they naturally emerged as themes. Responses focused on six areas that serve as sub-headings for the data: (1) notions about the Master Teacher plan, (2) criteria for selecting a master teacher, (3) teachers' performance, (4) testing of students and teachers, (5) conception of evaluation, and (6) problems with the plan.

Notions about the Master Teacher Plan

Five broad questions guided the inquiry into the administrators' and teachers' notions about the Master Teacher Program. Summaries of the responses to these questions follow.

Question 1: How was the Master Teacher program introduced to your school? The data concerning the conception and origin of the program revealed that the model for devel-

opment was the administrative model. This model utilizes top down, line-staff procedures, where initiation for the program originated with the superintendents. Having decided that a master teacher plan was needed, the superintendents arranged meetings with the university experts, sought approval for the project from the Oklahoma Legislature and formulated a planning committee consisting of administrators, parents, school board members and teachers. The teachers were then invited to provide suggestions for developing the plan and establishing criteria for selection. One administrator stated,

I can relate to six years of merit pay. In the beginning, the teachers were not involved in the plan. This was brought about by myself and the State Department of Education. When we brought it out and said, 'This is the way it's going to be,' there was paranoia rampant (interview).

He commented further,

I don't know it if was ethical to involve the teachers in the development of the program since we [the superintendents] knew what kind of plan we wanted and pretty much had the criteria established. Of course, there were a few things added we hadn't thought of (interview).

This same administrator described himself as a benevolent dictator who was establishing the Master Teacher Program as a means of improving teachers not by doing something "to" teachers but essentially "for" teachers in the hope that it eventually would lead to doing something "with" teachers.

The teachers interviewed did not feel that they had a choice of whether there would be a program; only a choice of

whether to participate in establishing criteria and applying for master teacher status. Some of the comments were:

It was presented that they [the school districts] were going to be working on the program and anyone interested in working from the ground level--from the beginning--in formulating the program, could participate. It wasn't the possibility that we might be involved in it, we will be involved in it. 'Who would be interested in setting up the criteria?'

. . . the teachers consulted! Are you kidding?

We didn't get to vote whether we wanted a master teacher program, just as we didn't get to vote on merit pay.

In our school we were told we were going to have a master teacher program.

The following similarities and differences were noted in the teachers' and administrators' responses. The teachers' felt the origin, development and implementation of the Master Teacher Program was dictated to them without their consultation or approval. In contrast, the administrators felt it really unnecessary to ask for teacher approval but did solicit teacher input on establishing criteria because it was felt to be a way of "avoiding problems." Establishing the Master Teacher Plan was viewed by administrators as a necessary step toward improving public relations, and they hoped it would help provide quality education for students. The administrators felt the Master Teacher Plan was "the thing to do" and that the plan must be implemented. One teacher noted that in the presentation of the Master Teacher Program to her school district, a distinction was made between merit pay and master teacher:

I think merit pay is based more on achievement scores. The way it was presented to us, it wasn't presented as merit pay. There was a difference, they said. This was the approach they took. This was not merit pay. We did hear the presentation from Seiling schools, which was merit pay. I think in merit pay, everybody is paid according to how much you participate in the program. All teachers can choose to participate or not. It's more wide-spread through the school system. This way, master teachers were just a select few and there was actually no criteria you had to reach with merit pay until the end of the year. Then you had your test scores. Maybe our information was not correct.

Question 2: Why do you feel the Master Teacher Program was brought to the district? The data from administrators revealed five possible reasons for establishing the Master Teacher Plan in their school districts. One was to reward teachers deemed "excellent;" another purpose was to eliminate teachers judged as "poor;" a third reason was to have master teachers provide a model for "poor" teachers; a fourth reason given was the public pressure placed on schools to prove the school deserved support and to prove teachers' worth. The fifth and last reason given was that it was an opportunity to initiate an innovative idea with the possibility of gaining political support and funding. Along this line, the following comments were made by administrators:

. . . the underlying thing was that this is something new and different; that different states are adopting this, different districts are trying this out and, in Oklahoma, someone's going to want to do this and there's going to be money available for this, so let's get this for our school district.

. . . to reward excellent teachers--those who want to reach for the stars.

I think probably most reform does come about as a reaction--not maybe just to the press or to reports, but from legislators, from the public within the school.

But, we've got to get rid of the mediocre ones. We will, but it's up to that teacher.

Well, I kind of hope maybe they do try to pattern themselves after the master teachers--to the extent that they can.

If the teacher refuses to do those things that are necessary for improvement, whatever that might be, then, I think the only alternative, if we're going to have all master teachers, you have to eliminate them [the poor teachers].

Most teachers expressed the following viewpoint as to why the program was implemented:

The major reason is to satisfy politicians and administrators. I think you'll find a lot of superintendents who will come up with ideas like this to make them look sort of good in the eyes of the public and in the eyes of the politicians.

It is a possibility that the legislature is saying, 'We're paying the best, and, therefore, don't have to give an across-the-board salary raise.'

They are definitely different areas, but I feel like it can go together and still be a good thing because, I feel like where the legislative priorities are is to get good teachers. I feel like the administrative priorities are the test scores, which result from good teaching. I feel like if you want the good teachers and good test scores that, inevitably, the children will profit from that. So, I think that no matter what the priority is, it all comes back to the children, which is what we're trying to do.

Evidently, they feel like we should keep on and on in trying to better ourselves. I agree with that, too. But, they're never satisfied. They're always wanting more. I don't know if they think we're not doing a good job. You know, we all go for more hours all the time to try to keep our degrees updated.

A cop out not to pay basic salary increases to teachers; only a few teachers were qualified to even try for it.

We see this as a possible political maneuver to say, 'We're paying the best, therefore teachers will not get a raise' through the legislature.

Question 3: Has the program benefited the school district, you personally, or your fellow teachers? If so, how? According to the administrators, the master teachers will gain recognition and monetary reward. The other teachers will also benefit because they will have the master teacher as a model. The school district will benefit by inservice and community projects.

According to teachers, the only ones who will gain from this plan are the master teachers themselves. They felt that the reward was mostly monetary. Most felt the master teacher plan made the administrators look good. Most indicated that politicians would probably feel that they did not owe them (those who were not master teachers) a salary increase since, "if they truly wanted a raise, they (the teachers) should apply for the master teacher program and earn it." Other teachers commented:

I guess it's for the four master teachers in our district. That's the only ones who are benefiting from it. I don't think the students have. I don't see that the master teachers have done anything different this year, really, as far as actual teaching of the children than they ever have before. But I don't see any difference there. I guess it's just the raise in salary and maybe the prestige for master teacher for some of them if that means anything. That's who it's serving, I guess. I can't see that it's bettered our school system any.

The \$6,000 per teacher has stimulated the economy of our community.

The only advantage or benefit I can see is that a few deserving teachers are being well paid for doing 'busy' work.

Public relations for the school superintendent, but the public thinks they [the master teachers] are the only ones really working.

I can't think of any benefits. None.

Money is important. Some of the best teachers are finally rewarded.

Hasn't benefited the students or other teachers as far as I can see.

In Oklahoma, we're so locked in with no salary increases for some time and maybe not for quite a while. This is a way that I can see to try to increase my salary. This is just an outlet to try to improve my situation. So, I guess I'm really narrow-minded, because I'd never thought of it in the whole perspective.

The \$6,000 was a big incentive and of benefit to me. None of the teachers are paid enough.

Several teachers mentioned that the master teachers were required to do extra things in the school to justify getting the \$6,000, but other than a couple of workshops, the master teachers had only been asked to stress the importance of testing. Extra assignments of inservice and materials developed were two of the benefits anticipated by the designers of the plan. The following statements were made by teachers:

Inservice was used to give a pitch on the importance of testing.

Material was presented on helping the slow learner.

Alongside these myths exist three sets of metaphors used in discussing children: military, industrial, and disease. The use of these metaphors, according to Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985), ensures that teaching-learning research will be seen from a technical perspective only.

Token Approach

This area of teacher effectiveness research has received only token recognition although it reflects a humanistic model. Included in this approach are studies based on the human aspects of the teaching/learning experience. Combs and others dealt with interpersonal relationships, the idea of "self as instrument" and the personal view of teaching. Combs (1965) contends that teachers' knowledge and methods do not define effective teaching. He claims that teaching is an "instantaneous reaction" which reveals the "quality of the person" (p.12). He states that the belief system or value system the person holds make the difference. Combs (1974, 1982) states that research has revealed that perceptions of self, others, and the purpose of schooling make a difference. Successful teachers, according to perceptual psychologists, see themselves as more adequate, trustworthy, worthy, wanted, and identified with others than less successful ones. Likewise, successful teachers view others as trustworthy, able, and tending toward self-actualization. Successful teaching can be distinguished according to the following kinds of purposes:

1. Good teachers perceive their purpose in teaching as being one of freeing, rather than controlling, students.
2. Good teachers tend to be more concerned with larger rather than smaller issues.
3. Good teachers are more likely to be self-revealing than self-concealing.
4. Good teachers tend to be personally involved rather than alienated.
5. Good teachers are concerned with furthering processes rather than achieving goals (Combs, 1965, p. 85).

Other characteristics, according to Combs (1965), with respect to the teacher's purposes have been suggested as connected with good teaching but have not yet been subjected to research. Good teachers' purposes are those of:

1. Helping rather than dominating.
2. Understanding, rather than condemning.
3. Accepting rather than rejecting.
4. Valuing integrity rather than violating integrity.
5. Being positive rather than negative.
6. Being open rather than closed to experience.
7. Being tolerant of ambiguity rather than intolerant (pp. 85-86).

Combs (1979), along with Dobson, Grey, and Dobson (1979), Sinclair (1968), and Rogers (1969), show that there is need for a caring, open and accepting atmosphere surrounding education. Aspy and Roebuck (1982) also contend that "students learn more and behave better when they receive high levels of understanding, caring, and genuineness, than when they are given low levels of them" (p. 199).

Ignored Approach

The subject for research in the third approach can be classified as person-centered. Dewey (1910, 1964) began a movement to view teachers' philosophies as reflective of

their decisions about the educational process. He believed in the inherent good in man who was in a constant state of change. Friere (1981) in a similar vein, remarks, "Our pedagogy cannot do without a vision of man and the world" (p. 38).

In this approach educators questioned the assumptions underlying the existing mode of educational endeavor. Rather than educators asking "how" to improve what is being done in schools, these researchers stress asking "why" we do what we do. Leaders affiliated with the ignored approach included Greene, Kliebard, Dobson and Dobson, Koetting, Giroux, Pinar, Apple, Macdonald, Eisner, and Huebner.

Several characteristics distinguish reconceptualists from other curriculum writers. The first characteristic of these reconceptualists is their agreement in opposition to the limitations of the technocratic rationality dominant in education. Pinar (1975a) asserts that the writers in this movement called "reconceptualist" agree in the "contention that the schooling experience is a dehumanizing one" (p. 359) which often results in the "one-dimensional man, the anomic man, dehumanized and for some critics, maddened" (p. 359). Pinar (1975a, 1975b) identified the following interrelated effects of schooling: Children are taught to model themselves after others. Self worth is dependent on the approval of others. However, becoming dependent on teachers, students fail to develop autonomy. There is a lack of healthy interpersonal relationships. Resulting

alienation causes the child to pretend to be other than who he is. The impersonality of large groups further contributes to loss of self. Schools thus numb children to their own feelings. Children are trained to respond to extrinsic motivation and therefore the role expectations become internalized.

The second characteristic of the reconceptual movement, explained by Pinar (1975a), is its foundational roots in European theoretical traditions of existentialism, phenomenology, psychoanalysis and neo-marxism. Paul Klohr presents a framework for summarizing recurrent themes in reconceptual literature. It is summarized briefly:

1. A holistic, organic view of man and his relation to nature.
2. The individual becomes the chief agent in the construction of knowledge.
3. The curriculum theorist draws heavily on his own experiential base as method.
4. Curriculum theorizing recognized as major resources the preconscious realms of experience.
5. The foundation roots of their theorizing lie in existential philosophy, phenomenology and radical psychoanalysis, also drawing on humanistic reconceptualization of such cognant fields as sociology, anthropology and political science.
6. Personal liberty and the attainment of higher levels of consciousness become central values in the curriculum process.
7. Diversity and pluralism are celebrated in both social ends and in the proposals projected to move toward these ends.
8. A reconceptualization of supporting political-social operations is basic.
9. New language forms are generated to translate fresh meanings--metaphors, for example (as quoted by Mazza, 1982, p. 9).

In creating a new way of thinking about schooling the reconceptualist focuses on the dominant conception of schools in society and the concerns apparent within the larger society: patterns of alienation, dominance, inequality and injustice. Rather than just focusing on the question of what schools are doing, how to improve what is being done, the reconceptualists emphasize that educators should be asking "why" are we doing what we are doing. The reconceptualists attempt to expose the ways in which societal patterns are often unconsciously reproduced in schools and through this exposure hope to promote emancipatory activity (Friere, 1970; Kliebard, 1975a, 1975b; Apple, 1983; Huebner, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1975e; Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1985).

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

As stated in Chapter I, this study does not claim to be value-free. When a person uses self as an instrument, past experiences, perception and values held will come into play in the interpretation. This notion has been well recognized in the literature. Eisner (1979, 1985) states that education and research constitute a "normative enterprise." In research, the selection of the problem, the method of inquiry, the interpretation of data and the significance of the findings reveal value judgment and valuing.

Similarly, Guba (1978) asserts that inquiry is inevitably grounded in the value system that characterizes the enquirer, the respondent, the paradigm chosen, the substantive theory selected and the social and conceptual context. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that values cannot be set aside, methodologically controlled, or eliminated. Guba (1978) presents the following five ways that naturalists insist values enter into and influence the course of inquiry (all of which are by definition excluded in the strict rationalist construction):

1. Values influence decisions about what to study, how to study it, and what interpretations to make of the resulting data.
The evidence for such influences is

- overwhelming (Bahm, 1981; Homans, 1978; Kelman, 1979; Krathwohl, 1980; Scriven, (1971), and most rationalists are willing to concede at least this form of value intrusion.
2. Inquiry is influenced by the paradigm selected to guide the investigation. The rationalist, for instance, who believes that reality is singular and convergent, will impose that construction on the findings, even when hearing respondents assert again and again that **their** constructions of the problem, or of their lives, agree at variance with both those of the investigator as well as those of other respondents. Thus, the rationalist proceeds much as does a court of law, constructing and reconstructing into a singular reality that which represents **truth** to him or her.
 3. Inquiry is influenced by the choice of substantive theory, which indicates the methods chosen to collect and analyze the data and ways of interpreting the findings. The substantive theory (like the methodological paradigm) is a construction, having roots in assumptions and values. Freudian constructions of personality are very different from Skinnerian; bureaucratic organization theory from loosely-coupled theory. If seeing is believing, it is also true that believing is seeing.
 4. Inquiry is influenced by the multiple value and belief systems which inhere in the context in which the inquiry is carried out. Contextual values include those stemming from individuals and those which inhere in social/behavioral, human, and organizational phenomena. A study of school curricula in a fundamentalist rural community is very different from a similar study in an upper-middle class suburb.
 5. Finally, inquiry may be characterized as being either **value-resonant** (reinforcing or congruent) or **value-dissonant** (conflicting). So, for instance, an inquirer could bound a problem to be studied, choose the paradigm within which he or she will operate, choose a substantive theory to guide the inquiry, and still have to determine whether the inquiry is value-resonant or value-dissonant with the context in which he or she will take the inquiry. When making this decision, problem, paradigm, theory, and context must exhibit internal coherence, value-fit, and congruence (value-resonance) in order for the inquiry to

be deemed appropriate and fitting, and in order to produce meaningful findings (Guba, 1978, p. 321- 322).

Theory of Design

This study utilized a style of research known as participant observation or field research. This style emphasizes direct observation, research (informant) interviewing, document analysis, respondent interviewing and direct/indirect participation. Gold (1969) suggested four theoretically possible roles for researchers conducting field work. These range from complete participant at one end of the spectrum to complete observer at the other end. Between these, but nearer the former is the participant-as-observer. Nearer the latter is the observer-as-participant. This study is written from the observer-as-participant point of view.

Field research has been termed by Guba (1978) as naturalistic inquiry. These four strategies in field research are considered the most appropriate means available for gathering data about the values embedded within the master teacher concept. Guba defines naturalistic inquiry as a paradigm for research which is qualitative and descriptive in nature and combines phenomenological, ethnographic and anthropological methods. He also pointed out that naturalistic inquiry is a research paradigm, not any one method (1978). The difference between the dominant scientific form of inquiry and the naturalistic paradigm can be traced to alternative world views; the classical world view and the

new physics world view. Classical physics, pioneered by the sixteenth-century English physicist Isaac Newton, has provided a western world view that has dominated the scientific world until only recently when it has begun to be questioned and reconceptualized. Such a logical, positivistic understanding has not only dominated scientific endeavors but the social sciences as well. The reality developed through this tradition has been based on fundamental assumptions about the nature of the universe. The universe was viewed as a huge machine set into motion by God, all elements passively running according to fixed, immutable laws. According to this understanding of the universe, things have a definite cause which give rise to a definite effect. Fundamental knowledge can be gleaned from objective testing, observation, and measurement. Such an understanding of the universe has come to influence a culturally contrived reality whose specific components have generalized to include views of man, nature, society, and all of its component parts. This view had an enormous impact on program development which is intimately linked to epistemological issues (i.e., to questions about the nature and validity of knowledge). Culbertson (1981) states,

From an epistemological standpoint, then, logical positivists assumed that knowledge about natural phenomena is the same as knowledge about human phenomena. They also believed that researchers could be neutral toward the subjects studied, including human subjects. Since researchers could make public their designs and operations and, since these could be replicated by other research-

The master teachers in our building have presented lessons to all of our students on how to prepare and take achievement tests.

Inservice was presented to staff on how to give the achievement test.

One teacher spoke to us about slow learners. One teacher conducted classes for students on CTBS tests.

One advantage that administrators mentioned was that teachers have other teachers to model themselves after. This conceptualization of modeling became one of the main conflicts between teachers and administrators.

When one administrator was asked to clarify his position on modeling, he stated,

Well, I would hope that we would. I would hope that we would also start developing teachers with the characteristics that have been found to be successful and to make really exceptional teachers.

He continues,

But, I think there's enough latitude in the definition of a master teacher and the criteria that would still allow people to be individuals. I would hope that we'd begin to get those people to a level where they start performing--all of them--at a master teacher level. But, I don't think that means we're doing away with the individualism. I think there's still going to be room for teachers to teach according to their individual natures in some kind of master teacher program.

However, the teachers viewed setting up a standard and establishing a model of "master teacher" as saying that "we do not want unique human beings but robots or 'carbon copies' of other teachers." Teachers expressed it thus,

I try to be the best teacher, best person I can be but they--the Master Teacher Plan is saying 'that is not good enough. You should be like so-and-so,' whoever the master teacher is.

The plan calls for standard teachers and standard students. There's no room for anyone to be themselves anymore.

I can't teach the way somebody else teaches.

You just have to settle in your groove. What works for you won't work for another and vice versa. They realize that we're master teachers, but I hope they don't compare us like they do children, because everybody has a different personality.

If somebody told me to be like a certain teacher, that's like my mother saying, 'Why don't you be more like your brother?' That would gall me. I think you shouldn't do it to teachers.

In an effort to discover what teachers thought was important, the researcher asked for a personal definition of a master teacher.

Question 4: How would you define a master teacher?

The administrators defined master teachers as those teachers who can teach "more content and skills to more students and more difficult learners in less time and for less money."

As a result of having a master teacher, the student will learn more content and thus raise his/her test scores. The ultimate goal from the administrator's perspective is to raise test scores. According to administrators, a master teacher is:

One that's productive for the students. The students produce in terms of standardized tests, in terms of behavior and in terms of criterion-referenced tests. All the generally accepted ways of behavior and attitude. All of those, I think, are shaped by the superior teacher.

One principal comments,

They enjoy coming to work. They don't sit down with a group of teachers and complain all the time

--someone that's happy in their job. The kids are achieving.

Another definition was given:

A master teacher is a teacher that is dedicated to students and that is concerned what students learn and achieve. It's a teacher who has the gimmicks to motivate students to want to learn and to achieve all that they possibly could in one given year, semester, or course, whatever the condition might be.

Another administrator comments,

Well, I think there are a lot of characteristics. It's not just what they do in a classroom, however, that is the most important thing. There are people who are able to, in their classroom, challenge their students with certain techniques such as effective questioning of students; the way they manage their students to make sure they are all involved in the discussion: the way they handle discipline to build up, you know, and they never let that student know that that is the end of the line. 'Here's what we're going to do.' I think that's a good characteristic of an effective teacher. A teacher who generally does very little grouping, I think, is a more effective teacher than one who tries to fragment the whole class.

Along the same line,

A master teacher is someone who goes in the classroom and has lessons planned with educational objectives. The test scores and all other indications are that they're getting it across to the kids, that the kids are learning those objectives that have been shown to be good objectives, things that the kids need to know.

The teachers' definitions were similar to the administrators' definitions along the lines of student achievement and production. However, the definitions given by the teachers contain an element of the "person" of the teacher rather than an "abstract" master teacher model. The terms, such as "mother," "counselor," "caring," "compassionate" and "warm"

portrayed a different picture than the term "producer" and "achiever" which characterized the administrators' definitions. According to teachers, an effective teacher is:

If I were looking--and many master teachers would not be identified as such--a master teacher is one who is there any time he needs to be. I think they go above and beyond for the kids.

Another teacher comments,

They watch out for little things; they are the counselor. They're the teacher that shows compassion--proficient in subject matter, and has a gift of motivation. They're not perfect: they make mistakes.

Along the same line,

. . . they get involved with their kids and get to know them at a more personal level and not just go in there and fill out the grade book and a plan book and wait for another day.

Others comment,

I would almost compare the master teacher in many ways to a mother. They want the best for their child. Sometimes it's hard to decide what's right. Sometimes you have to give punishment. But a mother has to do that to her child so they will grow up to be a productive person. I think in many ways a teacher has to be a mother to those kids.

I think a teacher has to be a caring person, one who's there to listen, to show the way to students. You've got to be knowledgeable and have the methods of getting things across to children. You can't just present it and say, 'Here it is.' You've got to find the way to teach or change your methods of teaching to fit the individual children at school. If I had to compare, I would say it'd probably be like a mother wanting the best for her own children.

One who is open-minded and willing to change. One who is willing to not get stuck in one little rut their entire teaching years: 'This is the way I'm going to teach it and that's it!' That won't work. You've got to use your resources and try

many different ways or I don't think you'll reach as many children.

A good teacher is a good person, one who likes themselves and kids.

You've got to be a hard worker with lots of energy to get to the children. You ought to have high moral values, I think, and set a good example.

Question 5: If you were eligible to apply for master teacher, did you? If not, why? If you had been eligible for master teacher, would you apply? If not, why?

This is a way that I can see to try to increase my salary. This is just an outlet to try to improve my situation.

The \$6,000 was a big incentive and of benefit to me.

Yes, it was the challenge.

The teachers who were eligible to apply for the designation of master teacher but chose not to offered the following reasons as to why they did not apply.

I don't feel like there is such a thing as a 'master teacher.'

I feel that the program has caused conflict and hard feelings among the staff.

I don't want my summer taken up.

I feel that most of our teachers are master teachers--at least those with 7-10 years experience.

I don't believe it [the Master Teacher Program] really identifies and honors the true master teacher.

Why do you have to be in one school system for a certain number of years? One of our best teacher's husband has moved every few years so she doesn't have tenure.

It makes other teachers feel inadequate.

I think \$6,000 for each teacher should be divided up among all teachers like our Christmas bonus.

The Master Teacher Plan divides the teachers, destroys cooperation, and increases dissension.

I don't believe in the [master teacher] idea. It's just not right and I can't be a part of it.

Criteria for Selecting a Master Teacher

The description of a master teacher given by administrators and teachers presented several differences. After describing their conception of a master teacher, each was asked, "How did the criteria for selecting a master teacher (as established by the committee) compare or contrast with your perception of the definition for a master teacher?" The teachers felt that there was a gap between the criteria and the definition given for a master teacher. Some of the teachers' comments were:

It was not, according to my idea.

I think they need to have guidelines to follow, but I don't think their guidelines go with my definition.

I heard several people comment, 'Why do you have to have a master's degree in order to participate in the program?' I can't see that. Because some people who have master's degrees--it's just a piece of paper and they're not really any more effective in the classroom than someone with a bachelor's degree. My master's is not in the area that I'm teaching in.

Just because someone can take tests doesn't prove s/he is a master teacher.

The criteria was set up for those who can present themselves well on paper.

Does it make me a master teacher because I can get people in the community to say, 'Yes, that is a master teacher?' No way!

What one person might think a master teacher is and what another person thinks may differ. I feel like, not only myself, but there's a lot of teachers that I've talked with that would fit into the same category as what I explained to you as to how I feel about it that would meet many, if not all, of the qualifications, other than taking that step to do these extra things.

My idea of master teacher is a personal one--subjective I guess--and they're trying to set up objective criteria--whatever that means.

How do you measure what we've talked about: caring, loving your kids? I don't know.

I don't think it's good. I think it is, again, letting a person, a test, the criteria decide whether someone's good or whether, 'Do I like him or not?' 'Is he effective in my eyes?' 'What did he make on a test?' Do we take a 100 percent average and say they're better than someone that's a 70 percent average?

How does anyone decide who is a 'master teacher' and who is not? There is no way to determine this.

Why a master's degree?

I think your master teacher comes from your performance in the classroom and not how well you score on the National Teacher Exam or how many papers you fill out, how many people you get to sign 'yes' that you're doing adequate work-- whatever it takes. Master teacher comes from what you have done in the classroom with your students regardless of who else in the community knows what has happened or what organization you belong to.

It's not really the most outgoing person that necessarily is qualified. Or the one that's had time to sit down and fill out all this paperwork.

A master teacher is dedicated to the idea of teaching the child that the child is Number One; being a master teacher is Number Two.

From the teachers' point of view, the criteria set up did not exemplify what they considered to be important in defining a master teacher. Although the administrators acknowledged the limitation of the criteria, they felt that the criteria exemplified a master teacher. Some of the administrators' comments were as follows:

I think the master teacher is one who is very well prepared in his/her field of study. They are experts. That's why we use the NTE exam.

A master teacher is one who works with the staff: always available and willing to help his or her colleagues. One who participates in activities--building professional meetings. If a teacher comes with a problem, that teacher is willing to try to assist in solving that problem. A master teacher is one who is active in community affairs. That is one of our criteria deemed not as important as others, but still one of them. I think that's important in a community. Maybe it's not as important in Oklahoma City and Tulsa, but it is in schools of that size and that are active in community affairs. They get lost a little more, probably, in a metropolitan area, but in a rural community, I think it's important that they are active in community affairs and that they put something back in the community.

Then I think you have to, obviously, be concerned about the results that that teacher gets. Year after year after year that teacher's students are very well prepared. They've grown in that classroom--as measured by standardized tests. I have no objection to that. If we know where those students are at when that teacher gets them and the students . . . her class just makes more than what the average growth would be. It would be a vocational teacher whose students, at the end of the year, are able to perform the tasks on a criterion referenced exam or something.

I feel there has to be some form of measurement in selecting master teachers. The criteria established is as good as any.

Teachers' Performance

The curriculum's primary influence on the program comes through the medium of testing. Its importance is reflected in the concept of productivity which translates into the performance of teachers. Although most of the teachers expressed the belief that they were expending much effort in being as effective as possible, they felt pressure to "perform." Not only did the teachers themselves feel pressure to perform, but they felt pressured to pressure the students to perform - especially on tests. Following are some of the teachers' comments:

I think I'd probably agree that teachers feel pressure to accomplish too much in too short a time because, other than our reading, we don't finish titles and, supposedly, we are to finish those books.

The thing that really concerns me is all we've been doing for the last 10 years, and I know I've been right up there with the administrators, wanting teachers to perform and students to perform.

Perform, perform, perform.

If I don't perform, I don't look good.

What difference does subject matter make if you're teaching that whole student? You're testing him over all different areas. They've got to comprehend it; they've got to read it; they've got to pull out from somewhere what that means. Yet, all the teacher can look at is, 'if they don't score good, I don't look good; therefore, I'm not performing.'

Performance has been dictated by our legislature.

Performance has been easing up on us through accountability, through testing programs, etc. It has caused future teachers to say, 'I must perform.'

Student performance, again, is still associated with the testing program. If they do not perform on a 9th grade level, they cannot be freshmen. Period. Cut and dried. That's it. 'Teacher, you must perform'. 'Student, you must perform.' 'You won't get to go to the 9th grade if you don't perform.' 'Time will pass - will you?'

Performance has been pushed upon us.

If you don't do it [perform], you're going to be a loser.

I can slam my hand down on the desk and say, 'You will perform!' Does that make me a master teacher?

It sounds almost like the National Socialistic Movement in Germany. If you perform for the state, you're rewarded. If not, you were destroyed. You perform--not for the benefit of yourself, but for the benefit of the state. It could tie in.

Some teachers expressed a value conflict over what was ignored because of the emphasis on performance yet admitted they usually compromise. The following comments reveal the conflict:

I think sometimes, because we stress performance, we miss getting the student to grab and gather in the knowledge and relativity of something and then be able to envision what they're going to do with it.

I don't want to, but they've forced us into it. Now, I've got to perform like everybody else. I want them to do their best on the tests.

Testing Teachers and Students

Teachers. The National Teacher Examination (NTE) was provided free of charge to any teacher in the three systems who wished to take it. Some teachers indicated that they took it because it was free. It was offered at no cost for

the first year, and they did not want to have to pay to take it later. Some teachers who took the NTE and passed it did not apply for the Master Teacher Program. The NTE required six hours of testing during an eight-hour period of time.

The cut-off for the NTE was established by the Master Teacher Planning Committee. The first year of operation the cut-off scores for each section had to be determined by the Committee. The plan for the future, however, was that the cut-off scores would be adjusted if necessary as a result of scores made by local teachers.

There were two notions that became evident in interviewing participants from all three systems in regard to the National Teacher Examination. There were no differences among the groups concerning the difficulty of the test. There were, however, disagreements among the group concerning the appropriateness of the test for the Master Teacher Program.

Respondents from all three systems felt that the NTE was difficult. Comments referred to the physical endurance of taking the test as well as to the mental endurance required for good performance on the test. Regarding the difficulty of the test, comments included:

The NTE was harder than I thought it would be. Communication skills were very important. The professional section was especially tough using hypothetical situations. Were the NTE to be given to everyone, many would not pass.

I was discouraged by the way the NTE was given. It was the worst torture you could put anybody through, but I did pass.

A more general background provides the best chance of passing the test--for example, elementary teachers with a background in art, science and math.

Many teachers were very skeptical about the exam. Teachers who did take it said it was the most exhausting experience they had been through.

I felt challenged by the NTE and wanted to see if I could pass it.

The NTE was very difficult and long. You could be brilliant in one area and not in another and not pass. It's hard to be a jack-of-all-trades. Art was a weak area for me.

I think your master teacher comes from your performance in the classroom and not how well you score on the National Teacher Exam or how many papers you fill out.

The test was downgrading to teachers who have been teaching a long time.

It was difficult; it was an all-day test with six hours of actual testing. Teachers' ability in the classroom should not be based on an exam.

I passed the NTE. It's been ten years since I took a standardized test. I felt real unsure.

Regarding the appropriateness of the test, comments included:

The score made on a test does not reflect how good a teacher is in the classroom; therefore, a 'master teacher' is not the one who scores high on a given test.

I am not sure the test is a good way to judge who is qualified and who is not. If your background and environment do not match up with the type of test, you might not do well.

I do not believe that the test is an indicator as to whether you are a good teacher or not. [This teacher passed the exam.]

I feel that teachers need to be competent and have the basic skills of reading and writing. I don't think the test should be the NTE. It was a very broad, general test.

It does not mean that you are a better teacher than the others; but it is as suitable as any other criteria. It has nothing to do with classroom ability.

If you are a good test taker, you do okay. If not, you will fail.

A person needs to be competent in his/her field. I support a test in the appropriate subject area or general literacy.

If the NTE is used, let a test in the specific teaching field override that test.

We needed some kind of measurement tool but it was the wrong thing.

There was more emphasis on the NTE than I expected. In an early meeting I attended, I remembered that the teacher was to be judged strictly on area of expertise rather than an overall score. There was a discussion about a student coming out of college being able to take the test better than a teacher that had been in the field several years. I thought that they would take the score in their area of expertise. I think some of the teachers that did not file for master teacher status did take the test. Some of the things on the test were so foreign that they were not just pertaining to a basic education.

Students. In general, the administrators understood the reason for and were very vocal about the need for the master teacher plan to be tied to raising standardized test scores. Raising the test scores was viewed as an accepted and perfectly worthwhile objective in public education. As one administrator noted: the test scores of the nation have been declining for years and it is a serious problem. The emphasis of this rationality can be seen in the following statements:

The test scores of the nation have been going down for quite a while and this is a very serious prob-

lem. I feel the district is seeing this and becoming concerned . . .and we intend to do something about it.

The pressure and emotional stress of testing on students was justified by one administrator. Concerning this, he states:

If we increase test scores, the kid's attitude is terrible because of the pressure that's put on them because of the testing. I've been down that road. What are we being held accountable for?

Parents want the basics . . .

The complete acceptance of raising test scores as one of the primary purposes of the Master Teacher Program and as an important and natural educational aim showed up in the justification of teachers teaching to the test.

I know it's been stated that our teachers teach to the test; I don't have a problem with that. They should be covering those things.

Some teachers, while expressing the inappropriateness of testing teachers also expressed the inappropriateness of testing students. However, the teacher succumbs to pressure and tests students. The following comments express the conflict:

Most standardized tests are written in such a manner that if a child can read and comprehend what they're reading, they don't have to know the subject matter. They can read the passage given and basically comprehend what it's saying. They can answer the questions on that test, which would tend to inflate the scores, rather than get a true idea of what they know.

I felt it [the testing situation] was very controlled and I worried a lot about whether I would have the end-product I desired.

No, you shouldn't judge a teacher on (student's) test scores. We have so many students whose home life affects their performance. The teacher only

has them, sometimes, for only 40 minutes a day. How can you judge a teacher on that?

I wonder if this is not going to cause teachers not to want to teach the kids that are harder to get results from. Because, if your pay depends on that (on how good a teacher you are) then, naturally, you are just human, and you're going to get to where you think, 'Why me?' I think it will cause a lot of resentment which, in turn, determines how you're going to treat those children. Kids are, after all, the ones we're teaching for. I think it could definitely affect them in the long run.

We are just treating the children like a computer. We're just putting software into a child--the material is the software--and we're just programming the software to be what he should be.

I can see it and it's scary. So, how do you teach this child and what direction do you take?

There are outside factors such as their home environments that we, as classroom teachers, don't have any control over. We don't have control over whether or not they go to bed at a proper time the night before they take their test; whether or not they've eaten a good breakfast before they came to school, and these are things that affect how well they do on the test as well as what they actually know.

You cannot test everything. Standardized tests are not a very good measure, but I've thought a lot about that and I don't know what else you would do. I don't know how else we could measure it. We have to have some form of measurement. Right now, that's the only thing we have.

Teachers express concern over student testing:

The Master Teacher Concept encourages an emphasis on small, short-term gains.

We won't be able to be a human being anymore (if we have more paperwork, etc.). We'll be machines just kind of feeding it out because, 'I've got to hurry up and get this knowledge into you by the end of the year.'

