

STATE COLLEGE BRANCH
SAVANNAH GA.
300
BOUND BY THE NATIONAL LIBRARY BINDERY CO. OF GA.

FACULTY RESEARCH EDITION

of

The Savannah State College Bulletin

Published by

The Savannah State College

Volume 26, No. 2 Savannah, Georgia December, 1972

PRINCE A. JACKSON, JR., PRESIDENT

Editorial Committee

S. M. JULIE MAGGIONI

WILLIE G. TUCKER

HANES WALTON

A. J. MCLEMORE, *Chairman*

Articles are presented on the authority of their writers, and neither the Editorial Committee nor Savannah State College assumes responsibility for the views expressed by contributors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The White Student in Five Predominantly Black Universities Charles I. Brown and Phyllis R. Stein	5
Accountability: The Educator's Responsibility John H. Cochran, Jr.	24
REQUIESCAT: The Graduate Studies Program at Savannah State College, 1968-1971 Dr. James A. Eaton	29
Determining the Role of Audio-Visual Equipment in the Improvement of Reading Comprehension among Pupils Enrolled in Grade Five at Florance Street Elementary School in Savannah, Georgia Norman Brokenshire Elmore	38
Inhibitory Effect of Amantadine Hydrochloride on Bovine Virus Diarrhea and SF-4 Viruses P. V. Krishnamurti, M. G. Little, and S. B. Mohanty	45
The Antinomies of Kant and Some Neo-Scholastic Replies Joseph M. McCarthy	48
The Testing Movement and Blacks Dr. Isaiah McIver	56
BLACKNESS IN OTHELLO: An Aspect of Thematic Texture Dr. Luetta Milledge	70
Onward to Cuba! Savannah and Slavery Expansion Dr. John E. Simpson	83
Rate Constants for the Formation of Tetrafluoroboric Acid in Water-ethanol Solvent Willie Turner and M. P. Menon	88
The South West Africa Mandate Dr. Hanes Walton, Jr.	93
"The Dollys: An Antebellum Black Family of Savannah, Georgia" Austin D. Washington	101
"Some Aspects of Emancipation in Eighteenth Century Savannah, Georgia" Austin D. Washington	104
"The Savannah Education Association, 1865-1867" Austin D. Washington	107

**ACCOUNTABILITY: The Educator's
Responsibility**

By

John H. Cochran, Jr.
Associate Professor,
Coordinator of Laboratory
Activities

Division of Education
Savannah State College

Evaluation, accountability, what have you? Within the last decade educators have gone wild about "accountability". Accountability to "whom?" "what?" "when?" "why?" are some of the questions that have been answered rhetorically, but not specifically.

These questions have not been answered to the extent that the classroom teacher knows what to do, pertaining to his being accountable to those who demand proof. The classroom teacher only knows that if "accountability" is required in his system he may be fired, if he has not "oriented" his students to respond properly to the instruments that are used to determine his effectiveness.

Recently, the writer had an opportunity to attend a board meeting in a large school system in Georgia, the board of education contacted personnel from the large state university to work with some of the teachers in their system. The consultants were to provide opportunities for teachers to learn some of the competencies needed to strengthen classroom instruction. The plan was excellent until one of the assistant superintendents felt the need for an evaluation of the program. A haphazard method of observation with some sort of rating was devised with little planning.

The rating plan must have appealed to the group of reading experts. One professor actually recommended the firing of one teacher to the board. He did not call names, but the seed was planted. This professor visited teachers' rooms, for not more than a hour, and had expected to see all of the techniques of a reading specialist exemplified by the ordinary classroom teacher. Though this was only a small part of the report made by the reading committee, the use of expert techniques by classroom teachers was the rating criteria of this group.

Are teachers going to be held accountable for the ideas and methods of consultants who spend very little time with them and know nothing about the unique individuals in the classrooms of these teachers? If we are going to recommend accountability in the public schools, then we must state specifically the roles of those involved. Each person must know where he stands, what is expected of him, his responsibilities, and his limitations. Persons designated to determine how well teachers have performed will also have to be accountable to those teachers, to the extent of their accuracy in evaluating teacher performance.

This bandwagon of accountability as it is practiced is misdirected, as are most "new" educational ideas (Lopez, 1970). Lessinger (1970) used as an example for his design for educational accountability the Texarkana Project. He would, also, require educational systems to do what is seldom done by any other public agency, industry, profession or public service. He would require public school systems to prepare a public statement that would balance monetary income with learning outcomes. However, the results of the Texarkana Project have been questioned because of possible ethical violations (Harmes, 1971, Bhaerman, 1971). The theory involved in accountability does

not direct the practice. Accountability must begin with the top echelon and filter down to the classroom teacher. It must be well planned, tested and directed.

The classroom teacher cannot be unduly limited by administrators concerning his methods and procedures of instruction. He must be allowed to do whatever is necessary to inspire children to learn. By the same token, children cannot be lumped into one group. There should be some allowances for them to reach attainable goals within a certain period (Lopez, 1970, 234, and Sullivan, 1969, 138). These goals should be tailored for each individual student according to his needs and interests. (We are assuming that the curriculum of the institution embraces the needs and interests of all of its students.)

