

included finding better ways to teach charting, training teachers as change agents and developing ways to confirm the general usefulness of the training procedures we use.

ADMINISTRATIVELY SPEAKING

Skip Berquam and Ann Starlin

Welcome to a new column in **JPT**. One of the results of the Second Annual Precision Teaching Conference held in Orlando in March was a re-structuring of this journal. As **JPT** is a growing and improving publication, considerable discussion took place regarding specific improvements that could be made. In the coming issues you will see and read the results of much of that discussion.

This section is being written especially for administrators and managers. It is not intended to be specific to school administrators. Our purpose is to address a wide range of administrative applications for precision data. We will be seeking input from administrators and managers who operate in a variety of settings.

Our goal in editing this column (notice the verb "edit"; it is our hope to be swamped with material submitted on this topic), is to present data concerning program development, implementation, and evaluation, all from the perspective of administrative decision-making. We also hope to include information regarding publications of interest to administrators, and vacancy notices for the precision administrator, when available. Correspondence can be sent to either of us:

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| Eugene "Skip" Berquam | Ann Starlin |
| 1308 W. Fourth | 2921 Harvard |
| Port Angeles, WA 98362 | Lawrence, KS 66044 |

A number of Precision Teachers have found useful information in the book **Human Competence: Engineering worthy performance**, written by Thomas Gilbert, and published by McGraw-Hill. This book presents a model for doing performance evaluations in a wide range of settings. A chapter on education presents some unique concepts that are compatible with a Precision Teaching approach. However, some of the specific suggestions concerning education are considerably behind where we currently are in Precision Teaching. Perhaps in a future column we will have a short (precise) abstract of this book.

Another feature that will be included in this column is a question and answer section. We will start this month with the following question: How can charted data be used to help structure the administrator's day? Those of you who have

found ways to make your work more efficient, please send in your ideas, preferably with charts.

In closing, we would like to present a quote from Education Secretary Terrel Bell. In summarizing research on effective teaching to a national elementary principals' group, Bell mentioned that one of the primary factors related to school achievement is a system for monitoring and assessing past performance. Bell stated, "When performance is measured, performance improves. When results are fed back, performance accelerates." Interesting vocabulary! Many charts say the same thing.

Take care and take data,

Skip Berquam & Ann Starlin

HIGHER EDUCATION

H. S. Pennypacker

Since 1969 when Jim Johnson and I first devised a college-level instructional technology around direct, nearly continuous behavioral measurement displayed on the Standard Chart, a growing portion of the professoriat has found that variations of this practice make teaching at the college level far more fun and productive. Moreover, many have noticed that courses taught in this fashion make excellent laboratories for the study of human learning, largely because real-world contingencies are in place and available for analysis. Students do, in fact, learn nonsense syllables more rapidly if grades and graduation are at stake than if the only reward is to stymie a graduate student's thesis project.

Over the past several years, I have observed a decline in published reports of innovations and their outcomes in this style of college teaching. At the same time, I have experienced a decided increase in informal communication about these matters. Individuals like Steve Graf, Julie Vargas, Charles Merbitz, Claudia McDade, Charles Olander, Bob Spangler, Bob Bower, and Og Lindsley, to name just a few, call or write to me at least twice a year to discuss a new tactic or discovery. These contacts are over and above the lengthy conversations that occur at every conference we jointly attend.

My aim in this column will be to share as many of these new procedures and their outcomes as possible. To accomplish this, I will need the help of everyone who is already using, or even thinking about using, the Chart as part of college-level curriculum. Please call (904) 373-3444 and follow the recorded instructions. I will return your call and add your contribution

to the column.

To give you an idea how the process works, I returned from the Orlando Precision Teaching Conference to discover that virtually all of my undergraduate students were at least one week behind optimal pace. We have made a textbook change this semester; an analysis of the charts suggested that the new book is not too good with technical definitions, the absolute foundation of any fluent technical vocabulary. My staff and I decided to implement Ogden's SAFMED procedure for our technical terms but were not sure of some procedural details that he had perhaps already refined. I placed a call to him and 30 minutes later we had the outline of a basic research question that badly needs asking. I will discuss both the question and the data in the next issue, but the problem is essentially this: Does it matter which component--term or definition--is on the "See" side of the card and which is on the "Say" side? Perhaps many of you have already addressed this problem. If so, would you please share your discoveries? We may be on the threshold of a revolutionary advance in instructional design, an advance that deductive cognitive theorizing has prevented us from recognizing. As always, of course, we will let the data decide.

I look forward to hearing from you and continuing both to learn and to teach as a result of Editor McGreevy's kindness in asking me to manage this section of the Journal.

COMPUTERS

Stephen Graf & William Wolking

Who's doing what and where with Precision Teaching and computing? Help keep us posted on what you are doing by writing the Editors. Prod for more information if you're interested.

Ogden Lindsley, Lawrence, Kansas. Lindsley has been at the forefront of Word Processing and microprocessed instruction. He is teaching classes in use of the Apple II. His presentations on computers at The First Winter Precision Teaching Conference (1981) and the Seventh Association for Behavior Analysis Convention (1981) use celeration analyses to address some myths currently surrounding computer-based education.

Charles Olander, Jacksonville, Alabama. Olander, Claudia McDade and their associates have implemented frequency and celeration-based computer assisted instruction at the Center for Individualized Instruction at Jacksonville State University. Data from the students is plotted on a video screen representation of the Standard

Celeration Chart. Olander uses the Apple II.

Charles Merbitz, Chicago, Illinois. Merbitz helped initiate the program at Jacksonville State, and is now working at the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago using Apple II computer games as exercises in rehabilitation following head trauma.

Ron Stearns, Orlando, Florida. Stearns and his associates in the Orange County Precision Teaching Project have developed "Bounce," a program for the Apple II which accepts data and draws celeration lines and learning pictures for 1, 3, 6, or 9 weeks on the Academic Chart.

Owen White, Seattle, Washington. White uses the time-sharing computer in his course on Exceptional Teaching that covers his book (with Norris Haring) of the same name. Student testing is handled by the program.

Jack Auman & Steve Graf, Youngstown, Ohio. Auman & Graf have constructed a program for the Apple II which provides students and data for teaching decisions. Users of the program try to help the fictitious students reach aims by making changes geared to affect the Learning Picture.

INNERS

Abigail B. Calkin

While I was not at the recent Orlando conference, I did receive Pat's letter about the idea of small columns. I suggested to Pat we add a column on inners.

Inners fall into several categories: thoughts, feelings, urges, and attitudes. Often some people lump these together and think they're all the same. A thought is a mental idea. A feeling is an idea with a mild physiological sensation accompanying it. An urge is a forcible drive or a continuing impulse toward an activity, according to the dictionary. Behaviorally defined, an urge is 20 thoughts per minute about something as opposed to 1 thought every 20 minutes. An attitude is a collection of 30-40 (or more) thoughts and feelings on a topic.

A project in a Human Relations class at Capital City Schools in Topeka helps students learn self-evaluation. Each student checks how she/he felt she/he did that day in class in the following 10 areas: self-starting, relaxing, participating in charting projects, controlling own behavior, sharing in discussions, respecting others, having a positive attitude toward self and others, caring about appearance, doing a good job, and keeping the journal.