If the Master Teacher Program ever started hurting the child, I'd say to do away with it. It may hurt me financially, but that's fine. Because I'm

here to help the child. If it's a deterrent to teachers or children, discontinue it.

The fact that teachers spend part of their working day implicitly or explicitly preparing students to make good scores on the test does not seem to be bothersome or problematical to most of the administrators. Such effort is viewed as right and good, or as the logical consequence of a rational curriculum. In the interviews administrators comment:

My reaction (to teachers teaching to the test and ignoring other important areas) is, if it's on the test, we have to assume that it's important or we wouldn't be testing for it. If it's not on the test, perhaps we need to look for a different test to test what we're teaching. I think we need to make it clear that we don't propose that we have all the answers now. Perhaps, when we get away from the first generation or early years, we'll see that criteria and reference tests might be more appropriate than a standardized test for measuring teacher effectiveness.

I don't have too much problem with teachers teaching to the tests. Obviously, if the test is going to test what we deem as being necessary and it tests the objectives we want to reach, then I have a hard problem with seeing what is wrong with teaching toward the test. If the objectives that we want to reach are going to be measured by that test, then I think we ought to be teaching what we decided was important. That's why I think that it is important that tests, in some respects, probably need to be more tailor-made than they are. But, I've heard that teachers will teach toward the test. But if the test doesn't measure what we're wanting to teach, we shouldn't be giving the test. If it does, then what's wrong with teaching toward those objectives?

This practice is accepted as a fact of life; this is reality and taken for granted. Consequently, it is viewed as entirely appropriate for teachers to attempt to enhance stu-

dents' achievement or skills scores. The educational aims of the master teacher and the "natural" purposes of education as raising standardized test scores are viewed by some teachers as diminishing the profession and calling of teaching.

Conception of Evaluation

The information in the application "packet" was considered the heart of the program. This packet, which contained various forms, would be the evidence the teacher provided the committee that s/he was indeed a master teacher. The committee had the responsibility of reviewing this evidence, assigning a point value to the various forms and making the decision of designating the persons chosen as master teachers.

The members of the selection committee made the following comments:

We evaluated the packet based on a point system. Point-wise, the evaluations were very close.

Some of the packets were not complete. I really felt bad because some of the packets lacked the parents' letters. I suppose the teachers should have checked to see that these were turned in.

Another committee member stated,

I was surprised how close each of our points were in evaluating teachers.

A few teachers did not qualify because they had holes in the packet.

Some of the teachers commented,

. . . so much paper work.

I felt the packet was too overwhelming--thick. The application was kind of like building a resume.

There were many areas in which you were judged. No one knew ahead of time where the emphasis was going to be placed.

The hardest part for me was the self-evaluation.

The process was very difficult. It required a lot of time to fill out the forms.

Problems with the Plan

Teacher morale has long been cited as an area of concern when implementing merit pay plans. The issue of morale did surface during the interviews in these three school districts. The researcher approached the analysis of the morale issue by asking, "Has the master teacher program affected the relationships among teachers?"

I wish there was some way to convey on paper the emotions portrayed during the interviews. Many of the teachers I talked with were trying to deal with the resentment this program had generated within them. One teacher expressed the tension as a cloud hanging over the school:

I feel, this may sound strange, but we've definitely seen a difference this year since this program has come about. Now, maybe there's more factors involved. You would think that something like this couldn't make a big difference, but it has. I feel like we're close and we have two master teachers in this school and I have coffee with them. We usually go down and relax after work. I love them dearly. It's not that I have a rift with them. We get along great! It's like a cloud hanging over us, it's just there, and it has been all year. I definitely think it must have some bearing on that.

Another expressed the dissension as silence:

People just don't talk about it. It's there--this feeling--but we don't discuss it.

While I was visiting one of the schools and talking with some of the teachers in the lounge, a master teacher walked in and silence fell.

Also observed in almost every instance was the concern of some teachers over the use of the term "master teacher" as the status designation. Comments voicing concern about the status designation were:

Some teachers didn't like the words 'master teacher'.

The criticism is that it causes division between groups of teachers. I have the feeling boundaries are being drawn between master teachers and non-master teachers.

Teachers fear parents only wanting their kids to be with master teachers. That hasn't happened. It is an option just like getting a master's degree.

I didn't want someone else to be chosen as better than I was. I feel it puts one teacher against another.

I attended a rally for pay increase in February where the word 'master teacher' at the rally received boos and jeers. Teachers of Oklahoma do not want Master Teacher Plans.

It is bad that the community sees these as masters. They wonder, 'Are the rest of us not master teachers?'

I think it does more harm than good to the system as a whole. It's fine if you are the one chosen.

A second observation in all three systems was that there was an element of resentment of the program on the part of the

teachers, which is seen in the following statements made by teachers:

I'm not totally against the Master Teacher Program, but I'm glad I didn't get it. Had I known that there was so much hate toward it, I wouldn't have even tried. I am not reapplying. It is out of the question for me. I feel like I get along with other teachers, but if I got it, I would be a loner. Others feel that they are just as good a teacher and deserve the money, too.

It caused hard feelings among the teachers. People here just didn't want the program.

It has caused dissension between teachers. Most teachers believe that they are doing a good job. Resentment is a good word for the problems between the staff here.

The closeness of the faculty may cause teachers to feel that they don't want to be identified as better than their peers and, therefore, would not volunteer and apply for the Master Teacher Program.

It seems like it has sort of lost interest here because I haven't heard of anything this year.

I sense a little resentment of a master teacher.

One teacher who is especially qualified is one of the most negative about the plan.

I do not believe the atmosphere at the high school was positive for implementing the Master Teacher Program. Some say they just don't like it. Maybe there is peer pressure not to apply.

I believe a lot of teachers felt that we had more master teachers in my school. They felt that we should have taken the money and given everybody a raise.

One of my main concerns and why I almost didn't go for it was because of my peers. I didn't think it was worth it.

At the end of the process, I said that I would never go through the embarrassment and humiliation of being turned down again.

Six thousand dollars is almost a third of my salary. Many teachers put in hard work and long hours and are not recognized or rewarded. It has been a negative factor in morale. I'm truly happy for the master teachers, but many other people also deserve the recognition.

Resentment and jealousy was seen by most administrators as a natural reality that happens to those that have worked hard and bettered themselves. One administrator explains,

There will be jealousy. People are jealous if you drive a better car than they do, you know. But if a person has demonstrated mastery and is willing to do the things that are necessary, I think there should be some high requirement. Then, the heck with the jealousy.

Master teachers received \$6,000 in additional pay as a result of this designation. In addition to their regular contract time, they were required to work an extra two weeks in the summer. This extra time was supposed to provide the master teachers with time to perform extra projects that would benefit the school system and their classrooms. They were to serve as consultants to other teachers, to provide in-service activities for other teachers, and to serve on evaluation teams.

The \$6,000 incentive became problematic. The amount was viewed by those who received it as sufficient incentive to create interest in the program. With only a few teachers receiving this additional amount, however, it also became a source of resentment. Responses to questions concerning the \$6,000 incentive from participants follow:

I feel that \$6,000 might be a little steep. But I've never seen a teacher yet that is over-paid. If I were eligible, I think I would apply for the money. Why wouldn't you do that?

The money sounded good.

The \$6,000 was a great incentive. I would not have bothered to fill all of that out otherwise. It is too large an amount for what they do.

There is a bit of resentment from other teachers toward the dollar amount.

Extra activities at the high school take a lot of work. Activities such as school before school, student council sponsor, and junior class sponsor bring additional pay ranging from \$150-\$250 a year. This causes resentment when a master teacher gets \$6,000 a year. It affects the high school teachers more than the other schools. This is where the morale problem comes in. The high school didn't have any master teachers apply. You can understand why.

I also asked those who did not feel that money was the prime mover what they felt would motivate teachers, and received the following replies:

Possibly recognition--somebody putting their hand on my shoulder and saying, 'You did a good job.' Money helps, but when I was in high school, I worked in a grocery store for quite a few years. One summer day, the boss came in and gave me a \$100 bill and said, 'You've done a good job.' Well, after that, I would have done anything for that man. That's all he had to do, so I think he spent his \$100 well. I think that's the problem now with the legislature and why teachers are so discouraged. It is the main course, but from what I feel, it's related to respect and if the legislature won't kick in the money, there's no sign of respect.

Being told by the administrator that I'm doing good; a pat on the back or a change in the schedule to help you out or give you more time to do this or that in something that they feel you're doing well at or that you have excelled in; trips, conferences, computers for the classroom, etc.

The kind of person I am, I like to set goals and compete with myself.

Competition versus cooperation between teachers has also been cited in the literature as an area of concern when

implementing merit pay plans. These issues surfaced during the interviews. The whole concept implies a meritocratic competition in which the few winners deserve to win and the losers deserve to lose. Most of the administrators viewed competition as a natural phenomenon of our capitalistic society. Administrators' comments were:

Every time they have a professional organization, they have elections, and that's a form of competition. Every time they pass out grades, that's a form of competition. Every time they apply for a job, they're competing with people.

Great things can be accomplished by competition.

We think competition is good for everybody but ourselves.

However, if you're not motivated to improve and you want to go after this carrot that we have up here, which is more salary, more recognition, then here's some things that we expect you to do to get there. Now there's nothing wrong with putting pressure on people to excel. We do it with students every day. We say, 'Look, if you want that 'A', here's what you do.' I think people perform if they have a goal they are going after. I think they're going to perform better. I think teachers, if they see the goal that is attainable, if they want to do the things necessary to reach it, will do a better job in their classroom.

Everybody can't be a master teacher. They don't have the ability. I know there are a lot of people in education who will never come up to the level of some others in education. They will never be able to relate to a class and get out of a class what some people can. Some people just have something they are born with to be able to relate to a group of kids and get them motivated.

I know that's all elitest, and I don't apologize for that because I think there are different levels of competency.

Concerning the message conveyed to students,

We are teaching children to go out into a competitive world. I don't know if it's right.

Wouldn't it be nice if, when students went out into the marketplace, all they had to do was to perform to their proficiency? I don't believe it works that way, because they're going to be judged and the product that they produce is going to be competing against other products, price-wise, quality-wise.

Several disagreed with this view, however,

I think if people are undercutting each other and using gestapo tactics of reporting, parents having the authority to write a letter against a teacher if they don't like that teacher, the principal being able to put his thumb down if that teacher does not conform to what he considers as effective, it's teaching students the wrong type of values, most definitely.

Competition can lead to jealousies, and that's one of the things we were definitely afraid of. We were interested in the child himself. Anything that would hurt a child, we were hesitant of.

Education is a unique field. You are working with the public. The school system is a reflection of the community itself and you're not assembling 'shimees' at a shimee plant and trying to be important. You're trying to educate a child. Again, how do you know if you've educated a child in a subjective way?

Most administrators interviewed believe in the capitalist system of free enterprise, competition and survival of the fittest. The meritocracy ideology was evident in the above statements. It was assumed that everyone begins the competition with an even or equal advantage. On the other hand, teachers did not value competition. Some stated,

I don't like competing against other teachers. We need to cooperate more.

The program is setting up winners and losers. I guess I'm a loser because I don't believe in it.

Master teachers' domination of other teachers was mentioned in the literature as being a problem. One principal stated that "it [domination] is happening here." He continues,

One of the master teachers in our building is already reporting to me about other teachers. This master teacher has reported several incidents that were not her responsibility. She is constantly criticizing and on the back of several co-workers. That can be a problem.

Resistance of Teachers. Nonparticipation of teachers in this type of plan was noted in the literature. In the ERS Report (1983) several programs that were established had no one apply for the money available. One of the current group of high schools did not have any teachers apply to participate in the program. The nonparticipation was viewed differently by administrators and teachers. To several administrators it just confirmed their judgment that all high school teachers resist policy changes more than other teachers in a school district. One administrator stated,

When you go to the high school you are going to find that the teachers do not approve of the program. Of course, any one can tell you that high school teachers usually resist changes more than elementary teachers.

Some teachers at the high school were accused of applying pressure so peers wouldn't apply. Some of the comments were:

I think the teachers [at the high school] have put pressure so other teachers won't apply.

Some of the teachers would apply, I think, but they are concerned about their peers.

Others perceived the nonparticipation of the high school faculty as teachers finally standing for "what they think is right." Some of the comments concerning this were:

I wish our teachers had stood together like the high school [teachers] did. None of them applied. they don't believe in it.

If we, the teachers, in our schools, had said 'we don't like it' and stood together, you wouldn't feel so alone.

I think it's great that the teachers did not apply. Maybe that will get the message across to the administrators that the program is not wanted by teachers.

Several teachers at this particular high school stated that "we do not believe in the plan and will not participate." The teachers stated that the "silent nonparticipation" was their way of "standing for what we believe is right." When the issue of voicing their opposition was suggested by another teacher, however, the teachers expressed concern for personal "survival in this small a school district." Since most of the teachers felt so strongly against the idea of a master teacher program, the idea of actively protesting was mentioned, Some of the comments made by teachers were:

We're a small school district and he [the superintendent] knows how we feel. It doesn't matter.

Teachers will stand sometimes but when you want them to stand together and say 'We're not going to take this anymore!', teachers feel a responsibility to the community and usually say 'this too shall pass'.

It's hard in a small community to go against the administrator.

Teachers will talk and voice their opinions here at school but usually won't stand up at board

meetings. They're afraid, I guess, of being the only one standing.

Moral Dilemmas. One administrator said his teachers were really against the idea of having master teachers and he was, too, in the beginning, but that,

. . . anything that the three administrators decide to do, I try to make it work. So we did. I said, 'Hey, let's do this! You know where you're going to lose and you could use the money. Let's make it fly!'

He continues:

They've tried real hard, but they still come back with one thing: 'Why should I be paid for doing my job? I want the money and I can use the money and spend it. I'm going to do the very best I can. Why should the school district be out to see we're paid more than the other school districts are?' They look out into the community and here their friends are without jobs that were in the oil fields, and people on welfare--not that they can go buy anything they want--they can't. But, they're happy to get the money. Some just think that it's wonderful, yet, they have that little feeling back in their mind and it's almost a moral issue: 'I'm taking this money and I'm being paid just because I test my kids and go through this process.'

Further, he adds:

I feel for them [teachers] and I have their feelings at heart. I think that's why we've got this situation of good rapport and relationships, because I can see their viewpoint and I have some of that feeling. I really think that because the other principal and I said, 'Hey, let's do this!' That's why they did it. I'll always feel that way.

Teachers expressed concern about using students to give a salary bonus. One teacher comments:

I don't think it is right to test these kids. All we do is test--and for what? To gain a bonus.

I have to live with myself and I'm not going to do it. I have to test because it is mandatory but I won't get a bonus for it.

Others expressed moral conflict:

Just as tests for teachers are not valid--testing students does not reveal what they know. It is not right.

We have to be a lot more to kids than just what we can get them to show us on paper. Because you do expect kids to do their best on tests. But you've also got to give them some consideration.

I don't know what the answer is in education, but some of the ways we go about things, you know for sure it's not the right way. You don't really know what the right way is, but you know sometimes what isn't right.

So, we come to the point where you say (and I hate to do this), 'who do I ignore?' I chose to ignore my top group more because I felt they could handle it and they caused trouble, so it was just natural. Now I regret it, because I should have spent more time with them. They would have been a good group to work with.

A speaker said several years ago that the Japanese had a 'Z' factor. The American industry has a term they call the 'right way.' Japanese say doing the 'right things.' I think maybe American education may be doing it the 'right way,' but are we doing the 'right thing'?

The conflict between teachers presented moral concerns.

This statement expressed the feelings of many teachers:

I don't like the way I feel, but to be honest, I resent the program. It has caused bad feelings toward others and myself. I'm uncomfortable with it.

One master teacher who left the school district commented:

I got shuffled by many of my fellow workers: very much closed out. Before, I had a wonderful rapport with the teachers and the community. I gave a lot of years only to be closed out.

In summary, the development and implementation of a Master Teacher Program in these school districts in Oklahoma has provided the research data for this study. The description of the origin and development of the plan has been provided as well as the data from the interviews. The interviews were presented by examining the six themes that emerged throughout the dialogue with administrators and teachers. These themes were: (1) notions about the Master Teacher Plan; (2) criteria for selecting a master teacher; (3) teachers' performance; (4) testing teachers and students; (5) conception of evaluation; and (6) problems with the plan.

Interpretation and Analysis of Findings

According to Huebner's Five Value Frameworks

As indicated in Chapter I, the five value frameworks presented by Huebner (1975) served as an interpretive tool for the axiological analysis of the master teacher concept. Huebner argued that the three dominant value frameworks presently found in educational endeavors are scientific, technical, and political. These three frameworks were found to stand out in the master teacher concept as developed and implemented in the Master Teacher Program of Stanley, Wayside, and Clearwater. This writer agrees with Huebner that the aesthetic and ethical value frameworks are virtually ignored.

Dominant Values

The data revealed that the Master Teacher Concept is based on a technical-political, scientific and rational explanation of human behavior. Although there has been a history of controversy regarding this concept, its popularity as "the answer" to educational problems seems to be increasing. Part of its appeal is directly traceable to the current educational context, particularly to budget cuts and the idea of accountability. The rhetoric of the Master Teacher Program claims that, although other programs have consistently failed, master teacher programs promise results. This program answers the question which frequently confronts today's administrator of education: "What evidence do we have to convince the public that local schools merit the public's continued support?" This notion can be seen in the earlier part of this chapter. One of the administrators noted that the program gave teachers the opportunity to "provide evidence that they were effective" (interview). Likewise, the program provided an opportunity for the superintendent to produce evidence that he was "doing a good job" and it helped to "restore confidence in the school" (interview).

Scientific Values. The Master Teacher Program, as a pilot study, was valued primarily for the "knowledge" that it would produce about master teacher plans. The pilot study was established by the State Department of Education

with funds allocated by the Oklahoma Legislature as a "treatment" in order to test the "feasibility of implementing this type of plan state-wide" (interview). Causal relationships were to be determined through the experimental pilot study. The staff at Land Grant University's Education Extension Office expressed the hope that perhaps a communication network among those developing or desiring to develop a plan could be set up in order to disseminate the information acquired by those experimenting with the Master Teacher Concept.

Scientific valuing was also demonstrated by the emphasis on observable, measurable and verifiable criteria for designation of a master teacher. Scientific valuing was noted in the fifth criterion which is the use of NTE testing as a basic requirement. This criterion states,

. . . [the participant] had demonstrated knowledge of appropriate subject matter through satisfactory achievement in the core battery and in the appropriate subject area test (where available) of the National Teacher Examinations; satisfactory achievement would be defined as scoring at or above the standard score nearest the mean, with adjustment of the score as local test data became available (Appendix E).

Students' test scores are another example of this emphasis on empirical evidence as demonstrated by the eighth criterion. The Master Teacher Plan (1984) stated that a teacher must:

. . . have demonstrated outstanding teaching performance and exceptional classroom practice as documented by at least above-average growth [by students] on a standardized achievement test and/or a criterion-referenced test approved by the district . . . (Appendix E).

Not only was the testing of students justified, but also the teachers' use of their energy and creative powers in preparing students for information for test-taking was boldly justified.

An analysis of the documents and the interviews revealed that one of the major aims of the Master Teacher Program was the improvement of teachers. The plan states,

Ultimately and most importantly, the Master Teacher Program is designed to improve the overall quality of the education being provided (Appendix E).

Improvement is based on the deficiency model. In this model teachers are viewed as objects that need to be "fixed." Many educators believe that the transmission of knowledge by teachers and the accumulation of this information by students would indeed bring improvement. The program emphasized cognitive development as seen in the following statement:

I think there are certain things that we expect children to know, certain skills that need to be mastered.

Our job at school is the intellectual training of students. The rest has to be left to home and family.

When one administrator was asked if he thought the goals of education were to teach certain, predetermined amounts of knowledge, he stated,

Well, I hope so. You know, I think there are certain things that we expect children to know. Now, that's not the end of it. Obviously, there are things that we are not going to measure by the standardized test. We're not going to measure some of the affective domains, I understand that. But I think there are some cognitive areas, some

academic, intellectual areas that we need to be developing in students and I think those things we can measure and I think we ought to be teaching it. There are certain things in reading, certain objectives we want students to reach at a given level in math, science, etc. I hope there is. If there isn't, we're drifting around out here, lost in the sea.

Further,

I think our job as a school is to deal primarily with the intellectual, academic growth of children. We've tried to get into the area of personal growth, social growth, and we do. But I think that's secondary. I think in our job, we can't do everything, and we need to somehow channel public schools in to teaching about the things that we're going to need in the future.

In considering the effects of the master teacher concept as a reform program, it is important to look beyond the language of "excellence" and "reward" because the concept carries with it certain assumptions about the nature of knowledge, the most effective ways children can work to gain that knowledge, the most effective ways for motivating teachers, and the role of the professional in developing and implementing the reform. In this part of the analysis the intention is to identify the assumptions.

The first assumption underlying the Master Teacher Concept is that knowledge is external to the individual. The second assumption underlying the master teacher concept is that knowledge which children are to acquire in school can be formulated in advance of instruction, usually in terms of behavioral objectives, and the attainment of these objectives can be measured subsequently in terms of performance criteria. A third assumption is that the work (activities)

students do to acquire this knowledge can be structured in a system of planned, sequential activities which involves pre-testing, instruction, and post-testing. A fourth assumption is that teachers are motivated to conform to administrators "ideal" of an effective teacher by monetary rewards. A fifth assumption is that the role of the professional teacher is one of implementing the instructional program so as to produce the results desired by the master teacher designers (Popkewitz et al, 1982).

Legitimate school knowledge, according to the assumptions of the master teacher concept, must be defined in a way that is measureable. Therefore, in developing the classroom curriculum, the first task of the teacher was to choose learning objectives that permitted attainment to be measured by explicit and public criteria. Behavioral objectives were viewed by administrators as "guides" for teachers. Many teachers viewed behavioral objectives as "constraints on spontaneity and flexibility." In establishing performance-based objectives as the basis for instruction, the developers of master teacher programs viewed clear and precise measurement procedures as fundamentally important. Detailed and explicitly stated objectives not only provided a specification of what was to be learned and implied how instruction may be conducted, but they also required equally detailed and frequent evaluation of children, extensive record-keeping, and alternative provisions for early attainers and for late attainers of objectives. De-

tailed assessment was intended to make instruction efficient and to provide proof that teachers were accountable. Several teachers, however, spoke of the "mounds of paperwork."

Measurement, an important aspect of scientific valuing, played a critical role as demonstrated by the emphasis on testing and teaching to the test. Teachers' evaluation, salary increase and further instructional planning depended on the use of measurement techniques and interpretation. Although Criterion 8 presented in the Master Teacher Plan allows "other measures of student growth, as available," which were deemed appropriate and acceptable by the committee, measurement procedures advocated by the committee were "standardized achievement tests and/or criterion-referenced tests approved by the district" (Appendix E).

Knowledge that can be defined in terms of prestated objectives that can be explicitly and easily measured is limited (Eisner, 1979, 1985; Macdonald, 1965, 1968; Apple, 1975). Such objectives are appropriate to discrete factual information and skills. The emphasis, as one administrator noted, was on "short term objectives rather than long term ones." Consensus by the staff of the school system about what constitutes the knowledge and skills to be learned as well as the most acceptable way of measuring the mastery of their attainment has to be reached or achieved. The emphasis in the master teacher concept is on knowledge transmission, skills which mandate the acquiring and remembering of information, and on substituting equivalent terms for one

another and by remembering relationships. The values the Master Teacher Concept celebrates with the positivists are instrumental ones of efficiency, economy, precision and objectivity.

The cause-effect relationship between teaching and student learning is assumed. This assumption that teacher behavior is tightly linked to student achievement is expressed by administrators in statements previously referred to, as follows:

Teachers are rewarded primarily on the productivity of their students.

I think you have to . . . be concerned about the results that that teacher gets. They've [students have] grown in that classroom--as measured by standardized tests.

Also, the belief that standard ways of teaching yield predictable results is noted in the following previously quoted statements concerning modeling:

Well, I . . . hope . . . they do try to pattern themselves after the master teachers--to the extent that they can.

Are we going to clone people with certain characteristics? Well, I would hope that we would.

Thus, scientific valuing compels the teacher to prove to the district or state that he/she is effective and, in fact, competent. As one administrator commented,

Funding depends on the projection of success in the schools. The schools have to prove the product is acceptable.

Technical Values. The technical value is the second dominant value framework found in the master teacher con-

cept. Robert Chin (1970), a well-known writer in the field of planned change, commented that "a profession conceals its values in its technical concepts" (as quoted by Warren Schmidt, 1979, pp. 58-59). Eisner (1979) agrees with Chin when he says:

Embedded within technique are implicit visions of what is important, and these visions are seldom appraised by criteria emanating from a conception of education itself (p. 14).

All schools possess educational technologies. Techniques, however, often become the end of school activity rather than a means of instruction. Technology provides an independent value system that defines curriculum, classroom activity, and teacher responsibility. All three school districts, although different in some of the formal ways in which they organize instruction and in their physical arrangements, by incorporating the master teacher program into everyday living, made techniques into a value.

The dominant value framework was exemplified in the committee process. The majority of the issues confronting the five committee meetings were viewed as technical problems (Appendix H). The language and activities of committee meetings centered on technical issues such as methods of setting up objectives for evaluation and establishing objective criteria. One of the first issues the committee addressed was the establishment of objectives for the project, as noted in the minutes of the first meeting (Appendix H). The establishment of objectives was for the purpose of evaluations. At the first meeting the faculty member who

was to conduct the evaluation stressed the importance of establishing objectives for evaluation. Establishing objectives is of primary importance in the technical framework; if objectives were not declared a priori, how would one know whether the objectives had been accomplished and the project could be declared successful or unsuccessful?

The means'/ends' model dominant in the western world's consciousness is an effort to control human activity. The technical mind set is toward the belief that one should not question ends but rather should generalize them through statements that are referenced to observable behavior. It was argued by the originators of the Master Teacher Program that schools have purposes and goals and it should be "possible to determine and measure the extent to which they have been achieved."

Another important function of the Master Teacher Plan Committee was the development of "objective" criteria whereby teachers would be evaluated. Technical valuing dominated the conversation as committee members tried to devise "objective" criteria to be applied by an objective evaluation committee (Appendix H). Two criteria established for selecting master teachers were seven years of experience and a master's degree (Appendix E). Thus, technical values are evident.

The influence of Logical Positivism is demonstrated by the acceptance of "reality" as a given, unquestioned and unassailed. Because the tests were pen and pencil tests,

the process was considered objective to many members of the committee. Not only was the process considered objective, the notion that man was definable in measurable, observable terms was unquestioned. This is demonstrated by the following statement made by an administrator:

We have to have some form of measurement. Right now, testing is the only thing we have.

Another proof of "objectivity" declared by the committee and accepted by most participants was the fact that the Master Teacher Evaluation Committee was "objective." This notion that the committee would be objective was accepted by participants because the members of the committee were persons outside the applicant's school district rather than inside the district. A teacher stated,

One thing that made the process more objective was that the evaluation committee was made up of people from the other school districts.

"The concept of merit pay has been borrowed from business and industry," commented one administrator. Not only was the program valued for the knowledge that was gained for administrators and legislators but it was also valued because it justified educational practices to business leaders. This notion was demonstrated by an administrator who said,

I hate to use the word merit, but why pay all teachers the same? Business people have a hard time understanding why we pay everybody that happens to be a fourth grade teacher the same. If you have four of them, why do they all get the same dollars? The only difference is whether they've worked two more years than another just doesn't seem normal. It's clear to them that all people don't perform at the same level.

As suggested in Chapter II, this attitude toward merit pay was traced to the scientific management and the "cult of efficiency of the 1920s." Kliebard (1975b) explains that about that same time, administrative positions began to be viewed as appropriate for schools. These positions, however, held limited authority. In an attempt to gain autonomy in their positions, school administrators "simply reacted to the influence of the scientific management movement in industry by interpolating those methods into the management of schools" (p. 55). Cost accounting and maximum utilization of school plants became paramount concerns of superintendents.

To gain prestige and to influence public opinion, managers of schools "took pride in adopting the vocabulary and techniques of industry to school administration" (Kliebard, 1975b, p. 55). In adopting the language and techniques of the scientific management era, Kliebard (1975b) noted that school administrators divorced themselves from the rank and file of teachers and gained some autonomy by identifying themselves with business executives. Superintendents discovered that the way to defend themselves against the onslaught by the businessman on the school board and on the tax rolls was to adopt scientific management ideology.

In explaining the use of "technical language" to talk about children another superintendent stated,

I wish we could talk about the whole child in the terms you're talking about, but we're not funded

along those lines. We have to use language that is understood by those that are funding education.

Along the same line another teacher commented,

When you say a child is working at 70-80 percentile it seems the public, parents, etc., understand this. However, I think we [educators] say this because it sounds so much more 'professional' and 'scientific' than to say they [students] really perform well. They [students] understand what they are doing and they can envision it.

The use of language which demonstrates this technical mentality can be seen in the following terms that dominated the interviews with administrators in particular. These terms were: productive, produce, teacher as performer, perform, achieve, measure, objectives, testing, and standard. The master teacher was described as one that can teach "more content and skills to more students and more difficult learners in less time and for less cost." As a result of teacher behavior, more content would be assimilated; therefore, test scores would be raised.

As noted by the definitions given, student learning was almost always viewed as the "product" of teachers' efforts. Implicitly, this view suggests that students are "passive vessels" to be filled; teachers are technicians; schools are factories.

The most common criteria used to assess teachers are input criteria such as knowledge of subject and preparation, followed by output (result-oriented) criteria including student test scores, attendance and behavior. The technical orientation was evident in the criteria selected for designation of master teacher (Appendix E).

Standards represent one's notion of an "ideal" teacher whereby all teachers are judged to see if they "measure up" to the values of those setting the standard. This criteria becomes a model by which teachers mold themselves according to the ideal. The main thrust of the master teacher committees was to establish standardized criteria which could be applied to all teachers. In Chapter II, it was noted that these criteria were most often stated in the form of traits, characteristics, styles, and behavior that constitutes what is important for a district. The basic assumption here seems to be that a set of criteria exists that can be used to assess all teachers in a school system regardless of the multitude of contextual conditions that may exist (Appendix E, F).

During the interviews the administrators used language that revealed a paternalistic bent toward teachers. That is, they seemed to view teachers as incapable of guiding and directing themselves. The administrators portrayed themselves as being in the position of controlling and directing teachers and all educational activity. Administrators viewed themselves as the knowledgeable adults who know best what is good and right for teachers and students.

On the other hand, in the document analysis, the teacher is portrayed as the director and controller of educational activities. These activities center on the authority of the teacher who, as a knowledgeable adult, knows better what is good for children. The teacher is an establisher of edu-

cational "goals and related objectives" for the student; the selector and modifier of instructional plans and materials; and the monitor of student learning. On forms D, E and F, the master teacher's performance was evaluated according to the following:

- Establishes appropriate instructional goals and related objectives consistent with the curriculum
- Creates, selects or modifies instructional plans and materials to accommodate learner instructional levels
- Monitors learner understanding and reteaches as necessary
- Establishes and maintains learner involvement in the learning task
- Establishes and maintains appropriate learner behavior
- Supports learner excellence and achievement (Appendix F).

The teacher was defined as a technician in control of the curriculum that the students were to learn. The curriculum was defined as subject matter or content that was to be imparted to students. The student, viewed as a passive, empty vessel to be filled, was to be tested to see that the content had been accumulated. Defining teaching and curriculum in technical terms ignores value questions of educational aspirations and creates an extremely controlled environment. As one principal explained, "Any time a school is set up on a pre-test/post-test situation, the curriculum is controlled and, I suppose, the teacher and student are, too."

The control over the curriculum presented a conflict for some teachers. One teacher stressed the importance of autonomy in the classroom by stating,

Often, my students need to talk about things in their life. Being able to talk is just as important as being able to add $2 + 2$. Sometimes, I've been able to get my students to talk out their frustration rather than fight. However, with the pre-test/post-test, I feel pressured to cover the content rather than spend time talking with my students.

On the other hand, confusing the autonomy of the closed door with power over the curriculum, several teachers believed they were in control because "we're told what to teach, but not how to teach."

Behavioral objectives were viewed by most administrators as a "guide for teachers." Although many teachers expressed philosophical and moral disagreement with the technical rationality, most of them expressed an alienation from self as well as feelings of helplessness. This is evident in the "what can I do" and "this too (master teacher program) shall pass" attitude.

In discussing how education is increasingly affected by the language and ethos of technology Greene (1985c) states that "educators have begun engaging in adaptive behavior" speaking and acting in precisely the way "technicism" demands. Terms, such as "competencies", "classroom management" and "input-output" appear as natural when applied to the educational world (p. 137). Technical valuing insists that all of the action having to do with teaching and learning are susceptible to measurement, testing, and experimental control (Greene, 1983, 1985a, 1985b, 1985c).

Political Values. Huebner (1975a) stressed that all educational activity is valued politically. One superintendent explained that the Senate Bill No. 74 before the 1985 first session of the 40th legislature of the State of Oklahoma grew out of the Master Teacher Program by stating,

I think that our program had a lot to do with maybe some of the things they're looking at regarding the law that grew out of this program. Obviously, there were a lot of other states that had done this before we did. But, I do know this, when the governor, in his original message, announced that he was going to implement a master teacher program statewide, a week later, one of the people in his office called us and said, 'The governor has announced this and we don't have anything on it. Could you send us a packet so we can have something?'

The evaluation was also considered of important political value. One superintendent states,

The legislature will be looking at the evaluation. Part of our agreement is to give the legislature the evaluations as soon as we get them done. This is originally what we intended for the duration, at least, to run for 3 years.

He continues by saying that,

Of course, we're in the second year and whether we are going to continue is debatable.

Therefore, a presentation was planned for the legislature.

He explains,

We did go down to the House Education Committee and made a presentation on the House floor on the master teacher plan. One of the women from our community served on our committee and went down and made a presentation about how we developed it, what we felt were the strengths and so forth. They were very interested. We did it at the same time the State School Board was having their day at the Capitol. They had all their school board members there, The House chamber was filled with school board members and members from the Master Teacher Planning Committee and we had a lot of

questions, inquiries from school board members that were there. We sent out I don't know how many copies of the program that they asked for. I think there's a lot of interest in the state to do this. I think there's a lot of interest outside of education to award teachers based on merit.

Public relations is an important aspect of the pilot study. This is clearly evident in the document A Proposal to Plan and Implement a Pilot "Master Teacher" Program for the State of Oklahoma (1983). It states,

. . .during Year Two of the project, the superintendents of the three school districts involved in the pilot program and members of the Master Teacher Plan Committee will undertake a formal, statewide program of publicity to inform the public of the benefits and the details of the pilot master teacher program. The informational program will include articles in the print media and interviews in the broadcast media, but will focus principally on personal contact with groups and individuals. These personal contacts will include appearances before formal meetings of established organizations as well as the calling of special, open, public meetings on the subject in cooperation with local school districts (Appendix D).

This was summarized in the following objective:

To implement a statewide campaign of information and publicity regarding the master teacher plan being implemented in [Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside] (Appendix D).

Huebner (1975a) stated that the political framework exists because educators have a position of power and control. In the Master Teacher Plan, the administrator has been placed in the position to influence directly or through the manipulation of resources. In the Master Teacher Program, \$6,000 became the resource manipulated by administrators and the evaluation committee.

