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Guest Editor's Comments

Mary E. Watson

The idea for this special issue of Higher Education came about a couple of years ago at a faculty retreat. I had a conversation with a faculty member who talked about how little his administration in higher education knew about Reality Therapy and how few articles have been published on the application at the university level. The majority of the articles published in the Journal apply the CT/RT concepts to public school systems or to counseling in general. While we realize that the information is often transferable to other environments, the thought of a special issue pulling together ideas specific to higher education seemed to be a worthwhile project. This issue is the result of the contributions of twelve people who wrote about their philosophy, ideas and experiences of using Reality therapy in many different aspects of higher education.

The first six articles are foundational. In the first article, Larry Palmatier discusses a philosophy of education. Tom Parish discusses the application of the “Quality School” model in the college classroom environment. Stanley Wigle writes about the need to incorporate quality school principles into university teacher education programs. Mitchell Beck examines the benefits of using the principles of lead management and quality schoolwork in teacher training programs. Bob Wubbolding provides a detailed university course syllabus for teaching Choice Theory and Reality Therapy. Pete Peterson offers ideas of how one can use CT/RT to meet professional needs and to conduct the business of “professoring” based on his own experience.

The next three articles relate to using self-evaluation in higher education. First, Josipa Basic describes a way to teaching university students using self-evaluation based on her experience as a faculty member at the University of Zagreb, Croatia. William Howatt outlines the concept of using a cognitive-behavioral journal program to introduce Choice Theory and to assist adult learners to take charge of their own lives. The third article in this section describes a model for annual review of faculty based on self-evaluation.

The next three articles relate to specific applications in working with students. First, Patricia Fetter presents a process for using the basic psychological needs to help college students discover what is missing in their lives and as a way to solve relationship issues on college campuses. Annamaria Wenner describes a program based on Choice Theory that she developed and implemented which successfully reduced damage caused by students within a residence hall. In the third special application article, Larry Litwack and I describe and analyze a videotape series that demonstrated five approaches to psychotherapy. This series of video tapes can be used in a college counseling theory course where therapeutic approaches are compared and contrasted.

The final article by Larry Palmatier continues the discussion of credentialing issues raised in the last issue by Bob Wubbolding.

I would like to thank all the contributors for helping to make this special issue actually happen. Your willingness to describe your ideas and share your experiences is very much appreciated.
Blueprint For A Quality Learning Community: From Ivory Tower To Luminous Lighthouse

Larry L. Palmatier

Abstract: This article proposes an integrated philosophy of education relying on four major strands of knowledge. Quality management principles, perceptual control psychology, choice theory, and systems theory form a confluence that grounds and embeds the search for an authentic learning community. Additionally, the article presents a vision of leadership for a quality school community.

Philosophy of Education

Ivory Tower does not capture an image of a structure that would house a real learning community. Fortress comes to mind, as do separation and even loneliness. Pointy-headed creatures that think logically but cannot relate compassionately burrow into isolated cells in the cold, windowless milieu that safeguards their talking head lifestyle. These petty pedants cling on an environment that neutralizes life’s slings and arrows as they concoct one academic schema after another. They huddle in the nooks of the rocky vault that insures their intellectual freedom and provides a lofty perch that towers above a society’s pitiful pedestrians.

A luminous lighthouse, projecting a shining beam, offers a warmer image and a more charitable tower and reflects an architecture that shares the hearthstone and signals a peaceful purpose. Those who dwell within the great rooms encircling this radiant tower are busy thinking and learning daily to interact more harmoniously. Their collective concoction is a unifying intent to extend the hopeful beacon that spreads their community esprit to all those along the dank side streets or adrift in the churning waters of a bitter biosphere. Their warm lucent rays suffuse the vast chilling oceans that imprison all the darker human instincts, while carrying light years of pleasant possibilities for transforming the very context of life through a boundless sea change.

A Faculty Retreat

The School of Education faculty set aside a 36-hour respite to take up some gnawing questions about who we wanted to be as a community and to tackle the meta-messages stockpiling in their midst. What do you most like about your work here at the university? What are the obstacles that, if these limitations were to vanish, you would find teaching and researching even more rewarding than you do already? If you could fashion a more ideal setting, what would you add? What would you modify or delete? What takes most of your attention? Are these the subjects that you want to continue to dominate your time over? What elements in your professional work do you feel with passion? What is your written or unwritten personal mission? Can you state a community mission to which you can subscribe wholeheartedly?

These were some of the structured questions that our faculty chose to answer as we kicked off a day and a half retreat on the topic of creating a quality learning community. The step-by-step process that preceded the planned solitude led us to this encounter of close conversations, open evaluations, forthright feedback, and spirited reports—all balanced with easy strolls around the gardens, informal fun, community meals, and light-hearted interactions. We knew that we had to break out of a business-as-usual routine if we were to begin interlacing our professional efforts with time specifically devoted to establishing both the ground for companionship and the ground rules for tending to closer relationships among ourselves.

Preparatory Work. A representative six-member committee had planned a brief faculty retreat for purposes of re-examining our School and our mission, and to prime a new agenda for improving our graduate programs. An invitation went out to all 35 faculty members to meet off-campus on a voluntary basis in order to rethink our academic and relational goals and the social norms that we had unanimously, albeit silently, adopted. We concurred that inviting an outside person as resource would provide us with an essential perspective, a sounding board, and, perhaps, an arbiter of last resort. In anticipation of the actual retreat, a handful of faculty members circulated independent three to five-page position papers on what a learning community is and how we might begin the journey.

Outcome. By the end of the day and a half meeting, we had assembled a series of proposals for future pursuit. Our plans spanned a vast territory, ranging from curricular development and improvements in the norms that guide our personal relationships, to crafting explicit procedures for collaborating interdepartmentally on a wide range of professional matters. Voting was unanimous to schedule more social times and to continue working toward agreement on a philosophical framework that would inform our next moves.

Philosophical Foundation. To contribute tangibly to that goal, I present this article as one such philosophical context for establishing a genuine learning community. The faculty has not adopted this blueprint for shifting from a learning center to a learning community, however, by expanding our
earlier notions for reaching a consensus on a new framework for quality, we might gain greater perspective on the full dimensions of our task. One reasonable starting point is to unfurl an explicit philosophy of education that can help faculty define the organizational mission and goals of a genuine learning community.

Seeking consensus on an educational philosophy that embeds a learning community is a reasonable beginning. Once this agreement among members is in place and the members share a common intention, plans will begin to appear naturally and particular activities will flow from the fountain of agreement.

An Idea a Minute. By using brainstorming techniques, almost any congenial group of reasonably creative and intelligent members can generate a list of novel projects within 30 or 40 minutes. The first stage, however, is strengthening the esprit of the group and this critical task makes all the subsequent tactics meaningful and insures success. Ivan Illich (1971) addressed the confusion that groups often make between appearances and substance. He wrote how people commonly confuse a large quantity of social services with social improvement, health programs and numbers of medical workers with a rise in citizens’ health, or a rigorous prison system with public safety.

Focusing on Adult Learners. The philosophy that I present here aims especially at adult learners and the way they approach their formal studies in higher education. Being new to the hallowed halls or having left academia, for at least a time, these older students have gained practical experiences in the art of living but desire in-depth knowledge and more current technological information and research skills. Most return to school now with a stronger sense of self. Exceptions to reentry students’ inclination to take a higher ground position may appear randomly as fleeting displays of self-doubt and questions about their timing. For the most part, however, the adult learners do bring clearer goals, an ardent wish for specific competencies, a hunger for pragmatic outcomes that they can apply in their everyday world of work, and a sense of mission that their efforts can effect a more just society.

A Cohesive Base. The philosophy I suggest is really an integration of three separate strands of knowledge and clinical practices. The first part comes from a tradition of humanistic education that carries an integral commitment to service, social justice, and community impact. The second part of the philosophy includes the principles and practices of quality management as W.E. Deming (1986) espoused in his 14 Points and William Glasser (1984, 1998 a+b) refined and applied to education.

