

If the superb combination of "outgoing teacher" and "contemplative researcher" were found, the university would benefit . . .

Screening for University Teaching

LAURETTA L. WOODSON

Coordinator of Student Teaching for
Secondary Schools; and Assistant Professor
of Education, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

AT THIS time the front line of educational activities is found, not in the schools and colleges, but in the adjoining community. The professional educator is expected and, in many instances, required by his employer to participate in community activities. The educator is a member, and sometimes the chairman, of community study groups, of curriculum planning groups, of boards of education, and/or of parent-teacher groups.

As the educator attempts to fulfill these educational-community obligations, he becomes a distinct leader in and a molder of community educational thought. In relation to the demands made upon his ability to use his professional preparation, he finds he must define, redefine, and modify his role as a teacher.

Role of the Faculty Member

When a contract is signed with the university, the new faculty member voices his expectations of the new position. He has become associated with a status organization and "he is to be a

teacher." He expects to prepare his lessons from a body of knowledge; he expects to meet his classes; he expects to be fully employed teaching during the school hours.

What may or may not be voiced at this time are the expectations of the university. Of course, the new faculty member will teach, but does he understand that he is also expected "to do research" and "to write"? The university probably expects also that the research will be a "project" that will be funded by a state or nationally recognized organization.

The university expects that the new man will join appropriate professional organizations. He may be just a member, but it is preferred that he get himself appointed or elected to an office.

The new man's colleagues expect that he will pull his share of the responsibility. He is expected to attend meetings, meet all deadlines, complete reports, and represent his group or department admirably. He is expected to be friendly and to demonstrate all the attributes of the "social animal."

Of course, the college students expect the new man to exemplify the qualities of a learned seer. After all, did he not just complete his doctorate and is it not rumored that "he is beginning a research project?" They expect him to share his wisdom. They expect him to teach.

Before very long the new man finds himself being suggested to take part in a community problem solving effort.

In the meantime the new man's family expect to share the limelight of his new prestigious role, and the university assumes that the family has all the know-how to fill the social role. Through it all the man sees himself in the role of the teacher in a greater theater among highly motivated, education-thirsty students.

As he begins to teach, he experiences the frustrations of all teachers—the unwilling "brains," the competitive "Sammys," the sincere students, the status-hungry students. He will learn that "to get ahead" in the academic world, he will be screened and evaluated. It is then that his definition of role becomes many-faceted. He must meet the demands of performance plus all the other categories of research and participation.

Criteria for Screening

A total program of identification and selection begins at the kindergarten level and continues throughout the careers of educators. Getting "Johnnie" into the morning or afternoon class reveals criteria for admission, such as: residence, vaccination, age, possessing capabilities of knowing his name, address, telephone number, tying his shoe laces, and buttoning his clothes. In some

schools an IQ test is administered for placement the following year in the first grade.

Eventually, there is the admission to college with its accompanying demands. Colleges are expected to attest to the health, personal characteristics, academic standing, and professional competence of its candidates seeking admission to teaching. Screening is especially exacting for candidates of doctoral programs.

Throughout this process it is assumed that desired abilities and characteristics can be identified and measured, that appropriate points for screening exist, that programs are adequately planned and carefully controlled, and that both the function of evaluation of the student and the opportunity for self-evaluation by the student are provided.

These assumptions are maintained in the screening and selection process for university teachers. Regardless of whether the teacher is applying for a position at the elementary, secondary, or college level, basic criteria for success in the classroom include: (a) mastery of subject matter, (b) sympathetic understanding of students and a willingness to confer freely with them, (c) effective classroom presentation, (d) teaching methods which will stimulate civic responsibility and instill democratic ideals, and, (e) a desire for continuing study and professional growth.

Professional Competence

A "Sample Definition of Professional Competence" was developed in Wisconsin. Four categories of professional competence were included: (a) classroom and laboratory teaching, (b) informal

teaching and counseling, (c) productive scholarship, and (d) professional service and public relations activities.

In category (a), *classroom and laboratory teaching*, merit was demonstrated by command of knowledge of his own and related fields, the ability to organize courses, the employment of good instructional procedures, the establishment of satisfactory student-teacher relationships, and the maintenance of a professional orientation. Emphasis in this area is on a good classroom teaching-learning situation.