The Master Teacher Plan espoused the idea of promotion of the teachers to a position of power and prestige. Paradoxically, the Master Teacher Plan, as presently established, places the teacher in a precarious position. For instance, all the following have the power to evaluate: the principal, school board members, parents, colleagues, the observation committee and the Master Teacher Evaluation Committee. As part of this evaluation the plan stated in Criteria 8 that a master teacher must:

- . . .have demonstrated outstanding teaching performance and exceptional classroom practice as documented by:
- C. Completion by the applicant's principal of the standard evaluation instrument described in 7-B above, which would include the opportunity for the principal to attach additional information in the form of a written narrative (the forms would be furnished to the applicant as part of the application packet);

Further, in Criteria 8 it is stated:

- E. Selection Committee interviewed the applicant;
- F. Selection Committee interviewed the applicant's principal;
- G. Completion of a questionnaire by three of the applicant's colleagues, to be chosen by the applicant, and by three other persons, also chosen by the applicant, who are either patrons of the district or parents of current or former students of the applicant, with no more than one respondent to be the parent of a current student (Appendix E).

Political values are evident in the letters from peers and patrons. As several teachers commented,

Almost every teacher can get three letters from teachers they are working with and three letters from parents.

This requirement means I better try to win a popularity contest and become friends with the mayor, parents, and other influential people.

Sure, I can get three teachers and three people in the community to say I am an excellent teacher. Does that mean they have seen me teach or know what kind of teacher I am?

The Master Teacher Planning Committee may be viewed as an attempt to provide the teacher and the public an illusion of participation since the program was set up a priori. This is clearly evident in one of the superintendent's comments concerning the establishment of the Master Teacher Planning Committee:

I don't know if it was ethical to involve the teachers in the development of the program since we [the superintendents] knew what kind of plan we wanted and pretty much had the criteria established.

Similarly, a member of the committee observed:

. . .it seemed from the beginning that [Stanley and Wayside] never varied from the original plan that the superintendent gave them.

It was also noted in the master teacher proposal that the criteria was already outlined a priori. It states,

It is likely, however, that the plan will focus on one or more of the following criteria: a required number of years of teaching experience (e.g., 5-7 years); demonstrated student growth during those years; embodiment of the principles of good citizenship; participation in professional growth activities; exemplary educational credentials, which would include as a minimum a Master's degree; achievement of a score above a predetermined level on an Oklahoma teacher competency examination; and the willingness and ability to assume additional responsibilities if selected as a master teacher. It must be emphasized that the criteria listed here are included in this paper merely as examples of the areas on which the criteria established by the committee might focus. The committee would be charged not only with establishing these criteria but also with specifying the means by which achievement of the criteria would be measured (Appendix D).

Another administrator put it this way,

I don't make any pretense about being anything other than a benevolent dictator. But, no one gave me authority to be anything else. I cannot let the teachers make the decisions. You're so limited. The law does not provide for that. They hold me responsible for that. The law doesn't provide for a shared power. It holds the board responsible and the board holds me responsible. I delegate all these things out. But when the final analysis comes out, the board's responsible and I have to make to them recommendations for master teacher. If I make a wrong recommendation too many times, then I'm gone and somebody else comes in and attempts to make the right recommendations.

This political value framework was shown to be evident in the initiation, development, and implementation of the Master Teacher Program. In the initiation of the idea, this framework was demonstrated in the conceptualization of the program by the use of an administration model for its development and implementation. The relationship was A over B rather than a dialogue model of development. The procedure in the Master Teacher Planning Committee meetings was politically oriented with the superintendent staying in complete control of the meetings and the decisions (Appendix H). Implicit in the notion of the technocratic preunderstandings demonstrated here are the false feelings of power and choice, the belief that one has control when indeed one does not. Teachers were given a small arena in which to operate, and from there they made only procedural decisions. In general, the large decisions were already made, not always with teachers' knowledge or at a level at which they questioned.

Huebner, along with James Macdonald and Paulo Friere, stressed that the interest in emancipation or domination can be detected in educational valuing and discourse. The discourse of domination or political control is prescriptive language. This is described by Friere (1970),

Every prescription represents the imposition of one man's choice upon another, transforming the consciousness of the man prescribed to into one that conforms with the prescriber's consciousness. Thus, the behavior of the oppressed is a prescribed behavior, following as it does the guidelines of the oppressor (p. 31).

Huebner also called this discourse "legitimizing language." Legitimizing language serves to make rational or legitimate actions of those in control. This served the purpose of establishing the claims that the people in power know what they are doing and have the right to make the decisions that they make. This type of language was demonstrated in rationalizing the choice to reward some teachers and not others. According to the Master Teacher concept, success is determined by character and hard work. The Puritan work ethic was appealed to as justification for the program, witnessed by the following statement from an administrator who was interviewed:

Here are some people that are working hard--that have demonstrated a high degree of capability. Let's honor them.

Political Darwinism was boldly espoused by most of those concerned with the development of the program. Survival of the fittest and the notion that the winners de-

served the rewards are firmly supported. That winners deserve to win and losers deserve to fail was taken for granted. This rationale, evident in the following statement also indicates the naturalness of this notion. One administrator stated:

Everybody can't be a master teacher. They don't have the ability. I know that's all elitest, and I don't apologize for that because I think there are different levels of competency. I know there are a lot of people in education who will never come up to (the level of) some others in education. They will never be able to relate to a class and get out of a class what some people can. Some people just have something they are born with to be able to relate to a group of kids and get them motivated.

The selection of the "best" or the elimination of what the program believes is a "poor" teacher was another aspect of the Master Teacher concept. One of the administrators said this:

But we have to get rid of the mediocre ones [teachers]!

Additionally, another administrator expressed:

If we're going to have all master teachers, and a teacher refuses to do those things that are necessary for improvement, whatever that might be, I think the only alternative is to eliminate them.

Ignored Values

If one examines only the criteria established (Appendix E) for selection of master teachers, the scientific, technical, and political values dominate; scientific valuing is demonstrated by the emphasis on measurement by testing; technical values are evident by establishing technical cri-

teria of seven years of experience and a master's degree; letters of recommendation from parents and peers and evaluation by principals and committees reveal the political values. Arrowsmith (1985) describes this type of teaching. He says,

Teaching becomes increasingly a matter of contractual relations, of measurable social utility, of quantifiable ends, of marketplace services (p. 56).

Conspicuously absent are aesthetic and ethical valuing. The qualities such as love of children, enthusiasm for teaching, or a fundamental belief in the worth and dignity of each individual are unquestioned and ignored.

Aesthetic Values. The main thrust of the aesthetic philosophic framework in education is the concern for the intrinsic nature and quality of educational experiences apart from the practical utilitarian function. The dominant values place man in the position of an "objective" being to be coerced by external stimuli. Thus, the master teacher concept is presented in Chapter II as a reward, a standard and a means of evaluation.

Huebner (1964, 1974, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c,) contends that the categories of objective learning are myths embedded in educational language which perhaps have prevented the development of other forms of thought. In exposing the problem resulting from interpreting learning only in psychological terms grounded in behavioral psychology, he asserted that educators view learning as a focus on changes in be-

havior. Huebner (1975a) asserts that this focus promoted shaping and conditioning rather than explaining man as creator, as transcendent being. It fails to see that man lives in the world, not apart from it. Aesthetic valuing presented another world view. This world view presented a different way of looking at people and their behavior. The Third Force in psychology viewed people as growing dynamic unique events in the process of becoming. It rather rejected the Stimulus/Response viewpoint, which is an objective descriptive way of looking at behavior that leads to mechanistic or manipulative ways of dealing with people in order to control the educational experience. People are considered "persons" of value rather than "objects" to be molded (Combs, 1965).

Within the dominant value framework, knowledge from man's scientific endeavor is presented to man who accepts this information unreflectively as a "given reality." Within the aesthetic framework, knowledge is not "out there" to be transmitted to the individual with the individual being tested to provide evidence that the accumulation of information has indeed occurred. It is, instead, an encounter with the external conditions in the environment through which man creates meaning. Mann (1975) poetically pointed out that "raw life is formless, chaotic and without meaning until man-the-artist creates meaning by bounding it" (p. 135). Huebner (1975a) states,

As an aesthetic form, knowledge in educational activity becomes symbolic of man's meanings and of his discovered truths. Knowledge as an esthetic form is a token of man's responsiveness to his own

feelings and inner life and to his being a part of its world. Scientific forms of knowledge point to man's willingness to listen to and observe the world around him and to be conditioned by the unknown world. Technical forms of knowledge are symbolic of man's power over the world, and of his desire to shape the world into his own image. Knowledge treated as having an existence beyond the individual or separated from man may be symbolic of man's unwillingness to assume responsibility for his own condition. Knowledge being made and remade in educational activity may symbolize that the educator recognizes that his knowledge is but one of the flowers of his life, which blooms and dies, and yet is the seed of new life (p. 234).

The Master Teacher Program placed the student in the position of being a passive recipient of some predetermined knowledge that was thought to be important for the student to know. Right answers became more important than personal meaning. Knowledge for the future rather than knowledge which can be enjoyed for its own sake was stressed.

On the other hand, Huebner (1975) believes that the student should be emancipated, should be freed to use knowledge to "heighten" his own significance, to "enlarge" his own sensitivities to the world, and to realize what he can be (p. 234). Huebner continues,

The nearly infinite possibilities of knowledge and knowing can be hinted at, and the mysteries of the world can be pointed to without the need to reduce them to problems to be solved (p. 234).

This knowledge Huebner speaks of has beauty and power. The student participates in the making of his own knowledge, adding to and subtracting from the possibilities. In a similar view, the perceptual psychologist views learning as

a personal discovery of meaning, a highly personal matter involving the way one sees himself and his experiences.

Greene (1985a, 1985b, 1985c) agrees with Huebner. In addition, she notes that the replacement of notions of excellence that have to do with the "enlargement of the mind" and the capacity for critical reflection have given way to technically constricted notions of competence (Greene, 1985b, p. 18). She calls for a recognition of a "multiplicity of excellence" (1985b, p. 19).

The notion of "uniqueness" is extremely important within the aesthetic framework. It views man as a unique unprecedented, unrepeatable creation. In Martin Buber's words man is "the source of all surprise in the universe" (as quoted by Nash, 1973, p. 4). Huebner (1975a) poetically expresses the uniqueness and complexity of man:

For centuries the poet has sung of his near infinitudes; the theologian has preached of his depravity and hinted of his participation in the divine; the philosopher has struggled to encompass him in his systems, only to have him repeatedly escape; the novelist and dramatist have captured his fleeting moments of pain and purity in never-to-be-forgotten aesthetic forms; and the man engaged in curriculum has the temerity to reduce this being to a single term--'learner'. . . The educator confronts the human being and no language will ever do him in or do him justice (pp. 219-220).

While Huebner (1965, 1974, 1975a, 1975b) confessed the inadequacies of our language to express the qualities of the "learner," educators professing to acknowledge "individual differences" continue to compile lists of standardized "competencies" for teachers and students whereby each is com-

pared and classified. A good teacher, Combs (1965) said, is "primarily a unique personality," each having his/her own peculiar methods, values, and techniques (p. 6). The master teacher concept, however, appeared to overlook uniqueness as a value. If good teachers are unique individuals, Combs contended, then "attempts to find common uniqueness would be very unlikely to get results" (p. 6).

The master teacher program also chose to classify people. Nash (1973) contended this was a value choice:

We are not compelled to classify; we could regard each student [teacher] as unique and incommensurable . . .the process of classification becomes so attractive and mind satisfying (not to say soul satisfying) to the classifier that he continues the process even when clear justification has closed and he may convince people (often including himself) that the labels of classification have a permanence and significance that in fact do harm to human potential (p. 5).

Historically, Greene (1985b) explains, from Jefferson to the present time educators have been at the center of the process of attempting to establish a "meritocratic society" (p. 4). Educators, she says, need to think about what is being done to "persons" when ". . .they structure social reality in terms of ladders, pyramids, hierarchies" (p. 144). Hierarchical notions, she asserts, infuse attitudes so people continue to "freeze persons" into superior and inferior categories (Greene,, 1985c, p. 144).

Classification, like that found within the master teacher program, often gives the illusion that there is one "universal model" of good teaching and that effective teach-

ers could be "carbon copies" of someone else's techniques, values, and personality. This was demonstrated through the identification of master teachers and the implication to the other members of the staff that this person is "worthy" of the position and "worthy" of emulation. During the interviews, several administrators confessed they wanted other teachers to "pattern" themselves after the master teachers. It was assumed that effective teaching was easily definable and easily identified. Pinar (1975a, 1975b) argues that students and teachers alike experience a loss of self via modeling. To desire to be like someone else, persons must first of all learn to be dissatisfied with themselves. This dissatisfaction was almost always conveyed by administrators to teachers and by teachers to students. Internalization represented a violation of self and leaves one questioning his adequacy as well as his identity.

Interviews with teachers from the three school districts revealed that the vast complex of competencies, all of which were demanded as criteria for good teaching, left them feeling "defenseless before criticism." Although these teachers expressed that many of the competencies did not fit their "person," the idea of a "standard" to which they "did not measure up to" made them feel "less" of a person and "inadequate" as a teacher. The failure to be considered as a master teacher left them feeling that no matter what they did well, it was never enough. Following are some of the teachers' comments:

I don't believe in the concept because I see all or most all of the teachers putting forth effort to do their best. Isn't that all anyone can ask of someone--their best?

My family and my students are my main priority. and I am not active in community projects. Yet, I would be penalized for this, if I choose to apply for master teacher. My points would be low in this part of the evaluation.

When someone is chosen as master teacher and given that title, it makes the rest of us--or it does me --feel that I am 'less' a person and not an effective teacher.

I've taught for almost twenty years in this same school system and I've always felt like I've given it all I had each year that I go into teaching. That's just the way I feel about it. As a teacher, I'm going to get in and give it all I have and I've always accepted my pay, wished and desired for more pay but, you know, we just have to take what we get and go on. I resent having to do above and beyond what I'm already doing for a pay increase. In other words, I've always done, I feel, my utmost to earn my pay and to do my job and I just resent having more expected of me to be called a master teacher, because I've done, and am doing, all that I possibly can, other than maybe taking a test, doing some extra paperwork, busy things, in order to earn the title of master teacher, which I don't care anything about. I think it's the every day 'getting in there and doing what you feel like you have to do and need to do to be a master teacher.' You should not have to be set aside to earn that title and to earn extra pay. I have been dedicated all these years. I resent having to keep doing more and more and more and more.

The school environment was conducive to educating students, but the emphasis was placed on basic skills. Teaching goals within the master teacher framework was detached from the inner life of the student. The student's interest and individuality were virtually ignored. Personal meaning of the curriculum content for the students was virtually ignored. It was assumed that the curriculum taught by the

teacher was the lesson learned by all the students; little emphasis was given to the students' ability to comprehend the lesson, perceive that which was important in their lives and to use this knowledge to create anew, to be artists constructing themselves, constructing life. The program was committed to predetermined standards. The generation or construction of knowledge is not discussed, nor is the learning of skills and attitudes appropriate for creating knowledge. Ambiguous knowledge is not identified as an objective. The creative arts, the humanities, social education, and the affective domain are exempt from the specified objectives rigorously applied to other subject areas. While these dimensions of instruction are verbally valued by advocates of master teacher programs, they receive little emphasis when implementation of master teacher programs is discussed. One reason given for ignoring these aspects of education is the difficulty of applying management techniques to objectives in these areas. The program did not offer to balance the personal and social interests of students. In fact, very few that this writer interviewed spoke of the child in any personal way. In fact, the student was usually discussed as a percentile, product, achiever, or under-achiever. Usually, when the child was discussed, the teacher invariably looked to a grade or a chart rather than to the student.

From the interviews and personal observation, however, this writer could feel the tension generated in teachers by the conflict between the requirements of the technical curriculum and their yearning for more personal involvement with the students, involvement in human activities beyond the technical. Unfortunately, in most cases, the power of technical control overrode the concerns of humanistic caring and took precedence over what the teacher might have thought important. Many of the teachers I spoke with seemed acutely aware of this lack of personal interaction, a closeness to students being pushed aside in deference to the technical curriculum.

The teachers, however, never seemed to question the legitimacy of the curriculum content as far as primacy of importance. They saw no problems with what they were "required to do;" in fact, most saw only problems with their own teaching. It wasn't efficient enough, thus, it did not allow them the time to implement their own activities. As a result, what is actually a normative issue of ends, what should be taught, was seen as an inadequacy on the part of the teacher in utilizing time wisely.

Teachers also seemed to believe it was natural and unquestionable that they should have no say concerning the ends of education and that they should teach curriculum decided upon by experts. The content to be taught was viewed by most administrators and teachers as most important of all. One teacher stated, "I'll have to concentrate on con-

tent. I have to concentrate on what will be tested at the end of the year."

Caring was seen by the teachers as the providing of a more personal kind of primary instruction. Because of the inherent norms of a system informed by technocratic values, care becomes simply the personal presentation of the technical mechanistic curriculum. The teachers, on the whole, did not see caring in terms of transcending the curriculum dictates; they saw it as an intensification, albeit personalization, of those dictates. When concern was combined with the technocratic-valued belief that educational problems were merely technical problems, then in an effort to acquire more time for human interaction with the student, a situation was created in which the student was certainly dehumanized (Apple, 1975; Pinar, 1975a, 1975b).

Although the main thrust of the Master Teacher Plan was cognitive development, Criteria 8 allowed for "other measures of student growth" (Appendix D). During the first year of implementation, test scores were unavailable because of the time factor involved in the application process. Therefore, samples of students' work and other evidence was allowed to be included in the evaluation process. During the interviews, several teachers shared with this author various materials that had been submitted. Two teachers that taught language arts had submitted an anthology written by the students. Therefore, aesthetic values were not completely ig-

nored. This book contained examples of the students' "response-ability" to their world.

Ethical Values. The ethical framework mentioned by Huebner (1975a) posits a world view described by Buber that is filled with I-Thou relationships rather than the I-It relationship inherent in the dominant value framework. People are viewed as "persons" rather than "objects." Buber describes this relationship as a dialogue of A with B rather than communication in a hierarchical bureaucratic structure of A over B. In the I-Thou model, each is regarded as a unique individual engaged in a reciprocal relationship in which each can influence the other.

Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985) have argued that education is a moral endeavor and that teachers and students cannot continue to be expected to leave their "persons" outside the door of the classroom in order to play a role. They agree with James Macdonald and Dwayne Huebner that a person has worth not because of his unique individuality but essentially because he is a person. Macdonald (1968) emphasized this concept:

A person is not to be thought of as a bundle of needs, or interests, or unique purposes that can be directed or guided or developed to someone's satisfaction (p. 30).

Creating an instructional experience sensitive to enhancing the person entails consideration of moral constructs such as "dialogue, promise, forgiveness, service, justice, beauty,

and vitality" (Macdonald, 1968). Huebner asserted that moral valuing demands that the "human situation existing between student and teacher must be uppermost" (p. 229). He presented the concept of response-ability, conversation, influence, promise and forgiveness. Response-ability or dialogue implies the notion that what everyone has to say carries equal weight (Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1985).

The master teacher concept virtually ignores this notion since teachers' and students' response-abilities are predominantly prespecified in observable and measurable terms (Appendix E, F). Ignoring the response-ability of teachers in the development and implementation of the master teacher program was evident throughout the interviews. For example, teachers were not consulted about whether they wanted a program or not. Even when the representative of the teachers expressed the teachers' concerns, these concerns were looked upon as "obstacles to be overcome" or "attitudes that needed to be changed" or "wrong conclusions that needed to be reeducated." The evaluation of the program conducted for the school districts by the Land Grant University Education Extension Office demonstrated this mentality (Appendix I). The teachers had answered the questions, written their views and expressed deep emotional concerns only to have the evaluators conclude that communication needed to be improved and teachers needed to understand what the districts were trying to do for them.

Concerning the Master Teacher Evaluation Report (1985) one teacher stated,

Of course, they asked our opinion as to how we felt about it and would we apply. If not, why not? If we felt like the criteria for master teacher--if they had chosen the right criteria for master teacher. I felt better after I was able to (express my opinion), because that's the first time they ever asked us anything about it. I felt better about it--knowing that it may not mean a thing. My husband and I were home that night. I said, 'You know how I feel . . . ' and I just started telling him and he told me, 'Write it down on paper.' I did. Seems like we've always kept what we really feel for so long. Now I'm beginning to think, if you have the opportunity to say what you think, just say it. So, I said what I and most of the teachers felt: 'We don't want the program. It's not good and when the idea is not good, it can't be improved.'

In the Master Teacher Evaluation Report (1985), however, we read:

They [teachers] believed that the evaluation process was an opportunity for them and their fellow teachers to express their opinions regarding the kinds of changes which might make the program more effective in the future (Appendix I).

Although the evaluators acknowledged that some of the issues are philosophically rooted, the notion is that teachers misunderstood the Master Teacher Program. The Master Teacher Evaluation Report (1985) states,

Some of the concern is deeply rooted in fundamental disagreements on the definition of an effective professional teacher, on whether a teacher's performance in and out of the classroom can be fairly and adequately evaluated, and on whether any part of a teacher's compensation should be tied to a performance-based set of criteria. Some of the concern, on the other hand, may be traced to misunderstandings about the program and the way it was intended to operate (Appendix I).

The notion that teachers misunderstood the program was noted in the following statements:

Some of the concern, on the other hand, may be traced to misunderstandings about the program and the way it was intended to operate (Appendix I).

The misperception regarding the selection process which surfaced on the questionnaires is one which might very well color teachers' perceptions of the fairness and equity of the entire program (Appendix I).

The need for teachers to be reeducated can be seen in the following suggestions from the Master Teacher Evaluation Report that teachers should be included in

informed discussion . . .which would serve . . . to clarify other aspects of the process . . .to correct misconceptions . . .to describe . . .for all teachers the kind of training being provided . . . (Appendix I).

During the interviews this researcher conducted, the evaluation process was viewed as a means to finally inform administrators and others "how teachers felt about the program and the negative impact it had on the school, teachers and students." The teachers viewed it as a means of saying, "Forget it! Find another means of benefiting our students and teaching staff" rather than "trying to improve on a program we don't want."

In the evaluation report, "teachers," not the "program," were viewed as the "problem" to overcome:

The single largest problem at the present time appears to be the acceptance of the program by the corps of teachers in each school district and the effect of the program on teacher morale (Appendix I).

Teachers were viewed as non-experts who should take into consideration the "expert" knowledge that went into the development of the program. The report says,

All teachers would probably benefit from a clarification of the details of the program--the composition of the selection committee, the selection criteria, etc.--and a discussion by those who participated in the design of the program of the rationale behind some of the choices which were made in developing the program's specific features (Appendix I).

It is noted, also, that those who are expert should inform those less knowledgeable. The evaluator stated,

Those that are informed are encouraged to share their 'expertise' (Appendix I).

Their expertise and familiarity with the many different issues and concerns germane to the topic is unique in the districts, and the sharing of their knowledge might serve to inform the judgments of others (Appendix I).

Along the same line, the suggestions of teachers are to be weighed as uninformed;

The suggestions which surfaced on the questionnaires should be considered in light of the committee's extensive familiarity with the subject (Appendix I).

Further, the evaluation report stated that not only should the training of "expert" evaluators be described but teachers should be allowed participation in training so they can be educated regarding the following:

All teachers might benefit from the kinds of discussions regarding performance appraisal, the role of expert judgment in the evaluation and selection process, the attributes of effective teaching, etc., which would undoubtedly be part of such a training session (1985, p. 32).

It was evident throughout the process that teachers' and students' feelings and concerns as "persons" were virtually ignored. Huebner (1975a, 1975b, 1975e) contends that in perceiving education as something one person does to another individual results in programs that abstract and alienate people.

Along the same line, students' response-abilities were also ignored. Huebner (1975a) contends, "forcing responses into preconceived, conditioned patterns inhibits this participation in the world's creation" (p. 230). He continues, "limiting response-ability to existing forms of responsiveness denies others their possibility of evolving new ways of existing" (p. 230). The Master Teacher Concept, with the emphasis on testing, determines the responses of students, which limits the expressive statements of children. Huebner (1975a) states that the consequence of testing is exemplified in conditioned responses and the notion of the curriculum being taught as a body of "knowns" and sure things rather than as an activity of man which illuminates the unknown and man's poetic character.

Next, Huebner (1975a, 1975c) contends that knowledge, used in the process of educational influences between educator and student, becomes an instrument of promise. The teacher promises that the educational activity will have personal meaning for the student. Huebner (1975a) remarks,

Look, with this knowledge I can promise you that you can find new wonders in the world; you can find new people who can interest you; and in so finding you can discover what you are and what you

can become. In so doing you can help discover what man is, has been, and can be. With this knowledge I promise you, not enslavement, not a reduction of your power, but fulfillment and possibility and response-ability. The real teacher feels this promise. He knows the tinge of excitement as the student finds new joys, new mysteries, new power, and new awareness that a full present leads to a future (p. 231)

It should be noted that the promise for personal meaning implies the present "being in the world." Huebner states that most educational activity sacrifices the present on the altar of the future. He states,

Too often today, promise is replaced by demand, responsibility by exceptions, and conversation by telling, asking, and answering (p. 231).

Forgiveness was another important concept mentioned by Huebner. This concept implies the freedom to risk making mistakes, being imperfect and non-expert at every endeavor, and risk-taking is imperative in personal and professional growth. Carl Rogers presents three conditions needed for a climate to be conducive to risk-taking and growth-promoting. These are congruencies, unconditional positive regard, and empathetic understanding. This means that the teacher does not put on a front or facade but is free to be him/herself which frees other persons to be themselves. Unconditional regard refers to an acceptance of the person as s/he is at that moment in the process of becoming. Empathetic understanding means that the educator senses accurately the feelings and personal meanings the other person is experiencing and communicates these to the individual. These conditions provide greater freedom to become one's self (Rogers, 1969,

1983). Teachers in the three Oklahoma school districts, however, expressed a fear of being themselves; they felt the Master Teacher Concept demanded them to be something or someone other than what they were. Teachers felt that "right action" and "right answers" were demanded of them and their students. Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985) agree that school environments functioning solely on the basis of the "right-wrong answer and appropriate behavior syndromes" need to entertain the alternative of "goofing up" necessary in risk-taking (p. 10). Forgiveness becomes an essential ingredient in educational environments. Huebner (1975a) states,

With the power to forgive and to be forgiven, the educator dares to influence and to be influenced in the present. With the possibility of forgiveness the student dares to express himself, to leap into the unknown, and to respond with the totality of his being. As long as man is finite, promise must be accompanied by the possibility of forgiveness, otherwise only the old, the known, the tried and tested will be evoked. Because the educator dares to influence, he must have the courage to permeate classroom activity with the ever-present possibility of forgiveness; for if he does not, his influence carries with it seeds of destruction through omniscience which can be only demonic (p. 232).

In summary, Huebner (1975a) argues that the three dominant value frameworks presently found in educational endeavors are scientific, technical, and political. These three frameworks were found to stand out in the Master Teacher Concept as developed and implemented in the Master Teacher Program of Stanley, Wayside and Clearwater. This writer agrees with Huebner that the aesthetic and ethical values

were virtually ignored. Without a doubt, a majority of the comments given by the administrators indicate a congruency between their values and those technical, scientific, and political values operating in the Master Teacher Program. Interviews with teachers, however, show not necessarily a dissent with these values but an awareness of and yearning for the missing ethical and aesthetic values. A poignant cry for the recognition, inclusion, and honoring of these values is heard in comment after comment. Perhaps a holistic Master Teacher Plan would suit both administrators and teachers by giving equal status to the ethical and aesthetic values as well as the others listed in Huebner's five value framework.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the value base of the Master Teacher Concept as implemented in three school districts in western Oklahoma. In Chapter I the author suggested that this study might serve those contemplating the development of a master teacher program as an aid in clarifying their beliefs and values and, ultimately in determining whether "that which is advocated is really what is desired" (Dobson and Dobson, 1981, p. 65).

Chapter II discussed several issues pertinent to the study of the Master Teacher Concept. First, the history of merit pay was presented. Second, three definitions of master teacher were reviewed. They were: the designation of master teacher as a reward to teachers who comply with stated requirements; master teacher as described by stated criteria for a standard; and master teacher as a means of evaluation. The research concerning the advantages and disadvantages of the concept was reviewed. Finally, three major paradigms of teacher effectiveness research--dominant,

token, and ignored--were also discussed. According to Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985), the dominant paradigm, which is meant to represent reality, in fact presents an illusion of the "universal teacher," "xerox model," or "role access model." Combs (1965) describes the token paradigm presented by Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985) as one in which teachers are encouraged to know themselves and use themselves in the teacher/student relationship. The ignored paradigm, an organic approach to teacher effectiveness research, questions assumptions underlying existing modes of research of curriculum development and instructional pedagogy. These reconceptualists focus their research efforts on the philosophic roots underpinning programmatic efforts of amelioration.

Chapter III contained a description of the methods and procedures utilized by the writer in this study. The semi-structured interview technique was used and the responses of the teachers and administrators were recorded; and later, the audio tape cassettes were transcribed. In addition, written documents and interviews were analyzed. This chapter also contained a description of Huebner's Five Value Frameworks, which served as an interpretative tool.

This study provided an opportunity for participants to express and communicate their perceptions, feelings, and ultimately their values. Through this means of communication, a new world was created and shared. Thus, via dia-

logue, both the interviewer and the interviewee have learned.

Chapter IV reported the origin and the process of development of the pilot project, findings of the interviews, and an analysis of written documents and interviews. Huebner's five value frameworks served as the interpretive tool. The categories of values were: scientific, technical, political, aesthetic and ethical.

In Chapter IV, participants spoke for themselves. Different notions about the Master Teacher Concept and various components of the program were discussed. These comments gave both richness and depth to this study. Teachers chose to discuss a variety of issues, from specifics related to a single aspect of the program to broader questions concerning the nature of education and its relation to learning. Participants directed their comments both to the content and process of the Master Teacher Program and they revealed feelings about administrators, about their fellow teachers, about children, about schooling, and about their job. Six themes emerged that served as sub-headings for the interview data: (1) notions about the Master Teacher Program, (2) criteria for selecting a master teacher, (3) teachers' performance, (4) testing of students and teachers, (5) conception of evaluation, and (6) problems with the plan.

The data revealed that the Master Teacher Program has been a negative force in the eyes of most teachers. The patterns of responses are clear and consistent. The "Master

Teacher Program Evaluation Report" (1985) stated that 65% and 77% of the teachers in the two school districts evaluated had participated in negative discussions concerning the program and 42% and 72% of the teachers did not want additional state dollars to be spent in continuing the program (Appendix I). In addition, the master teacher evaluation report stated that 100% of the teachers from the Stanley school district and 80% of the teachers from Wayside indicated that they had not benefited from the program (Appendix I). It is not really necessary to use statistical techniques in analyzing these data. The results are straightforward; the messages were clear. The messages conveyed were that most teachers felt that the master teacher concept had been administrator-imposed upon them, and the developers of the plan had failed to take into consideration the perceptions, needs, and values of teachers or students. The data revealed that the master teacher concept was based on a technical-political, scientific and rational explanation of man and the aesthetic and ethical qualities of human relationships were virtually ignored. The Master Teacher Program has failed to meet the needs of teachers. Regardless of how one feels about performance-based accountability teachers' perspectives, needs, and values need to be understood and taken into account in program development (Combs, 1969; Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger, 1980; Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1985).

Further information pertinent to this study is included in the Appendixes which consist of the following: Appendix A contains Table V. Table V presents a list of the various types of merit pay programs. Appendix B contains correspondence from the three school districts giving permission to conduct the research, interview the teachers, and have access to the written documents. Appendix C contains a sample transcribed manuscript of one of the interviews that the researcher conducted. Appendix D contains a copy of the proposal to plan and implement a pilot 'master teacher' program for the state of Oklahoma. Appendix E contains a copy of the master teacher program. Appendix F consists of the application and evaluation forms from the "Master Teacher Application Packet." Appendix G contains a summary of the involvement of the Land Grant University with the school districts of Clearwater, Stanley and Wayside. Appendix H consists of the minutes of the school districts and combined Master Teacher Plan Committee. Appendix I contains the "Master Teacher Evaluation Report." Appendix J consists of sample field notes. Appendix K contains the memorandum from the Dean of Education.

Implications

To recapitulate, it was stated in the first chapter that this study was undertaken as an attempt to ascertain the value framework explicitly and implicitly embedded in the conceptualization of the Master Teacher Program. For

the purpose of this study, values were divided into five categories developed by Dwayne Huebner which were used as the interpretive tools for the analysis. The categories included: scientific, technical, political, aesthetic and ethical values. Fundamentally, the analysis of the Master Teacher Concept consisted of registering the themes dominant in the written documents and the interviews obtained with participants in the program. It was found that the scientific, technical and political values were dominant and that the aesthetic and ethical were virtually ignored.

The dominance of technical, political and scientific values, to the exclusion of aesthetic and ethical values not only creates an "imbalanced view" of reality but an "incomplete" educational experience for students and teachers. Huebner (1975a, 1975b, 1975e) asserts that educational endeavors are richer and more meaningful when all five value categories are considered and reflected in program planning. Programs and classroom activity, which are socially significant because of heightened technical efficiency might have greater personal significance for students and teachers if the aesthetic and ethical categories are used to value the activity. In order to include aesthetic and ethical values, Huebner (1964, 1974, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1975e) suggested that an alternative language needs to be considered in talking about persons. Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985) express this need for a "new way of thinking about what we have already thought" (p. 61). With a different language,

one which stresses "growth" rather than "production," there would be possibilities of creating new metaphors to project new images and, hopefully, create a better world for teachers and students in the present as well as in the future.

Elliot Eisner has expanded Huebner's work and has become the leading advocate for developing aesthetic rationality into a method of educational criticism. Eisner has described the goal of educational criticism as the rendering of the nature of educational activity into language so that others will understand it more deeply. Educational "connoisseurship" is one alternative for educators which allows them to break from technological rationality and explore other possible modes of evaluating and explaining educational endeavors. This alternative mode engages educators in moral or ethical and aesthetic reflection.

The ultimate aim of including aesthetic and ethical values is the development of an emancipatory form of reflection. The aesthetic and ethical frameworks provide a method for demystifying knowledge and allowing persons to create their own meaning, pursue personal inquiries, and extend beyond what they have been taught. The "extending beyond" and "transcending self" convey the idea of "mastery" encouraged within the ignored aesthetic and ethical value frameworks (Greene, 1985a, p. 17). In 1934, Dewey touched upon this "extending beyond" in the idea of mastery in the fields of art. He explains,

The masters themselves usually serve an apprenticeship; but as they mature they absorb what they

have learned into their own individual experience, vision, and style. They are masters precisely because they do not follow either models or rules but subdue both of these things to serve enlargement of personal experience (p. 301).

This suggests that mastery can never be defined with reference to a set of predefined models, criteria, or articulated standards. Greene (1985a) contends that the application of principle to practice takes place through the transforming medium of "personality and personal action." She states,

If, indeed, the sharing relationship we hope to see among teachers and their students grows out of a soil of moral commitment, personal action to realize articulated values is needed. To me, those values include regard for the individuality and sense of agency of the other, freedom and transcendence rather than sheltering and control, solicitude, intellectual passion, integrity, clarity, and mutual concern (p. 25).