The third component is a combination of three contemporary psychological perspectives that emphasize choice, responsibility, internal control, and systems theory. The three distinct but compatible models are William Powers’ (1998) perceptual control theory (PCT), William Glasser’s (1998a) more user-friendly choice theory (CT), and interpersonal systems theory (Becvar & Becvar, 1996; Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 1996). The latter especially emerges in solution focused (de Shazer, 1994; O’Hanlon & Hudson, 1991, O’Hanlon & Weiner-Davis, 1989, and Furman & Ahola, 1990), strategic (Madanes, 1984; Haley, 1987; and 1993), and narrative models (Freedman & Combs, 1996; Monk, Winslade, Crocket, & Epston, 1997; White, 1995; White & Epston, 1990; and Zimmerman & Dickerson, 1996).

Transforming A Learning Center To A Learning Community

The late W. Edwards Deming (1986) proposed a four-part framework that structures a values laden context and defines the managerial principles and practices that lead to outcomes of quality anywhere in the world. I incorporate the outline that Crawford, Bodine, & Hoglund (1993) presented as an excellent and concise backdrop for Deming’s key points. Others are free to adapt Deming’s four essential elements to their sites and to make unique applications of these four powerful pillars and the 14 Points that follow.

1. System of Profound Knowledge
2. Knowledge of Systems Theory
3. Knowledge of Psychology, and
4. Variation (common cause or law averages)
   Rather than adopting Deming’s views verbatim, many would-be innovators select and integrate the elements that they find compatible with their core philosophy. These four components make up Deming’s four foundation piers that support the quality system that he espoused.

1. System of Profound Knowledge
   This first pillar is actually a coded phrase for an educational philosophy that forms a basis for the entire system. Centuries of tradition as embodied in the life and selected works of such luminaries as Thomas Aquinas, Ignatius of Loyola, Paulo Freire, Ivan Illich, and John Dewey-coalesce in present day humanistic education and give substance and form to the affirmation that every individual person has value and worth.

   The Counseling Psychology Department faculty, of which I am a part, grappled with an organizational mission statement that would be more specific than the global vision for the University in an effort to convey the faculty’s most meaningful goals.

Three Main Goals of the Counseling Psychology Faculty

I. Foster the Life of the Mind
   1. Sponsor a commitment to the intellectual life of the community
      • Generate new knowledge,
      • Synthesize and interpret existing knowledge, and
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II Foster the Life of the Spirit

1. Imbue the work of students and faculty with ethical standards

2. Enhance students' theoretical knowledge and skills by providing for their intellectual, emotional, and spiritual development

III. Engage in Continuous Service to the Community and the World

Departmental Mission Statement. The faculty of the counseling psychology department renews a long-standing commitment to the honorable mission of educating knowledgeable, ethical, compassionate, and competent counselors and psychologists. Graduates will leave the university to serve the needs of kindergarten to adult learners in schools and colleges, employees in industry, clients in a wide array of community agencies, and individuals and families in culturally diverse society. They may provide their future service activities in state, national, or international settings.

The faculty remains unswerving in fostering and continually improving an enjoyable organizational climate at USF where risk-taking becomes the norm. In this friendly and creative context, students naturally capture a family esprit that kindles their openness to learn and inspires them to develop all their innate abilities. Here they may freely challenge ideas, grow in mind and heart, participate in evaluating the program, and interact vigorously with peers and faculty mentors on their journey to academic success and professional status as counselors and counseling psychologists.

Fundamental to the mission is acquiring in-depth mastery of pragmatic, developmental, solution-focused, family systems, and interactive therapies that help others solve troubling conflicts, exercise free and responsible choices, reach important personal goals, and find swift and permanent relief from emotional and mental pain. The faculty mission affirms social justice and equality, integrity, optimism, rigor, collaborative leadership, and high quality relationships and accomplishments. All graduate students become colleagues within a vibrant community of scholars that they co-create with the faculty. In turn, this unique learning community serves as a protective harbor within which all members may find the courage to assume personal responsibility, to self-evaluate, to dream, to tap their emotional and intellectual talents and to tune into their sense of awe.

2. Knowledge of Systems Theory

Any leader in today's global economy—including an educational leader—needs both an immersion in system theory and a pragmatic eye on continuous renewal of the system itself. Setting linear models aside, Deming was free to observe that practically 96% of environmental static signals system flaws and not human defects.

The primary difference between the conventional wisdom of the hard sciences that searches for independent pairs or sequences of causes and separate effects, a systemic view posits a circular or interactional model that views causes and effects as interchangeable. The new paradigm differs dramatically from the earlier viewpoint. As no institution can ever stay in a static position and hope to flourish, a leader must work toward systemic improvements on various fronts. From a systems perspective, the ideal is to succeed at orchestrating an alignment between the energies of all the autonomous members of an institution and their collective goals.

Keeping in mind that each human being is a system and every human interaction a systemic phenomenon, the beginning level of a single human system is the individual perceptual control or choice system. This level becomes a system-within-a-system when the individual interacts with others in any social context—family, friends, or organization. These structures, in turn, exist in concentric pools of ever widening systems-within-systems, as individuals relate to an immediate family, to multiple families, to a culture, to multiple cultures, to a society, to a world, to political realities, and to multi-strand historical pathways.

The preliminary questions about any system are these. What is the larger system's definition of the role of the subsystems? Can the subsystems live with this identity? What are the formal and informal norms that fix the limits of a single unit within a higher education setting? What is the level of support for current programs and what is the degree of alignment institutionally? What types of new educational programs are possible to initiate and promote? What is the quality of the relationships between the various subsystems and between those units and the larger systemic context? What degree of support exists for future development and what is the potential for acquiring new funding in the form of gifts and grants? What is the current state of relationships among the professionals within a particular subsystem? What degree of support exists within and beyond a department, college, or school for improving those relationships and enlarging the role of the unit?

3. Knowledge of Psychology

Psychology refers to the fundamental role of human choice in any important behavior and the reality of human relationships that encompass and contextualize everyone's life space. The traditional and more narrow, intrapsychic views of psychology do not apply here as these largely represent an inapplicable cause and effect paradigm that is, by definition, immune to empirical testing and that mines too deep beneath the golden essence of psychology-present time relationships. The main psychological theories that inform this paper are choice theory and the perceptual control psychology from which Glasser's (1998a) model evolved. Completing the circuit are the systems theories, especially solution-focused, strategic, and narrative
paradigms, as these forms are most compatible with one another by sharing a common premise: behavior control perception.

4. Variation

Heralding an institutional goal-A 20% increase in student enrollment may be reasonable and even critical to survival, but the key question, according to Deming, was, “By what method?” Anyone can declare any goal, but if no one knows how to get there, the words are sanctimonious and hollow. Some goals are attainable and some are coincidental. Similarly, program and personnel evaluation must include the influence of variation, a naturally occurring factor in the life of any person or company.

Even good sales agents may produce results that vary widely from a month-to-month perspective, not due to incompetent lapses on their part, but because the winds of the moment within the business system create a variance in high sales factors beyond anyone’s rational or immediate control. Bosses that first spawn and then stir up a phony hype to keep their people off guard are, in reality, whistling sharp little boomerangs that help the company instill adversarial competition that distracts a sales force from the primary mission. The employees are too busy looking over a shoulder to avoid those fast-moving blades that will surely be coming back around soon with a message that raises self-doubt and an individualistic spirit. This scenario is hardly a formula for arming a staff with the calm confidence a person needs to form a bond of trust with the next customer.

Accountability is important as is the need to distinguish between common causes (attributable to system factors) and special causes (resulting from idiosyncratic or personal behavior). In this way, educational leaders can avoid scape-goating a particular person for results that may have been beyond that individual’s control. Increasing enrollment numbers in a program that suddenly faces more intense competition from outside institutions may not follow automatically from a major increase in the advertising budget. Spending more time improving the system and conveying the unique benefits of a particular program before expecting a competitive advantage may be more effective and beneficial in the longer run.

W. Edwards Deming’s (1986) Principles Of Transformation

Inevitably, the most important aspect of one’s working life is the quality of relationships, depending, to a large extent, on the social context in which one operates. W. Edwards Deming’s guidelines form a cohesive package and offer educators in the new concrete lighthouse a blueprint for achieving genuine community for all learners.

1. Create Constancy of Purpose for the Improvement of Product and Service

This guideline relates to making explicit any program’s purpose that, ideally, derives from a consensus among faculty, administration, and staff. People in organizations succeed more fully whenever they agree on a guiding purpose and define every program and working relationship in unambiguous terms.

