

The status quo teacher evaluation defined in terms of state certification requirements, credit hours and an "A" in student teaching is no longer a sufficient measure of effectiveness.

## Considerations for educational change

by Carole J. Urbansok



Carole Jean Urbansok earned her B.A. at Wittenburg University and her M.A. and Ph.D. at the University of Toledo. She is an Assistant Professor in Education at Kansas State University. She has strong interests in developmental psychology applied and learning theory and has past publication and current research projects in this area.

Accountability issues have been sweeping through the little red schoolhouses for some years now. They have created turmoil in every corner of that segment of the academic community. Foremost among the repercussions dictated by accountability has been the necessity of re-evaluating what teachers are doing.

The status quo teacher evaluation defined in terms of state certification requirements, credit hours and an "A" in student teaching is no longer a sufficient measure of effectiveness. In the wake of this storm a new pedagogy has appeared. Performance or competency based teacher education was conceived partially in response to accountability demands and the need for major revisions in teacher evaluation techniques. The performance based model has had only limited impact on the higher echelons of academia and has beset the general elementary and secondary sector with confusion and ill-effect.

Perhaps we must now face the possibility that the thrust was misdirected toward public school evaluation and some few special teacher education programs. Perhaps, rather than accountability for public school personnel, professional integrity among both the professoriate responsible for pre- and in-service training and the school personnel-students requires examination.

Teacher education before teacher evaluation is in dire need of revision. Prevention may not be an exciting topic, but it is perhaps the necessary measure. With public school evaluation as the target, accountability can highlight, but not remedy, professional incompetence due to personal inability or training deficiency. Professional integrity in the form of self-accountability among the university faculty charged with preparation of public school personnel, allows prognosis to become feasible and prescription somewhat less of an impossible promise. Thus, the professoriate can serve as a model for similar self-assessment among public school administrators and teachers. Such multi-level concern will mitigate educational incompetence and the present dearth of adequate training.

In a quantitatively oriented society, academic freedom can no longer be maintained as the ultimate shield against academic scrutiny. This very license that traditionally has lent support to effective, professionally justifiable programs and well-qualified competent educators, now serves to promote credit-generating programs of questionable quality and faculty, at all levels, willing to supply verbal knowledge without the scholarly inquiry and substantive application necessary to insure learning in its purest sense.

This does not mean to suggest an inquisition of university programs and faculty by some superordinate mechanism created to seek out and destroy offenders of our community of scholars, any more than this seeks to support a surge of accountability in the public domain. Unfortunately, such administrative and accrediting bodies as NCATE merely aid in perpetuating a myth of valid and reliable institutional evaluation. Furthermore, the pseudo-elegance and feigned courtesies of institutional introspection gloss over the core problems facing any academic arena attempting such in-house assessment. On either level of evaluation, outside or in-house, surveys and observation devices can be and typically are developed to avoid data reflecting the stark reality of

academic impoverishment where it exists among programs on-campus or in the community. A fear of infringing on academic freedom and, above all, of upsetting an economical status quo brings most evaluation efforts short of effecting change.

Neither does this mean to suggest administrative mandates nor policy statements. Changes of extensive consequence are not likely to be effected with necessary efficiency through such vehicles alone.

Political overtones and, again, economics portend their failures. The task must rest in the hands of the separate educators. Individual professors, teachers and administrators as overseers of programs, unique classes, independent study, field and practicum experiences maintain the authority to require standards of excellence or insignificance. In closing, two points of departure are offered to educators as considerations for change. First, selecting content appropriate to some mean, or lower ability level of a class perpetuates mediocrity among students and denigrates the teaching profession. And secondly, dictating to the whims of credit accruing students is, in the final analysis, a disservice to professional competence, scholarly authority and the academic freedom of all levels of the educational community.

---

## Review

# The human dimension in management

Causing Others to Want  
Your Leadership

by

Robert L. DeBruyn,  
Robert L. DeBruyn and Associates,  
Manhattan, Kansas,  
1976, 184 pages, \$12.95.

Dr. Robert L. DeBruyn opens his book by stating there are two distinct sides to management—"things" and "people." The things of management are important, and usually represent the principal thrust of virtually every graduate course in educational administration. However, when they are taught *in absentia* from the human dimension of administration, the aspiring educational executive is rendered potentially ineffective. Success in managerial effort requires training and skill development in human engineering. Educational managers are in the people business; and, it is to this principle that Dr. DeBruyn has dedicated his work.

Part I of the book refreshes the readers' recollection of basic tenets of human nature. These include the physiological and psychological unlearned primary human motives—the requirements to be free from hunger, thirst, pain and so on; and the secondary motives—gregariousness, affiliation, achievement, power, status and so on.

From brief discussion of these basic truths, DeBruyn examines the nine priorities common to virtually every human being—the need for esteem and love, predictability, autonomy, exhibition, introspection, avoidance of confrontations, sympathy, endurance and heterosexuality.

By becoming familiar with human motives and the personal priorities of people, the practicing executive is able to: (1) Understand what people's actions **actually** mean rather than guessing at what they **appear** to mean; (2) React **objectively** rather than **subjectively** to human behavior; and (3) View problem situations **professionally** rather than **personally**.

In closing Part I, DeBruyn presents the seven key motivators underlying human activity. These are: (1) Personal Gain—what is in this for me? (2) Prestige—how will this activity help me feel or look important? (3) Pleasure—will I derive some measure of pleasure from this activity? (4) Imitation—the theory of third person support, or, others are doing this, too; (5) Security—will what I am doing enhance or weaken my position? (6) Convenience—will this activity make things easier for me? (7) Desire to Avoid Fear—fear of anything new dominates the activities of many individuals.

In Part II of the book, DeBruyn aggressively examines the foundations of management, the principles of managing oneself and the laws of managing others. He closes Part II with a brief section on problem situations and guidelines for problem analysis.

Before managers can manage others, they must first be able to manage themselves. Self management comes