Further,

The master teacher may be said to have incarnated many of these values, but they cannot be identified with measurable qualities. They can only be discovered through reciprocity, through a dialogue involving moral beings open to possibility, to what lies forever beyond. Similarly, merit can only be discerned in attachment to and action on such values (p. 25).

The importance of considering value priorities in educational endeavors cannot be overemphasized. The process of education and development of programs demand unceasing analysis and critical reflection because it is not a neutral, value-free process. As stated in Chapter I education is a life-long process, a normative enterprise, and a moral endeavor. Macdonald (1971) asserts that,

Education in formal schools is essentially a moral enterprise. This is simply and fundamentally true

inasmuch as adults decide that the young should grow up in certain prescribed ways and learn certain kinds of things rather than others. There are judgments which directly influence the development of each human being and provide both possibilities for freedom and sets of constraints upon individuals (p. 7).

Value priorities, according to Huebner (1966) generally are set in one of the basic educational referents: subject matter, social phenomenon, or people (learners). Macdonald (1971) agrees that ". . .it does make a difference which one of the three one begins with" (p. 199). He states,

This is frequently so because the choice of priority often implies a value position about a referent that makes the definition of this referent different from what its definition would be if it came later in the set of priorities (p. 199).

In essence, the study of values is the study of "how to make a world" for children (Macdonald, 1971, p. 199). Choice is a matter of considerable "philosophical import," Joyce and Weil (1980) contend, since the teaching model that is promoted by different programs "gently and subtly create the world of the learner and the teacher. The world is learned, along with its values" (p. 20). They state,

We think of teaching as a process by which teachers and students create a shared environment including sets of values and beliefs (agreement about what is important) which in turn colors their view of reality. The 'models' of teaching that we choose have much to say about the kind of realities admitted to the classrooms and the kind of life-view likely to be generated as teacher and learner work together (p. 1).

Making a world with children is not simply concern for the educative environment; it is also "concern for the human events that occur within the environment" (Huebner, 1975a,

p. 265). Educators are endowed with the responsibility of allowing persons to become fully functioning human beings capable of making decisions and critical judgments about their world. Relationships among students and between students and their teachers are an important aspect of education in that they help youngsters develop their own self-concepts--those lasting values which children will carry with them throughout their lives. Therefore, the human quality in education cannot continue to be overlooked. It cannot continue to be assumed that the aesthetic and ethical values are automatically included in educational planning (Eisner, 1985; Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1985; Greene, 1985a, 1985b, 1985c; Huebner, 1964, 1974, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1975e).

In considering the aesthetic and ethical values, Rogers (1969) in his book entitled Freedom to Learn, points out that basic questions that often plague students are "Who am I? Why am I here? What is the meaning of life?" In developing educational programs, a serious effort to organize and use knowledge to address the problems and issues of life could be considered. Mulder (1984) states that the basic questions asked in such programs might well be "What are the problems people face in this world?" and "How can schools and teachers be used to alleviate or help solve those answers?" He emphasizes that sources consulted for answers could bridge across disciplines rather than focusing on just the one discipline of behavior psychology. According to

Mulder (1984), this focus on behaviorism in educational planning presents a limited and distorted world view.

The master teacher concept, rooted in behaviorism and positivism, presents a different conceptualization of teachers and students than the psychology known as person-centered or humanistic. The master teacher concept promotes the conception of the student as a passive, empty vessel as contrasted to the conception of the student as an active participant and creative artist. The master teacher concept also promotes the conception of the teacher as an object to be molded and externally motivated as contrasted to the artistic professional.

From the humanistic position it is considered the inherent right of each person to be accepted, respected, and treated as a capable unique individual. Each person is viewed as unique and complex as the first rose of summer; that each has his/ her own special abilities, characteristics, interests, values, experiences, and development (Aspy, 1978). Teachers are free to be "authentic" (Rogers, 1983) and to use their unique personalities to give guidance and support when necessary without dominating the work process (Combs, 1969). Person-centered psychologists feel that young children grow as they are given choices of curriculum content and methodology from a range of available options according to their personal interests and values. As children experience success, and faith in children is demonstra-

ted by teachers and parents, students are motivated to proceed in a learning continuum that promotes higher levels of learning and self-esteem (Aspy, 1978). The teacher supports children's thinking and provide options and learning experiences for each child in an atmosphere of trust.

In promoting this type of curriculum experience, teachers play a significant part. If this assertion is valid, then, teachers' self awareness of their beliefs and values is basic. In order to facilitate this awareness, Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger (1980) suggest dialogue concerning differing philosophies among members of a school. They contend that with the ". . . uniqueness of each individual teacher prized in the schools, then and only then, will the uniqueness of individual children also be emphasized" (p. 73). Further, ". . .when this emphasis upon the uniqueness of individual persons in the schools is achieved, then learning, total personal development, will flourish" (p. 73). Most important, according to these authors, is the discussion concerning the priority of values. They state,

. . .students and teachers alike engage in 'self-betrayal' of values, forcing themselves to fit into another's mold and to "interact with others in ways that have no personal meaning or value (Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger, 1980, p. 82).

These authors stress the need to allow all concerned to express and explore their values to facilitate the "unfolding of self and others," to encourage growth of the "fully functioning person" (p. 84).

Growth, according to these authors and other reconceptualists, occurs only as persons question the "taken for granted" rather than accepting their situation as determined, as given (Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1985; Eisner, 1985; Pinar, 1975a, 1975b; Greene, 1985a, 1985b, 1985c). In addition, Greene (1985c) points out that only in "visualizing," in "possibilizing" of things being other than they are--of transcending such existence is one empowered to ". . . discover a new freedom for themselves--a power to decide how they want to conduct themselves and how they want to be judged" (p. 169).

In sum, schools are complex, interrelated social organizations made up of persons with varying perceptions, philosophies, needs and values. "Simplistic approaches to improving the quality of schools are ineffective" (Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger, 1980, p. 73). Also, since education is a normative enterprise and a moral endeavor, considerations relative to amelioration ought to consist of moral judgments concerning the good and the right. Greene (1985a) suggests that the concepts of mastery and merit cannot be separated from a vision of a transformed school in search for a better order of things. She contends that,

The very making of them ought to be a way of creating values, of moving toward possibility. It is a matter of our shaping our purposes once again, of pondering together--not simply what is, but what ought to come to be (p. 25).

Recommendations for Further Research

This study brought to light many aspects of education which could not be fully researched here. Identifying the values in the Master Teacher concept was the purpose of this study. However, it is suggested that each of the five value frameworks be studied in depth separately. It was not the author's intention in Chapter IV to present a contrast of teachers' and administrators' perceptions concerning teacher effectiveness. However, this difference in perception was evident. Differences in perceived teacher effectiveness, from the viewpoints of administrators and teachers, is thus a topic deserving of more study. Value congruency/ dissonance among teachers and administrators could be studied further. An appropriate tool for determining value congruence would be the Perceptual Base Line System developed by Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger (1980). The interviews could be studied for indications of alienation or nonalienation and teacher objectification of self and others using a similar methodology utilized by Bullough et al (1982). Another interest could be the study of the Master Teacher Concept and the ideology of domination. Yet another area in which further research is warranted is that of the outside political and social forces (state legislature, mandates, parent organizations) affecting the school system.

Man's temporality was an important theme in Huebner's (1975b, 1975c) writing. Perhaps the significance of educa-

tion in which the meaning of life and death is uppermost in dialogue would cause serious consideration of optimal use of time during school programs and life. This theme needs further study. Participants in the program raised an important question that warrants attention:

If master teacher programs have continually failed, why does the idea that we can measure merit persist?

Concluding Comments

It was noted that administrators in the Master Teacher Program in Oklahoma used various forms of "management technology" in envisioning, implementing and carrying out the Master Teacher Program in their respective districts. It has further been shown that the "production methodology concept" prevalent in business today is also evident in educational rhetoric. "Production" and "performance" are buzzwords in the field of education in relation to both teachers and students, and testing has become the primary means by which the "end product" is judged. Administrative control over the participants in the program as a means by which to bring about the desired end was another factor considered in the analysis of the program.

This researcher experienced in these three school districts a world view that perpetuates an ideology that reconceptualist curriculum writers contend saturates the consciousness of education to the point that the reality that is constructed is taken for granted and is not viewed

as problematic (Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting, 1981; Apple, 1982, 1983; Kliebard, 1975a, 1975b). This vision of education functions as an ideology of management. An ideology of management, rooted in control, results in systems of domination and exploitation, often, without being consciously recognized by the people involved (Apple, 1982; Kliebard, 1975a, 1975b). As noted in Chapter II, Apple (1982) refers to this notion in the "deskilling and reskilling" of teachers by saying,

While the deskilling involves the loss of craft, the ongoing atrophication of educational skills, the reskilling involves the substitution of the skill and ideological visions of management (p. 146).

He also points out that there are three kinds of control that can be employed to help extract more work-- simple, technical, and bureaucratic. Simple control is exactly that, simply telling someone that you have decided what he/she should do, or else. Technical controls are less obvious because controls are embodied in the physical structure of the job. Finally, bureaucratic control signifies a social structure where control is less visible due to the fact that its principles are embedded within the hierarchical social relations of the workplace. He goes on to argue that technical and bureaucratic control and deskilling tend to go hand in hand. He states,

deskilling is part of a long process in which labor is divided and then redivided to increase productivity, to reduce 'inefficiency,' and to control both the cost and the impact of labor (p. 147).

He continues,

Management attempts to separate conception from execution. The control of knowledge enables management to plan; the worker should ideally merely carry these plans out to the specifications, and at the pace set by people away from the actual point of production (p. 148).

This separation results in reskilling as well as deskilling. Thus, the relatively autonomous nature of teaching is lost and the art of teaching is replaced by an ideology of scientism and management. In the Master Teacher Program, rather than simple control being used, where control is openly exercised by supervisors or persons in authority (and hence possibly subverted by teachers), power was made invisible by being incorporated into the very structure of the work itself. The control comes from what seems to be a legitimate overall structure which is taken for granted (Apple, 1982, 1983).

The final decisions to be made by teachers and administrators, as well as this author, are whether or not to adapt to demands placed on them externally which may result in alienation of self, hypocrisy, or mask-wearing; whether or not to leave their positions, or create an illusion of compliance in attempts to beat the system, or whether to participate in emancipatory praxis. Reflective thinking and value congruencies in action are essential aspects of this self reflection action. Eisner (1979) presents a thought-provoking observation:

What is truly sad is that those of us in the field of education--teachers, administrators, professors of education--have so seldom tried to help the

public understand the complexities of education as a process (p. 13).

He continues by raising poignant questions:

Why have we been so willing to accept assumptions about teaching, curriculum, and evaluation that have at least questionable validity? Why is it that we have so seldom pointed out the practical naivete` of promises to make schools more effective by setting up minimum standards and by measuring . . . (p. 13).

Education can continue to focus upon the achievement of learning objectives rooted in the technical, political and scientific value framework and neglect the fundamental goals of the aesthetic and ethical value framework dedicated to the fundamental goals of freedom. According to Macdonald (1971), Dobson and Dobson (1981), and Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985), freedom of the individual constitutes the only tenable moral goal of individual development and, simultaneously, the only process by which freedom can realize itself as a goal. The conflict between education benefiting the individual rather than the collective society, and educators being centrally responsible to children rather than accountable to the collective society demands prioritizing personal choices. Macdonald (1971) asserts that,

One will perform technical acts in either case, but one can escape the moral responsibility for his acts if one is mainly accountable to the collective. However, if one assumes moral responsibility, then the individual must come before the collective (p. 7).

Greene (1985a) adds these questions to the ones posed by Elliot Eisner:

Given alternative possibilities, will the individual who judges [merit and mastery] give primary loyalty to what the commissions or state agencies now demand or to what he or she perceive to be the needs and desires of diverse individual children? Will the person respond to the summons of conscience or accede to institutional demand (p. 18)?

In the final analysis, the questions to be answered are personal. The individual must choose his/her own way, pose his/her own questions, and listen intently as the self and world converse.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Apple, M. Commonsense categories and curriculum thought. In J. Macdonald and E. Zaret (Eds.), Schools in search of meaning. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.
- Apple, M. The hidden curriculum and the nature of conflict. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.
- Apple, M. Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan, 1979.
- Apple, M. Education and power. Boston, Massachusetts: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Apple, M. Curricular form and the logic of technical control. In M. Apple and L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in schooling. Temple, TN: Temple University Press, 1983.
- Argyris, C. Human problems with budgets. Harvard Business Review, 1953, 31, 108.
- Arrowsmith, W. The calling of teaching. In D. Purpel and H. Shapiro (Eds.), School and meaning. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1985.
- Aspy, D. Research on humanistic objectives. In R. Leeper (Ed.), Humanistic education: Objectives and assessment. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1978.
- Aspy, D. and Roebuck, F. Affective education: Sound investment. Educational Leadership, 1982, 39, 488-494.
- Avila, D., Combs, A. and Purkey, W. The helping relationship sourcebook. Second edition. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977.
- Barber, L., and Klein, K. Merit pay and teacher evaluation. Phi Delta Kappan, 1983, 65, 247-251.
- Barr, A. Teaching competencies. In W. Monroe (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research. New York: Macmillan, 1950.

- Barr, A. Measurement of teacher characteristics and prediction of teaching efficiency. Review of Educational Research, 1952, 22, 169-174.
- Barr, A., Burton, W. and Brueckner, L. Supervision. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938.
- Bell, T. A philosophy of education for the space age. New York: Exposition Press, Inc., 1962.
- Bell, T. The master teacher. School Business Affairs, 1984, 7, 31-43.
- Berger, P., and Luckmann, T. The social construction of reality. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.
- Biaggi, L. A design for teachers' beliefs-practice congruency in secondary schools. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.) Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, 1982.
- Biddle, B. and Ellena, W. (Eds.) Contemporary research on teacher effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Bird, T. School organization and the rewards of teaching. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1984.
- Bobbitt, J. The elimination of waste in education. The Elementary School Teacher, 1912, 12, 260-267.
- Bolton, D. Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1973.
- Brighton, S., and Hannan, C. Merit pay programs for teachers: A handbook. San Fransisco: Fearon Publishers, Inc., 1962.
- Broudy, H. Building a philosophy of education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Broudy, H. A critique of performance based teacher education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of College for Teacher Education, 1972.
- Broudy, H. Predicaments, problems, puzzles, and paradoxes in educational research. Educational Theory, 1983, 33, 33-39.
- Broudy, J. A good teacher is harder to define than find. American School Journal, 1977, 164, 25-28.

- Bullough, R., Goldstein, S. and Holt, L. Rationale curriculum: Teachers and alienation. The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 1982, 2, 132-143.
- Butler, J. The role of value theory in education. In P. Smith (Ed.), Theories of value and problems of education. Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1970.
- Callahan, R. Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Casey, W. Would Bear Bryant teach in the public schools? Phi Delta Kappan, 1982, 64, 500-501.
- Charters, W., and Waples, D. The commonwealth teacher training study. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Chruden, H. and Sherman, A. Personnel Management. Fifth edition. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western Publishing Company, 1976.
- Clarke, G. Merit rating: Myth or possibility. National Elementary Principal, 1973, 52, 101-103.
- Clute, M. Humanistic education: Goals and objectives. In R. Leeper (Ed.), Humanistic education: Objectives and assessment. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1978.
- Cohn, M., Kottkamp, R. and Provenzo, E., Jr. Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes. Phi Delta Kappan, 1986, 67, 559-567.
- Combs, A. Perceiving, behaving, becoming. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962.
- Combs, A. The professional education of teachers. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.
- Combs, A. Florida studies in the helping professions. Social Science Monograph. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1969.
- Combs, A. Why the humanistic movement needs a perceptual psychology. Journal of the Association for the Study of Perception, 1974, 9, 13-19.
- Combs, A. Myths in education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979.

- Combs, A. A personal approach to training: Teaching beliefs that make a difference. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982.
- Costa, A. A reaction to Hunter's knowing, teaching, and supervising. In P.L. Hosford (Ed.), Using what we know about teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.
- Cross, P. The rising tide of school reform reports. Phi Delta Kappan, 1984, 66, 167-172.
- Cubberly, E. Public administration. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1915.
- Culbertson, J. Three epistemologies and the study of educational administration. The University Council for Educational Administration Review, 1981, 22, 1-6.
- Curran, W. Ethics in medicine: Historical perspective and contemporary concern. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977.
- Daresh, J. Where is the merit in merit pay? Kappa Delta Pi Record, 1985, 21, 77-80.
- Darling-Hammond, L. A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession. The Elementary School Journal, 1986, 86, 530-551.
- Darling-Hammond, L., and Wise, A. Teaching standards, or standardized teaching? Educational Leadership, 1983, 40, 66-69.
- Daugherty, G. and Dronberger, G. A merit pay program that works: The Seiling, Oklahoma experience. Spectrum, 1983, 1, 3-10.
- Deci, E. Intrinsic motivation. New York: Plenum Press, 1975.
- Deci, E. The hidden costs of rewards. Organizational Dynamics, 1976, 4, 61-72.
- Department of Education. Tennessee Master Teacher Program. Nashville, Tennessee: State Department of Education, 1983.
- Dewey, J. Democracy and Education. New York: The Free Press, 1916.
- Dewey, J. Art as experience. New York: Monton, Balch, 1934.

- Dewey, J. Lectures in the philosophy of education. New York: Random House, Inc., 1966.
- Dobson, J., Grey, B. and Dobson, R. The effects of teacher-counselor consultation on the sociometric status and achievement of elementary school children. Research in Education, ED 172103, 1979.
- Dobson, R., Dobson, J. and Koetting, R. Problematic aspects of school reform. (Unpublished paper presented at Oklahoma State University.) Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, 1981.
- Dobson, R., Dobson, J., and Koetting, J. Looking at, talking about, and living with children. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1985.
- Dobson, R., Dobson, J., and Kessinger, J. Staff development. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, Inc., 1980.
- Dobson, R., and Dobson, J. The language of schooling. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, Inc., 1981.
- Doremus, R. What ever happened to Kalamazoo's merit pay plan. Phi Delta Kappan, 1982, 63, 409-410.
- Downs, C., Berg, D., and Unkugel, W. The organizational communicator. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Educational Research Service Report. Merit pay plans for teachers: Status and descriptions. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1979.
- Educational Research Service Report. Merit pay for teachers. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1979.
- Educational Research Service Report. Evaluating teacher performance. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1979.
- Eisner, E. The educational imagination. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1979.
- Eisner, E. The educational imagination. Second edition. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1985.
- Elam, S. Performance-based teacher education: What is the state of the art? Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1971.

- Emans, R. A proposed conceptual framework for curriculum development. The Journal Of Educational Research, 1966, 59, 327-332.
- Etizioni, A. A comparative analysis of complex organizations: On power, involvement, and their correlates. New York: Free Press, 1975.
- Feldvelbel, A. Teacher evaluation: Ingredients of a credible model. The Clearing House, 1980, 53, 415-420.
- Friere, P. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Seabury Press, 1970.
- Friere, P. The adult literacy process as cultural action for freedom. In J. Snarey, F. Epstein, C. Sienkiewicz, and P. Zoghates (Eds.), Conflict and continuity: A history of ideas on social equality and human development. Boston: Harvard Educational Review, 1981.
- Fronidizi, R. What is value? An introduction to axiology. Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company, Inc., 1963.
- Gallup, A. The Gallup poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1984, 66, 97-107.
- Gallup, A. The Gallup poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools. Part 2. Phi Delta Kappan, 1985 17, 323-355.
- Giroux, H., Penna A., and Pinar, W. (Eds.), Curriculum & Instruction: Alternatives in education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1981.
- Glaser, B., and Strauss, A. The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.
- Gold, R. Roles in sociological field observations. In G. McCall and J. Simmons (Eds.), Issues in participant observation: A text and reader. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.
- Goodlad, J. The dynamics of educational change: Toward responsive schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Goodlad, J. A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1983a.
- Goodlad, J. Teaching: An endangered profession. Teachers College Record, 1983b, 84, 575-578.

- Greene, M. Teacher as stranger. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
- Greene, M. A philosophical look at merit and mastery teaching. The Elementary School Journal, 1985a, 81, 17-26.
- Greene, M. Equality/Excellence. In D. Purpel and H. Shapiro (Eds.), School and meaning. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1985b.
- Greene, M. Evaluation and Dignity. In D. Purpel and H. Shapiro (Eds.), School and meaning. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1985c.
- Guba, E. Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, 1978.
- Guba, E. The context of emergent paradigm reeseach. Paper presented at the Career Development Seminar by the Center for Public Affairs and the School of Education, Univeristy of Kansas and The University Council for Education Administration, Overland Park, Kansas, 1983.
- Guba, E., and Lincoln, Y. Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. In G. Madaus, M. Scriven, and D. Stufflebeam (Eds.), Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. Higham, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1983.
- Guttenburg, R. Incentive systems for education personnel. Final Report. Columbia Teachers College, Columbia University, 1971.
- Hatry, H., and Greiner, J. Issues in teacher incentive plans. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1984.
- Hertzberg, H. Competency based teacher education: Does it have a past or a future? Teachers College Record, 1976, 78, 1-21.
- Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966.
- Herzberg, F. et al. Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.

- Holzberg, R. Merit pay - past? CBTE - future? Kappa Delta Pi Record, 1974, 24, 100-101.
- Hovelman, L. A Q study of three teacher perceptions: Self, effective teachers and merit-pay recipients. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1984.)
- House, E. Assumptions underlying evaluation models. In G. Madaus, M. Scriven, and D. Stufflebeam (Eds.), Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. Higham, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1983.
- Houston Independent School District. Second Mile Plan-- Impact Study 1978-80, 1980-81. Houston, Texas: Houston Independent School District, 1982.
- Huebner, D. A reassessment of the curriculum. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
- Huebner, D. Moral values and the curriculum. Paper presented at the Meeting on Moral Dilemma of Public Schooling, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 1965.
- Huebner, D. Curriculum as a field of study. In H. Robison (Ed.), Precedents and promise in the curriculum field. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.
- Huebner, D. Implications of psychological thought for the curriculum. In G. Unruh and R. Leeper (Eds.), Influences in curricular change: Papers from a conference by the ASCD Commission on Current Curricular Developments, New York, New York, December 1966. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1968.
- Huebner, D. Curriculum as the accessibility of knowledge. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Curriculum Theory Study Group, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1970.
- Huebner, D. The leadership role in curricular change. In M. Lawler (Ed.), Strategies for planned curricular change. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.
- Huebner, D. Humanism and competency: A critical and dialectical interpretation. Paper presented at the Meeting on Humanism/Competence, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1974.

- Huebner, D. Remaking curriculum language. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.
- Huebner, D. Curricular language and classroom meanings. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975a.
- Huebner, D. Curriculum as concern for man's temporality. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975b.
- Huebner, D. Poetry and power: The politics of curricular development. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975c.
- Huebner, D. The contradiction between the recreative and the established. In J. Macdonald and E. Zaret (Eds.), Schools in search of meaning. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975d.
- Huebner, D. The tasks of the curricular theorists. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975e.
- Huebner, D. The moribund curriculum field: Its wake and our work. Curriculum Inquiry, 1976, 6, 153-167.
- Huebner, D. Developing teacher competencies. Paper presented at the Meeting of Western Canada Educational Administrators, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, 1979.
- Johnson, M. Definitions and models in curriculum theory. In H. Giroux, A. Penna and W. Pinar (Eds.), Curriculum & instruction: Alternatives in education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1981.
- Johnson, S. Merit pay for teachers: A poor prescription for reform. Harvard Educational Review, 1984, 54, 175-185.
- Johnson, S. Pros and cons of merit pay. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1984.
- Joyce, B. and Weil, M. Models of teaching (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

- Jung, S. Guidelines for evaluating teacher incentive systems. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1984.
- Kitwood, T. The nature of human valuing. (Unpublished M.Sc dissertation, University of Brantford, 1974.)
- Kitwood, T. On values and value systems: Evidence from interviews with adolescents. Educational Research, 1976, 18, 223-231.
- Kitwood, R., and Smithers, A. Measurement of human values: An appraisal of the works of Milton Rokeach. Educational Research, 1975, 17, 175-179.
- Klein, K. Merit pay and evaluation. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1984.
- Kliebard, H. Bureaucracy and curriculum theory. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975a.
- Kliebard, H. Persistent curriculum issues in historical perspective. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975b.
- Kluckhohn, C. Mirror for man. In R. LaPiere (Ed.), Readings in anthropology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1955.
- Lather, P. Research as praxis. Paper presented at the 6th Curriculum Theorizing Conference, Dayton, Ohio, 1984.
- Learned, W., and Bagley, W. The professional preparation of teachers for American public schools. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1920.
- Lewis, A., and Meil, A. Supervision for improved instruction: New challenges, new responses. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.
- Lortie, D. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Macdonald, J. Educational models for instruction. In J. Macdonald and R. Leeper (Eds.), Theories of instruction. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965.
- Macdonald, J. Myths about instruction. Educational Leadership, 1965, 22, 609-617.

- Macdonald, J. A curriculum rationale. In E. Short and G. Marconnit (Eds.), Contemporary thoughts on public school curriculum. Dubuque, IA: William c. Brown, 1968.
- Macdonald, J. The school environment as learner reality. Curriculum Theory Network, 1969, 4, 45-54.
- Macdonald, J. A vision of a humane school. In J. Saylor and J. Smith (Eds.), Removing barriers to humaneness in the high school. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971.
- Macdonald, J. The school as a double agent. In V. Haubrich (Ed.), Freedom, bureaucracy, and schooling. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971.
- Macdonald, J. Curriculum theory: The state of the art. Journal of Educational Research, 1971, 64, 195-200.
- Macdonald, J. The domain of curriculum. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1974.
- Macdonald, J. Curriculum and human interests. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.
- Macdonald, J. Curriculum theory. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.
- Macdonald, J. Living democratically in schools: Cultural pluralism. In C. Grant (Ed.), Multicultural education: Commitments, issues and applications. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977a.
- Macdonald, J. Looking toward the future in curriculum. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Professors of Curriculum. Miami, Florida: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977b.
- Macdonald, J. Scene and context: American education today. In C. Beegle and R. Edelfelt Eds.), Staff development: Staff liberation. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977c.
- Macdonald, J. Value bases and issues for curriculum. In A. Molnar and J. Zahorik (Eds.), Curriculum theory. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977d.

- Macdonald, J. Curriculum consciousness and social change. Foundational Studies 1978, 5, 27-45.
- Macdonald, J., and Clements, H. Moral dilemmas of schooling. Educational Leadership, 1965, 23, 29-32.
- Macdonald, J. Theory-practice and the hermeneutic circle. Paper presented at a Curriculum Theory Conference (The Airlie Conference), Airlie, Virginia, 1980.
- Mann, J. Curriculum criticism. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.
- Mazza, K. Reconceptual inquiry as an alternative mode of curriculum theory and practice: A critical study. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 1982, 4, 5-89.
- McDowell, S. Accountability of teacher performance through merit. Banff, Saskatchewan, Canada: Speech given at the Western Canada Educational Administrators' Conference, 1971.
- McDowell, S. Merit salaries (and other devices). Education Canada, 1973, 13, 14-19.
- McGreal, T. Successful teacher evaluation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.
- McGregor, D. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- McGuire, C. and Thompson, J. The costs of performance pay systems. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1984.
- McIntyre, K. The merits and demerits of merit pay. NASSP Bulletin, 1984, 68, 100-104.
- McLaughlin, M. and Marsh, D. Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, 1978, 80, 69-94.
- Merit salary programs for teachers. San Diego, CA: Board of Education, 1957.
- Meyer, H. The pay-for-performance dilemma. Organizational Dynamics, 1975, 3, 39-50.
- Moore, R. Master teachers. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1984.
- Morris, V. Philosophy and the American school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

- Mulder, R. A framework for examining reconceptualism and deriving its possible implications for undergraduate liberal arts teacher education. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1983.)
- Myers, W. Behavior management: A positive approach. Beaumont, Texas: BEC Publishing Company, 1977.
- Nash, P. A humanistic approach to performance-based teacher education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1973.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.
- Newcombe, E. Rewarding teachers: Issues and incentives. Baltimore, Maryland: Maryland State Department of Education, 1983.
- Neff, F. Performance based teaching: A new orthodoxy? In R. Smith (Ed.), Regaining educational leadership. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975.
- Palaich, R. and Flannelly, E. Improving teacher quality through incentives. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1984.
- Pinar, W. Sanity, madness, and the school. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkely, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975a.
- Pinar, W. The analysis of educational experience. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkely, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975b.
- Polyani, M. Scientific outlook: Its sickness and cure. Science, 1957, 125, 480-484.
- Popkewitz, T, Tabachnick, B., and Wehlage, G. The myth of educational reform. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.
- Rescher, N. Introduction to value theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Rist, R. On the means of knowing: Qualitative research in education. New York University Education Quarterly, 1979, 10, 17-21.

- Robinson, G. Merit pay for teachers. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1979.
- Robinson, G. Merit pay plans for teachers: Status and descriptions. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1983.
- Rogers, C. Freedom to learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.
- Rogers, C. Freedom to learn for the 80s. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1983.
- Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.
- Rokeach, M. Understanding human values: Individual and societal. New York: Free Press, 1979.
- Rosenholtz, S. Political myths about reforming teaching. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1984.
- Rosenholtz, S. Political myths about education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 1985, 18, 349-355.
- Schein, E. Organizational psychology. Second edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Schlechty P., et al. Recommendations for improving the career opportunities of teachers in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools: A constructive alternative to merit pay. Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC: Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Board, 1983.
- Schmidt, W. Organizational frontiers and human values. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1970.
- Sergiovanni, T. Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. Journal of Educational Administration, 1967, 67, 66-82.
- Sergiovanni, T. (Ed.), Supervision of teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.
- Sergiovanni, T., and Starratt, R. Supervision: Human perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1983.

- Sinclair, R. Elementary school educational environment: Measurement of selected variables of environmental press. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 29, 3048A.
- Sisk, H. Management and organization. Second edition. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western Publishing Company, 1973.
- Skinner, B. The technology of teaching. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1968.
- Spindler, G. Education and culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.
- Spradley, J. The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1979.
- Stauffer, R. and Withers, C. What are the advantages and disadvantages of teacher merit rating plans? Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1958, 42, 214-218.
- Stocker, J. Differentiated staffing in schools. A review of current policies and programs. Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1970.
- Swender, L. Selected teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation of instruction at the junior high school level in a southeast Kansas community. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1985.)
- Sykes, G. Caring about teachers. Teachers College Record, 1983, 84, 579.
- Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. Action for Excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools. Denver, CO: Educational Commission of the States, 1983.
- Taylor, P. Realms of value. In P. Smith, (Ed.), Theories of value and problems of evaluation. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1970.
- The National Association of Secondary School Principals. Teacher incentives: A tool for effective management. Reston, VA: Cresap, McCormick and Paget, 1984.
- Tranel, D. A lesson from physicists. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1981, 59, 425-429.
- Tyler, R. Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

- Tyler, R. Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- Ubbelodhe, R. Axiological analysis and curriculum theorizing. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1973.)
- Vans Bortalanffy, L. Robots, men, and minds: Psychology in the modern world. New York: George Braziller, 1967.
- Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1975.
- Wilkerson, M. The masks of meritocracy and egalitarianism. Educational Record, 1982, 63, 4-11.
- Wilson, L. and Mandell, A. Faculty evaluation and reward. Paper for Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia, 1977.
- Worth, W. Can administrators rate teachers? The Canadian Administrator, 1961, 1, 1-4.
- Zais, R. Curriculum: principles and foundations. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1976.

APPENDIX A

TABLE

TYPES OF MERIT PAY PLANS

TABLE V
TYPES OF MERIT PAY PLANS

Type of Plan	Example
General Board Policy/Contract Provisions	A broad statement such as: "additional increments for exceptional or meritorious performance may be granted upon recommendation of the administration and at the sole discretion of the Board of Education."
Percent Increases for Merit	"A payment of 2% for exemplary performance during the preceding school year [will be] based on the evaluation of criteria cooperatively developed by building principal and teacher pending guidelines cooperatively developed by teaching staff and administrators for district wide application."
Merit Longevity Pay	Longevity pay (\$150 above maximum) based on professional growth available to teachers after 20 years of service.
Horizontal Advancement Based on Merit	Teachers advance to next track for consideration of service (instead of just educational requirements).
Ranges on Salary Schedule for Meritorious Service	A pay range available at each educational level. Placement in the range dependent on performance.
Double-Increment/Honorarium for Meritorious Service	Teacher eligible for twice the increment normally given (for experience).
Supplemental Contract for Meritorious Service	\$1,000 a year in a supplemental contract.
Multiple Track salary Plan (e.g., Career Ladders or Ranks for Teachers)	Three tracks for teachers (e.g., probationary, professional, outstanding).
Merit Pay for Conducting a Curricular Project	Extra pay for conducting a teacher-designed instructional improvement project.
Merit Increases Determined by a Point System	Points used in calculating salary awarded for education (20%) and for performance (80%).
Merit Bonus with Performance Criteria	Superior ratings of specific performance criteria in the following categories: teaching skills, classroom and school environment, communication, interpersonal relationships, and professional contributions.

Source: Educational Research Service, Inc. Merit pay for teachers, 1979.

APPENDIX B
CORRESPONDENCE

P.O. Box 304
Perkins, Ok 74059
April 23, 1985

Superintendent
Clearwater Public Schools
Clearwater, OK

Dear Superintendent,

My advisor spoke to the superintendent of Wayside school district Monday and he granted permission for me to complete my interviews since I was unable to conduct them during the evaluation process. These interviews are in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral dissertation concerning the Master Teacher Concept.

I need a letter of permission from you, as well as the dates when my visits would be possible. I also would appreciate a copy of the minutes of your school district meetings, as well as a copy of the minutes of the committee meetings.

Knowing that your time is valuable, I thank you in advance for your cooperation in allowing me the opportunity to work with you and your faculty on this matter.

I am looking forward to seeing you.

Sincerely,


Betty Jo McCarty

/mlh

ALL OF CLEARWATER SCHOOL MASTER TEACHER INFORMATION IS
HANDLED THROUGH THE WAYSIDE SCHOOLS. PLEASE GET ANY
INFORMATION YOU NEED FROM THERE.

THANKS,

SECRETARY
CLEARWATER PUBLIC
SCHOOLS

STANLEY PUBLIC SCHOOL

April 26, 1985

Ms. Betty Jo McCarty
Stillwater, OK

Dear Ms. McCarty:

Please consider this letter as permission to visit with our teachers concerning the Master Teacher Plan. Please contact the principals as to the best time.

Sincerely,

Superintendent

P.S. Copies of Board minutes will be available when you visit.

WAYSIDE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

April 25, 1985

Ms. Betty Jo McCarty
Stillwater, OK

Dear Ms. McCarty:

Permission is hereby granted for you to conduct interviews with selected staff members of the Wayside teaching staff regarding the Master Teacher Program. You understand that these interviews are to be scheduled during a planning period of the teacher and at their convenience. No disruption of classroom teaching time will be allowed.

Information and documents that are not of a confidential nature may also be viewed if you desire.

See you on April 30 and 31.

Sincerely,

Superintendent

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER

SAMPLE INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER

Interviewer: Are you familiar with the Master Teacher Plan?

Interviewee: Fairly well. It was presented at our faculty meeting.

Interviewer: How was the program presented to the school district?

Interviewee: It was announced that our school would participate in the Master Teacher Program and the teachers could participate on the committee if they wanted to. The teachers here did not want the program.

Interviewer: If the teachers did not want the program, did they vote for or against it?

Interviewee: We didn't vote. We were just told we were going to have a program.