Many in higher education report their satisfaction with their work to be in direct proportion to the agreement that faculty, administration, and staffs agree on role identity and professional purpose. Professional productivity is often a function of a tangible sense of camaraderie and teamwork among employees at various levels. Criticism, carping, blaming, and complaining all lead to a destructive atmosphere that impinges on the freedom within the relationships. Enjoying a broad participatory role is the best antidote for this narrow confinement and role ambiguity or conflict.

2. Adopt the New Philosophy

This point encourages all employees within a university to face the new challenges that exist in a very competitive economy and an increasingly more interdependent world (Thurow, 1992). The new philosophy also fosters a climate that sets a priority on quality and rejects poor work, materials, and service. This organizational principle of quality applies to the relationship between and among the professionals (faculty, staff, and administration) and between those groups and the academic unit’s alumni.

Many people say they cannot describe exactly what quality is, and so defining this nebulous concept operationally may bring more clarity to the term. Most do admit, however, that they can readily recognize this elusive characteristic when they see a product of quality or experience services that are of quality.

Some of the characteristics and organizational conditions that contribute most to generating products of quality and to sustaining services of quality are the following.

A. Working in a safe and non-coercive environment
B. Working on meaningful tasks
C. Maintaining a willingness to do one’s best at all times
D. Enjoying a sense of satisfaction by participating in activities of high quality
E. Engaging in work activities that damage no one
F. Working continuously to improve products and services
G. Producing results that are useful in some way
H. Producing a service or a product that holds up and retains value over time

3. Cease Dependence on Outside Inspection for Quality

Encouraging participatory governance and self-evaluation throughout the process is the subject of
this point. When everything is for keeps and an authority figure stands around monitoring or micro-managing to insure a certain output, no improvement in the level of quality can occur. Inspecting after-the-fact results does not lead to quality. What works is improving the process and eliminating all efforts to infect the work environment with the tension and self-absorbing behavior that fear brings. One of the most relevant caveats in this regard is to insure that those who are most competent in a specialty have a significant voice in defining an academic program and in determining the program elements.

4. Long-Term relationships and Loyalty Take Precedence over Low Price

Deming considered price as meaningless without taking into account a measure of the quality or true value at the end of the purchase. Most universities sustain a tradition of loyalty among their graduates, the intensity of which may range from strongly loyal among some departments' alumni to more reserved and passive among other entities. By refining the educational programs that a school or college offers and by clarifying the status of the current organizational climate, the professionals can insure success in nurturing the relationships and keeping a focus on the outcomes of quality. To build consensus in a large system on the matter of people's roles and relationships takes continuous effort. Similar attention is necessary to maintain agreement about the protocols that apply to adult learners. Similarly, attention to welcoming and orienting all adjunctive faculty members will pay dividends as will making the exact nature of educational programs as clear as possible.

5. Improve Constantly and Forever the System of Production and Service

The best time for a professional staff to inject quality into a system is at the design stage, rather than after-the-fact. Making a change in the leadership of a unit within the organization is another opportune moment for reexamining the issue of constant improvement. The faculty of any unit always has a distinct advantage in working with their own population. Working with adults who generally know what they want from their formal studies is a special opportunity. These more mature students typically take their professional development seriously because they choose to play an active role in their respective fields.

6. Institute Training on the Job

Following this guideline, the leadership in an organization is the person or office responsible for encouraging a well-articulated on-the-job training program. When the culture of a learning community sets a priority on improving job competencies, the content in which the students study expands. A vibrant college is not a warehouse storing curricular content and opening on a fixed schedule for curiosity-seekers that pay a hands-on visit to browse and sample the wares.

A college, ideally, represents a genuine learning community that influences other learners to the degree that all participants show mutual respect and engage in learning. Some examples of the technical training that the service and information providers may find useful are skills in communication and persuasion, team building, distance learning, decision making, problem analysis, conflict resolution, choice theory, managing multiple projects, making public presentations, creating relevant and engaging curricula, and short-term problems solving. Implementing such a plan at the heart of a department or college-all on a voluntary basis-will likely lead everyone to higher levels of competency and greater productivity, not to mention encourage more energy and enjoyment.

Effective leadership is the wellspring that sponsors opportunities for faculty and staff members to gain professional information and to share their knowledge and curiosity. The aim of this type of training is to enrich the working conditions so that everyone can easily contribute to the common purpose and breathe life into the organizational mission. Programs already in place will likely continue to benefit everyone and serve as a base for any new programs or incentive initiatives that the community may develop in the future.

7. Institute Leadership

Deming stated that the leadership is responsible for quality. A lead manager, therefore, does not stand apart to judge the faculty, staff, and student-consumers in order to send memos of deficiency or to rank their individual performance. Rather, a leader helps people do a better job at reaching the goals that all participants actively support. Leaders with an interest in quality programs and relationships evaluate their own performance in relation to all the parties-faculty, staff, students, and others in the community-in order to know what they can do to foster improvement.

Managing Styles. One way to clarify some distinctions in the behavior, attitude, and style that managers use is by comparing a boss with a leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boss</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tells</td>
<td>Shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referees</td>
<td>Facilitates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays cop</td>
<td>Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictates</td>
<td>Engenders enthusiasms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses coercion</td>
<td>Nurtures quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Removes barriers to need attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaunts power</td>
<td>Encourages self-empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies external motivation</td>
<td>Taps internal motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats symptoms</td>
<td>Treats causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blames individuals</td>
<td>Examines systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Eliminate Slogans, Exhortations, and Targets

Slogans and other shortsighted gimmicks create adversarial relationships when a manager uses these ploys to imply that higher quality is, primarily, a function of increased effort by team members. More than anything, these manipulative practices reveal a whip-cracking mentality that distances staff and faculty and always falls short of arbitrary quotas. Deming’s experience proved that higher quality resulted from correcting system glitches and not from imposing verbal prods.

Using public banners that proclaim a learning community’s intent is not the same as attempting to compel members to produce. These social reminders of the soul of a place can serve as a powerful source of inspiration and may remind everyone that the mission of a college and university is greater than any individual or even the sum of all individuals. The more grassroots these expressions of the will of a group, the better.

Giving voice to a value system that faculty members, administrative leaders, alumni, and graduate and undergraduate students define and embrace is not the same as creating adages that exhort passive employees to achieve by perspiring more. Quality springs from within a person. Encouraging members of an educational community is not coercive. To draw the distinction more clearly, such encouragement could come out in the following form: “Every person connected with our college is valuable to us.” Another way to say this is: “Here, everyone succeeds.” “When one wins, we all win.” Deming advised avoiding any motto that obviously seeks to manipulate students, staff, or faculty into working harder. “Work hard today; rest tomorrow” or, “A Tomcat never rests” will not work, no matter the form.

11. Eliminate Numerical Quotas

Some institutions resort to such statements as, “...90% of students will achieve at a 70% level by mid-point in the program.” This form of arbitrary goal setting represents a damper to quality because these minimal standards reflect external control psychology and invite a “good enough” mentality. Anytime someone extrinsically imposes such nebulous numbers, no one need worry that the organization will reach the arbitrary goals. When facing such generic plans, imposed from on high, Deming would always ask: “By what method?” The critical elements, therefore, in goal-attainment are: realistic plans, participation and endorsement by all those affected by the goals being set, and delineation of the tangible methods for achieving the goals.

Deming created this 11th component of his total quality management system because the management-by-objectives method had focused too myopically on the end goal instead of the interim process and did not usually include any trace of a master plan by which to help anyone do a better job. Quotas that reflect the average output of a group lead to an outcome that celebrates mediocrity. When an organization reaches one of those drab goals, half the employees would be producing above and half producing below the arbitrary quota. Naturally occurring variation could just as easily have been the factor leading to such split results.

The problem is to improve the system and find out who are having trouble. Changing the system so that everyone can succeed is the only way to achieve
quality results. Quality learning is not average learning or minimal learning, but learning that cannot reflect the average output of a single class or any university unity. If the exclusion focus becomes a grade or a standardized test score, the learning process itself, or even a meaningful interim product of learning, would have to take second place. An effective system accommodates the primary purposes of a creative and substantive educational program that contains the deepest cultural values the participants have jointly endorsed.