The idea of meeting the needs of all of the students may be considered a plea for individualized instruction, but true evaluation of the teacher's effectiveness would have to consider the unique position of each individual student. The position of each student at the beginning of a program would have to be assessed before his progress could be evaluated during or at the end of a program (Goodlad, 1966, 102; Millman, 1970). The importance of the subject area to the individual must be accounted for (Almy, 1964, 48). Besides, most evaluation is done in terms of mastery, which primarily embraces the cognitive domain. Granted that the cognitive domain is important, but mastery could consist of memorization.

Once students have the idea that what is taught in schools is of benefit to them, learning will be more pronounced. Education should produce change. This change should be in behavior, rather than making students' minds archives of factual fragments. Student performance should be measured by behavioral changes (Goodlad, 1966). Educational programs and practices should be geared to involve the student in desirable change. This change should be desired not only by the society the student represents, but by the student (Tyler, 1967, 18). Once the student accepts these changes as desirable, the process of teaching becomes less complex. In contrast, the standard process is that changes and goals are defined for the student and he is forced to accept them. The student resists this forced change, consequently he registers minus on the evaluating scale.

The point here is, evaluating for accountability is more complex than it has been made to seem. If teachers are going to be held accountable, then they should know for what they are accountable, to whom, why, and how they are accountable. They should know for what they are not accountable and how much autonomy they have in the instructional program (Barro, 1970).

The classroom teacher is accountable to his students. He may be responsible to the school system and the taxpayers, but he is primarily responsible to his students. The student is the most important element of any educational institution or system, and he represents the only true product. It is the teacher's duty to provide opportunities that will develop the mental and intellectual capabilities of all of his students to the maximum. Now, whether this development takes place or not when the op-

portunities are provided is another matter; because the student is influenced by other factors in his environment.

The teacher is required to expose his student to infinite activities, disciplines, and ideas. Their reaction to this exposure should not be a standard one. The teacher does not indoctrinate, he guides. The student's reaction is related to how he analyzes that to which he is exposed. This is what the teacher is accountable for provided he is allowed the freedom to plan and innovate, and is provided the necessary materials.

The teacher is accountable to his students during the entire year. His professional duty may not be limited to an academic year, he may have to recommend or issue other statements regarding a student. The teacher does have the right to privacy and personal rights just as any other citizen has. His professional competence should not be judged by his personal involvement as long as he keeps them separated from his instructional duties.

A system that does not permit teachers to instruct and create to their potential, will reduce creativity and learning in students. Accountability must begin in the State Department of Education and extend to the systems and the schools. Each component should be evaluated on its own merits according to its responsibilities. The teachers and principals should not be used as the scapegoat for uncooperative state legislatures, school boards, and communities. Each must recognize and live up to its responsibilities.

Today's call for accountability does not apply to teachers, it applies to educational practices as a whole. Changes will have to be made to facilitate any evaluations embracing accountability. The State Department of Education down to the local boards must institute curriculum changes and programs that will allow teachers the freedom to teach children as they need to be taught. Then, teachers will be able to acknowledge accountability as a creditable educational practice.

Professional educators should plan, govern, and test any accountability measures and instruments involving teachers. This is the only guarantee that evaluations for determining teacher accountability will be conducted properly. It would be a drastic mistake for the idea of accountability to result in reduced mental agility for students and a loss of creativity for teachers. Teachers could show that they have met the specifications of accountability by teaching tests (Wildavsky, 1970, 212). This obsession for testing in America is probably one of the major causes for the rebellion of young people. They pass academic tests, but they are unable to cope with societal problems. We do not want the case for accountability to lead us further down the path of irrelevancy of the instructional programs in our schools.

Accountability is important, but it should help those to be judged to become more competent, rather than insecure, in the teaching profession. True, dedicated teachers have been accountable for centuries (Robinson, 1970, 193). The present day concept of accountability should reinforce this dedication, or it is not applicable to the field of education (Lopez, 1970, 234).

Until professional educators get together and formulate practices, and principles to govern the practitioner in the field of education, we will remain beggars for wages, whipping boys, and mud scrappers in the eyes of the American Public.

REFERENCES

- Almy, M. Child development and the curriculum. In D. Hubner (Ed.) *A reassessment of the curriculum*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1969.
- Barro, S. M. An approach to developing accountability measures for the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 1970, 52 (4), 196-205.
- Bhaerman, R. D. Accountability: The great day of judgment. *Educational Technology*. 1971, 9 (1), 62-63.
- Goodlad, J. I. *The changing school curriculum*. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1966.
- Harmes, H. M. Specifying objectives for performance contracts. *Educational Technology*. 1971, 9 (1), 52-56.
- Lessinger, L. M. *Every kid a winner: Accountability in education*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970.
- Lopez, F. M. Accountability in education. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 1970, 52 (4), 231-235.
- Millman, J. Reporting student progress: A case for a criterion-referenced marking system. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 1970, 52 (4), 226-230.
- Robinson, D. W. Accountability for whom? For what? *Phi Delta Kappan*. 1970, 52 (4), 193.
- Sullivan, H. J. Epilogue. In W. J. Popham, H. J. Sullivan and L. L. Tyler, *Instructional objectives*. American Educational Research Association monograph series on curriculum evaluation No. 3. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Tyler, R. W. Changing concepts of educational evaluation. In R. W. Tyler, R. M. Gagne, and M. Scraven. *Perspectives of curriculum evaluation*. American Educational Research Association monograph series on curriculum evaluation, No. 1. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.
- Wildavsky, A. A. Program of accountability for elementary schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 1970, 52 (4), 212-216.