Interviewer: How do you feel about the Master Teacher Program?

Interviewee: I'm not sold on the idea. I can see the concept in one way, then I can also see a lot of negative things about it.

Interviewer: How has the program affected the school district?

Interviewee: I feel the teachers chosen are master teachers, but there are a lot of master teachers in this school. There have been some hard feelings. We've talked a lot about it but there's nothing we can do.

Interviewer: You and some of the other teachers have negative feelings concerning the Master Teacher Concept?

Interviewee: Yes, and I'm trying to deal with those feelings personally. The other teachers are, too. These feelings cause you to not like yourself or to be dissatisfied with yourself.

Interviewer: How would you define a master teacher?

Interviewee: One who is open-minded and willing to change. One who is willing to not get stuck in one little rut their entire teaching years: "This is the way I'm going to teach it and that's it!" That won't work. You've got to use your resources and try many different ways or I don't think you'll reach as many children. You've got to be a hard worker with lots of energy to get to the children. You ought to have high moral values, I think, and set a good example. That's on the teacher's part. I think the teacher puts students first.

Interviewer: How do you feel your definition compares to the criteria established for master teacher?

Interviewee: Well, I see a master teacher in a more personal, subjective way. To designate a master teacher, I suppose there has to be some objective criteria set up. How would you measure the personal qualities that make up an effective teacher? How, can they measure these qualities with test scores?

Interviewer: Has the Master Teacher Program affected the curriculum in your school and, if so, how?

Interviewee: The testing has changed the way a lot of the teachers teach. We used to cooperate more. You know if the music teacher needed the students, we'd let them go practice. Now, we concentrate on getting the content covered.

Interviewer: Do you feel there is a given body of knowledge every child needs to know?

Interviewee: It's not going to be the same little pieces of knowledge. Every child is going to be different. One may not have what another one does, but they're still going to be able to function. But here, we are told not how to teach, but what basically to teach, for testing.

Interviewer: How do you feel about testing?

Interviewee: It bothers me. No matter how much you drill and drill and beat it into a little child's head, they're going to remember how to do it more than that fact. They'll know the process of getting the answer. Just like testing teachers doesn't prove who is an effective

teacher, testing students doesn't prove how good a teacher you are nor what the student knows. But, it's forced on us. Performance is all you hear. I don't like testing and I have to do it but I won't receive a bonus for doing it. Testing puts a lot of pressure on teachers and especially students.

Interviewer: Did you apply for master teacher?

Interviewee: No, I did not.

Interviewer: Why?

Interviewee: I don't believe in the idea. I don't think it's right to say that some teachers are better than others.

Interviewer: Do you feel the school district has benefited from the program?

Interviewee: As I said, the ones that received the \$6,000 benefited, but no one else. The master teacher came to my room to instruct us in taking the achievement test.

Interviewer: What values do you feel the Master Teacher Concept portrays?

Interviewee: I would say it's political. It's a ploy to pay a few teachers rather than giving all teachers a needed raise. Of course, the teachers chosen for master teacher benefited.

Interviewer: How did the teachers react when the Master Teacher Plan was introduced here?

Interviewee: It was pretty quiet. People were mainly thinking about it. I didn't hear a lot of 'Let's go for it! Let's get it!' I did hear a whole lot of negative things.

Interviewer: If you were asked what incentive would encourage you to improve, what would you say?

Interviewee: Being told by the administrator that I'm doing good; a pat on the back or a change in the schedule to help you out or give you more time to do this or that in something that they feel you're doing well in, or that you have excelled in: trips, conferences, computer for classroom, etc.

APPENDIX D

A PROPOSAL TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT A
PILOT "MASTER TEACHER" PROGRAM
FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

A PROPOSAL TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT A PILOT
"MASTER TEACHER" PROGRAM FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

To be planned and piloted by the
School Districts of Clearwater, Stanley and Wayside -

Submitted to the Oklahoma State Department of Education

May, 1983

A PROPOSAL TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT A PILOT
MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Introduction

Institutions of higher education have long had in place a system whereby those of their educators who have excelled at their profession have received recognition for this excellence by being promoted in rank from instructor to assistant professor, to associate professor, and finally to full professor. This particular system of recognition ensures that those who are doing an excellent job at their teaching continue to do what they do best--teach. They are not promoted to new jobs but instead have conferred upon them a distinguished title (and usually an increase in salary) in their existing jobs.

The tradition has not been the same in elementary and secondary education, where teachers who have demonstrated their excellence in teaching have historically been recognized for this by being moved to higher positions of a different kind. They are usually taken out of the classroom to fulfill administrative duties. The only path to advancement open to them requires that they leave the teaching ranks.

Plans are now being suggested by a number of sources which would remedy this situation--which would recognize teachers for their excellence in their profession, provide a means of advancement for them, and yet leave them primarily in the classroom to continue doing for the schoolchildren of the nation what they do so well--teach. The plans proposed often allow for a broadening of the opportunities for teaching by the "master teacher" to include both formal and informal consultation by the master teacher with his or her teaching colleagues. Most of the master teacher plans which have been proposed link the system to a significant increase in salary for those designated as master teachers; in addition, the plans often call for the master teachers to be em-

ployed by the school district for one or more months during the summer in order to allow them to plan and conduct workshops for their fellow teachers and to undertake other special assignments related to their function as master teachers.

President Ronald Reagan and Secretary of Education T. H. Bell have endorsed the broad concept of a master teacher approach to elementary and secondary education. Several states have adopted or are in the process of adopting such plans. The concept is a sound one, and while there can be debate over the best way to inaugurate such a plan as well as over the specifics of the system's operation, it is a concept which ultimately will benefit both the teaching profession and the schoolchildren it serves.

Oklahoma should be in the forefront of the movement toward excellence in education, and the master teacher concept is a very visible, tangible, and powerfully significant step in that direction. Yet, as with all new steps, the challenge should be undertaken with care. This paper proposes a careful initiation of the concept in the state of Oklahoma, through a year of research, planning, and consultation with interested and concerned parties; an initial year of implementation as a pilot project in the communities of Stanley, Wayside and Clearwater and a second year of implementation to be accompanied by a thorough evaluation of the three-year pilot project.

It is anticipated that the master teacher concept as it is developed and refined for application in the state of Oklahoma will be integrated with several other steps which the state has recently taken in its quest for educational excellence--namely, the continuing education program of staff development and professional growth for teachers facilitated by Oklahoma House Bill 1706, as well as the provisions of the Bill dealing with the entry-year assistance committee structure for new teachers and the teacher competency examinations.

Objectives of the Project

- 1) To research the various approaches to implementing a master teacher plan and to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of these approaches with interested and concerned parties.
- 2) To produce a master teacher plan appropriate for the state of Oklahoma, which will represent the consensus of a wide variety of groups interested in achieving excellence in education, and which will form the basis of the pilot master teacher project to be implemented in the Clearwater, Wayside and Stanley school districts.

Through a cooperative arrangement with the College of Education of Land ~~Grant~~ University (LGU) a faculty member and a graduate student in educational administration at LGU will be employed for twelve months for 25% and 50% of their time, respectively, to assist the school districts of Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside in a comprehensive review of the literature which has been published on master teacher plans. In collaboration with the representatives from ~~LGU~~, school district personnel will also contact representatives of those districts and states (such as Tennessee) which are currently operating master teacher-type plans. Contacts will also be made with appropriate staff at the U.S. Department of Education to inform them of what is being undertaken in Oklahoma and to obtain from them the names of other districts/states which might also be exploring the establishment of a master teacher plan.

Concerted efforts will be directed toward obtaining information about the most current ideas on the master teacher concept and toward securing all formal and informal evaluations of these ideas where the ideas have been put into operation. In this research, care will be taken to solicit comments not only from State Department of Education representatives and superintendents in those states/districts where master teacher plans are being implemented, but also from teachers' organizations, individual teachers, organizations of school administrators and individual administrators, parent groups, and representatives of other education-related organizations as appropriate in order to ob-

tain a comprehensive view of the plans in operation and to evaluate them from the perspectives of many different groups. The intent of the research is to be as thorough as possible in obtaining details of possible approaches to a master teacher plan and candid evaluations of how such approaches have actually worked. Synopses of existing and proposed plans and brief characterizations of the evaluations will be recorded and cataloged for use in the communication phase of the project (described below) and in the drafting of a master teacher plan for the pilot program.

Following the research phase of the project, representatives of the school districts of Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside, with assistance from representatives of ICGU, will draw up and implement a plan of communication which will attempt to inform and be informed by the opinions of groups and individuals vital to the success of a master teacher plan in Oklahoma. These groups would include but not be limited to: Oklahoma legislators; Oklahoma State Department of Education officials; teachers' organizations; school administrators' groups; local and statewide PTA groups; other education-oriented organizations; and, as appropriate, representative students from the schools involved. In addition to specific meetings with formal organizations, the plan of communication should include one or more open meetings to which the public is invited. While the pilot project will involve only three specific school districts, an important concern throughout the program will be to follow a course which will carefully lay the groundwork for future acceptance of the master teacher concept by diverse groups in school districts throughout the state.

The research and communication phases of the project will explore at a minimum: the structure upon which a master teacher plan might be organized; the underlying philosophy and rationale of such a plan; the criteria by which

master teachers would be selected; the composition and procedures of the committee which would be charged with selecting the master teachers; the appropriate monetary compensation for those designated as master teachers; the responsibilities of master teachers; the system of evaluating the master teacher plan concept; and procedures for modifying the plan as a result of both formal and informal evaluation.

The research phase of the project should be completed within the first three months of the project. At the conclusion of the research phase, a Master Teacher Plan Committee will be named by the superintendents of the three districts involved in the pilot project. The committee will be charged with drafting a plan which will be the basis for the master teacher project undertaken in the districts of Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside. The committee will include representatives of each of the three school districts, and within this representation will attempt to include administrators, teachers, parents, school board members, concerned citizens of the community, and, as appropriate, students. The committee will also include one or more representatives of an institution of higher education, the Oklahoma State Department of Education, and the Oklahoma Legislature. In drafting its plan, the committee will attend and will listen to the opinions expressed in the series of formal and informal meetings which will comprise the communication phase of the project. The communication phase of the project will occupy the fifth and sixth months of the first year of the project.

The final report of the Master Teacher Plan Committee will be ready no later than the end of the seventh month of the project. At that time, and based upon the plan submitted by the Master Teacher Plan Committee, the composition of the Master Teacher Selection Committee will be determined and the committees (one for each district) will be named. The criteria by which the

master teachers will be selected will be publicized. The actual criteria for selection will be determined by the Master Teacher Plan Committee; it is likely, however, that the plan will focus on one or more of the following criteria: a required number of years of teaching experience (e.g., 5-7 years); demonstrated student growth during those years; embodiment of the principles of good citizenship; participation in professional growth activities; exemplary educational credentials, which would include as a minimum a Master's degree; achievement of a score above a predetermined level on an Oklahoma teacher competency examination; and the willingness and ability to assume additional responsibilities if selected as a master teacher. It must be emphasized that the criteria listed here are included in this paper merely as examples of the areas on which the criteria established by the committee might focus. The committee would be charged not only with establishing these criteria but also with specifying the means by which achievement of the criteria would be measured.

- 3) To select a total of as many as twenty teachers combined from the three districts (with the exact number to be contingent on the available funding) to be designated and to function during the second year of the project as master teachers for their districts.
- 4) To design an evaluation plan for the pilot program which will include both formal and informal evaluation methods and which will attempt to include the perspectives of a variety of groups with interest in the project.
- 5) To implement a statewide campaign of information and publicity regarding the master teacher plan being implemented in Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside.

At the same time that the Master Teacher Selection Committees are named in each of the three districts, the method of nomination and the selection criteria will be publicized to all teachers and to the communities at large. During months 8-12 of the first year of the project, the selection of the master teachers will proceed according to the guidelines and the timetable set

forth in the plan submitted by the Master Teacher Plan Committee. Also during these months, the details of an evaluation plan for the project will be further refined by the Master Teacher Plan Committee. A faculty member with expertise in evaluation will be employed for 24 days of consulting during the second year of the project, and at 25% release time during the third year of the project, to assist the school districts with the design and implementation of a comprehensive evaluation plan. A second faculty member will be employed for five days of consulting during the third year of the project to assist with the writing of a final project report.

By the beginning of the second year of the project, the master teachers for the districts should be named and ready to begin their first year of service in this capacity, and the evaluation plan for the project, including any reporting forms necessary, should be specified and ready to be implemented. Year Two of the project will focus on this implementation and ongoing evaluation.

In addition, during Year Two of the project, the superintendents of the three school districts involved in the pilot program and members of the Master Teacher Plan Committee will undertake a formal, statewide program of publicity to inform the public of the benefits and the details of the pilot master teacher program. The informational program will include articles in the print media and interviews in the broadcast media, but will focus principally on personal contact with groups and individuals. These personal contacts will include appearances before formal meetings of established organizations as well as the calling of special, open, public meetings on the subject in cooperation with local school districts throughout the state.

- 6) To continue in the third year of the project with the implementation and evaluation of the master teacher plan in each of the three districts.

- 7) To draft a report of the project to be presented to those from whom funding for the project has been received, to the officials of the three districts, and to the public at large.

The approximately twenty teachers named at the beginning of the second year of the project will continue in the third year of the project to serve in the capacity of master teachers. The routine evaluation of the project will continue, and a final evaluation report will be prepared for the public.

- 8) To continue the service of the initial twenty master teachers beyond the period of the project with funds from the school districts involved.

Assuming that the pilot program is evaluated as a success, the three school districts involved in the pilot program will continue to support the increased salaries of the twenty master teachers beyond the conclusion of the project.

APPENDIX E

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM PROPOSED FOR
THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF CLEARWATER,
STANLEY AND WAYSIDE, OKLAHOMA

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM

Proposed For the School Districts of
Clearwater, Stanley and Wayside Oklahoma

Submitted by the Master Teacher Planning Committee
for the Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside School Districts

April 15, 1984

PREFACE

The Master Teacher Program described in this report is the product of the deliberations of a 28-member committee representing the school districts of Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside. The committee included classroom teachers and librarians, School Board members, school district patrons, principals, and superintendents. During the course of the committee's deliberations, staff of a Land Grant University's College of Education furnished committee members with research on the master teacher concept, evaluation and testing as they relate to the program, and current developments in the area of teacher incentive structures.

This document was developed as the result of a grant to the Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside school districts by the Oklahoma Legislature through the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

On March 14, 1984, the plan was presented for review within a public forum at the Oklahoma Department of Education for the purpose of soliciting comments from interested individuals and organizations.

MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM

for the school districts of
Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside Oklahoma

Purpose

The Master Teacher Program is established as a means to encourage, recognize, and reward excellence in teaching in the public schools.* It is also intended as a means for the school district to benefit from the expertise of its Master Teachers by employing them to assume additional responsibilities, as appropriate, in the areas of curriculum development, in-service education, consultation with fellow teachers, research, service on committees, etc.

Ultimately and most importantly, the Master Teacher Program is designed to improve the overall quality of the education being provided to the children and young adults of the community by identifying and emphasizing excellence in all aspects of the educational endeavor. In addition, implementation of the Master Teacher Program will assist the district in retaining its best teachers, recruiting the most competent new teachers available, and building public confidence in the teacher pay plan by basing it in part on the recognition of excellence.

Application Process

Each year, teachers meeting the specified minimum criteria may apply for consideration by the Master Teacher Selection Committee. The committee is charged with the responsibility to evaluate the applicants in terms of the specified minimum criteria and to identify those whose records are so outstanding and exemplary, in the informed professional judgement of the committee, as to merit their designation as "Master Teachers." It is hoped that funding will be sufficient to support all those who merit the designation "Master Teacher." However, in those instances where available funding is not sufficient, the committee will designate as Master Teachers only the number of persons for whom funding is available, with the selection to be based on a comparative ranking of the meritorious candidates by the committee. In those cases where available funding exceeds that required to support the number of Master Teachers selected by the committee, the excess funds will remain uncommitted for that year.

All applicants will be notified in writing of the decisions of the committee. Those who are not selected to serve as Master Teachers will be given

*For the first year of implementation of the pilot program, eligibility will be confined to classroom teachers. During the first year, however, the committee will examine the feasibility of developing appropriate criteria for librarians, counselors, and other certificated personnel.

the option of meeting with representatives of the committee for a post-selection conference to discuss the committee's evaluation of the applicant's candidacy or of receiving from the committee a written statement regarding this.

Master Teacher Responsibilities

It is intended that Master Teachers not only will serve in an informal way as role models for their colleagues, but will also undertake a formal program of additional professional responsibilities during the regular school year. The nature of the responsibilities to be assumed during the regular school year by each Master Teacher will be mutually agreeable to both the teacher and the school district and might include supervision of student teachers, assistance to beginning teachers, individual consultation with colleagues, instruction of in-service workshops, development of curriculum materials, etc. Such assistance will not be restricted to colleagues within the Master Teacher's own district, since the three pilot districts have agreed to exchange Master Teachers where the expertise of one would be beneficial to the teachers of one or both of the other two districts.

During the summer, each Master Teacher will be employed by his/her district for two additional weeks to assist with projects which are of mutual interest and benefit to the teacher and to the district, and which are consonant with the status of Master Teacher. The salary supplement to be associated with the assumption by the Master Teacher of increased responsibilities during the school year and two additional weeks of employment during the summer will be \$6,000, which includes fringe benefits.

Where a need exists on the part of the district, the Master Teacher may be offered employment during the summer for longer than two weeks. In such instances, the teacher will be compensated for this additional summer employment by the local district at a rate equal to that received during the regular year.

Criteria

To be designated as a Master Teacher, an applicant must as a minimum meet the following requirements:

- 1) Be a classroom teacher holding standard certification who is employed full-time with the district and spends a minimum of three periods each day in the classroom.
- 2) Have been awarded tenure by the district in which he/she is employed.
- 3) Have seven years of full-time professional experience.
- 4) Have earned at least a master's degree.
- 5) Have performed satisfactorily on the Core Battery Tests of the National Teacher Examination (NTE) in the areas of communication skills, general knowledge, and professional knowledge; satisfactory achievement will be defined as scoring at or above a specified minimum score

to be decided upon by a sub-committee of the three Master Teacher Selection Committees, who will meet with a representative of the NTE for the purpose of reviewing information about the test and setting a minimum score. Information regarding the minimum score selected will be available after May 15, 1984, from the chairpersons of the three committees.

- 6) Have the capability and willingness to assume additional duties to be agreed upon by the Master Teacher and the district. These duties shall span the regular school year and shall also include a minimum of two weeks of employment during the summer.
- 7) Have demonstrated outstanding oral and written communication skills throughout the interview and the classroom observation portions of the selection process; in any written materials submitted as part of the application process; through successful completion of the appropriate section of the National Teacher Examination; and through written responses to a series of questions, included as part of the packet of materials to be completed by all applicants, which are designed to assess knowledge of teaching and learning principles as well as linguistic and analytical skills.
- 8) Have demonstrated outstanding teaching performance and exceptional classroom practice as documented by:
 - A. At least above-average student growth on:
 - (1) a standardized achievement test and/or a criterion-referenced test approved by the district, and/or
 - (2) other measures of student growth, as available, which are deemed appropriate and acceptable by the committee (the committee may solicit advice in this regard from an expert in evaluation).*

Each applicant will be encouraged to submit in writing a description of any relevant factors affecting the context in which his/her measures of student growth should be evaluated.

- B. Completion by the applicant of a standard self-evaluation instrument which will include the opportunity for the applicant

*In the first year of the program, many applicants will not have access to test scores which will compare student achievement at the beginning and the end of the year; therefore, it is anticipated that in the first year many applicants will be limited to submitting or describing to the committee "other measures" of above-average student growth. The committee will accept and evaluate these measures on an individual basis. It is assumed that in the future, as more districts undertake testing programs which furnish both beginning-year and ending-year data, more applicants will be able to submit standardized achievement and/or criterion-referenced test data as well as "other measures" of student growth for the committee's review.

to attach additional information in the form of a written narrative which describes the applicant's philosophy, methods, significant achievements, etc., in the area of teaching performance and classroom practice (the forms will be furnished to the applicant as part of the application packet).

- C. Completion by the applicant's principal of the standard evaluation instrument described in 8-B above, which will include the opportunity for the principal to attach additional information in the form of a written narrative (the forms will be furnished to the applicant as part of the application packet).
- D. Submission by the applicant to the committee of a portfolio of relevant materials, to include but not be limited to samples of instructional plans (unit plans and lesson plans); classroom policies, rules, and procedures; samples of tests and testing procedures, etc.
- E. Selection Committee interview with the applicant.
- F. Selection Committee interview with the applicant's principal.
- G. Completion of a questionnaire by three of the applicant's colleagues, to be chosen by the applicant, and by three other persons, also chosen by the applicant, who are either patrons of the district or parents of current or former students of the applicant, with no more than one respondent to be the parent of a current student.
- H. Classroom observation by a special evaluation team from outside the district to be appointed by the Selection Committee.* The evaluation team will consist of two persons chosen for their expertise in evaluation and/or pedagogy who will report their observations to the Selection Committee. It is anticipated that one member of the team will be a representative from an institution of higher education, where feasible, which will provide a link between higher education's participation in the Entry-Year Assistance Program of Oklahoma House Bill 1706 and the Master Teacher Program.

The evaluation team will meet with the applicant at least several days before the first observation to become acquainted with one another and to give the applicant an opportunity to supply the observers with background information concerning the class setting.

Classroom observations will include one scheduled and one un-

*Classroom observation will not be part of the selection process in the first year of implementation since applications from teachers will not be due until July. In subsequent years, the program's timeline will call for receipt of applications in ample time to arrange for the classroom observations.

announced visit by the evaluation team. The observers will meet with the applicant after each observation in a post-observation conference in order to share with the applicant the information gathered and to give the applicant the opportunity to record his/her reactions to the data. All parties must sign the conference form, indicating that the conference has taken place.

- 9) Have demonstrated significant participation in professional growth activities, to include but not be limited to participation in educational courses, workshops, conferences, etc.; participation in professional organizations and committees; participation on curriculum committees; sponsorship of student extracurricular activities, etc., with supporting data to include but not be limited to a narrative from the applicant which describes the extent, nature, and significance of the applicant's contributions in these areas and their relationship to his/her professional development and/or classroom performance.
- 10) Have demonstrated participation in community and civic affairs, with supporting data to include but not be limited to a narrative from the applicant which describes the extent, nature, and significance of the applicant's contributions in these areas.

Confidentiality of Materials and the Selection Process

Materials submitted by the applicant to the committee will be held in strict confidence. In those cases where the applicant will ask others to submit written materials to the committee (e.g., responses to questionnaires completed by colleagues, the principal's written evaluation, etc.), these materials will also be held in strict confidence by the committee and will not be made available to the applicant. An assurance of this confidentiality will be printed on all questionnaires and forms which are part of the application packet. In addition, the content of oral interviews, classroom observations, and the selection process itself will be held in confidence by all concerned.

Appointment and Renewal

In the ongoing Master Teacher Program, Master Teachers will be appointed for three-year terms, subject to the continued availability of funds and the successful completion of the limited annual review described below, which will be conducted at the conclusion of the first and second years of the three-year appointment. However, during the first year of the pilot program, the Master Teachers selected by the committee will be assigned by lot to serve either one- or two-year appointments. This will be done so that the introduction of Master Teachers into the program will be on a staggered basis, and the three-year re-submissions of their applications for continuance in the program will not all be received in the same year.

At the conclusion of the first and second years of a Master Teacher's three-year appointment, a limited review will be undertaken to verify that the Master Teacher should continue in that status. The limited review will in-

clude one observation visit to the teacher's classroom by the outside team of evaluators described in section 8-H on page 4, and an interview by the applicant with the members of the Selection Committee for that district. The interview setting will also provide an opportunity for the Master Teacher to evaluate the effectiveness of the overall program from his/her perspective. This information will be combined with a written evaluation from each Master Teacher, as well as with other data to be collected, and will constitute an ongoing formal review of the entire Master Teacher Program.

Master Teachers will be required to make formal re-application to the program every three years and to undergo the entire selection process at that time; they will not, however, be required to submit new scores on the National Teacher Examinations.

Composition of the Selection Committee*

The Master Teacher Selection Committee for this program involving the school districts of Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside will be comprised of two teachers, one patron, and one administrator from each of the three districts, with each district deciding how to select its members. It is assumed that once the Master Teacher Program is underway, the teacher-members of the committee will be chosen from among a district's previously designated "Master Teachers."

In considering applications and selecting master teachers from any one district, the members of the committee who are from that district will not be eligible to participate in the review and selection process.

Local School Board Approval

Final adoption of this Master Teacher Plan and the selection of a district's Master Teachers are subject to approval by the local School Board.

*The composition of the Selection Committee is subject to change if the Master Teacher Program is adopted on a state-wide basis. Should state-wide adoption occur, it is envisioned that the review and selection process for a district would be handled by a committee composed of members from outside the district, possibly constituted in the manner in which North Central Association accrediting teams are assembled. It is nonetheless assumed that the teachers who would serve as members of these committees would themselves be current or former Master Teachers.

APPENDIX F

APPLICATION AND EVALUATION FORMS FROM
THE MASTER TEACHER SAMPLE PACKET

FORM A

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM

Application Cover Sheet

APPLICANT'S NAME: _____

POSITION HELD: _____

OFFICE ADDRESS: _____

HOME ADDRESS: _____

OFFICE TELEPHONE: _____ HOME TELEPHONE: _____

DEGREES HELD:

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Field of Study</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

CURRENT STANDARD CERTIFICATION(S) HELD:

SCORES ON THE NATIONAL TEACHER EXAMINATION:
(Indicate tests taken and scores achieved. Attach a copy of the official report from the Educational Testing Service.)

LIST BELOW THE NAMES OF YOUR PRINCIPAL AND THE SIX PERSONS WHO WILL BE COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRES IN SUPPORT OF YOUR APPLICATION:

Principal: _____

Colleague: _____

Colleague: _____

Colleague: _____

Patron/Parent of Student: _____

Patron/Parent of Student: _____

Patron/Parent of Student: _____

Applicant's Name: _____
 Application Cover Sheet: Page 2

Do you have tenure with your local school district?: _____

Are you employed full-time with the district and do you spend a minimum of three class periods per day in the classroom?: _____

Indicate your number of years of professional, full-time experience: _____

Please list below all the professional positions you have held. List your current position first and then continue the list in reverse chronological order. For each position, indicate the title and whether the position was full-time or part-time (if part-time, please indicate the extent of your employment), the dates of your employment in that position, and a general description of your duties/responsibilities in that position. (Use additional sheets of paper if necessary, listing your name and the appropriate page number of the application cover sheet at the top of each additional page.)

TITLE
(FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME)

DATES OF
EMPLOYMENT

DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES/
RESPONSIBILITIES

FORM BApplicant's Name: _____
Professional Judgement Questions: Page 1**THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM****Professional Judgement Questions: To Be Completed By The Applicant**

This component of the application process is intended to assess an applicant's knowledge of teaching and learning principles as well as linguistic and analytical skills.

Please consider the following questions thoughtfully and answer according to your best professional judgement. Three blank pages are attached to this form, but you should feel free to use additional (or fewer) pages if appropriate. If you use additional pages, please put your name and the appropriate page number in the upper right-hand corner of each page.

The three questions to which you should respond are grouped below. In responding to each question, please indicate the number of the question which you are addressing.

QUESTION #1: It is the end of the school year and one of the textbooks which you were required to use the past year is scheduled to be used again next year. However, in using the textbook this past year, you found that it was not entirely adequate. (In answering this question, assume one of the following: 1) the text's treatment of the subject was somewhat sketchy and you felt additional supplementary materials should be provided to cover the subject more adequately) or 2) the text was too difficult in some respect—e.g., language, level of treatment of the subject—for your students.) You are now faced with using the text again next year. What activities might you undertake at this point to deal on a short-term as well as a long-term basis with the situation?

QUESTION #2: It is now four months into the school year. Lindsay, one of your students, has been receiving average grades in your class. In a routine parent-teacher conference, Lindsay's parents express concern that she may not be living up to her full potential. They cite her above-average grades in past years (if you teach Kindergarten or First Grade, assume that they cite her general ability, which they believe has been demonstrated in a variety of informal ways). What might be your response to the parents? What steps might you take at this point to address their concerns?

QUESTION #3: For the last three days, Tom, one of your students, has occasionally been deliberately disruptive in class—talking, refusing to sit down, refusing to begin the work you have assigned. He does eventually respond to your direction—but only after "making his point" in front of the class. This type of behavior is very uncharacteristic of him. His behavior is now starting to cause unrest among the other students in the class. What kinds of activities might you undertake to explore and deal with the cause of Tom's behavior, and how might you deal with its effect on the classroom situation?

FORM C

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM

Submission of Data Regarding Student Growth

Criterion #8 of the Master Teacher Program is stated as follows:

"have demonstrated outstanding teaching performance and exceptional classroom practice as documented by:

A. at least above-average student growth on:

- (1) a standardized achievement test and/or a criterion-referenced test approved by the district, and/or
- (2) other measures of student growth, as available, which are deemed appropriate and acceptable by the committee (the committee may solicit advice in this regard from an expert in evaluation).

Each applicant will be encouraged to submit in writing a description of any relevant factors affecting the context in which his/her measures of student growth should be evaluated."

You are encouraged to submit whatever data or information you believe is relevant to this criterion as far as demonstrating student growth. If you have access to beginning-year and ending-year standardized achievement or criterion-referenced test data, you may wish to submit it. In addition, you may wish to submit "other measures" of student growth which you believe are significant. Included in this latter category may be such things as: the number of your students over the years who have been successful in regional or state-wide competitions in the subject you teach; examples of the work of these students in these competitions, etc. You are encouraged to reflect on those indicators of student growth with which you are familiar and to document or describe these to the committee.

In addition, as stated in the last paragraph of the information quoted above, you are encouraged to submit in writing a description of any relevant factors which you believe affect the context in which your measures of student growth should be evaluated. For example, if you do have access to standardized achievement test scores and you choose to submit them, you are invited to describe the extenuating factors which you believe should be considered in evaluating those scores.

It is anticipated that for this first year of the Master Teacher Program, many applicants will not have access to test scores which will compare student achievement at the beginning and the end of the year; therefore, it is anticipated that in this first year many applicants will be limited to submitting or describing to the committee "other measures" of above-average student growth. The committee will accept and evaluate these measures on an individual basis.

Applicant's Name: _____
Student Growth: Page 2

It is assumed, however, that in the future, as more districts undertake testing programs which furnish both beginning-year and ending-year data, more applicants will be in a position to submit standardized achievement or criterion-referenced test data as well as "other measures" of student growth for the committee's review.

Please use the space below and the additional attached page to describe and/or report the evidence of "above-average student growth" which you wish to submit. Feel free to use additional pages if necessary, but please remember to put your name and the appropriate page number in the upper right-hand corner of any additional pages of narrative.

Included in this packet is a folder marked: "Materials Related to Student Growth Data." If you wish to submit materials related to student growth in addition to a narrative description, please include these other materials in this folder. The folder we have included with this packet has a space provided for your name. Please clearly mark your name on both the folder and on each page of any materials you include in it. It would also be prudent to include a note on the front of the folder, indicating the number of pages or pieces of material included in the folder. If the folder we have included is not large enough, you should feel free to substitute a different kind of folder.

FORM D

Applicant's Name: _____
 Self-Evaluation Instrument: Page 1

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAMSelf-Evaluation Instrument: To Be Completed By The Applicant

PART I

Part I of this Self-Evaluation Instrument provides an opportunity for you to evaluate yourself in relation to certain competencies and indicators appropriate to teaching performance and classroom practice. The scale to be used to indicate your "degree of achievement" ranges from "1" for low achievement (significantly below average), through "3" for average achievement, to "5" for high achievement. Please circle the number which you believe represents your consistent level of achievement in each category.

	DEGREE OF ACHIEVEMENT				
	High		Ave.		Low
--Establishes appropriate instructional goals and related objectives consistent with the curriculum	5	4	3	2	1
--Prepares instructional plans and materials incorporating principles of effective instruction	5	4	3	2	1
--Creates, selects or modifies instructional plans and materials to accommodate learner instructional levels	5	4	3	2	1
--Monitors learner understanding and reteaches as necessary	5	4	3	2	1
--Establishes and maintains learner involvement in the learning task	5	4	3	2	1
--Uses evaluation to improve instruction	5	4	3	2	1
--Reports learner status and progress to learners and their parents	5	4	3	2	1
--Establishes and maintains appropriate learner behavior	5	4	3	2	1
--Establishes and maintains a classroom climate conducive to learning	5	4	3	2	1
--Demonstrates positive verbal and non-verbal behavior to learners	5	4	3	2	1
--Makes effective use of classroom resources	5	4	3	2	1
--Promotes parent/community interest in the school	5	4	3	2	1
--Initiates activities and projects in the school	5	4	3	2	1

Applicant's Name: _____
 Self-Evaluation Instrument: Page 2

	High		Ave.		Low
—Works cooperatively with peers, administrators and community members in planning and implementing curricular and extra-curricular activities	5	4	3	2	1
—Creates materials/programs and shares these with peers and administrators	5	4	3	2	1
—Assists peers and others in identifying and solving instructional problems	5	4	3	2	1
—Encourages student effort and progress	5	4	3	2	1
—Supports learner excellence and achievement	5	4	3	2	1

PART II

In Part II we would like you to provide the Selection Committee with a narrative describing any of the aspects of your teaching or classroom practice which you believe are important in understanding your accomplishments in these areas. The committee is interested in receiving both statements of philosophy, explanations of methods and approaches, and descriptions of significant achievements (including specific, concrete examples, where available), in an integrated narrative. Note: There will be opportunity provided later in this application packet for you to submit actual documents (e.g., sample tests, lesson plans, etc.) which support your candidacy. In Part II of this self-evaluation instrument, we are interested in having you describe in writing the extent, nature, and significance of your teaching performance and classroom practice.

We have provided two blank pages for your narrative, but you should feel free to use additional pages (or fewer pages) if appropriate. If you use additional pages, please put your name and the appropriate page number in the upper right-hand corner of each page.

Please begin your narrative on the following page.

FORM E

Applicant's Name: _____
 Principal's Name: _____
 Principal's Evaluation: Page 1

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAMPrincipal's Evaluation: To Be Completed By The Applicant's Principal

The applicant named above is applying to the Master Teacher Program for his/her school district. Part of the application procedure requires that the applicant's principal complete an evaluation form. The Master Teacher Selection Committee would like to thank you for your participation in this activity and assure you that your responses will be held in confidence by all concerned; they will not be made available to the applicant. Please return this form by July 30, 1984, directly to the Selection Committee, in the addressed envelope which has been provided to you by the applicant.

PART I

Part I of the Principal's Evaluation provides an opportunity for you to evaluate the applicant in relation to certain competencies and indicators appropriate to teaching performance and classroom practice. The scale to be used to indicate the applicant's "degree of achievement" ranges from "1" for low achievement (significantly below average), through "3" for average achievement, to "5" for high achievement. Please circle the number which you believe represents the applicant's consistent level of achievement in each category. If there are one or more areas in which you have not had sufficient opportunity to observe the applicant, simply circle the last option--NO--for no opportunity to observe.