12. Remove Barriers to Pride of Workmanship

One way to create an environment where high quality work becomes the norm is for administrators to identify the system problems, to consult those working closest to the troubles, and to implement the suggestions that bubble up from faculty, staff, and larger community. Problems within an organization are easier to resolve by knowing the nature of human motivation (Glasser, 1998a) and the mechanics of a perceptual control system (Powers, 1998). One key is involving all of the stakeholders-faculty, students, and alumni-in a decision making process that leads to effective solutions.

13. Institute a Vigorous Program of Education and Self-Improvement

This point invites an entire work force to engage in individual growth and personal development that moves everyone beyond mere technical on-the-job training and improvement of occupational skills, as in Point #6. This point encourages everyone in a system to develop a plan to maintain an ongoing swirl of intellectual discovery, learning, and personal development.

Becoming more willing to supplement technical faculty and staff development with activities that lead to further reading, learning, and sharing among colleagues at work sets a college community apart and serves as an excellent group role model to all students. Beyond personal satisfactions, these self-improvement experiences help everyone compete from a position of clarity and lead to system improvement. Lead managers and faculty members who continue to acquire skills in diverse personal areas will not be putting off to retirement years the many enjoyable balancing experiences they can have now. Most people would probably prefer to work side-by-side with others who can express themselves musically or artistically, or do creative writing, speak a foreign language, or go backpacking in the mountains. All of these activities and many others contribute powerfully to a useful perspective on one’s work life.

14. Take Action to Accomplish the Transformation

No one currently working at any institution of higher education needs convincing that change is the order of the day. All leaders who want their institutions to thrive absolutely must engage in a continuous process of personal and institutional self-renewal. With such leadership, members of any learning community will have the hope they need to help them manage the two types of inevitable changes: developmental adjustments that occur continuously for any living person or system, and idiosyncratic demands that follow unexpected events. Take, for example, unexpected downturns in economic markets, hurricanes that kill 18,000 people in five countries over for days, or the cancerous effects of mean-spirited politics. To manage the improvements that put an educational organization in a strong, cutting-edge position, the effort must involve every member of the community and the context must exude systemic support and ongoing discussion.

Perceptual Control, Choice, And Systems Theory

The third component in the philosophical context that would most benefit adult learners integrates three contemporary psychological perspectives-control, choice, and systems theories. Both William Powers' perceptual control theory and William Glasser's choice theory emphasize to one degree or another, choice, internal control, alignment with intentionality, and responsibility. These two complementary models contrast radically from the conventional reinforcement and aversive tactics in Skinner's (1971; 1976) behavior work. Systems theory represents a radical shift, as well, by deleting the pervasive cause and effect viewpoint and substituting a circular paradigm in which cause and effect become interchangeable as they bend all the way around in the closed loop that befits the very heart of human relationships and interactions.

All three of these theories represent a qualitative shift from a more pervasive philosophy that had long dominated the field of education and, indeed, most institutions, throughout the world. This common perspective decries freedom, yet many appear to tolerate and even abide by the ineffective and damaging practices. Controlling through domination is an external control psychology that routinely poisons relationships through an exclusive reliance on punishments and enticements. These external devices are tools that poor managers design, but these bosses are mostly deluding themselves that they can succeed in shaping individuals' behavior and, ultimately, in controlling others.

The phrase external motivation is an oxymoron in this context because, as living beings, we are all self-regulating or cybernetic-i.e., self-steering. No one can, therefore, truly control others or force them to do anything against their will. In contrast, leadership that trusts, persuades, and even inspires others to connect with their personal sense of self when they are at their best is the primary type of education that represents legitimate quality. Needless to say, rejecting coercive educational methods is no sign of weakness.

Summarizing My Philosophy of Education

The structure of quality that I have adopted for educating adult learners is consistent with the Ignatian tradition that marks the Jesuits’ long-standing educational philosophy. Boldly stated, this philosophy claims that treating students lovingly is not overstating the care and attention that teachers
and professors should give to those who want to learn. Some of the practical aims that I espouse are lifetime learning and encouraging students at all levels to choose ethical behaviors and to engage in community service. In addition, I value teaching collaboratively and respectfully and assisting adult learners through such tangible services and resources as academic and career advising.

Rather than cajoling learners to engage in tasks that they recognize as meaningless, or trying to badger them into a submissive posture in relation to authority figures, I am most at home affirming students of any age. The humanistic treatment that learners crave at most universities invites faculty and staff to encourage learners of all ages to explore and invent. Experience show that when students pursue goals that they see as meaningful, they will naturally work hard, produce more, score well, and enjoy the learning process and outcomes.

The essence of human motivation is a relentless drive to match our sensory images from the outside world with the internal perceptions we hold as intentions. When we have what we want, and we successfully align our sensory and mental images, we experience a satisfying sense of control. When we see no alignment between our sensory pictures and our intentions, we sense the perceptual error as a frustration signal. This distress then activates our behavioral system to act on the world and get the perceptual alignment we want. Seeing someone we cherish standing just out of reach is another occasion for us to entertain a gnawing frustration in the awareness of a strong urge to have and hold something that we lack. Sensing an unmet need, facing a thwarted intention, or perceiving a gap between what we want and what we have, all lead to frustration and invite us to behave in a new direction.

Motivation, by definition, is always internal because the energy behind any goal-seeking behavior is a specific want. Even when a particular goal is a concrete material product, such as a ring or a wristwatch, we hold the ultimate choice about striving for such a material product. The want is always in our head! Our inclination to achieve, our desire to be close to another person, our yearning to taste freedom, and our natural inclination to find enjoyment and comedy in the world, are all examples of the genetic instructions that we follow. We are internally motivated to orchestrate our lives from deep within our unique and individual system of control or choice.

Although the external environment may sometimes appear to motivate us, this potpourri of outside information can never truly control us. Everything we think, feel, or do is in reference to a mental picture of what we value as meaningful, enjoyable, useful, and representative of ourselves when we feel at our best. Whatever we may sense is information only and does not define us or make us behave in certain ways. What activates our behavioral system is the frustration signal that emerges when we find a gap between what we actually perceive and what we would prefer to see.

Each of us is a living control system that is always seeking to control for or match our internal perceptions by aligning our sensory pictures with our intentions. We can do nothing more than aim at reaching those specific intentions. Our behavior is, therefore, always our best attempt to find a sensory match for a reference picture that we have already put inside our head. What makes the world go around is a vast sea of individuals literally spending their lives being cybernetic. To work hard at trying to change anyone from the outside inward is, therefore, a futile project. What can happen when an entire institutional system, in the form of a college, implements this educational philosophy or one compatible with these principles?

Implications for Adult Learners. Educators, who wish to implement a more concrete form of community values, could do so by making one major shift in the procedures for admitting university students. Operationally defining the process for selecting, orienting, and enrolling students through criteria that match a competency profile for graduates will advance educational quality beyond a misty hope. Once university students meet reasonably rigorous selection criteria and receive an acceptance letter allowing them to begin their graduate studies, all efforts from a post-secondary faculty and staff must be positively encouraging.

Defining Education and Management

Often even university educators overlook the need to define the basic concepts related to their main task of teaching. Ideally, the definitions of education, teaching, counseling, and managing (Glasser, 1984, 1998a) reflect one's personal philosophy of educational quality and one's institutional mission statement.

Education is a process of discovering that learning adds quality to our lives. Quality is relative to the extent of which we ask and answer our own significant questions and meet our innate needs for love, power, fun, and freedom.

Teaching is a process of imparting specific skills, knowledge, and learning-to-learning strategies through a variety of techniques, such as explaining and modeling-to people who want to learn these skills and knowledge. Their motivation for learning is their belief that, sooner or later, these skills, knowledge, and methods of learning for a lifetime will add quality to their lives.

The question every faculty member must answer is what to do when pure teaching is not possible for any reason. This condition appears to be common in public schools where a compulsory education mandate stifles the freedom and enjoyment that go with exercising options. Adult learners, predominantly graduates of that same public school system, may carry with them some residual anxiety about "coming back to school". Students intent on returning to college or university are likely to set aside their former encounters with rigidity and prepare to express a genuine open-to-learn spirit. The answer to the query about teaching reluctant learners remains the same for high school, middle school or college-professors who find that they cannot teach in a pure sense must resort to a managing mode.