In category (b), *informal teaching and counseling*, merit is demonstrated by the teacher's accessibility. Office hours are posted; scheduled conferences are kept, and evidence of hurry-up and speed-up conferences is absent. The teacher shows real concern for the personal, social, physical, and professional welfare of the student.

In category (c), *productive scholarship*, merit is determined by a consideration of both the kind and the quality of scholarship. Productive scholarship can be the collection, organization, and presentation of data; planning, conducting, and reporting experimentation; critically evaluating theory and practice; inventing or improving techniques and instruments of research or formulating plans and constructing materials for application. These kinds of scholarship are all essential and important. Each kind is judged on its usefulness, its importance, its newness, its soundness (technical excellence), and its effectiveness. Lastly, it is judged on its projective qualities (problem-raising character).

In category (d), *professional service and public relations activities*, merit is

determined by the kinds of service, such as positions, assignments, participation with national committees and commissions; consultation services; community, state, or regional activities. These services are judged in terms of the qualities listed in category (c).

At Temple University the scale for reviewing the performance of staff members includes five categories. These are: (a) teaching performance, (b) scholarly research, (c) intellectual and personal qualities, (d) candidate's standing in the profession, and (e) services within and outside the university.

The rating scale has five levels of achievement. In general, these are interpreted to read: (a) lowest level, average performance, no research, personally undependable, avoids professional activities and not interested in community affairs; (b) minimal performance in quality and frequency; (c) good, moderate, occasional performance; (d) excellent productive performance, well-liked, recognized; (e) consistently exceptional performance, highly respected, highly regarded by his peers, extremely active.

Category (a), *teaching performance*, is interpreted as having two parts, namely: professional competence and teaching effectiveness. The candidate is rated in relation to his command of the subject, continuous growth in the scholarship of his field, ability to organize his material and to present it with force and logic, capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relation of his subject to other fields of knowledge, and the spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize his learning and teaching.

In addition, the candidate is rated as to his effectiveness with beginning,

advanced, undergraduate, or graduate students. He is also rated as to the level of his least effectiveness. He is rated in his fairness, maintenance of high standards, harshness, or easiness. A description of the candidate's ability to deal with students outside the classroom, and the extent and skill of his participation in the guidance and advising of students is required for analysis.

In category (b), *scholarly research*, the candidate is rated on the value of his research, whether the scholarly activity is continuous or merely occasional, how his work compares in quantity and quality with other people in the department, and whether his achievements have received recognition from national authorities in the field.

In category (c), the candidate is rated on *intellectual and personal qualities*. His genuine intellectual distinction, depth and breadth of culture, his ability to influence others, his capacity for working with others, his integrity, his sense of humor, and imagination are examined. In other words, as a human being, is the candidate a liability to the group or an outstanding asset?

In category (d), the candidate's *standing in the profession* is rated. He is judged in terms of his activity in professional organizations, participation in national or regional meetings, offices held, professional awards and services leading to the advancement of his profession.

In the last category, (e), *services within and outside the university*, the candidate is rated on administrative duties performed, participation in faculty government and in the formulation of departmental, college, and university

policies, and his service to his community, state, and nation.

Personal Survival vs. Professional Advancement

The candidate worth his salt is interested in a good job that will demonstrate his abilities and provide him with opportunity for professional advancement. At the same time he must of necessity be concerned about his own personal welfare. The demands on his health and his time can increase to epic proportions. It is only as the new man can quickly scan each new situation that he can judge his personal survival and his professional advancement. While he is both "dedicated" and vitally interested in being an influential leader for good, he must daily weigh each problem to be solved and each demand made upon him.

With this aspect in mind, the suggestion has been made that universities should employ four or five men to fill each of the various categories of university screening. The four or five candidates would do first what they each do best—teach, counsel, research, public relations, and second, they would each become resource agents to the other professional staff members.

In-depth production would be possible, professional frustration would be reduced, and personal survival would become pleasurable activity. If the superb combination of "outgoing teacher" and "contemplative researcher" were found, the university would, of course, benefit, but until this combination is discovered, the university teacher will be screened and rescreened and then probably always found wanting in at least one category. 

Copyright © 1967 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.