	DEGREE OF ACHIEVEMENT					
	High	Ave.			Low	
--Establishes appropriate instructional goals and related objectives consistent with the curriculum	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Prepares instructional plans and materials incorporating principles of effective instruction	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Creates, selects or modifies instructional plans and materials to accommodate learner instructional levels	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Monitors learner understanding and reteaches as necessary	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Establishes and maintains learner involvement in the learning task	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Uses evaluation to improve instruction	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Reports learner status and progress to learners and their parents	5	4	3	2	1	NO

Applicant's Name: _____
 Principal's Name: _____
 Principal's Evaluation: Page 2

	High	Ave.	Low		
--Establishes and maintains appropriate learner behavior	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Establishes and maintains a classroom climate conducive to learning	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Demonstrates positive verbal and non-verbal behavior to learners	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Makes effective use of classroom resources	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Promotes parent/community interest in the school	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Initiates activities and projects in the school	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Works cooperatively with peers, administrators and community members in planning and implementing curricular and extra-curricular activities	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Creates materials/programs and shares these with peers and administrators	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Assists peers and others in identifying and solving instructional problems	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Encourages student effort and progress	5	4	3	2	1 NO
--Supports learner excellence and achievement	5	4	3	2	1 NO

PART II

In Part II we would like to invite you to provide the Selection Committee with a narrative describing any of the aspects of the applicant's teaching or classroom practice which you believe are important in understanding his/her accomplishments in these areas. Where possible, it will be helpful if you can provide specific, concrete examples. Feel free to comment on those aspects of teaching and classroom practice which were included in the form above, or to address any other aspects of the applicant's performance in these areas which you believe to be significant.

We have provided two blank pages for your narrative, but you should feel free to use additional pages (or fewer pages) if appropriate. If you use additional pages, please put the applicant's name, your name, and the appropriate page number in the upper right-hand corner of each page. If possible, please type-write your narrative.

Please begin your narrative on the following page.

FORM F

Applicant's Name: _____
Colleague's Name: _____
Colleague Questionnaire: Page 1

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM**Colleague Questionnaire**

The applicant named above has applied to be considered for the status of Master Teacher by the Master Teacher Selection Committee for the school district. As part of the application process, the applicant is required to contact three colleagues and request that they complete the "Colleague Questionnaire" in support of the applicant's candidacy. The applicant should have furnished you not only with a copy of this questionnaire but also with an addressed envelope for the return of the questionnaire directly to the Selection Committee by July 30, 1984. Your responses will be held in confidence by the committee and will not be made available to the applicant. The Master Teacher Selection Committee appreciates your time and effort in responding to this questionnaire.

In Part I, we would like you to assess the applicant on a number of specific points. If there are one or more areas in which you feel you are not qualified to offer an opinion (e.g., you have not had an opportunity to observe the applicant in situations which would give you information in relation to that area), simply circle the last option—"NO"—which indicates that you have had no opportunity to observe. It is assumed that not everyone will be able to respond in all areas.

In Part II, we have provided you with an opportunity to comment on any aspects of the applicant's professional life which you believe to be relevant to a consideration of his/her merits. You should feel free to respond with information/descriptions/examples/evaluations related to the areas touched on in Part I or to any other aspect of the applicant's contribution to the schools and to the teaching profession which you deem appropriate.

Applicant's Name: _____
 Colleague's Name: _____
 Colleague Questionnaire: Page 2

PART I

Please circle the number which you believe represents the applicant's consistent level of achievement in each category. The scale ranges from "1" for low achievement, through "3" for average achievement, to "5" for high achievement. If you have no knowledge of the applicant's competence/activity with regard to a specific category, please circle the last option—NO—which indicates that you have had no opportunity to observe the applicant in this context.

<u>Category.</u>	DEGREE OF ACHIEVEMENT					
	<u>High</u>		<u>Ave.</u>		<u>Low</u>	
--Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of his/her subject matter	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of teaching and learning principles	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Establishes appropriate instructional goals and related objectives consistent with the curriculum	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Creates, selects or modifies instructional plans and materials to accommodate individual learner needs	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Shares materials and ideas with colleagues	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Effectively and consistently motivates students	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Effectively manages the classroom environment	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Effectively and efficiently uses resources in support of his/her instruction	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Professionally and effectively involves the parents of students in the educational process	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Actively and effectively promotes the school to the community	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Actively and effectively participates in professional organizations/groups	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Actively and effectively takes part in establishing and achieving school goals	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Initiates and contributes to informal and formal discussions among colleagues of educational issues/ideas	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Willingly and effectively provides assistance to colleagues	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Demonstrates outstanding oral and written communication skills	5	4	3	2	1	NO

Applicant's Name: _____
Colleague's Name: _____
Colleague Questionnaire: Page 3

PART II

Part II is an opportunity for you to provide the Selection Committee with information, descriptions, examples, and/or evaluations of the applicant which you deem relevant to a consideration of his/her candidacy for Master Teacher status. The space below and an additional blank page have been provided for this narrative response. Please feel free to use additional (or fewer) pages as appropriate. If you use additional pages, please put the applicant's name, your name, and the appropriate page number in the upper right-hand corner of each page. If possible, please typewrite your responses.

FORM G

Applicant's Name: _____
 Patron/Parent Name: _____
 Patron/Parent Questionnaire: Page 1

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAMPatron/Parent Questionnaire

The applicant named above has applied to be considered for the status of Master Teacher by the Master Teacher Selection Committee for the school district. As part of the application process, the applicant is required to contact three school district patrons and/or parents of the applicant's current or former students and request that they complete the "Patron/Parent Questionnaire" in support of the applicant's candidacy. The applicant should have furnished you not only with a copy of this questionnaire but also with an addressed envelope for the return of the questionnaire directly to the Selection Committee by July 30, 1984. Your responses will be held in confidence by the committee and will not be made available to the applicant. The Master Teacher Selection Committee appreciates your time and effort in responding to this questionnaire.

In Part I, we would like you to assess the applicant on a number of specific points. If you have no knowledge of the applicant's competence/activity with regard to a specific category, please circle the last option--NO--which indicates that you have had no opportunity to observe the applicant in this context. It is assumed that not everyone will be able to respond in all areas.

In Part II, we have provided you with an opportunity to comment on any aspects of the applicant's professional life which you believe to be relevant to a consideration of his/her merits. You should feel free to respond with information/descriptions/examples/evaluations related to the areas touched on in Part I or to any other aspect of the applicant's contribution to the schools and to the teaching profession which you deem appropriate.

Before beginning, please indicate with a checkmark which of the following options describe your relationship to the applicant (check all the options that apply):

- _____ school district patron
 _____ parent of a former student of the applicant
 _____ parent of a current student of the applicant

Applicant's Name: _____
 Patron/Parent Name: _____
 Patron/Parent Questionnaire: Page 2

PART I

Please circle the number which you believe represents the applicant's consistent level of achievement in each category. The scale ranges from "1" for low achievement, through "3" for average achievement, to "5" for high achievement. If you have no knowledge of the applicant's competence/activity with regard to a specific category, please circle the last option--NO--which indicates that you have had no opportunity to observe the applicant in this context.

Category	DEGREE OF ACHIEVEMENT					
	High		Ave.		Low	
--Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of his/her subject matter	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of teaching and learning principles	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Establishes appropriate instructional goals and related objectives consistent with the curriculum	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Creates, selects or modifies instructional plans and materials to accommodate individual learner needs	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Effectively and consistently motivates students	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Effectively manages the classroom environment	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Effectively and efficiently uses resources in support of his/her instruction	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Professionally and effectively involves the parents of students in the educational process	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Actively and effectively promotes the school to the community	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Actively and effectively takes part in establishing and achieving school goals	5	4	3	2	1	NO
--Demonstrates outstanding oral and written communication skills	5	4	3	2	1	NO

PART II

Part II is an opportunity for you to provide the Selection Committee with information, descriptions, examples, and/or evaluations of the applicant which you deem relevant to a consideration of his/her candidacy for Master Teacher status. The following two blank pages have been provided for this narrative response. Please feel free to use additional (or fewer) pages as appropriate. If you use additional pages, please put the applicant's name, your name, and the appropriate page number in the upper right-hand corner of each page. If possible, please typewrite your responses.

FORM H

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM

Professional Growth Activities: An Open-Ended Form

To be Completed By The Applicant

This form is furnished to you to record and describe your professional growth activities since embarking on a professional teaching career, with emphasis upon your more recent activities in this area. As noted in criterion #9 of the Master Teacher Program, the applicant should demonstrate "significant participation in professional growth activities, to include but not be limited to participation in educational courses, workshops, conferences, etc.; participation in professional organizations and committees; participation on curriculum committees; sponsorship of student extra-curricular activities, etc." You should feel free to include any activities which you believe could be characterized as professional growth and development.

The supporting data which you are permitted to submit in this regard shall "include but not be limited to a narrative from the applicant which describes the extent, nature, and significance of the applicant's contributions in these areas and their relationship to his/her professional development and/or classroom performance." Please note that as a minimum you must submit a narrative describing your involvement. The narrative should be more than a mere listing of your activities. For at least many of the activities you should be attempting to describe the extent, the nature, and the significance of your contribution and the relationship of the activity to your professional development and/or classroom performance.

We have attached two blank pages for your narrative. You should feel free to use additional (or fewer) pages if appropriate. If you use additional pages, please put your name and the appropriate page number in the upper right-hand corner of each page.

Please note that you are not limited to submitting a narrative. In addition to the narrative, you may submit any supporting documentation which you think is appropriate. For example, if in the past you received a letter from an officer in an organization to which you belong, thanking you and describing some specific work which you did on behalf of the organization, you might want to submit a copy of the letter. If you were the principal author of a curriculum review for your grade level, you might want to submit a copy of the study. If you conducted a workshop for your fellow teachers and you received evaluations of your presentation by those present, you might wish to submit the evaluation sheets (or a summary of them). You may submit any supporting data which you believe is significant. We have included in this packet a folder in which you should place any "Materials Related to Professional Growth Activities" which you wish to submit. If the folder is not large enough, you should feel free to substitute a different kind of folder. Please clearly mark your name on the folder. The folder we have included with this packet has a space provided for this.

Please clearly identify each page of your supplementary materials by putting your name somewhere on each page, preferably in the upper right-hand corner. It would also be prudent to include a note on the front of the folder, indicating the number of pages or pieces of material included in the folder.

FORM I**THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM****Community/Civic Participation: An Open-Ended Form****To be Completed By The Applicant**

This form is furnished to you to record and describe your participation in community and civic activities since embarking on your professional career, with emphasis upon your more recent activities in this area. As noted in criterion #10 of the Master Teacher Program, data supporting the involvement of the applicant in this area shall "include but not be limited to a narrative from the applicant which describes the extent, nature, and significance of the applicant's contributions in these areas." You should feel free to include any community/civic activities which you believe demonstrate your involvement in the life of the community.

Please note that as a minimum you must submit a narrative describing your involvement. This narrative should be more than a mere listing of your activities. For at least many of the activities you should be attempting to describe the extent, the nature, and the significance of your involvement. We have attached two blank pages for your narrative. You should feel free to use additional (or fewer) pages if appropriate. If you use additional pages, please put your name and the appropriate page number in the upper right-hand corner of each page.

You should also note that you are not limited to submitting a narrative. In addition to the narrative, you may submit any supporting documentation which you think is appropriate. For example, if in the past you received a letter from an officer in a civic organization to which you belong, thanking you and describing some specific work which you did on behalf of the organization, you might want to submit a copy of the letter. If you spoke to a local service club on the needs of the schools, and you received an evaluation of your presentation from those present, you might want to submit a copy of the evaluation summary.

You may submit any supporting data which you believe is significant. We have included in this packet a folder in which you should place any "Materials Related to Community/Civic Participation" which you wish to submit. If the folder is not large enough, you should feel free to substitute a different kind of folder. Please clearly mark your name on the folder. The folder we have included with this packet has a space provided for this.

Please clearly identify each page of your supplementary materials by putting your name somewhere on each page, preferably in the upper right-hand corner. It would also be prudent to include a note on the front of the folder, indicating the number of pages or pieces of material included in the folder.

You should begin your narrative on the following page.

APPENDIX G

SUMMARY OF LGU INVOLVEMENT

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 25, 1983
TO: Head, ABSCED Department
FROM: Director of Education Extension Office
SUBJECT: Master Teacher Pilot Program Meeting

After checking with each of you we have scheduled a meeting of the department heads and extension coordinators on Tuesday, August 30, to discuss the Master Teacher Pilot Program. We have scheduled the meeting for 8:45 a.m.

Enclosed is a summary of the involvement of Land Grant University in the project with Clearwater, Stanley and Wayside schools.

MASTER TEACHER PILOT PROGRAM

For the School Districts of Clearwater,
Stanley, and Wayside, Oklahoma

Involvement of Land Grand UniversityYear One

A faculty member from LGU will be employed for twelve months and 25% time; a graduate student from LGU will be employed for twelve months at 50% time; a secretary from LGU will be employed for four months at 25% time.

The LGU faculty member and graduate student will assume major responsibility for a comprehensive review of the literature which has been published on master teacher-type plans. The review of the literature is scheduled to be conducted primarily during the first three months of Year One.

Concerted efforts will be directed toward obtaining information on the most current ideas on the master teacher concept and toward securing formal and informal evaluations of these ideas where they have been put into operation. In this research, care will be taken to solicit comments not only from State Department of Education representatives and superintendents in those states/districts where master teacher-type plans are being implemented, but also from teachers' organizations, individual teachers, organizations of school administrators and individual administrators, parent groups, and representatives of other education-related organizations as appropriate in order to obtain a comprehensive view of the plans in operation and to evaluate them from the perspectives of many different groups. Synopses of existing and proposed plans and brief characterizations of the evaluations will be recorded and catalogued for use in the communication of the project (described below) and in the drafting of a master teacher plan for the pilot program.

LGU personnel will assist the school districts in designing and implementing a plan of communication which will attempt to inform and be informed by the opinions of groups and individuals vital to the success of a master teacher plan in Oklahoma. In addition to specific meetings with formal organizations, the plan of communication should include one or more open meetings to which the public is invited. The communication phase of the project will begin in approximately the fourth month of Year One. While the superintendents of the three districts will bear the major responsibility for this phase of the project, the LGU faculty member working with them will undoubtedly be called upon to attend and to be available for questions during some meetings.

The research and communication phases of the project will explore at a minimum: the structure upon which a master teacher plan might be organized; the underlying philosophy and rationale of such a plan; the criteria by which master teachers would be selected; the composition and procedures of the committee which would be charged with selecting the master teachers; the appropriate monetary compensation for those designated as master teachers; the responsibilities of master teachers; the system of evaluating the master teacher plan concept; and procedures for modifying the plan as a result of both formal and informal evaluation.

The faculty member would continue throughout the first year of the project to be available for advice to the districts as the superintendents name a joint Master Teacher Plan Committee which would be assigned the task of drafting the actual plan for implementing the pilot master teacher project. Based on that plan, the composition of the Master Teacher Selection Committee for each district will be determined and the criteria by which master teachers will be selected will be specified. As needed, the faculty member and graduate student would be available for additional research tasks which might be necessary to assist these committees.

By the end of Year One, approximately six or seven master teachers will have been designated in each of the three school districts, with their tenure as master teachers to begin the following year.

Year Two (if funded)

An LGU faculty member with expertise in evaluation will be employed for 24 days of consulting during the second year of the project to assist the districts in designing and implementing a comprehensive plan of evaluation for the pilot projects.

Year Three (if funded)

An LGU faculty member with expertise in evaluation will be employed for twelve months at 25% time to assist with the implementation of the evaluation plan and the drafting of a final report. In addition, the faculty member who was affiliated with the project in Year One will be employed for five days of consulting during the third year of the project to assist with the writing of a final project report.

APPENDIX H

MINUTES

STANLEY MASTER TEACHER PLAN MEETING

OCTOBER 31, 1983

The Stanley Committee for the Master Teacher Program, consisting of five members, held an open hearing at 2:00 p.m.

It was emphasized that the primary purpose for the Master Teacher Plan is to reward exceptional teachers and to encourage them to stay in the classroom, thereby ensuring that the student's educational process may be facilitated through superior instruction.

Points discussed were as follows:

1. Should, in fact, one of the requirements for entering the program be the master's degree? The committee felt, as did the majority of others who attended the hearing, that the master's degree should be a stipulation for entering the program.
2. Should a standard number of years experience be set as a stipulation for entering the program? An arbitrary number of five years was discussed and favored by those present.
3. Should a master teacher, once designated, be reviewed periodically? It was the consensus of the committee that some form of review should be established to ensure that requirements continue to be met.
4. Should the competency test taken by the master teacher candidate be relevant only to his or her field of instruc-

tion, or should it be a comprehensive test? The general feeling was that the test should sufficiently cover that teacher's field of instruction.

5. Should the name for the program be, in fact, "Master Teacher"? Some felt that there might be a better title for the program. No suggestions, however, were made as to what that title might be.

6. Requirements to be fulfilled by the master teacher candidate, in addition to the master's degree and the competency test were briefly mentioned. Some possibilities were extra college courses to provide enrichment, the ability to assist other teachers in achieving master teacher status, and the willingness to assist in the review process for other master teacher candidates.

The committee adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

WAYSIDE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Wayside Master Teacher Plan Committee met Thursday evening, November 17, 1983, at 7:00 p.m. in the superintendent's office. All nine members of the committee were present. Four other persons not on the committee were also present.

The superintendent opened the meeting by introducing the committee members and explaining the purpose of the committee and the proposal submitted to the Legislature to recognize outstanding teachers as "Master Teachers." He advised this proposal was presented as a means of keeping these teachers in the classroom, rather than promoting them to supervisory or administrative type positions or losing them to industry for increased salaries. The superintendent also went over suggested criteria for the selection of these master teachers. Committee members, along with the other interested persons present, offered suggestions concerning criteria for selection. The following criteria were agreed upon by those present:

A. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

A minimum of five years teaching experience, with tenure status in the local school system.

B. DEMONSTRATED STUDENT GROWTH

This was an area of concern for several of those present. Although it was agreed among those present that

there should be evidence of student growth, it was not agreed as to the best method to determine growth. Standardized tests, criterion referenced tests, tests especially developed to correlate with local objectives, etc. were discussed.

C. EMBODIMENT OF THE PRINCIPLES OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP

Although it was agreed that "good citizenship" could mean many things, it was also agreed that good citizenship is an important issue and should be considered as one of the criteria for the selection of a master teacher.

D. PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION

There should be evidence of active participation of the master teacher in professional organizations which are basically concerned with the area(s) in which that teacher is currently teaching.

E. EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS

A master's degree would be a minimum requirement for the master teacher since a master teacher should have credentials above and beyond the requirements for a beginning teacher.

F. REVIEW PROCESS

The master teacher will be subject to a review by the Master Teacher Selection Committee every three years. This review should include a review of each entrance (selection) criteria.

G. COMPETENCY TESTING

The master teacher would have passed the competency test in the area(s) taught as administered new teachers entering the profession in Oklahoma. It was not agreed upon as to what score should be obtained on that test.

The master teacher should also show evidence of having successfully passed an English proficiency test as administered by a state university.

H. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The master teacher should accept a leadership role during the school year. This could include availability for consultation with other teachers (in both local and area schools). Any additional needs, such as curriculum review and revisions, workshops, research, new projects, etc. could be pursued during the summer months, with extra compensation.

I. SALARY DIFFERENTIAL

Prestige was discussed as an important item to a master teacher. However, it was suggested and agreed that a 20% differential of the master teacher's salary be provided as an incentive to remain in the classroom and continue in the area of her expertise (outstanding teaching) for the benefit of students.

Discussion also dealt with whether or not this 20% should be figured on total contract salary (with increments included) or whether this should be the same amount for all

master teachers, regardless of years taught. Consensus was not reached.

These criteria are presented by the Wayside Master Teacher Plan Committee for consideration by the combined Master Teacher Plan Committee of Clearwater, Stanley and Wayside schools.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

COMBINED MASTER TEACHER PLAN COMMITTEE

CLEARWATER, STANLEY, WAYSIDE

The combined Master Teacher Plan Committee of Clearwater, Stanley and Wayside schools met in Wayside at the End of Main for a noon luncheon meeting on Monday, November 28, 1983. Representatives from each school's committee were present, along with the director and two assistants from the Education Extension office of Land Grant University, and each of the superintendents from Clearwater, Stanley and Wayside.

The Wayside superintendent, acting as moderator, welcomed committee members and other participants, after which each person introduced him/herself and stated the position each held in the school system. Copies of the minutes of the public hearings held by each school, along with a summary of these minutes as prepared by the Clearwater superintendent, were distributed.

The director of Land Grant University Education Extension office advised that the university can provide additional information in any area noted by the committees and asked one of his assistants to address the evaluation process. The assistant stated he needs to have information early in the planning stages in order to gather information to match the objectives. This should be early in the first year as the second year will get post data after the fact. A Land Grant University staff member will also be available to meet with the committee(s) if necessary.

The Wayside superintendent suggested the list of criteria be discussed item by item for consensus, when possible, or left for more committee work and further discussion at a later meeting.

I. EXPERIENCE

Consensus was reached for five years experience, with local tenure.

II. DEGREE

Consensus was reached for a minimum of a master's degree.

III. COMPETENCY TEST

Consensus was reached for some type of competency testing. However, the test itself was not agreed upon. The Oklahoma State Competency Test was discussed, along with the National Teachers' Exam. The superintendent from Stanley suggested that Land Grant University look over various competency

tests and make recommendations to this committee. The director of the Education Extension office agreed that Land Grant University will do this.

The Clearwater superintendent advised this committee that the Clearwater committee is opposed to the master teacher plan as is being presented and prefers a "step" process rather than a "leap" process. This could mean a series of as many as three steps to becoming a master teacher. Clearwater committee members also voiced a concern over a predetermined number of slots available to each school for master teachers. They felt this would create personnel problems and that a step process would allow more teachers to participate in the program.

Discussion followed the introduction of the step concept. The relationship between the step process and merit pay was discussed, and there were questions again concerning the number of slots that would be available in each school for master teachers. The Wayside superintendent stated the number of slots in the proposal are arbitrary numbers and that they were presented to the legislature for funding purposes. It was agreed that a plan should not be developed which would be closed to all but a few teachers. He then suggested each committee go back and look at the step plan and perhaps criteria for each level, with the hope that consensus can be reached by this combined group at the next combined meeting. This suggestion appeared to be agreeable with the group.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES

Consensus was reached that the master teacher would be available for consultation with other teachers, assist other teachers in achieving master teacher status, and be able to work during the summer months (for additional pay, to be negotiated by the district).

V. OTHER CRITERIA

The Clearwater superintendent suggested the following criteria, in addition to that set out on the combined master teacher criteria as prepared by Clearwater: professionalism, school activities, all-around program, parent involvement, criterion referenced tests, performance based tests in subject areas, objective plan approved by the administration, principal evaluation.

Other suggestions were letters of recommendation from the community, etc., good citizenship, demonstrated student growth, leadership, and student discipline.

The director of the Land Grant University Education Extension office suggested an application form to fill out with these different criteria listed on it. A Clearwater representative stated that the application form should be so explicit that the applicant should almost know before he submits his application that he will qualify. The committee would merely be validating, not making subjective judgment. The Stanley superintendent stated the selection committee should not be arbitrarily selected by the principal or superintendent and that master teachers themselves would eventually serve on the selected committee. The selection now would be a validation process. The director of the Land Grant University Education Extension office stated that any administrator sitting on the committee would not be welcome.

Consensus was reached on demonstrated student growth, leadership, principal evaluation, and student discipline. It was also agreed that all suggested criteria should be listed under "Measureable", "Observable" and "Subjective" headings on the application form. Each committee will go back and work on this area.

VI. PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION

It was agreed that "active participation in professional organizations/activities which are basically concerned with area(s) in which the teacher is currently teaching should be listed under Other Criteria."

The Wayside superintendent asked the university to provide this committee with recent studies of "characteristics of a good teacher." The university agreed to do this.

VII. SALARY DIFFERENTIAL

After a lengthy discussion of appropriate differential, this item was tabled until our next meeting. Clearwater suggested \$10,000 and the Stanley superintendent asked to go on record as recommending a minimum of 20% of salary schedule, if the money is available.

VII. NOMINATION OF "APPLICATION" PROCESS

It was agreed that an application form is necessary and will have to be filled out by the individual applicant as that person is the only one who can furnish all of the necessary information.

IX. REVIEW PROCESS

No consensus was reached. Stanley suggested that some form of review should take place to ensure requirements (cri-

teria) continue to be met. Wayside suggested a review of master teacher every three years by the selection committee. It was also suggested that the evaluation be in the form of an instrument for annual review by the faculty.

X. EVALUATION PROCESS

The assistant from the university Education Extension office advised we need to state goals soon. Expected accomplishments, criteria, etc. need to be identified. This should be measurable and observable, with baseline data (e.g. student growth). Good citizenship, professional growth, how to show increases, etc. need to be defined in order to know whether or not objectives are met.

The director of the Education Extension office expressed pleasure at the progress from "merit pay" to "master teacher" plan. He also stated that if we are going with steps toward master teacher, this should be couched "steps leading to master teacher." Steps should lead to master teacher and not end with a step.

The Wayside superintendent asked for comments and advised the minutes of this meeting will be mailed to each school. We will meet again in the future in a joint meeting. This meeting date is open.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Acting Recorder

WAYSIDE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Wayside Master Teacher Plan Committee met Thursday afternoon, January 19, 1984, at 4:00 p.m. in the superintendent's office. There were eight members of the committee present.

The superintendent opened the meeting by explaining the purpose as being to finalize our version of the criteria for the reflection of a master teacher. This proposal will be presented to the combined group at a meeting to be held at 10:00 a.m., January 26, 1984, at the end of Main in Wayside, for the purpose of finalizing the proposal to be presented to the Legislature for approval.

The following criteria were agreed upon by the Wayside committee:

A. COMPETENCY TESTING

A competency test in the area(s) taught (test and score not agreed upon). NOTE: The Land Grant University is to furnish information regarding teacher's examinations, and agreement will be reached after reviewing such material. The master teacher shall also show evidence of having successfully passed an English proficiency test (either as a part of the competency test or through a separate test).

B. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Five years experience, with local tenure.

C. DEGREE

Minimum of Master's Degree.

D. DEMONSTRATED STUDENT GROWTH

Through nationally recognized standardized test (based upon average growth).

E. GOOD CITIZENSHIP

As demonstrated by three letters from fellow teachers, recommending on the basis of ethical behavior, along with three letters from community members (with only one being from a parent of a current student).

F. ENDORSEMENT FROM PRINCIPAL

A letter of recommendation from present principal.

G. PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION

There should be evidence of active participation of the master teacher in professional organizations and/or activities which are basically concerned with the area(s) in which that teacher is currently teaching.

H. INTERVIEW WITH COMMITTEE OUTSIDE THE SYSTEM

The committee shall be composed of three patrons and three teachers (an administrator could be included). The purpose of the interview shall be to review and validate information furnished by the applicants and make recommendations for master teacher status.

I. SELECTION OF VALIDATION COMMITTEE

The original validation committee shall be members of the Master Teacher Plan Committee of the three schools (Clearwater, Stanley and Wayside). This committee will select the patrons to serve. Master Teachers shall be included on subsequent validation committees.

J. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Master Teacher shall be available for consultation with other teachers, assist other teachers in achieving master teacher status, and be available to work during the summer months (for additional pay, to be negotiated by the district).

K. SALARY DIFFERENTIAL

20% differential, on base salary.

L. REVIEW PROCESS

A review will be made every three years, going through the entire verification (application) process, with the exception of the competency test.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

MASTER TEACHER PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING

Clearwater, Wayside, Stanley

The committee for the Master Teacher Plan, consisting of members from each of the three participating schools met at the End of Main at 10:00 A.M., on January 26, 1984. The superintendents from Wayside and Stanley were present, a representative from the State Department of Education, the director and his assistant from the Land Grant University Education Extension office and a Land Grant University graduate assistant.

Minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and approved in a motion made by the Wayside superintendent and seconded by a committee member.

The Stanley superintendent, moderator, outlined the agenda for the meeting, which called for a discussion of each school's plan as well as approval of standards discussed. Guests were introduced and the meeting ensued.

The Stanley superintendent asked the assistant to the director of the university Education Extension office to present information concerning the National Teacher's Examination. She stated that she had sent copies to each of the three schools of information on the NTE, as well as information relevant to good teaching. The director of the Education Extension office stated that the NTE can be used for the purpose of teacher evaluation, but that he felt that it should be only one of many evaluative tools.

Copies of the Clearwater plan were distributed and one of the committee members from Clearwater explained the plan as they conceive of it. The plan consists of three steps, the third being master teacher status. Discussion followed.

The Wayside plan was presented by the Wayside superintendent. Each member of the committee received a copy. The plan consists of a one-level program leading to master teacher status. Discussion followed.

The Stanley superintendent explained that the Stanley plan is similar in format to the Wayside plan, consisting of a one-level approach to master teacher status. Discussion followed.

He then called for review and approval of each item on the agenda, and the committee proceeded.

Nine motions were made and approved as follows:

1. The Wayside superintendent made a motion that the NTE be adopted as a competency test for evaluation of master teacher candidates. Motion seconded by a Clearwater representative. Motion passed.
2. The Wayside superintendent made a motion that the Master's degree be a requirement for the master teacher candidate. Motion seconded by a committee member. Motion passed.
3. A representative from Clearwater made a motion that six letters of recommendation for the master teacher candidate be required, three from peers, three from patrons, of which only one can be from a student's parent. Motion seconded by a Wayside committee member. Motion passed.
4. The Wayside superintendent made a motion that self-evaluation of the master teacher candidate with principal endorsement be adopted as a requirement. Motion seconded by a Wayside committee member. Motion passed.
5. A Wayside committee member made a motion that student growth be measured by a nationally recognized stand-

ardized test or a criteria and reference test approved by the district. Motion seconded by a committee member. Motion passed.

6. A Clearwater committee member moved that the committee accept items 8 and 9 on the Clearwater plan; Master teacher candidate must demonstrate professional growth and involvement in community affairs. Motion seconded by a committee member. Motion passed.
7. A Clearwater committee member moved that the master teacher review committee be composed of two teachers, one patron, and one administrator from each district as determined by each separate school with committee members not involved in their own school's candidate's selection. Motion seconded by a Wayside committee member. Motion passed.
8. A Clearwater committee member moved that items H, I and 10 be approved. These items restated the composition of the committee as approved in motion #7, and added that the initial validation committee shall consist of the original master teacher plan committee members. Motion seconded by the Wayside superintendent. Motion passed.
9. A Wayside committee member moved that local tenure be part of the criteria for the master teacher candidate. Motion seconded by a committee member. Motion carried. (Feasibility of master teacher status being transferable to be addressed at a later time.)

At this time a discussion ensued concerning the format of the Master Teacher Plan. A Clearwater committee member explained in depth his concept of the step plan as Clearwater envisions it. Wayside and Stanley committee members presented points advocating the one-level plan to the Master Teacher status. An impasse was reached.

The moderator called for adjournment after asking the director of the Land Grant University Education Extension office to outline the two plans so that the committee could possibly decide upon the best course to take. A tentative date of February 9, 1984, was set for our next meeting. The committee adjourned at approximately 2:15 P.M.

Acting recorder

The Wayside Master Teacher Plan Committee met in the superintendent's office Wednesday, February 8, 1984, at 3:15 p.m. The following recommendations were presented by the committee for presentation to the combined committee on Thursday, February 9.

1. Modify the composition of the Master Teacher Committee to include a university representative, or in the case of a vocational teacher, a person from industry/business community.
2. Increase the authority of the committee to more than simply a validation body. The committee, after review of the application and interview with the applicant, could recommend acceptance or rejection of the applicant to Master Teacher status.
3. The Principal endorsement should include specific evaluation of the teacher to identify "characteristics" accepted as traits of "Master Teacher."
4. Seven years experience necessary for eligibility.
5. Application of applicant to include:
 - a. Identification of special teaching skills and strategies.
 - b. Methods of classroom management.
 - c. Willingness to aid other teachers (description of how this would be accomplished).

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

AGENDA
MASTER TEACHER COMMITTEE
WAYSIDE, OKLAHOMA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1984, 10:00 A.M.

- I. Review of Points of Agreement in Selection Process
 1. National Teacher's Exam
 2. Master;s Degree
 3. Five Years Experience
 4. Local Tenure
 5. Demonstrated Student Growth
 6. Self Evaluation with Principal's Endorsement
 7. Demonstrated Professional Growth
 8. Documentation of Community Involvement
- II. Review Committee's Unresolved Items
 1. "Step" vs. "Leap"
- III. Consideration of Any Other Criteria in the Selection Process
- IV. Adopt Committee Criteria for "Master Teacher". Selection Process
- V. Develop time Limits and Responsibilities for Implementation of Plan
 - A. Public Hearing
 1. Date, Place and Time
 - B. Publication and Distribution of Committee's Plan
 - C. Assign Responsibility for Developing Actual Selection Process
 1. Selection Committees
 - a. Application Forms
 - b. Selection of Review Committees
 - c. Recommendation of Verification Process
 - d. Time Line
 - D. Other
- VI. Set Time for Review and Completion of Items Listed In #V. (Set Next Meeting.)
- VII. Adjourn

The Clearwater Master Teacher Committee conducted a public meeting and the following recommendations and observations were recorded:

Bank President

- (1) Favored additional pay for Master Teachers.
- (2) Expressed opinion that administrators were capable and should be prime factors in the identification process.
- (3) Expressed belief that extra pay was a motivating factor in quality work.
- (4) Expressed opinion that lack of additional pay had a negative effect on the quality of teaching.
- (5) Selection criteria should be based upon performance.

Former Teacher, Parent and Housewife

- (1) Favored additional pay for Master Teachers.
- (2) Expressed opinion that identification would be hard but not impossible.
- (3) Expressed opinion that additional pay would motivate staff members to work to become "Master Teachers."

Elementary Teacher

- (1) Opposed "Master Teacher" Plan.
- (2) Expressed opinion that "Master Teacher" identification and pay would have a divided effect on staff.
- (3) Expressed opinion that some would not have time to qualify because of other responsibilities which would not be fair.

Elementary Teacher

- (1) Criteria for selection should be based upon many factors. These should include expertise in subject area, measurable learning experiences, childrens attitudes toward learning, relationship to peers, students and parents, exprience, degree, childrens self concepts, and organizational skills.

In other committee discussions, the following topics were discussed:

- (1) Nomination
 - (A) Self Nomination
 - (B) Staff Administrator Nomination
 - (C) Student-Parent Nomination

(2) Measurable and Observable Criteria

- (A) Student Welfare
- (B) Organizational Skills
- (C) Respect of Colleagues
- (D) Degree
- (E) Number of Years Teaching Experience
- (F) Motivational Skills
- (G) Student Achievement
- (H) Teacher Test Scores (National Teacher's Exam
- (I) Contributions to School Climate and Staff
- (J) Attendance of Teacher
- (K) Professional Acceptance of Responsibility
- (L) Professional Growth Activities

Generally speaking, many teachers opposed the master teacher plan for several reasons. Some of those given were:

- (1) Criteria for identification would not be measurable.
- (2) Failure of merit pay and other programs in the past.
- (3) Lack of funding by state to continue program.
- (4) Negative effect on moral of staff.
- (5) Parental demands that all children be with Master Teacher.
- (6) Negative effects that identification would have in community toward those not chosen as Master Teachers.
- (7) Belief that seven or eight positions would not be adequate for staff and when filled, what chance do others have to achieve "Master Teacher" status.