Management, operationally, is a process of persuading people that working hard and doing a quality job at what a
manager asks them to do, will add quality to their lives and, usually, to the lives of others. In this case, I am applying managing skills to undergraduate and graduate educational programs because even an adult learner with a positive interest in learning may settle for a “good enough” plateau or may remember how threatening learning had once been.
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The whole focus of Choice Theory is on the notion that the student must want to learn. In other words, students won’t learn what they don’t want to learn, but teaching becomes more effective as soon as the students who hurt or have a strong interest, discover that they can learn a better way (Glasser, 1980). How wonderful it would be if this was always the case throughout the entire educational process (i.e., K-12 and beyond). Unfortunately, however, the bored of education seem to evolve around the middle school years, and continue until such time that the students either quit high school, or graduate simply because they have “served their time”. For such students, little concern has generally been offered regarding whether or not they are truly excited about what they are learning or have learned. Hence, many of these students are actually turned off by schooling well before they have matriculated from high school.

Of course, all students aren’t turned off by school. In fact, the younger students (i.e., K-3) usually are delighted by the prospect of going to school, but by the high school years, however, this enthusiasm and excitement is often all but absent. Hence, our nation’s high school drop-out rates hover around 30%, while gangs seem to take over where schools leave off for many teenagers. Glasser (1990) actually described one high school student, however, who had become thoroughly bored by his high school experiences, but nevertheless was working very hard at a McDonald’s Restaurant in order to pay for his eventual college education. Of course, you might ask, “How could this be so?” “How could it be that a youth could be turned off by school (i.e., high school) on the one hand, yet excited about going to school (i.e., college) on the other hand?” Well, whatever the reason, at least the student in question is still excited about some aspect of his future education, and that’s great news. For on that excitement much can be built. It’s important to remember, though, that the student was definitely interested in his future college education, was willing to pay for it (or at least a portion of it), and was willing to work hard once he had the opportunity to go to college. All of these factors strongly indicate that the student will be motivated to do well in school because of his own high level of cognitive dissonance or personal commitment to his own college education. This is a crucial ingredient that makes the whole educational process go a lot easier for everyone, and is especially important for students to do well in college today.

Yes, it’s true, that in a “quality-school”-type college environment more—if not all—students will more likely benefit because such experiences may serve to awaken the sleeping giant, by somehow getting students interested, even where such interest might not have existed before. The rest of this paper will therefore be dedicated to examining what professors and teachers should do in order to make a difference, and turn their students on in the process.

To begin with, all professors and teachers should make friends with their students. Of course, this could take a little work, but it should be well worth it. In order to achieve this end, teachers could learn their students’ names and/or attend their students’ performances and/or activities, for in so doing they will more likely convey to their students that they genuinely care for them too. In other words, as teachers befriend their students, their students will more likely befriend them, by placing each other in their respective “Quality Worlds”. Most importantly, though, is that students will also likely include what the professor or teacher teaches in their “Quality Worlds” too. Other things that teachers and professors can do in order to gain admission into their students’ “Quality Worlds” are generally centered around the fulfillment of the following specific needs:

**Love and Belonging.** One way to fulfill this need is to maintain positive perceptual filters and act like a friend.

**Power.** One way to fulfill this need is to strive to excel, be highly credible, and help your students to do likewise.

**Freedom.** One way to fulfill this need is to offer choices and not ultimatums.

**Fun.** Sure you can teach without using humor or having fun, but does anyone want you to?

Besides fulfilling students’ basic needs, professors and teachers can also share their personal pictures or goals that they believe to be held in common with their students. They can also set the proper example by approaching their students and their subject matter with great enthusiasm.

In addition to the suggestions offered above, other options are also available, all of which are in keeping with William Glasser’s (1990) “Quality School” model. For instance, professors and teachers should always begin by explaining **WHY** a particular topic is taught, followed quickly by some recommendations regarding **HOW** and **WHEN** their...
students will be able to use them. Believe it or not, these ideas are even applicable to teaching graduate level statistics courses, as well as any other course too. Next, try to assign students to small groups (this should be very need-satisfying for everyone in various ways), but be sure that there is at least one highly capable person assigned to each group in order to keep the group moving in the right direction. Always facilitate quality work by asking questions and answering them too. Remember to never punish since it often creates adversarial roles. Never give up. Instead, always seek to find better alternatives. That these strategies work for college students has been demonstrated by Parish (1992a, b), as well as others.

Another strategy that professors and teachers should implement is where they de-emphasize the “Golden Rule” and emphasize, instead, the “Platinum Rule”. In other words, they should not strive to do unto their students what they would want for themselves (i.e., the professors & teachers). Rather, they should do unto their students what they (i.e., the students) want done for them. Here are some hints regarding how this can be accomplished.

At the outset of a course one needs to be sure to ask students what they want. Just be sure to offer specific choices that are in line with the course’s established objectives, and that they are also in keeping with what you are prepared to teach. For instance, I have regularly taught a course concerning how to motivate yourself and others. At the outset of these classes I always ask the students the following questions:

1. How would you like to understand yourself and others better?
2. How would you like to motivate yourself better?
3. Would you like to know what you can do in order to increase your influence on others?

The students, in turn, raise their hands indicating what they want. Of course, in nearly every instance all the students raise their hands for each question. When this occurs the professors or teachers have (1) involved their students, (2) found out what they wanted, and (3) placed some responsibility on them regarding their joint ownership of these objectives.

Then after each class period, students should be asked to indicate what they learned today that was (1) in keeping with the agreed upon objectives, (2) of interest to them, (3) able to be used five years from now, and/or (4) likely to be beneficial in helping them become a better future teacher, spouse, parent, and/or person? This strategy further involves the students, helps them to see how what was discussed could be applied to their lives, and helps others to see it too. Truly, when one’s classmates say something was important to them, it’s incredible how others also quickly see the light. That’s what good teaching—at any level—is really all about.

With such involvement and commitment from the students learning by them becomes more readily assured, especially if the professor or teacher remembers the following simple four steps—which are all in accordance with Glasser’s (1990, 1993) “Quality School” model.

1. Explain what is expected (Explain what quality is).
2. Demonstrate (or have demonstrated) what exactly is expected, i.e., show how to achieve quality.
3. Demonstrate how to evaluate quality work.
4. Allow individuals to set goals, evaluate their own work, and feel good about their successes.

For quality work to occur in higher education, or anyplace else, the key is whether or not the students value their efforts, and/or whether or not those they respect and admire also value their efforts. Where these things happen, the role of the teacher should more likely be that of a “guide from the side”, rather than a “sage from the stage”. After all, the students must be ultimately responsible for their own survival, both academically and otherwise. The professors and teachers, in contrast, are simply supposed to be friendly, ask thought-provoking, information-giving questions (if possible), help in goal setting and plan making (at least until the students can do so on their own), and always helping them to understand that if they endure, that success is practically assured. Of course, whether they succeed or fail will always be their choice! I guess that’s why Glasser’s (1998) most recent book is entitled Choice Theory.
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William Glasser has championed the need to change how public scholars are educating our children. He has operationalized his Choice Theory/Reality Therapy concepts into what he has referred to as the Quality School Model (1990). While Glasser's model has been almost exclusively applied to K through 12 and special education environments, there has been little work on exploring the applicability of the Quality School Model to higher education settings. This article examines the potential benefits of using Glasser's principles of lead management and quality schoolwork in teacher training programs. There is a growing concern in higher education that university students are not performing at a level of excellence demanded by the challenges of a rapidly changing world.

Teacher trainees, in particular, need to be prepared to deal effectively with an ever increasing population of at-risk youth. As many as twenty-five percent of American youth drop out of school before age 16 (Brodinsky, 1989). Many others stay in school, but join gangs and are otherwise disruptive to the goals of the academic institution. Instead of being the source for resolving these problems, there is troubling evidence that there may be systemic factors within the schools that are aggravating the problems. Kagan (1990) cited evidence that schools may actually exacerbate feelings of alienation and rejection of "at-risk" youth that eventually cause them to drop out. Beck and Malley (1999) said that the current focus that schools place on competition, grades, and mastery tests is inimical to promoting a sense of belonging among many students. Bright and motivated kids that come from intact and supportive families typically do well, but an increasing number of less fortunate students from turbulent and dysfunctional backgrounds are at high risk for failure. Burnett & Walz (1994) pointed out that when schools do not meet student needs for identity and belongingness, they tend to gravitate toward gangs that provide them with a sense of belonging not available anywhere else in their lives.

Unfortunately, the age-old paradigm of the student-teacher relationship has been one in which the teachers are "talking-heads" and students are passive receptacles of information. After conducting a nationwide field study of American high schools, Sizer (1984) observed that the degree to which this model was uniformly adopted throughout the country was nothing less than astonishing. Unfortunately, when this happens, children become utterly passive learners, vegetative receptacles of information. "No more important finding has emerged from the inquiries of our study than that the American high school student, as student, is all too often docile, compliant, and without initiative" (p.54).

Glasser (1993) referred to this type of pedagogy as "boss-managing" in which the classroom is run using coercion, rewards, and punishment. He called for a different model that he referred to as "lead-managing." Bossing children instead of leading them inevitably brings out the rebellious proclivities of children and creates emotional distance between the student and teacher.

"... it is still apparent to me that both teachers and administrators are having great difficulty making the major change in the system of education that has to be made if their school is to become a Quality School. They have to give up boss-managing and start lead-managing" (p.2).

Living a Quality World

This changing landscape of K through 12 education presents many special challenges to the inexperienced teacher. By living and practicing the Quality School Model during their own undergraduate and graduate educational experiences, students in teacher education programs will be better prepared to become quality educators themselves.

All humans seek a quality world in which they can experience for themselves the maximum amount of happiness and success and the minimum amount of pain, suffering, and failure (Glasser, 1993). According to Glasser, the quality world is one in which the person satisfies one's genetically encoded needs for belonging, freedom, fun, power, and survival. When these needs are not being met, the environment in which the person is functioning ceases to be a quality world.

From the subjective perspective of the student, a quality school is one in which the student feels that he or she is safe, accepted, respected, and experiences learning as fun. Glasser (1993, p. 22-25) outlined the following essential six conditions for quality schoolwork to become possible:

1. There must be a warm and supportive classroom environment.
2. Students are always asked to do the best they can do.
3. Students should only be asked to do useful work.
4. Students are asked to evaluate their own work and improve it.
5. Quality work always feels good.
6. Quality work is never destructive.

Having had the opportunity to use these principles and witness their effectiveness in more than two decades of work.
with emotionally disturbed youth, I have become an ardent believer in these ecological principles for effective education. Consequently, when I accepted a position as Chair of the Special Education Department at Central Connecticut State University, I decided to incorporate them into the teacher training program. If the teachers-to-be are going to adopt the quality school teacher model, then it makes sense for them to live the model during their teacher training program. It would be incongruent and inefficacious to try to convince teacher trainees about the merits of the Quality School Model by using conventional, didactic teaching methods. Glasser once pointed out that it is impossible to teach Reality Therapy by merely writing or explaining. He likened it to asking Isaac Stern to explain how he plays the violin but never asking him to actually play. The manner in which the components of quality schoolwork are integrated into the teacher training program is described below.

Creating a Warm and Supportive Classroom

Following Glasser's admonition that quality schoolwork can only be achieved in a warm and supportive environment, I have adopted a 3-C model in many of my teacher training classes, with each "C" referring to climate, context, and contract.

I try to establish a climate of friendliness and mutual respect from the very first class. This comes quite naturally to me because I love being in the classroom, having something of a type A personality, and am energized by the students' youthful enthusiasm and idealism. I also try to use appropriate self-disclosure as a way to communicate that I am not a stodgy or stuffy old professor who looks down at students in a pretentious or condescending manner. I strongly believe that an atmosphere of mutual respect and self-disclosure is a way to share a sense of common humanity with my students.

By context I am referring to the classroom setup. It is quite amazing how many college classrooms are still set up in the standard rectangular-like fashion reminiscent of the one room schoolhouse of yesteryear. According to Glasser (1993), this sends an implicit message to the students on the first day of class that the course will be boss-managed in the traditional fashion. Instead, I almost invariably begin class in circle configuration with me as part of the circle. Hopefully, the students get the message that I am interested in minimizing the amount of an Individualized Education Plan (IDEA) or Section 504 of the Disabilities Education (IDEA) or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, I ask students to conduct a functional needs analysis of hypothetical cases of students with physical or emotional disabilities. When they identify the child's most salient needs, I then ask them to develop appropriate intervention strategies that might form the basis of an Individualized Education Plan. They also participate in hypothetical PPT conferences with students taking on different roles. The students find these activities fun, challenging, and relationship building.

Creating a Democratic Classroom

A democratic classroom is one in which all members take responsibility not only for their own success but for the success of the group as well. Glasser (1986) emphasized the use of the "learning-team" as a way to promote a sense of ownership for the activities of the group. The learning-team promotes cooperation instead of competition and takes advantage of each class member's unique talents and skills. It also prepares students to learn to work in teams that may be the single most important skill needed in today's rapidly changing workforce. In most of my classes, I break the class up into learning teams every week and give them an exercise that is germane to the topical item of the week. As an example, when we are studying the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, I ask students to conduct a functional needs analysis of hypothetical cases of students with physical or emotional disabilities. When they identify the child's most salient needs, I then ask them to develop appropriate intervention strategies that might form the basis of an Individualized Education Plan. They also participate in hypothetical PPT conferences with students taking on different roles. The students find these activities fun, challenging, and relationship building.

Using Concurrent Evaluation

The last way in which I try to incorporate the Quality School principles into my classroom is through the process of concurrent evaluation. Glasser (1993) advocated the abolishment of the age-old method of "teach, test, rank, and coerce the losers" (p.94). Instead, he urged that to promote excellence in the classroom, schools should "involve [students] deeply in the process of evaluating their own work through concurrent evaluation. The concurrent evaluation method incorporates the Japanese management concept of "Kaizen" or continuous improvement. Quality improvement
is infused into the learning process by having students evaluate their work while they do it. Without the opportunity for continuous self-improvement, students will not do quality work. In my classes, students learn how to evaluate their own work, how to improve it, and how to persevere until quality work has been achieved. They are provided with ample opportunity to share their work with each other, get feedback from each other and get feedback from me. Glasser (1993) said that “when students help each other, whether they do it informally as members of a small working group or as teaching assistants, they learn far more than if they just do their own work and do not teach or help others” (p. 99). The concurrent evaluation method works nicely with student portfolios.

To continue to emphasize student ownership and responsibility for the progress of the class, I also conduct concurrent evaluation of the class in general. As a group, we discuss what is going well and what areas are in need of improvement. This type of evaluation not only empowers the student, it treats the student as a professional and provides me with extremely valuable feedback.

Conclusion

By incorporating the three “Cs” into my classes and modeling lead management strategies to my students, I feel that as they become educators they will be more likely to take these concepts and integrate them into their classrooms. If we are going to have any influence on our educational systems and demand quality from our students, we need to start with our teachers in training. They hold the key to successful school reform and the re-claiming of our at-risk youth.
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Incorporating Quality School Principles and Practices Into a University Teacher Education Program

Stanley E. Wigle

The vast majority of the articles which have appeared in the Journal of Reality Therapy addressing the concept of "quality schools," have focused on k-12 school (Baskett, 1993; Bray, 1995; Edens, 1993; Greene & Uroff, 1991; Lafontaine, 1994; Parish, 1996; Parish & Stallings, 1992; Saviola, 1996; Wigle & Dudley, 1991; Wigle & Manges, 1993; Wigle & Manges, 1995). However, Wigle (1996) reported on an effort to begin to incorporate Glasser's quality school concepts into a university teacher preparation program. The idea behind that effort was that if a paradigm shift to quality schooling is to be made, then colleges and universities who prepare teachers must incorporate, teach and model the concepts of quality schooling within their programs (Wigle, 1996). In a commentary on the Wigle article, Palmatier (1996) pointed out that transforming single courses in teacher preparation programs would not effect the desired paradigm shift in K-12 schools. According to Palmatier, what is required is that entire teacher preparation programs must be organized with an aim to prepare graduates who can teach, model, and support quality schooling practices.