APPENDIX I

THE MASTER TEACHER EVALUATION REPORT

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM
EVALUATION REPORT

Office of Education Extension
Land Grant University

June 5, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Planning Year, 1983-84	2
Selection Committees	3
Selection Criteria	3
Master Teacher Selections for 1985-86 School Year	4
Evaluation	5
Master Teacher Interviews	5
Questionnaires for Colleagues	11
<u>Open-Ended Responses</u>	
Question #24: Strengths of Program	21
Question #25: Weaknesses of Program	24
Question #26: Suggested Changes	27
Recommendations for Future Consideration	29
 <u>Appendix</u>	
Master Teacher Program Plan	
A List of the Members of the Master Teacher Selection Committees	
Master Teacher Program Evaluation Questionnaire and Cover Letter	

THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM
EVALUATION REPORT

Introduction

During the Spring of 1983, Mr. _____, Mr. _____, and Mr. _____ superintendents, respectively, of the school districts of Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside, Oklahoma, met at various times with representatives of the Oklahoma State Legislature and with staff of the Oklahoma State Department of Education to discuss their interest in formally investigating the possible benefits inherent in the various merit pay, master teacher, and career ladder plans being proposed by school districts, state education agencies, and other governmental agencies across the United States. The recent publication of several educational reform reports, issued by a variety of national commissions and research teams, had again focused the country's attention on the quality of education being provided in the nation's schools, and the renewed emphasis on achieving excellence in education included an avowed concern with ensuring the quality and the adequate compensation of the teachers serving in those schools.

During the early 1980s, state legislators and educational leaders across the country had focused their efforts on improving the base salaries of all teachers, and, at the same time, establishing some system of recognition and monetary compensation to attract and retain in the teaching profession the very best people. The latter efforts often took the shape of merit pay plans, where at least part of a teacher's salary is tied to an evaluation of his/her achievements; master teacher plans, whereby a district's or state's most exemplary teachers are recognized with an increase in salary or other benefits; or career ladder plans, whereby a more comprehensive system of career steps is established, which allows an individual teacher to advance in the teaching profession along a career path, with each succeeding step tied to an appropriate increase in pay. The career ladder plans proposed in the 1980s often culminated in a final step which was called the "master teacher" level, and the Oklahoma superintendents believed that the concept of master teacher was one which stood alone as a system of recognition and yet could be incorporated at some later time, if appropriate, into a more comprehensive career ladder plan.

On July 1, 1983, the Clearwater, Stanley, and Wayside school districts were funded by a grant from the Oklahoma Legislature, through the Oklahoma State Department of Education, for an initial year of planning for the development of a master teacher program. The initial grant was to be used to investigate the feasibility of such a program, its benefits and its limitations, and to design a program which might be piloted in the state of Oklahoma. The planning grant was followed by a second grant for the 1985-86 school year which allowed for the implementation on a pilot basis of a Master Teacher Program for the three districts.

Planning Year, 1983-84

A Master Teacher Plan Committee was established by the three superintendents, with representation from each district. Each superintendent appointed to the committee individuals representative of various constituencies with an interest in the master teacher concept. Clearwater's representatives to the committee included nine teachers, one school librarian, one principal, one school patron, one school board member, and the superintendent; Stanley's representatives included two teachers, one school patron, one school board member, and the superintendent; Wayside's representatives included five teachers, one principal, two school patrons, and the superintendent.

The 28 members of the Master Teacher Plan Committee met five times to consider the master teacher concept and the shape which such a program might take in their school districts. Meetings of the full committee were held on November 28, 1983, in Wayside January 26, 1984, in Wayside February 9, 1984, in Wayside February 16, 1984, in Clearwater and February 29, 1984, in Stanley. Each of these full committee meetings was preceded by one or more meetings held within each school district. The district-level meetings were an opportunity for the district's representatives to discuss with other teachers, administrators, and patrons from their district their concerns and suggestions regarding the master teacher concept.

A review of the published literature on the subjects of master teacher, merit pay, differentiated staffing, and career ladder plans was prepared by staff of the College of Education of the Land Grant University during the first three months of the grant and was used by the members of the Master Teacher Plan Committee for background information as they began their discussions. The review of the literature focused on the following considerations and components which other plans had incorporated into their final structure: philosophies, rationales, or goals; selection committee; selection process; selection criteria; compensation; responsibilities/opportunities; duration of status/ongoing process; and evaluation. Staff of the Land Grant University provided additional information to the committee on the plans currently being proposed across the United States as the committee continued its discussions during the Spring of 1984.

A variety of concerns and issues were considered by the committee members as they listened to the suggestions of their colleagues within their own districts and as they debated these issues in the full committee meetings. The Clearwater representatives felt strongly that the concept of master teacher should be viewed as one step on a career ladder of at least three steps. The reluctance on the part of other committee members to design a plan consisting of three steps was based not on the merits of the idea but rather on a feeling that the committee was charged, under the terms of the grant, to investigate only the master teacher concept. Therefore, on a vote of the committee (with each district having one vote), the Clearwater proposal to design a multi-step plan was defeated. However, members of the committee felt that at a later date the state might look at the incorporation of the Master Teacher Program into a multi-step, career ladder program.

The final plan for the Master Teacher Program which was adopted by the committee is appended to this evaluation report. The plan was presented on March

14, 1984, in a forum at the Oklahoma State Department of Education. Representatives of various school organizations and associations from across the state, including teachers organizations, were invited to attend the meeting to discuss the plan and to offer comments regarding it. Several suggestions received at the meeting were subsequently incorporated into the application packet which was distributed to all teachers interested in applying to the program.

Following the public forum at the State Department of Education, the committee met again on March 22, 1984, in Stanley to finalize plans for the preparation of a comprehensive packet of materials to be distributed to all teachers interested in applying for the Master Teacher Program.

Because applicants for the program would be required to submit scores from the National Teachers Examination, a special administration of the examination was scheduled by the Land Grant University for May 26, 1984, in Wayside. The State Department of Education grant covered the cost of this special test administration, and therefore there was no charge to the participating teachers.

The scores from the National Teachers Examination arrived back in the districts later than anticipated, and the original timeline for the application process had to be revised somewhat from what had earlier been announced. However, the new timeline was well publicized by the superintendents to those interested in applying. The timeline called for the application packets to be available at the schools by April 15, 1984, for interested teachers to pick up. Teachers had to notify their district by May 1, 1984, if they intended to take the NTE at the special administration. The deadline for submission to the appropriate Selection Committee of all materials required to make application to the program was August 17, 1984, with notification of the Selection Committee's decisions to be made by September 14, 1984.

Selection Committees

As specified in the Master Teacher Program plan, the Selection Committee for a district would not contain members from that district. A list of the members of each of the three Selection Committees was included in the application packet which was furnished to each interested teacher; the list is also included in the appendix to this report.

The Selection Committee for Clearwater included four Stanley representatives (the superintendent, a school board member, and two teachers) and four Wayside representatives (a principal, a central office administrator, a teacher, and a parent). The Selection Committee for Stanley included the Wayside personnel previously listed and four representatives from Clearwater (a principal, two teachers, and a school board member). The Selection Committee for Wayside included the Clearwater and Seiling representatives previously listed.

Selection Criteria

As noted in the application packet, the criteria specified in the Master Teacher Program plan were weighted by the Master Teacher Plan Committee.

trict has not been included in this evaluation of the project conducted at the completion of its first year.

Both of the teachers in the Stanley school district who completed the application process were chosen to serve as Master Teachers for 1985-86: _____ high school English teacher, and _____ a high school science teacher.

Of the six teachers in the Wayside school district who completed the application process, four were chosen to serve as Master Teachers for 1985-86: _____ an English/Drama teacher in the middle school; _____ a sixth- and seventh-grade language arts/reading teacher; _____ a fourth- and fifth-grade remedial education teacher; and _____ a remedial education reading teacher.

Evaluation

The evaluation conducted by _____ University included two phases. The first phase consisted of personal interviews with each of the six master teachers currently serving in that capacity. Each interview was one hour in length; they were conducted by Dr. _____, Head of the Department of Applied Behavioral Studies at _____ University, and Mrs. _____ Assistant Director of Education Extension at _____ University. With the permission of the interviewees, notes were taken by the interviewers on the responses made to a series of informal questions and to an open-ended request for suggestions for improving the program.

The second phase of the evaluation consisted of the administration of a written questionnaire to the teachers and administrators in the two school districts currently employing master teachers:

The purpose of the evaluation of the Master Teacher Program was to gather information concerning the program from educators in the two school districts with a view to re-examining the program and revising it as appropriate.

Master Teacher Interviews

The interviews in Stanley were conducted on March 28, 1985, in the School Board meeting room. The interviews in Wayside were conducted on April 4, 1985; two of the master teachers were interviewed in the counselor's office at the middle school and two were interviewed in their classroom. Each master teacher was interviewed separately.

Regarding the master teacher concept and the program's purpose, the master teachers felt that if the program works properly it should serve to identify the epitome of the person who loves to teach. The program should select those who make a real commitment of energy and time to their teaching. As one teacher noted, some teachers aren't "into their jobs like the master teacher should be--they walk out at the end of the day without work in their arms," while this particular teacher spends at least two hours each night in evaluating and preparing.

Those criteria deemed of highest importance were: demonstrated outstanding oral and written communication skills; at least above-average student growth; responses on the self-evaluation instrument completed by the applicant; responses on the evaluation instrument completed by the applicant's principal; and the portfolio of teaching materials submitted by the applicant.

Those criteria deemed of secondary importance included: interview with the applicant; interview with the applicant's principal; completion of a questionnaire by three of the applicant's colleagues and by three school patrons or parents; classroom observation; and professional activities.

The criterion dealing with participation in community and civic affairs was considered less significant than the other criteria, and the following six criteria were viewed as basic requirements to establish eligibility for consideration: be a classroom teacher holding standard certification who is employed full-time with the district and spends a minimum of three periods each day in the classroom; have been awarded tenure by the district; have seven years of full-time professional experience; have earned at least a master's degree; have performed satisfactorily on the Core Battery Tests of the National Teachers Examination (NTE) in the areas of communication skills, general knowledge, and professional knowledge; and have the capability and willingness to assume additional duties to be agreed upon by the Master Teacher and the district.

Because of the short timeline in place for the Master Teacher Program's first year of implementation, which extended the process into the summer months, the following criteria were not used in the initial year: classroom observation, applicant interview, and principal interview.

On May 8, 1984, a sub-committee of the Master Teacher Plan Committee met in Wayside with Mr. _____ of the Educational Testing Service, the company which publishes the National Teachers Examination, for the purpose of validating the use of the NTE as a criterion for the Master Teacher Program. The process of validating the NTE established the following recommended scaled scores and the following minimum required scores on the NTE for Master Teacher Program applicants:

	<u>Recommended Scaled Score</u>	<u>Points Representing 1 Standard Error</u>	<u>Minimum Required Score</u>
General Knowledge	657	5	652
Professional Knowledge	663	4	659
Communication Skills	656	10	646

Master Teacher Selections for 1985-86 School Year

Of the three teachers in the Clearwater school district who completed the application process, one was chosen to serve as Master Teacher for 1985-86: _____ an elementary teacher. However, Ms. _____ moved out of the district in December, 1984, and the Clearwater school district was without a Master Teacher for the remainder of the year. Because Clearwater experience with an operating Master Teacher Program was limited to three months, the dis-

One master teacher felt that the program offered teachers an opportunity to take a step up and still stay in teaching. He wasn't interested in administration and he believed that, outside of the opportunity for advancement through administration, most people perceived of teaching as a dead-end position. He thought there should be something more, something to achieve and to advance toward.

Another master teacher viewed the purpose of the program as identifying those teachers teaching at an excellent level and compensating them for that--rewarding them. She also felt, however, that additional duties were a legitimate part of the program. The master teacher, in her opinion, is one who is highly motivated to do things the average teacher might not even think of. The master teacher is not an 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. person, and she believes that teachers know this.

One master teacher, who thought that compensation for excellent teaching was long overdue, was nonetheless skeptical at first about the Master Teacher Program, because she felt that many of the criteria would be difficult to measure. However, she believes strongly that education needs some sort of incentive to keep good people in the profession. One of the master teachers described his interest in applying as a challenge which he wanted to take up to see if he could achieve. "The money was nice, but it's the prestige of the position that was most attractive. The real reward is your students' achievement and parents coming up to thank you for helping."

Yet another master teacher, who mentioned that the application process did require a great deal of time and effort but was a genuine learning experience in the self-examination it required, felt that the purpose of the program was to reward those doing a good job, to encourage teachers to continue their professional development, and to serve as an incentive ("as far as some place to go") for all teachers.

Regarding the perception of them and of the program by other teachers, most of the master teachers felt that the response of teachers in their districts had been sometimes positive and at worst indifferent. For the most part they have detected very little negative feelings, or at least, as one of them put it, "we're not hearing about it if it's there." Several teachers expressed the view that the younger (or newer) teachers are more in favor of the program than are the older (more experienced) teachers. They did sense, and in fact themselves support, the position that all teachers need a raise. Still, all of the master teachers believe that the Master Teacher Program, or something like it, is also needed. The master teachers described the reception of the program by their fellow teachers as: "well-received for the most part"; "moderately positive, haven't heard a negative comment from staff"; "most think it's a good program, that it's a start"; "no resentment from other teachers"; "have heard good and negative, but more good, with a hint of the view that 'I'm not going to do it so I wish they didn't have it' but nothing negative against the master teachers themselves."

All of the Wayside master teachers expressed concern that the high school teachers seemed less supportive of the program than did the elementary and middle school teachers. One teacher believed that distrust of the program by the high school teachers extended all the way back to when the program was first proposed, and that peer pressure at the high school kept interested

teachers from applying. All of the Wayside master teachers described support for the program at the elementary and middle school levels as relatively strong and felt that the negative feelings which did exist were emanating primarily from the high school.

Regarding the selection criteria, the master teachers generally supported the existing criteria. Only the requirement of the master's degree was questioned by more than one master teacher. The National Teachers Examination requirement was generally supported.

"Thorough. Classroom observation needs to be in there. The application process covers everything. I think the NTE is good--people should be able to pass. Maybe some have gotten in a rut and let their brains get lazy."

"Have to have some criteria and the ones for this program are pretty sound. Might be some things that could be improved but no ideas now. Many teachers didn't like paperwork--but I didn't think it was so bad. The NTE requirement is good. If you weaken the NTE requirement, the program will have less credibility with legislators and the general public."

"Might look at the weighting of the criteria a little differently. I had questions about the NTE, but after giving it consideration, I believe it is reasonable."

"The cut-off score on the NTE bothers me some. I would hope no one thing would keep a person out, and I feel strongly that the master's degree should not be required."

"Glad the NTE is going to be kept as a requirement. The opportunity to present materials of my choosing in the portfolio represented me well."

"The criteria were fair, though we have some master teachers who do not have a master's degree. I don't think the master's degree that most of us acquire contributes much to teaching excellence. Some workshops have enhanced teaching much more than coursework for the master's. Would recommend that courses taken by an applicant (and described by type and quality) be allowed to substitute for the master's degree."

"I like using student achievement--but not as the only criteria. I think the weighting was fair."

All of the master teachers felt that the selection process itself was fair. Two of the master teachers served on the selection committees for the districts other than their own, and they saw the process from the perspective of selector and selectee. One of them expressed "a little worry about the selection process because it does come down to the committee's august opinion. But it's amazing how close the individual committee members' opinions were. Throughout the process we were all concerned with doing it right, and in the end the applications that made it were so superior to the ones that didn't that I can still remember the differences." This master teacher did recommend, however, that there be some stability in the composition of the selection committee and some training for those doing the selecting. Since the two master teachers who served on selection committees had also been members of the Master Teacher Plan committee which designed the program, they felt that

they understood intimately the details of the program and its intent and spirit. Both of these teachers felt that new people coming to the selection committee might not understand the program as well and might not be comfortable in the selection role, so both of them mentioned the training of the selection committee members as a desirable activity for the future. A third master teacher, who did not serve on the selection committees, also recommended training for the selectors.

Two of the master teachers expressed strong feelings that the program continue to have the selection committee composed of persons from outside the district; moreover, one of the teachers believed that the committee members should be from districts outside of the immediate area (i.e., they should not be from neighboring districts).

One master teacher expressed concern that the process was too concentrated; time was a problem since so many things had to be done within a short timeframe. He recommended spreading out the process to start the application procedures in the Fall for appointment the following year.

The master teachers identified a number of reasons why, in their view, more teachers did not apply to the program in its first year. The reasons cited most often were: fear of the NTE test, an unwillingness to take the time to prepare the application, and peer pressure against the program.

"A lot are afraid to take the test. I heard one man say that he wouldn't open the packet for less than \$6,000--he thought the application packet was awesome--and it did take me 25-30 hours to prepare my materials."

"Fear of failure. If they didn't apply they could always say 'I know if I had tried, I could have done it.' The amount of work required was a factor and the need to do it within a short timeframe. Plus many are afraid of anything new; they don't like to break old habits and they feel threatened."

"The test discouraged many and it was a barrier they couldn't get around. They didn't bother to look into the program in more detail."

"Some didn't understand the program. Some worried about how the faculty would react. Some didn't want to devote the extra time if they were to be selected."

"NTE and possible failure on it, with peers asking how they did on the test. There was peer pressure regarding trying to show others up. And there was peer pressure at the high school level against applying." (A W_____ teacher)

"It was a tough process--especially filling out the materials. And the passing of the NTE made many nervous, especially those who felt they were not up on their math skills since they had been away from college for a long time. Some master teachers don't do math at all, and the NTE will cut out some who are otherwise deserving. There should probably be an alternative way (route) to becoming a master teacher. And there was pressure at the high school not to apply." (A W_____ teacher)

Most of the master teachers have informally or formally undertaken additional responsibilities during their year as master teachers, yet all of them believe that their first responsibility is to the children in their classrooms. All of the teachers had felt some increase in the number of teachers informally soliciting their advice on professional matters. In addition, two of the teachers had presented programs for children from other classrooms; one of the teachers presented a formal inservice program for colleagues. Another teacher is working on an inservice topic for next year, and all of the teachers have responded to committee assignments which they believe they were chosen for because of their master teacher status. Several of the teachers had already identified the projects they will work on during their two weeks of employment during the summer; the others planned to do it before the end of the semester.

The master teachers expressed some concern that they not be taken out of the classroom too much in pursuit of other kinds of contributions which they might be able to make to their district or to other districts.

"The most important thing is the child and we should remain with children as much as possible--because that's what is important. However, if I can help other teachers, I can help those teachers' students, so I'm interested in whatever inservice or one-on-one cooperation I can do. I think the program has helped make me a better teacher which is better for my students. I find myself thinking--'what would a master teacher do in this situation?' I feel I am a role model and I take the role seriously."

"I think it's important if we are going to be available to other teachers to have some released time during the teaching day. More students would benefit in the long run if we can reach them through their teachers."

"I don't like being out of the classroom--especially when I have to miss classes. If I could be released from teaching a course, where I would have a free period each day to be available to other teachers, that would work better than missing classes. However, I feel that I would probably be accepted more readily outside the district than within it as an adviser, and yet going outside the district would require missing classes."

All of the master teachers believe that the Master Teacher Program has received strong and helpful support from the administrators in their districts. One expressed concern that without such continued strong support the program might not be as well organized, especially with regard to the application and selection process. Several master teachers mentioned that it was individual encouragement from their building administrators that had led them to apply to the program.

The teachers from W----- all expressed the feeling that parents and the community generally knew about the Master Teacher Program and supported it. The Seiling teachers were not as sure that the parents and community knew very much about the program. All of the teachers, however, mentioned that in many respects they had deliberately "played down" their master teacher status, lest other teachers think that they were trying to set themselves too far apart from the group. Several commented that more parents than teachers, for example, had come up to them to congratulate them on the honor. The prevailing view was that, once identified, they felt it their responsibility to keep working as they always had, ready to accept new assignments (e.g., committee

work) when asked, ready to consult with fellow teachers upon request, ready to undertake specific projects as appropriate, but without "blowing their own horn too much."

Most of the master teachers felt that the amount of the stipend was a factor in their decision to apply and would continue to be a factor in the decision of other teachers to apply. A reduction of the stipend to \$1,500--2,000 would reduce the number of applicants in the view of most of the master teachers, since many could not afford to give up two weeks of summer employment which they might find elsewhere in order to fulfill the summer duties of the Master Teacher Program. Five of the six master teachers specifically mentioned that a \$2,000 stipend might be appropriate as the compensation for the lowest rung on a three- or five-step career ladder, and there was support among all six master teachers for a step plan which would offer concrete incentive to even the newest teachers along a ladder of advancement opportunities, with the incentive attached to the top rung approximating the \$6,000 additional compensation being paid as part of the pilot Master Teacher Program. As one master teacher put it, "the smaller the money, the smaller the incentive." The master teachers felt that the requirements for the top rung on the ladder, the master teacher level, should remain as stringent as they were for the pilot Master Teacher Program, but the requirements for lower steps on the ladder should be less stringent and within the reach of a greater number of teachers.

When asked to rate the effectiveness of the Master Teacher Program in achieving its objectives on a scale of 1 to 5, from low to high achievement, the master teachers assigned the following ratings:

- "3.5. I don't know what to do to improve the program, since many times what works in one situation won't in another. Looking back, I'm not sure what I would say has distinguished those I've thought were good teachers. Things can't be applied across-the-board. I believe in the program and we just need to keep working and thinking about it. It's needed--we need to elevate the teaching profession and reward excellence. We need to give new people beginning an incentive to stay in longer and at least give teaching a chance. Some teachers say: this is not perfect; I'm not going to get involved. But we only come close to perfection by moving towards it. I would like to see positive things in Oklahoma and this is a positive thing. It's great to be rewarded for excellence in the classroom, but the legislature and the public will require strings--extra duties, showing how the master teachers will be helpful to others in the profession, and so I think the additional duties are appropriate. I think the program is one that's probably past due, and I would view it as positive even if I hadn't received the award. We should work now on improving it. I believe it will work state-wide. It has merit and is going in the right direction. We have to keep looking at the goal; the problems can be dealt with."
- "4. I would encourage administrators/principals to encourage their master teachers. Let would-be applicants for the program know the test is not that bad and how to prepare for the test and for submitting all of the materials."
- "5, as far as the objective of having someone people (teachers and, to a lesser degree, parents) can turn to for advice. I hope it will be expanded across the state."

"4. I'm really happy about the program."

"3+. Not a 5 because it has not been warmly received by all of the staff, but any change is traumatic. Teachers as a profession, as a whole, are those least likely to want to change. Teachers from the old guard are so submissive. Younger teachers are more supportive. Females are more supportive than males. Elementary and middle school teachers are more supportive than high school, perhaps because elementary and middle school requires cooperation from teachers to work effectively--you have to do it together. At the high school, on the other hand, teachers are more specialized, work independently. There is more polarization among individual teachers at the high school, less working on a common cause. The Master Teacher Program might be received more favorably if the teachers produce more tangible products as a result of their service; summer is probably the best time for teachers to have the time to work on such things." (A W. _____ teacher)

"4. We've always given our students the best, however. The program hasn't changed that. But it has made me a little more aware; I've worked a little harder. The only failure I can see is perhaps the sour-grapes attitude from some of the other teachers: I don't make as much money as she does so I don't have to do as much. I feel now that I'm really being paid well for the hard work I have always put in."

Questionnaires for Colleagues

During the week of April 29, 1985, the Wayside and Stanley school districts distributed to their teachers and administrators a questionnaire designed to assess the respondents' perceptions of the Master Teacher Program. The questionnaire was accompanied by a letter from the superintendent, requesting the cooperation of the respondent, and a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope for the respondent to return the questionnaire directly to _____ University. A copy of the letter and the questionnaire is appended to this report.

Twenty-four of the 45 questionnaires distributed at Stanley were returned, for a response rate of 53%. Forty-seven of the 80 questionnaires distributed at W_____ were returned, for a response rate of 59%. Not all respondents answered every question; therefore, the total number of responses reported for each question will vary.

All of the respondents from both school districts responded that they were aware of the Master Teacher Program, and all of the respondents except one (from W_____) indicated that they knew those who were selected in their district as master teachers. Twenty-three of the 24 S_____ educators correctly responded that two teachers were selected from their district (one respondent believed that four were selected), and 39 of the 47 W_____ educators correctly responded that four teachers were selected from W_____ (five respondents believed that three teachers were chosen, and two respondents marked "don't know" as their response).

92% of 24 S_____ respondents replied that they had been formally informed of the purposes of the Master Teacher Program; 77% of 47 W_____ respondents indicated that they had been informed. Respondents could then check off each of

the methods by which they had been informed of the program. The percentage of respondents checking each option is reported below (for this question, the maximum number of responses possible for the S_____ group was 21; the maximum number for the W_____ group was 31).

	<u>Stanley</u>	<u>Wayside</u>
Administrative memo	72%	61%
Faculty or staff meeting	100%	100%
Personally by your administrator	38%	45%
Article in newspaper	10%	52%
Other	5%	29%

Sources of information cited under the "other" option included: Education Association meeting; was involved in the selection of the master teachers; helped to develop the plan; fellow workers; served on committee to formulate program; W_____ Education Association members; memo in mailbox; recognized at Board meeting and at Honors Banquet; memo; the master teachers.

Respondents rank ordered several stated objectives of the Master Teacher Program according to their opinion of the appropriateness of the objectives (from 1 = most appropriate to 6 = least appropriate). The percentage of S_____ and W_____ respondents ranking each objective in each of the six possible categories is reported below. A total of 20 S_____ educators and 42 W_____ educators responded to this question.

	A P P R O P R I A T E N E S S					
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Reward teachers for outstanding performance						
Stanley	25%	30%	15%	15%	15%	0%
Wayside	43%	10%	7%	10%	10%	21%
Encourage outstanding teachers not to leave the profession						
Stanley	25%	25%	15%	15%	10%	10%
Wayside	10%	45%	12%	17%	12%	5%
Encourage outstanding teachers to share their expertise with fellow teachers						
Stanley	10%	15%	10%	35%	20%	10%
Wayside	7%	24%	29%	21%	19%	0%
Provide an incentive for teachers to continue their professional development efforts						
Stanley	30%	10%	30%	20%	10%	0%
Wayside	29%	10%	12%	24%	7%	19%

A P P R O P R I A T E N E S S

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Inform the public at large that excellence in teaching is recognized and encouraged by the profession						
Stanley	5%	15%	5%	15%	10%	50%
Wayside	5%	7%	26%	12%	29%	21%
Provide a professional role model for less experienced (new) teachers						
Stanley	5%	5%	25%	0%	35%	30%
Wayside	7%	5%	14%	17%	24%	33%

Respondents were asked to what degree they believed the objectives of the Master Teacher Program had been achieved in their district. They were to rate the degree of achievement along a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 = no progress toward achievement and 5 = high achievement. In S—, 24 respondents answered the question; in W—, 46 respondents replied:

	<u>Stanley</u>	<u>Wayside</u>
1 (no progress)	17%	35%
2	21%	24%
3	38%	22%
4	25%	15%
5 (high achievement)	0%	4%

Twenty-three of the 24 persons responding from S— had had informal discussions about the Master Teacher Program with their co-workers. 35% of these discussions had been more positive than negative; 65% of the discussions had been more negative than positive. Forty-three of the 46 persons responding to this question from W— had had discussions about the Master Teacher Program with their co-workers; 23% of the discussions had been more positive than negative; 77% of the discussions had been more negative than positive.

58% of 24 S— respondents and 30% of 46 W— respondents believe that state dollars should be spent to continue the Master Teacher Program on a pilot basis; 42% of the S— respondents and 70% of the W— respondents did not favor spending state dollars to continue the pilot program.

61% of 23 S— respondents and 32% of 44 W— respondents believe that a Master Teacher Program in some form should be expanded to state-wide participation at some point in time; 39% of the S— respondents and 68% of the W— respondents did not favor this idea.

88% of the 24 S— respondents and 72% of the 36 W— respondents replied that they knew the criteria which were used as the basis for selecting the Master Teachers in their districts; 12% of the S— respondents and 28%

of the W—— respondents did not know the criteria.

Those who indicated that they knew the criteria were then asked to check those items on a list which they believed were used as criteria for the selection of the master teachers. Twenty S—— educators and 32 W—— educators completed the check list. The percentage of respondents checking each of the items is indicated below. All of the items except superintendent preference and School Board suggestion were actually listed in the Master Teacher Plan as criteria for selection, although classroom observations were not completed during the first year selection process.

	<u>Stanley</u>	<u>Wayside</u>
Years of teaching experience	80%	91%
Educational level (academic degree)	90%	88%
Standardized test scores on a teacher examination	85%	100%
Parental input	50%	44%
Principal evaluation	70%	72%
Classroom observations	70%	59%
Examples of teaching materials	40%	53%
Superintendent's preference	10%	28%
School Board suggestion	0%	9%
Professional activities	75%	78%
Community involvement	65%	66%
Student achievement	60%	66%

Respondents were then asked to rank order the listed criteria in terms of how important they considered the items to be in the selection of a Master Teacher, with 1 = most important and 12 = least important. The table on the following two pages indicates the percentage of respondents who ranked a particular item under each of the 12 options, with the total number of S—— responses equal to 21, and the total number of W—— responses equal to 41.

Question #12 asked respondents to indicate if they thought there were other criteria used in the selection process which were not listed. 18% of the 22 S—— respondents and 16% of the 44 W—— respondents believed there were other criteria; 82% of the S—— respondents and 84% of the W—— respondents thought that there were not. Respondents who answered "yes" suggested the following criteria which were not on the list (note: peer evaluation was, in fact, a criterion which was included in the Master Teacher Program plan as a selection criterion but it was not included on the list in the survey):

Stanley three evaluations from co-workers; peer recommendations; letters of recommendation.

Wayside: personal opinion of those involved; opinion of teaching cohorts-- teachers know who the real master teachers are; who you know, not always "what"; recommended by peers, I'm not sure of this value; who you were; after reading the criteria they attempted to qualify; I think that principals and/or members of the selection committee might have been influenced by their own personal opinions concerning the personality of teachers rather than classroom performance.

Question #11. Please rank order the listed criteria in terms of how important you feel they should be in the selection of a Master Teacher, with 1 = most important and 12 = least important. The percentages representing S_____ are based on 21 total responses; the percentages representing W_____ are based on 41 total responses.

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>
Years of teaching experience												
Stanley	10%	33%	10%	19%	5%	10%	0%	0%	5%	0%	5%	5%
Wayside	27%	24%	15%	10%	5%	10%	5%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%
Educational level (academic degree)												
Stanley	24%	10%	19%	0%	14%	10%	5%	5%	5%	10%	0%	0%
Wayside	15%	34%	15%	7%	7%	7%	10%	2%	0%	2%	0%	0%
Standardized test scores on a teacher exam												
Stanley	10%	5%	10%	14%	0%	5%	14%	10%	10%	5%	0%	19%
Wayside	7%	7%	10%	7%	7%	12%	12%	10%	5%	5%	7%	10%
Parental input												
Stanley	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	10%	5%	14%	10%	19%	19%	19%
Wayside	2%	0%	2%	0%	10%	7%	7%	10%	10%	20%	22%	10%
Principal evaluation												
Stanley	5%	5%	10%	10%	24%	10%	19%	5%	10%	0%	5%	0%
Wayside	5%	0%	7%	20%	2%	17%	7%	10%	12%	7%	7%	5%
Classroom observations												
Stanley	24%	5%	5%	19%	19%	5%	0%	14%	5%	5%	0%	0%
Wayside	5%	7%	17%	20%	20%	12%	10%	0%	2%	7%	0%	0%
Examples of teaching materials												
Stanley	0%	19%	10%	10%	19%	14%	10%	10%	10%	0%	0%	0%
Wayside	0%	10%	5%	15%	15%	7%	7%	20%	17%	2%	0%	2%
Superintendent's preference												
Stanley	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	10%	10%	29%	14%	24%
Wayside	0%	0%	2%	0%	5%	2%	7%	2%	5%	22%	41%	12%

328

Responses to Question #11 continued

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>
School Board suggestion												
Stanley	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	10%	10%	5%	10%	43%	19%
Wayside	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	7%	10%	20%	17%	41%
Professional activities												
Stanley	0%	5%	10%	5%	0%	14%	33%	14%	14%	5%	0%	0%
Wayside	2%	2%	5%	12%	15%	10%	22%	17%	15%	0%	0%	0%
Community involvement												
Stanley	0%	5%	5%	5%	10%	0%	5%	10%	19%	19%	10%	14%
Wayside	0%	5%	2%	0%	10%	5%	7%	15%	20%	15%	5%	17%
Student achievement												
Stanley	29%	14%	19%	14%	10%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%
Wayside	37%	7%	20%	10%	5%	10%	2%	5%	2%	0%	2%	0%

Question #13 revealed a significant misperception on the part of the respondents regarding the Master Teacher Program selection process. The question asked respondents whether anyone from their school district served on the selection committee when the applications for Master Teacher from their district were being considered. In fact, this was not the case--i.e., no one from an applicant's own district served on the committee reviewing that applicant's materials and candidacy. However, 50% of the 24 S_____ respondents and 26% of the 47 W_____ respondents believed that someone from their district served on the selection committee when the applications from their district were being reviewed; another 42% of the S_____ respondents and 55% of the W_____ respondents answered that they did not know if this was the case. Only 8% of the S_____ respondents and 19% of the W_____ respondents knew that no one from their district served on the selection committee which considered the applications from their district.

33% of 24 S_____ respondents and 28% of 47 W_____ respondents replied that they knew the specific composition of the Master Teacher selection committee(s); 67% from S_____ and 72% from W_____ did not know the composition.

Question #15 asked respondents if they thought the Master Teacher selection process was fair. Of the 23 S_____ educators responding to this question, 43% responded "yes," 4% responded "no," and 52% responded "don't know." Of the 47 W_____ educators responding to this question, 30% responded "yes," 30% responded "no," and 40% responded "don't know."

In response to question #16, 67% of the 24 S_____ respondents and 30% of the 46 W_____ respondents indicated that they had been informed that the Master Teacher was available to assist them on a consultative basis with questions or problems they might have. 33% of the S_____ respondents and 70% of the W_____ respondents indicated that they had not been informed of this.

Question #17 asked each respondent if he or she as an individual had benefited professionally from the Master Teacher Program. None of the 24 S_____ respondents and 17% of the 47 W_____ respondents indicated that they had benefited; 100% of the S_____ respondents and 83% of the W_____ respondents indicated that they had not benefited personally. The W_____ respondents who indicated that they had benefited professionally cited the following examples:

Material has been presented on helping the slow learner: a lesson on using the computer in the classroom was given.

I am concerned about "slow learners." One of our master teachers presented to the faculty information about these students (realistic expectations and methods). Another concern of mine is achievement testing (school-wide). Other master teachers gave puppet shows for each elementary class, 1-3, and presentations for 4-5, concerning attitude, anxiety, etc., in this regard. I feel these were quite beneficial.

The master teachers in my building have presented lessons to all of our students on how to take achievement tests and inservice to staff on how to give them. Mrs. _____ has helped on our "Read on Oklahoma" project.

The assistance received from that person--professional guidance, etc.

Helped bring about the sharing of teaching techniques which has been very beneficial.

Serving on the committee was an experience. More teachers should know of the work and consideration that were involved.

One of them spoke to us about slow learners.

Conducted classes for students on how to perform up to their abilities on our CTBS tests--understanding, etc.