The observation made by Palmatier about the extent of the transformation that will be needed in college and university teacher preparation programs is a good one. However, academia tends to be quite conservative and significant change requires time and perseverance (McQuaide & Pliska, 1994). Therefore, it is incumbent upon individuals who staff teacher preparation programs to take advantage of every opportunity to continue to incorporate the principles of quality schools into such programs. It is in the spirit of that commitment that the project which is reported in this paper was undertaken. The purpose of this paper is to report on the incorporation of the principles and practices of quality schooling in a university teacher preparation program through the use of statements of program learning outcomes, portfolio assessment, and faculty mentoring.

Program Outcomes and Portfolio Assessment

In order to ensure that its graduates would be effective facilitators of learning in K-12 schools, the faculty of the School of Education (SOE) in a small state-supported university in the mid-South recently adopted a statement of student learning outcomes in an effort to improve the efficacy of its teacher preparation program. Based upon empirical research and best practice within the educational community, this statement outlines the knowledge and skills a student is expected to be able to display upon graduation from the university’s teacher preparation program. This statement also incorporates many important principles and concepts of quality schooling in that it stresses the importance of a relevant and purposeful curriculum, the authentic assessment of such a curriculum and a pedagogy which facilitates active student involvement (Wigle & Harris, 1994; Wigle & Manges, 1993, 1995, 1997). Having adopted this statement of student learning outcomes for all undergraduate programs in the School of Education (SOE), the next step was to facilitate the adoption of these outcomes by students as important reference perceptions in their quality worlds. One of the ways that was chosen to accomplish this was to adopt a portfolio assessment system for all students in the SOE.

A portfolio is a purposeful collection of student work that exhibits that student’s effort, progress and achievement relative to predetermined goals (Ryan & Kuh, 1993). Portfolios allow students to carefully select a wide range of documents that give evidence of their achievement of important knowledge and skills. By making careful choices of the kinds of documents to include, a student’s portfolio will be a much more authentic summary of his/her professional knowledge and skills than will a transcript of grades or a record of paper-and-pencil assessments. Documents that mirror the tasks and products that practicing professionals engage in and produce, give direct evidence of a student’s ability to perform “real world” tasks. The “real world” relevancy of such documents is the essence of their authenticity and accounts for their persuasiveness in attesting to the abilities of the individual submitting them (Arter & Spandel, 1992; Farr, 1990; Paulson, Paulson, & Meyer, 1991; Wiggins, 1989; Yumori & Tibbetts, 1992).

In a belief that what students control for affects their choices of behaviors (Wigle & Manges, 1993), the focus throughout the portfolio assessment system is clearly upon the statement of student learning outcomes adopted by the SOE. By making the learning outcomes of the SOE central to the entire enterprise of creating, selecting, refining, and organizing portfolio evidence, these outcomes are coming to be adopted as reference perceptions in students’ quality worlds. As important quality world reference perceptions, these pictures are coming to impact student behavioral choices as students attempt to actualize such pictures in their portfolio documents. In addition, because a portfolio is a self-initiated documentation of growth, students are coming...
to have a sense of ownership over their own learning, an awareness of personal strengths, and opportunities to make choices about how they wish to present themselves as professional. All of this significantly relates to students’ basic need for power. As students have come to perceive portfolios as one effective way to meet their needs, it has greatly enhanced the active participation of students in the learning processes within the SOE.

As important as it was to convince students to place the SOE learning outcomes into their quality worlds by stressing the relevancy of such pictures to their needs and goals, it was also necessary to find or create a way in which faculty efforts and student efforts could intersect and support each other. It was necessary to design a process whereby students and faculty would be able to engage in substantive conversations about the progress that each student was making toward the learning outcomes that the faculty wanted students to place in their quality worlds. Because of the pressing demands that are made on the time and attention of both faculty and students during the delivery of academic course work, such conversations are not really possible in that context. Neither are such conversations possible during the academic advising process because faculty and student attention tends to be intently focused on enrollment in course work for the next academic term. Therefore, it was decided that faculty would arrange for separate meetings with their advisees expressly for the purpose of talking with them about the SOE learning outcomes, about the growth they were making in terms of the program outcomes, and about the development of their portfolios to document that growth. In this manner, faculty came to serve as mentors to students in the teacher preparation programs of the SOE.

Faculty Mentoring

There are many possible definitions of mentors and mentoring in the research literature (Blackwell, 1989; Kogler-Hill, Bahniuk, Dobos, & Rouner, 1989; Moore & Amey, 1988; Moses, 1989; Schmidt & Wolfe, 1980; Shandley, 1989). However, it was decided by the faculty to define mentoring as an intentional, nurturing process of interaction between faculty and students, outside of the context of academic course delivery. As suggested by William Glasser (1998), the aim of such interaction has been to build strong, positive relationships between faculty and students. As it was intended, such relationships are becoming a basis upon which students choose to place the faculty into their quality worlds as people that students want to help them further develop and refine the skills, abilities, and understandings they will need as teachers. This definition of and approach to mentoring was purposefully selected because it suggest that an important role played by faculty is to engage students in this process of development in ways other than formal classroom instruction.

There is a body of literature which indicates that contact with faculty outside of the classroom is linked to academic success (e.g., Astin, 1977; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1977; Tracey & Sedlacek, 1985; Wilson, Gaff, Dienst, Wood, & Bavry, 1975). There is also a good deal of research evidence to suggest that the more time and effort students invest in the learning process and the more intensely they control for and engage in their own education, the greater will be their growth and achievement (e.g., Astin, 1984; Glasser 1969, 1990; Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education, 1984). From this perspective, mentoring is viewed as a vehicle for promoting learning to students as a quality picture that can meet several important basic needs.
If what you are doing to improve isn’t working like you want, what might you do instead?

Let’s make a plan to implement some of these alternative activities.

Purposeful, positive and goal-directed faculty-student contact outside of course work delivery helps to build the positive relationships which become the basis on which students choose to deepen their involvement in their own learning. Students are helped to see the relevance and purpose of the learning activities required in course work, and faculty come to reflect upon their own instruction and its relation to program outcomes. It is through the faculty mentoring process and the portfolio assessment system that the program learning outcomes related to quality schooling become firmly incorporated into the quality worlds of both students and faculty. It is this faculty-student intersect, made possible by mentoring conversations, that creates the critically important congruency between program goals, faculty instruction, student learning, and outcome assessments. Such a congruency between student and faculty reference perceptions, and student and faculty behavior must exist if a teacher preparation program is going to be an effective model of quality schooling concepts and practices.

Conclusion

If the education community is to make a “paradigm shift” to quality schooling, then teachers and those institutions who prepare individuals to teach will play important roles in the process (Wigle, 1989). Individuals who prepare future teachers will themselves need to incorporate, teach, and model the concepts of quality schooling in teacher preparation programs. If the concepts and practices of quality schooling are consistently modeled in teacher preparation programs, then there is a significant probability that the students in those programs will incorporate those concepts into the K-12 classrooms in which they begin their teaching careers (Wigle, 1996). As Palmatier pointed out, incorporating the concepts and practices of quality schooling into a single isolated course within a program of study is probably not sufficient to create the sorts of teacher preparation programs that will be needed in the future. What will be needed is to organize an entire teacher preparation program around the concepts of quality schooling. However, even though this paper reports on efforts of a SOE to accomplish such a transformation, much work remains to be done. The alignment of all course work with the concepts of quality schooling, the coordination of faculty efforts both within the SOE and across the entire campus, the creation of a means of screening applicants into the program in ways which are congruent with the intended outcomes, and the coordination of the efforts of the SOE with area K-12 schools are just some of the tasks which remain to be accomplished. Timing is important to the effort. The conservative nature of the academic world must be accommodated in order to avoid unnecessary negative reactions to proposed changes. However, perseverance, patience, and a willingness to commit to the principle of “never give up” are the tools which will eventually bring about the transformation that so many in
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Reality Therapy Goes To College: A Syllabus For Teaching Choice Theory And Reality Therapy

Robert E. Wubbolding

Abstract: A syllabus for teaching a university course on choice theory and reality therapy is described in detail. Students enrolling in the course can apply it as a basic intensive week if the professor is a qualified Institute instructor. Discussed in the course are the development of choice theory and reality therapy, comparisons with other theories, specific strategies and techniques, as well as applications to management, counseling, education, family relationships and group process. The reader is invited to use the syllabus in its entirety, select parts of the syllabus, adapt it, or improve upon it in developing university courses.