21% of the 24 S_____ respondents and 21% of the 47 W_____ respondents indicated that they believed their fellow teachers had benefited from the Master Teacher Program. 46% of the S_____ and 64% of the W_____ respondents indicated that they did not believe their fellow teachers had benefited, and 33% and 15%, respectively, indicated that they did not know if their fellow teachers had benefited.

25% of the 24 S_____ respondents and 26% of the 47 W_____ respondents indicated that they had talked about the program with others in their district besides school employees; 75% of the S_____ and 74% of the W_____ respondents had not talked with non-school employees about the program.

26% of 23 S_____ respondents and 47% of 47 W_____ respondents believe that the general populace of the district is aware of the Master Teacher Program in their district; 48% of the S_____ respondents and 28% of the W_____ respondents believe that the general populace is not aware, and 26% from S_____ and 26% from W_____ do not know if the populace is aware. Of the six S_____ respondents who believe that the general populace is aware of the program, 67% (four respondents) believe the community's response has been positive and 33% believe that it has been indifferent. Of the 22 W_____ respondents who believe the general populace is aware of the program, 36% believe the community's response has been positive, 23% believe it has been negative, and 41% believe it has been indifferent.

13% of the 24 S_____ respondents and 15% of the 47 W_____ respondents feel that students in their district are generally aware of the Master Teacher Program; 21% of the S_____ and 68% of the W_____ respondents replied that they believe the students are not aware, and 67% of the S_____ and 17% of the W_____ respondents do not know if the students are aware. Of the three S_____ respondents who felt that the students are aware of the program, one felt that the students do know who was designated as Master Teachers, one felt that the students do not know, and one indicated that s/he did not know if the students are aware of this. Of the seven W_____ respondents who believed that the students are aware of the program, six felt that the students know who was selected and one felt the students do not know.

Question #22 asked respondents if they were eligible to have applied for the Master Teacher Program. 39% of the 23 S_____ educators responding to this question and 45% of the 44 W_____ respondents indicated that they had been eligible to apply for the Master Teacher designation; 57% of the S_____ and 51% of the W_____ respondents were not eligible, and 4% from each group did not know if they were eligible.

Question #22 went on to ask those who were not eligible to apply to indicate whether they are making an effort to meet the eligibility criteria. 15% of the 13 S—— respondents not eligible to apply indicated that they are making an effort to meet eligibility criteria; 14% of the 22 W—— educators who responded to this question indicated that they are making an effort to meet eligibility criteria. 85% of the S—— respondents and 86% of the W—— respondents are not making an effort to meet the eligibility criteria.

Question #22 also asked those respondents who had indicated that they were eligible to apply whether they had in fact applied. Of the 9 S—— respondents who were eligible to apply, one (11%) indicated that s/he had applied; two (10%) of the 20 W—— respondents who were eligible indicated that they had applied. The 89% of the S—— respondents and 90% of W—— respondents who were eligible to apply but did not offered the following reasons why they chose not to apply:

Stanley

I did apply last year but dropped out after the NTE because of personal family problems.

I did not want my summers used for the Master Teacher Program.

I feel that it would cause a conflict among the faculty. I feel there is no such thing as a "master teacher"--there are more teachers that are better qualified than others.

Time not available to fill out papers; time spent teaching.

I feel that the Master Teacher Program has caused tension among the faculty and I feel that my rapport with the faculty would be less positive if I were working in the Master Teacher Program.

No really good reason.

Takes too much time away from classroom and home activities--incentive wasn't worth it.

I am not one who likes to speak before groups; I was told the master teacher would do a lot of public speaking, inservice workshops, etc.

I am not a classroom teacher.

Wayside

99% of all teachers with 7-10 years of experience are master teachers to begin with.

The ones who got it, at least two of them, did not deserve it over others.

Professional involvement and community involvement made it impossible to have time to adequately prepare for the NTE.

No time for paperwork in the summer because of another job.

Sentiment against the program in our building plus I don't believe it really honors the true master teachers.

Because of the negative attitude about the program that my co-workers have. They believe it is not fair!

I was not available to take the national teachers test and now hesitate because I will have to pay for the testing and there is no assurance that I will become a master teacher. Also, another special education teacher did apply and qualified everywhere except student growth. Therefore, she was rejected. She is a superior teacher and is our present "Teacher of the Year."

(1) Too much red tape! (2) Why do you have to be in one school system for a certain number of years? (3) Why a master's degree?

I don't believe in the master teacher concept.

Took too much time.

I do not believe in it.

During the first year I was not eligible because of my teaching field. I didn't apply this year because as an educator I resent having to keep proving myself--test, conduct inservice, work longer school year, etc.

I am not convinced that this program is beneficial. I feel that teaching is a united effort by all faculty members and all should be compensated.

No interest.

I feel that it is totally unfair to all credited teachers!

I think it causes bad feelings among the teachers.

To be a master teacher you should not have to compete; it should come naturally. Also, it has caused hard feelings. If you like teaching and are a good teacher, you are a master teacher.

I have earned by B.S. degree and master's degree and have taught for almost twenty years. During my teaching career I have always considered myself a professional, and have had pride in the fact that I have played an important part in educating the youth of our community. Therefore, I don't feel that I should apply for the master teacher designation. Even though I certainly could use the increase in pay, I'll continue to earn my salary through daily teaching the students to the best of my ability as I have done in the past.

I don't have the time to write and compile all the necessary paper work. I feel that teachers should be paid and recognized for what they do in the classroom and should not have to do extra "busy" work for these rewards. Also, I feel that this will turn out to be too political.

Question #23 asked respondents if they might apply for the Master Teacher designation in the future. Of the 24 S—— responses to this question, 32% indicated that they might apply, 55% said that they would not, and 14% said that they did not know. Of the 42 W—— responses to this question, 10% indicated that they might apply, 60% indicated that they would not, and 30% indicated that they did not know.

The last question on the survey asked respondents if they felt that the Master Teacher Program had had a positive effect, a negative effect, or little effect on teacher morale in their district. Of the 24 S—— responses to this question, 21% indicated a positive effect, 29% indicated a negative effect, and 50% indicated little effect. Of the 46 W—— responses to this question, 15% indicated a positive effect, 67% indicated a negative effect, and 17% indicated little effect.

There were three open-ended questions on the survey. The responses of those who completed these items are reported in full below.

Question #24 asked respondents to describe briefly what they feel are the strengths of the Master Teacher Program:

Wayside

The only strength that I can see is that a few deserving teachers are being well paid for doing the necessary paper work to qualify for the program and for doing other "busy" work.

Salary.

Money.

It's a program that has not come forth as yet.

The honor of winning the title; the compensation.

(1) Public relations for the school--but the community thinks they are the only ones that really work. (2) The \$6,000/teacher has stimulated the economy of our community.

None.

Recognizes our best teachers.

I can't think of any.

Award the master teacher in money for qualifying.

?

In itself, the program could provide encouragement to some to work toward a higher standard of ability in the classroom which is what we want. The idea is good; the objectivity of selection is my concern.

Money.

Gives some recognition to some teachers.

Teachers need some program to upgrade them, but giving a few a \$6,000 gift does little to upgrade our system. We have not had a raise for three years. This was in poor taste, with poor timing. More thought and planning need to go into a program of this type.

Are there any strengths?

Pay based on achievement. Reward those who seem to be doing a better job.

As of the present, I don't feel that it has any strengths.

Don't know.

Money is important. Finally, the best teachers have a chance to be rewarded.

None as far as I can see except monetary for the individual teacher. Most teachers do an equally good job without being paid a decent wage.

It gives good teachers a chance to be recognized. They are rewarded.

Rewards and recognizes excellent teachers.

To help teaching become a professional position.

It rewards those teachers with higher degrees and some years of experience.

Monetary reward for good teachers.

The money!

I see none!

None.

More money for teachers.

(1) Requirements for designation. (2) Idea sharing. (3) Satisfaction gained for work accomplished.

Rewarding excellence in the field of teaching certainly benefits all concerned. It also should encourage all teachers to strive toward excellence.

If all the teachers in a system met a certain criteria, they should all be eligible for award.

Reward excellent teachers and encourage them to remain in education.

Outstanding teachers (who make the extra effort to apply) can be monetarily rewarded and encouraged to share their expertise with other faculty members and the school district as a whole.

Question #25 asked respondents to describe what they feel are the weaknesses of the Master Teacher Program:

Wayside

Many teachers in our school district are deserving of a pay increase or reward for doing an excellent job year-after-year. These teachers will not receive this money because they don't have time for any more "busy" work or don't qualify, such as librarians. Also, I feel that teachers should not be out of the classroom for master teacher duties during the year.

Hard feelings.

I think the \$6,000 for each teacher could be put to a better use.

Jealousy among fellow teachers.

Don't know exactly what they are supposed to do.

A lack of in-depth research when presenting facts in an oral report. I feel this program has promoted a negative professional attitude in other teachers. I do not think I am a second-class teacher since I am not a master teacher.

The master teachers do not have the time to be a resource person. The faculty is never aware of the programs or progress the master teacher program is making. If anything, it is downplayed.

Bias.

It divides the teaching staff.

Haven't seen how it has benefited the students or other teachers.

It makes the other teachers feel "inadequate."

How does anyone decide who is a "master teacher" and who is not? There is really no way to determine this!

A copout not to pay basic salary increases to teachers; only a few teachers are qualified to even try for it; consideration that coaches, band directors, and ag teachers put in far more hours before they can work on this extra program as opposed to most regular 8:00--4:00 classroom teachers. Basically you have to belong to a union to be selected. Politically, people can be favored according to their longstanding family ties in a community. Some teachers have a naturally higher number of LD kids.

They did not do their jobs any better or different than the rest. Their extra duties or responsibilities were not evident.

It divides the teachers, destroys cooperation, and increases dissension.

Some teachers who are good teachers and are not eligible do more work than master teachers without recognition either monetarily or verbally.

We have many excellent teachers; we cannot reward only a few chosen ones, especially when they have done nothing more to earn it than others. It was originally stated these teachers would have many extra contributions to make and they have done none of them.

I know several teachers with B.S. degrees that do a much better job in the classroom than teachers that are master teachers or have master's degrees.

Creation of jealousy in personnel.

Too much red tape, bitter feelings among co-workers.

Don't know.

It causes "low morale," dissension, and general friction and a host of problems.

I'm not sure the school system receives much benefit from this program.

Master teachers don't earn their dollars.

(1) There is a limited number which can be chosen. (2) I have yet to see what the master teachers do to improve the school. It is a lot of money spent on a few and for what purpose?

Poor attitude of teachers to accept the program.

Benefits only a few teachers.

The criteria used in the application and selection.

Divides the faculty; hurts morale; causes resentment.

A lot of excellent teachers aren't rewarded.

I don't think our master teachers earn their money.

Too limited in number of people who can be chosen master teacher. Lack of teacher input in development of the program.

Some teachers, who are indeed master teacher quality, are intimidated by peers; thus, they may never apply. Some master teachers may not be able to qualify on perhaps one or two requirements.

One teacher in our system is losing her job because she does a better job than another V.I.P. who wants the award. There is a feeling of competition and suspicion.

Some excellent teachers do not want to go through all the "red tape" to qualify for the program.

Attitude of some faculty members toward master teachers. The master teacher must exhibit a degree of humility (instead of appearing as a "know it all") to fellow teachers. This has been an area of concern with me regarding one master teacher.

Dissension among teachers. Breaks up team work in the school system. I don't think this will ever change.

Too much competition instead of cooperation among the teachers.

Stanley

It becomes a burden of time which a master classroom teacher doesn't have.

The test scores of a teacher do not reflect how good a teacher is in the classroom; therefore, a "master teacher" to me is not the one who scores high on a given test.

This program has been in effect for such a short time that I have not formed any opinion of its weaknesses.

Too much weight put on outside classroom activities; concentration should be on the in-class performance.

I don't consider this to be a necessary use of state or local school funds in light of budget crunches.

Long hours of testing and not being able to leave during testing for a break (such as bathroom).

Don't know.

I don't like the title "master teacher." I feel no one ever really is one. It seems to make others feel superior when our subject areas vary so greatly, we can't be judged according to our peers.

The master teacher program tries to use too many criteria for determining the master teacher. The question is, "How well does the individual perform in the classroom?" Too many outside variables have been incorporated into the selection process.

Few teachers were accepted from our district. Few teachers (2-3) applied from our district.

Chosen on written work. Good classroom ability not used.

Conflict among faculty members. Also, when working on curriculum, I do not feel that a high school teacher is qualified for the curriculum on the elementary level.

Limiting the number of honorees in each participating school.

Not interested.

More emphasis could be placed on students' achievements of master teachers.

I do not feel that the money should be spent in this manner.

Dissension among teachers. Breaks up team work in the school system. I don't think this will ever change.

Too much competition instead of cooperation among the teachers.

Stanley

It becomes a burden of time which a master classroom teacher doesn't have.

The test scores of a teacher do not reflect how good a teacher is in the classroom; therefore, a "master teacher" to me is not the one who scores high on a given test.

This program has been in effect for such a short time that I have not formed any opinion of its weaknesses.

Too much weight put on outside classroom activities; concentration should be on the in-class performance.

I don't consider this to be a necessary use of state or local school funds in light of budget crunches.

Long hours of testing and not being able to leave during testing for a break (such as bathroom).

Don't know.

I don't like the title "master teacher." I feel no one ever really is one. It seems to make others feel superior when our subject areas vary so greatly, we can't be judged according to our peers.

The master teacher program tries to use too many criteria for determining the master teacher. The question is, "How well does the individual perform in the classroom?" Too many outside variables have been incorporated into the selection process.

Few teachers were accepted from our district. Few teachers (2-3) applied from our district.

Chosen on written work. Good classroom ability not used.

Conflict among faculty members. Also, when working on curriculum, I do not feel that a high school teacher is qualified for the curriculum on the elementary level.

Limiting the number of honorees in each participating school.

Not interested.

More emphasis could be placed on students' achievements of master teachers.

I do not feel that the money should be spent in this manner.

There should be as many in the program as can pass the qualifications. More stress should be on what goes on in the classroom, not in the community or projects one has been involved with.

I think that we need a better way to measure student progress.

Quota restrictions per district; teacher testing.

Don't know. Seems like certain teaching areas would definitely have an advantage.

Question #26 asked respondents to indicate how they feel the Master Teacher Program could be modified to be more effective in achieving its objectives, assuming that it will exist in the future:

Stanley

More teachers should receive extra pay for what they are presently doing in their classrooms, after and before school and during the summer months, without adding extra work to their already busy schedules. More emphasis should be placed on students' achievements and less on how well teachers can fill out the papers of application for the program. Too much paper work is just adding to the burden of the teachers.

Complete new set of standards. Everyone who goes through college four years, master's program, should be called a "master teacher"!

Peer selection.

The program is downplayed because I feel the administration does not know how to keep morale up. The master teacher should be more available to the faculty than doing public relations work for the school.

Raise the present salary of every teacher to a starting level of \$20,000.

Drop it and use the money to increase all teacher compensation.

I think teachers and community would have a more positive attitude if we could see some way the schools were benefiting from the program.

?

Although bonuses might need to be lower, make a program where all teachers, regardless of degree and hours, or years of experience, can work on a program for individual bonuses. For most people I talk to, the reaction is somewhere between little effect and negative. With the way the economy is, a number of people that I talk to are concerned the given reason for the Master Teacher Program has a dark side to it, that it is a "window dressing" excuse not to pay Oklahoma teachers a basic salary increase at appropriate times. My understanding of the concepts of the program where all teachers can work and get a bonus I agree with however.

More money and more selectees so they are not such a very small group.

(1) Annual evaluation. (2) Master teacher should have master's degree in area of teaching.

We need a plan where everyone in the system can participate if they choose to do so, working together, not separately.

Better inform the faculty of requirements and purposes prior to selection.

Master teachers should be used as advisers, supervisors, etc., so that their expertise can be shared with other teachers.

No way!

It should involve more people.

Use master teachers for before school classes, etc.

Forget it--find something else that would benefit our students and the teaching staff.

Everyone should be positive about the idea--teachers, administrators, legislators, and the general public.

You might try to let teachers have some input into the program rather than from the administration.

Those on the staff need to be more aware of the special projects which the master teachers are required to perform.

Perhaps using master teachers for 10 months of the year or more. Developing summer programs for students who need to master skills unobtainable during school year.

Should be based on the amount of gain the children make, relative to their ability and placement at the beginning of the year, during the school year.

The people who wrote this program did an excellent job. At this time I know of no changes that I would recommend.

I feel fellow teachers would accept this program if the master teachers would become involved in projects which were more visible. I have heard comments that they haven't "earned" the extra \$6,000 (projects so far not that in-depth).

We don't need a master teacher program to prove quality teaching.

Communicate to the teachers exactly what the goals of the program are. Administration needs to encourage participation.

Stanley

Allow that teacher more free time.

Do away with teacher test scores and spend more time in classroom with teachers.

I don't know.

More stress should be put on the teacher's classroom performance and less on how many committees the person has been on, how many offices held, etc. Being a public figure does not necessarily mean the person is a better teacher.

I need to see some outcome from funds invested.

Don't know.

There are needs to provide master teacher certification for others who excel in coaching and not just the classroom.

I don't know.

The variables used for selection could be narrowed to indicate less community or social involvement and more classroom performance. Also the master teacher is actually only a means of selecting people for extended contracts, not reward for performance.

Student achievement; teaching practices.

A master teacher does not necessarily have to have taught a certain number of years. Also, working a teacher too much will create a quicker burn-out.

Change the name of the program (the term "master teacher" seems to have a stigma to some people). More emphasis on what the teacher actually does in the classroom with the students.

Master teachers provide inservice training to other teachers.

Teacher performance.

We need a more accurate method of measuring student progress. Applicants should know in advance what criteria are being used to evaluate them in the classroom observations.

Place more emphasis on experience, degree, and good teaching rather than paper work and teacher testing as indicators of a master teacher.

Recommendations for Future Consideration

In their interviews, the master teachers expressed confidence that the problems with the Master Teacher Program would prove to be the kind that inevitably accompany the implementation of any new program. They all felt that the program was a "step in the right direction" and that the master teacher concept, preferably as part of a more comprehensive career ladder plan, would be-

come more accepted by all teachers as the various elements in it were fine-tuned during the course of the program's first few years of operation. They believed that the evaluation process was an opportunity for them and their fellow teachers to express their opinions regarding the kinds of changes which might make the program more effective in the future.

The single largest problem at the present time appears to be the acceptance of the program by the corps of teachers in each school district and the effect of the program on teacher morale. On the questionnaire distributed to school district educators, 29% of the S_____ respondents and 67% of the W_____ respondents indicated that the Master teacher Program had had a negative effect on teacher morale. While 50% of the S_____ and 17% of the W_____ respondents indicated that it had had little effect, and 21% of the S_____ and 15% of the W_____ respondents indicated that it had had a positive effect, there nonetheless is a significant number of the districts' teachers who are concerned about the program's impact.

Some of the concern is deeply rooted in fundamental disagreements on the definition of an effective professional teacher, on whether a teacher's performance in and out of the classroom can be fairly and adequately evaluated, and on whether any part of a teacher's compensation should be tied to a performance-based set of criteria. Some of the concern, on the other hand, may be traced to misunderstandings about the program and the way it was intended to operate.

There appears to be some ambiguity among S_____ and W_____ teachers on the role and duties to be assumed by those designated as master teachers. On the one hand, master teachers were to be rewarded with additional compensation merely because they were excellent teachers; on the other hand, master teachers were to assume some additional responsibilities in exchange for at least part of the additional compensation. There is ambiguity regarding what and how much should be done to "earn" the additional compensation, or whether in fact any extra duties need to be undertaken at all. Those teachers who believe that the extra compensation is tied exclusively to extra duties would tend to judge the program on the number and the quality of the extra duties they see performed. Where master teachers did perform extra duties which were concrete and visible, teachers tended to cite these on the questionnaire as individual benefits they received. The master teachers themselves, as well as some of those responding to the questionnaire, cited the need for the master teachers' contributions to be more visible and perhaps more concrete, and this is an area that might be explored for the future. It might also be beneficial to stimulate discussion in a general way and among all the teachers of the districts regarding the issue of extra compensation and the degree to which it is and is not (or should be and should not be) tied to extra duties.

There was some misperception on the part of educators completing the questionnaire regarding the details of the program itself--e.g., the criteria which were used. The most significant misperception, however, is related to the composition of the selection committee. 50% of the S_____ respondents and 26% of the W_____ respondents believe that persons from their own district served on the committee to select the master teachers for their district. Another 42% of the S_____ respondents and 55% of the W_____ respondents indicated that they do not know whether persons from their district served on the selection committee for their district. The selection committee for a

particular district did not include members from that district, and this is stated in the Master Teacher Program plan which was included with each application packet distributed to interested teachers.

The misperception regarding the selection process which surfaced on the questionnaires is one which might very well color teachers' perceptions of the fairness and equity of the entire program. All teachers would probably benefit from a clarification of the details of the program--the composition of the selection committee, the selection criteria, etc.--and a discussion by those who participated in the design of the program of the rationale behind some of the choices which were made in developing the program's specific features.

This informal discussion and sharing of ideas might also address some of the recommendations for change which surfaced in the master teacher interviews and on the questionnaires. The weighting given to each of the criteria, as well as the advisability of the different criteria, might be discussed and considered again in light of the opinions reflected on the questionnaires. However, those who served on the original Master Teacher Plan committee reviewed a number of different plans and options and studied the justifications behind a variety of approaches to selection criteria, the selection process, etc. Their expertise and familiarity with the many different issues and concerns germane to the topic is unique in the districts, and the sharing of their knowledge might serve to inform the judgements of others. The suggestions which surfaced on the questionnaires should be considered in light of the committee's extensive familiarity with the subject.

The informal discussions, which might be organized along a round-table or seminar type of format, would also serve as the opportunity to clarify other aspects of the process which produced the Master Teacher Plan. For example, several of the comments on the questionnaires seemed to indicate that some educators in S and W might not have been aware that teachers served on the committee that designed the program and on the committees that selected the master teachers. A series of informal discussions would allow time not only to correct misconceptions and generate ideas for future modifications of the Master Teacher Program, but might also prompt a rather serious, reflective and extended discussion of a whole series of questions related to the life of the professional educator: what constitutes effective teaching?, does the teacher have professional responsibilities which extend beyond his/her classroom?, what are the fundamental issues behind performance-based compensation plans?, in what ways are individual teachers accountable to the public, to their profession, to their students? A local discussion of this sort, with a general focus on the profession of teaching, might complement the discussion to be generated all across the country in the next year by the recently appointed Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. The national Task Force, underwritten with funds from the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, is charged with developing a "blueprint to make teaching a true profession," and the discussions in the Oklahoma pilot Master Teacher districts might inform and be informed by this national debate.

Finally, the need for training of those charged with the responsibility of selecting the master teachers was suggested by three of the current master teachers. The recommendation is a good one, and the training might also serve to alleviate the fears of some educators in the districts regarding the capa-

bility of the members of the selection committee to make the kinds of judgments required of them. It might be useful to describe for all teachers the kind of training being provided to those on the selection committee, or even possibly to open up the training sessions so that any interested teacher can participate. All teachers might benefit from the kinds of discussions regarding performance appraisal, the role of expert judgment in the evaluation and selection process, the attributes of effective teaching, etc., which would undoubtedly be part of such a training session.

The interviews with the master teachers and the data from the questionnaires attest to the fact that the Master Teacher Program was generally well publicized to the teachers of the districts. Teachers were made aware of the program and the process for making application to it. To encourage teachers to apply, the districts arranged for a special administration of the National Teachers Examination in Watonga, and they arranged to pay the fee for all those teachers interested in taking the test. The application materials were clear and well designed, and a full Application Packet was made available to every teacher who wished one.

Those involved in designing the Master Teacher Plan, in evaluating applications, and in implementing the program during the pilot year have evidenced a high degree of care and concern in approaching what they considered to be an important but difficult task. As one selection committee member put it, "throughout the process we were all concerned with doing it right." Across the country, school teachers and administrators, state education agency personnel, state legislators, and educational reformers are wrestling with the same complex issues involved with performance-based compensation for teachers. The Oklahoma pilot Master Teacher Plan has been cited in a number of educational circles as an example worthy of study. The idea of performance-based compensation for teachers is one which continues to be debated on its philosophical merits, and the difficulties involved in evaluation are very real issues. Across the country, acceptance of merit pay plans, master teacher programs, and career ladders for teachers is uneven at best, and Oklahoma is no exception.

While a number of concerns surfaced during the master teacher interviews and on the questionnaires, a number of positive indicators were apparent as well. On the questionnaire, for example, 58% of the S— respondents and 30% of the W— respondents indicated that they believe state dollars should be spent to continue the Master Teacher Program on a pilot basis. 61% of the S— respondents and 32% of the W— respondents believe that a Master Teacher Program in some form should be expanded to state-wide participation at some point in time. The master teachers themselves expressed great faith in the potential of the program. Continued discussion within the districts of the Master Teacher Program elements, particularly as they might be incorporated into a more comprehensive and far-reaching career ladder plan (which was suggested by all six master teachers), might generate further refinements and improvements of the program and a broader base of support among the educators in the districts.

APPENDIX J

SAMPLE FIELD NOTES

SAMPLE FIELD NOTES

These field notes represent samples of the data collected for this study.

11/28/83

Notes concerning the first meeting of the Master Teacher Plan committee. These notes were taken from the minutes and in conversation with other participants.

Master Teacher Planning Committee Meeting

The first meeting of the master teacher planning committee met in Wayside at the end of Main for a noon luncheon on Monday, November 28, 1983. Representatives from each school's committee were present, along with the superintendent, the faculty member from the Land Grant University, and staff from the Educational Extension Office.

The public hearing in each school district was discussed and compared. The list of criteria was discussed item by item for consensus, when possible, or left for more committee work and further discussion at a later meeting.

The faculty member, who would also be responsible for evaluation of the program stressed the need for the committee to give him information early in the planning stages in order for him to gather information to match the objectives.

1/26/84

The second meeting of the master teacher planning committee was held on January 26, 1984, as a noon luncheon meeting.

Inside the stage was set, a U-shaped table was placed between two doors going into the adjoining room. The aroma of coffee and dinner being prepared floated through the air and I inhaled deeply. Small groups of people were already helping themselves to coffee and participating in small talk. The director of LGU Education Extension office, his assistant and I were introduced to the different committee members and to the representative from the State Department.

As the meeting was to begin, everyone began to be seated. The superintendents and the director from LGU Education Extension office sat at the head table. At the left and right of the head table congregated the teachers, patrons and principals from each school district. Each district's members assembled themselves together.

The superintendent from Stanley moderated the meeting and each committee group was to share and explain the plan envisioned by the school, teachers, patrons and administrators from the school district he/she represented.

The representative from Clearwater presented their plan first. In their presentation their school district wanted (1) a three step plan so most teachers could participate rather than an elite teaching group being established. Instead of a "leap" from teacher to "master teacher," the

plan called for three steps. In the first step, any teacher with three years of experience, 16 hours of college credit beyond his/her degree and documented proof of student growth could apply. Part of the application process included an evaluation (the form provided by the committee) by the principal. If a negative evaluation was received, then there was to be a plan of action which would provide steps toward improvement and eventually a positive evaluation. With a positive administrator's evaluation, the applicant would furnish three letters of recommendation from patrons and peers. She/he would also take the National Teacher's Examination with no minimum score required. A teacher who met these requirements would receive an additional compensation of \$,3000.

The plan called for improvement from step one to step two. According to the plan, the teacher has two years in which to move from step one to step two, or lose the step credit and the additional salary.

Step two called for 5 years of experience, 24 hours college credit beyond the bachelor's degree as well as a positive evaluation from the principal, demonstration of student growth and letters of recommendation.

In addition, the NTE would have to be taken with a minimum score which was to be determined by the Plan Development Committee after studying the exam. Compensation for reaching step two was \$5,000 above the contract salary.

Should a teacher wish, she/he could stay at step two indefinitely.

The movement to the master teacher level, step three, added some special requirements. The teacher would have to have been in the district long enough to have achieved tenure. Seven years of experience would be required in addition to the previous requirements in steps one and two. Further, the applicant for master teacher status would be required to demonstrate professionalism through involvement in activities and/or organizations and personal growth through involvement in school and community affairs. The master teacher committee would also interview the applicant. The compensation for this designation would be \$9,000 above the contract salary.

The participants from Clearwater envisioned the plan to be a 3-step plan set up in such a way that as the teacher qualified for or met criteria for each step the teacher would be assured of promotion. This type of plan, they felt, safeguarded against favoritism, and political and subjective judging of a committee.

In addition, this plan, according to the Clearwater representative, secured some sense of autonomy for the teacher since he/she would have a self-check list and know exactly what was required to move from one step to the next.

The Master Teacher Evaluation Committee would serve a different role. Essentially, the committee would be responsible for validating that all sources in the packet were

correct and all the forms required had been turned in. The committee would not be responsible for judging a teacher "excellent," "good," or "bad." They wanted the requirement of a master's degree to be changed to hours equivalent to a master's degree. Examples were given of teachers wanting to take courses in subject matter or other areas of interest rather than being forced to take certain courses for a master's degree.

Clearwater expressed the concerns of its teachers of having a person or group of people invading their classrooms to observe a few minutes of instruction and judge whether someone was an "excellent" teacher, "good" teacher, or a "bad" teacher according to the "gospel of that particular observer." The group

- Felt that few people understood the complexity of teaching and did not want to subject teachers to subjective judging;
- Felt that few could evaluate - judge worth;
- Felt that there would be morale problems if only a few were chosen;
- Felt that there were exceptions (individual uniqueness and eccentric allowed (not just conformist should be a master teacher));
- Disapproved tests - "Why use tests when they do not test or prove whether I am a good teacher or not?";
- Emphasized that they were dealing with a real genuine person - not an abstract "master teacher";

- Felt that the money allocated for master teachers should be divided equally no matter how many teachers qualified;
- Did not want a quota set;
- Questioned whether money was prime motivator;
- Viewed teaching as an art;

This group appeared to have studied, read and discussed the Master Teacher Concept. Others relied on the authority of superintendents.

The representative from the State Department felt that the plan looked too much like a modified present-day pay schedule. She emphasized the legislature would not pass this type of plan. Therefore, many of the fears, concerns and individual examples were thought about briefly, then discarded as the task of preparing a document for the legislature took preminence. One member stated that "the members of the committee must write a master teacher plan for the legislature rather than for teachers."

Stanley and Wayside agree that:

1. Money is a prime motivator;
2. It is alright to place a carrot in front of the teachers - if they go for it - why not?
3. Certain subject matter and skills should be taught;
4. The administrators are the experts - teachers should be told what to do.

The superintendent had consulted with the State Department of Education and had drawn up the merit pay plan. It was then presented to the teachers. In his words "the first year was hectic and we had a lot of problems." Therefore, when he decided to implement the master teacher program, he established a committee to write the plan. These two superintendents agreed upon the following:

1. An elite group should be established;
2. Tests should test what a teacher has taught - if not, change the test;
3. There is nothing wrong with teachers teaching to the test;
4. Children are receptors of knowledge;
5. Competition is good;
6. Teachers were not expected to like the program; they were obstacles to be overcome.

During lunch, teachers expressed their apprehension. One teacher stated, "Our teachers don't believe in this program!" Another stated, "Whatever money is appropriated for the Master Teacher Program, there should be that much designated for legal fees."

The teacher sighed and began discussing the criteria with another teacher. "I don't feel a master's degree is necessary." She used an example of a teacher at her school who has more hours than is needed for a degree.

During the drive home the conversation centered on the expertise of the administrators in controlling the meeting.

One person said,

I marvel in watching _____ [name of superintendent]. He's so cool and nonchalant. He lets the committee have just enough rope and when he feels it is time, reels the issues in.

When I share my misgiving about the idea and the problems others have encountered, it is quickly dismissed.

Another staff member keeps quoting "all the teachers are exemplary. We are just selecting out the best."

4/30/85

The drive to Wayside was pleasant and relaxing. It had been several months since I had talked with anyone. I relived the Master Teacher planning meetings and wondered how the program had affected the school districts.

I visited first with the superintendent. Then, I visited the middle school. The principal introduced me to the five teachers in the lounge. I asked the teachers how they felt about the Master Teacher Program. All of them put "thumbs down."

One teacher excused herself because she was due back in class and agreed to talk with me later. The others expressed dissatisfaction with the program. Some of the comments reflected that the program had affected the social system and these four felt it had negative effects. One teacher comments,

One teacher, missed passing the NTE by one point. This teacher has been recognized at the state and

national levels as being outstanding in the vocational field.

Another teacher commented,

One teacher, a special education teacher, did not show student growth. Some teachers show more student growth than others. Some teachers are saying that these kids are going to suffer because teachers aren't going to want to teach them.

4/31/85

Today, I visited with three principals. These administrators feel they are caught in the middle between their loyalty to the teachers and their support to the superintendent. Each of the principals stated that he had to talk with his teachers to encourage them to apply.

APPENDIX K

MEMORANDUM FROM DEAN

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 30, 1983
TO: Director, Education Extension
FROM: Dean, College of Education
SUBJECT: Master Teacher Proposal

Dear Sir:

I have reviewed the proposal for a Pilot Master Teacher Program in cooperation with the cities of Wayside, Stanley and Clearwater.

As you know, the master teacher concept is generally misunderstood and viewed as a code for "merit pay." Thus, the way we communicate what we are attempting to facilitate in the communities should be carefully developed and communicated. Similarly, our support role should be clearly defined.

On page 3, I note that the Proposal suggests that a faculty member and graduate student in Educational Administration will be employed for 12 months for 25 percent and 50 percent respectively, etc.

We should leave the appropriate department and specific faculty person to be used in a project of this sort open. That is, I am not sure that the best qualified person in the College to do this kind of literature search and analysis would necessarily come from Educational Administration.

Please keep me informed in advance regarding the status of this proposal. Thanks.

2
VITA

Betty Jo McCarty

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN AXIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE MASTER TEACHER
CONCEPT

Major Field: Curriculum and Instruction

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Winnfield, Louisiana, December 29, 1943, the daughter of Mottice Creel and William Cecil McCarty, Sr.

Education: Graduated from Winnfield High School, Winnfield, Louisiana, in May, 1961; received Bachelor of Science degree in Elementary/Early Childhood Education from Angelo State University in August, 1979; received Master of Education degree in Elementary Education from McNeese State University in May, 1983; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1986

Professional Experience: Co-director of Hope Rescue Mission in Natchez, Mississippi, 1967-1970; Director of Christian Girls School, Rhoda Home for Girls in McNeil, Mississippi, 1970-1973; Classroom Teacher and Public Relations Coordinator, Rebekah Christian Academy, 1973-1977; Internship in fifth grade and Kindergarten at Fannin Elementary School in San Angelo, Texas in 1979; Special Education Teacher, grades 1-6 at Eden Elementary School in Eden, Texas, 1979-1980; Classroom Teacher, fifth grade at W.T. Henning Elementary School in Sulphur, Louisiana, 1980-1983; Graduate Assistant, Education Extension Office at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, January, 1984, to August, 1984; Graduate Assistant, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, August, 1984, to May, 1986.

Member of: American Association of University Women,
Alpa Chi, Kappa Delta Phi, Phi Delta Kappa, Sigma
Tau Delta, Calcasieu Association of Educators,
Louisiana Association of Educators, Texas Associa-
tion of Educators, Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development, Oklahoma College Personnel
Association, National Organization for Women,
American School Counselor Association, and The Na-
tional Council of Teachers of English.