Reality Therapy Goes To College: A Syllabus For Teaching Choice Theory And Reality Therapy

The conventional method for teaching the basics of choice theory and reality therapy is a four-day, 27 contact hour intensive workshop known as "intensive week." The William Glasser Institute also allows a qualified basic week instructor who is a university professor to extend to students credit for a basic week. By applying to the Institute, a basic week instructor or advanced week instructor can utilize a university course taught according to the university calendar as a basic intensive week (Programs, Policies and Procedures Manual, 1999). The course summarized below is three semester graduate credit hours with 45 contact hours and two instructors: one advanced and one basic.

Purpose

The material described below is intended to be replicated and adapted by university professors who wish to teach such a course in masters or doctoral level programs in psychology, counseling, social work, human services, or corrections departments. Below is a detailed syllabus, including assignments, which has been used in such a university course. The purpose of assignments is discussed in small groups by students. If students decide that an assignment is not useful, an alternative is formulated.

Restrictions

The course is taught within the boundaries of university, college, and departmental boundaries. It meets once per week for 15 weeks. Standards, such as the necessity of students receiving a letter grade as well as class attendance, are predetermined and are often not negotiable. These restrictions are seen as congruent with the philosophy of W. Edwards Deming (1986, 1993).

Course Title: Introduction to Reality Therapy

Course Description: This course includes a basic explanation of choice theory, formerly control theory or control system theory. The history and significance of this theory are explained as well as comparisons made with other theories. Reality therapy is explained, demonstrated, and practiced in class. Other concepts related to reality therapy are explored such as the conditions of quality and lead management. Students are expected to read, participate and apply the system to their own students or clients.

Grading Policy

Students will receive the grade which they determine is appropriate. Instructors describe standards to be used by students in their self-evaluation.

• Preparation for classes by reading texts and discussion of them in class.
• Value of presentations based on newsletters, journal articles, etc.
• Consistency in keeping and discussing logs describing how they have used the ideas.
• Quality of audio taped interviews as determined by feedback and self-evaluation.
• Class attendance, participation, and contribution.
• Quality of role play practice in class.

Texts


Newsletters of The William Glasser Institute in North America, Australia, Ireland, United Kingdom, Japan, Korea.

Reprints of articles on reality therapy from the International Journal of Reality Therapy and other sources.

Behavioral Objectives

Students will be able to do the following:

1. List and define the five needs.
2. Define and identify the content of the quality world, comparing place and perceived world.
3. Describe “total behavior” and the four components of it.
4. Define two levels of perception.
5. Trace the history of reality therapy and choice theory.
6. Enumerate specific helps and hindrances to the establishment of an appropriate environment.
7. Describe the procedures which lead to change.
8. Demonstrate environmental and procedural skills with familiar and unfamiliar clients.
9. Identify four specific techniques to be used in marriage and family counseling.
10. Illustrate how reality therapy can be integrated into the stages of group development.
11. Explain how reality therapy is adapted in multi cultural settings.
12. List and explain the conditions of quality as well as the components of quality.

Methodology
1. Lecture/large group discussion.
2. Small group discussion in learning teams.
3. Jig-saw cooperative learning activities.
4. One-to-one student discussion.
5. Viewing video tapes.
6. Recording audio tapes of consultation and counseling sessions.
7. Use of log or journal and discussion in class.
8. Presentations to class.
9. Various assignments given on an ad hoc basis.

Course Outline
I. Introduction
   A. Fill out the forms.
   B. Get acquainted. Students introduce themselves using the “Who Am I?” activity (Wubbolding, 1987). Using any of the categories below, they introduce themselves to each other and to the large group.

      **Who Am I?**

      | 1. Name   | 11. Place of Residence |
      | 2. Age    | 12. Family            |
      | 3. Sex    | 13. Hobbies           |
      | 4. Race   | 14. Professional Goals|
      | 5. Religion| 15. Social Class      |
      | 7. Occupation| 17. Credit Rating    |
      | 8. Income | 18. Military Rank     |
      | 9. Organization Affiliation| 19 Physical Characteristics|
      | 10. Political Views| 20 Past Personal History|

II. Body
A. Comparison with other methods.
   1. Freudian Psychoanalysis - e.g., the role of the unconscious.
   2. Adlerian Therapy - e.g., the importance of family influence.
   3. Rational Emotive Behavioral Therapy - e.g., the place of needs.
   4. Behavioral Therapy: e.g., the difference between helpful and harmful rewards - how some behaviorism can be a controlling method.
   5. Transactional Analysis - e.g., how language plays an important role in counseling.
B. Origins of Control Theory.
   1. Definition.
3. The journey: what is a quality school?

D. Glasser’s Choice Theory.

1. Reason for name change.
2. Human Needs and Wants.
   Special Application: Students are now asked to describe themselves using the “Who Am I?” activity but without referring to any of the items contained on the list. Thus they describe themselves on a deeper level alluding to their needs, their wants, their values, etc.
4. Perception: Levels of perception, the perceived world.
5. Ineffective Ways to Gain Control: Stages of regressive behavior.
6. Effective Ways to Gain Control: Stages of effective behavior.

E. Deci’s book Why We Do What We Do (1996)

F. Reality therapy: the delivery system.

3. Demonstration by professor of reality therapy via role plays with class members playing persons with whom they wish to apply reality therapy: Situations with individuals, families, groups, classes, etc., are demonstrated. Issues which emerge include conflict resolution, multi cultural concerns, family relationships, as well as ethical considerations.
5. Practice by class in small groups of six and in triads.
6. Special applications to marriage and family relationships and to counseling.
   a. The importance and content of each partner’s contribution.
   b. Paradoxical techniques: Reframing, prescription, retraining and predicting relapse.
   c. Responsible communication. “I messages” vs. arguing, blaming, criticizing, etc.

III. Conclusion. Professional considerations.


B. Structure of The William Glasser Institute.

Student Responsibilities

1. Attend class. Missing more than two (2) classes will result in an added assignment. A grade of incomplete will be given until the assignment is completed. Please contact learning partners for information discussed during time missed. Students who know they will miss more than three (3) classes are asked to take the course at a more convenient time. Missing 30 minutes = ½ absence.

2. Participate in group activities such as discussions and cooperative learning activities.

3. Read required texts and be able to relate readings to class discussions and to small group discussions. Work in teams. Identify themes from cases in casebook.

4. Read articles dealing with reality therapy. Summarize and evaluate them in class discussions.

5. Read assigned handouts and Institute Newsletters.
6. Make presentations in class on the above materials. Each student is to be knowledgeable about one application of reality therapy.

7. Record audio tapes of counseling sessions for replay in class.

8. Evaluate own performance using the standards described earlier.

9. Practice environmental and procedural skills of reality therapy in class in role play sessions.

10. Keep written log on use of reality therapy, recording critical incidents at least once a week. Discuss in class.

**Summary**

The reader is welcome to use this course outline, to select segments or to adapt it to a specific setting and to the boundaries and restrictions established by the university. This syllabus is designed for instructors who wish to accomplish more than can be done in a four-day intensive week. Comparisons with other theories are made. The development of choice theory and reality therapy is traced. And yet role play practice is the cornerstone of the course. The overall target is that students gain knowledge of how and where choice theory and reality therapy are located among the theories used in the helping professions. In addition to the development and refinement of skills, specific techniques and strategies are also targeted.
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Flying Solo: The CT/RT Professor

What a thrill it must be for student pilots when they come to a point in their training when they are given permission to take the airplane on a flight without the instructor. While mentoring may provide some level of comfort, we all have the desire to do things our own way (do our own thing).

Academic freedom is one of the great advantages of being a professor in higher education. The business of the university professor is usually defined by the university system in three major areas. The university expectations of its professors are the following: (1) to do research leading to publication, and pursue outside funding, (2) to provide community service, through serving on department, college, and university committees, to make professional presentations, to conduct workshops and to have active participation in professional organizations, (3) to teach classes, advise students, and participate in curriculum development. Although the degree of emphasis on any one of these areas varies from university to university, most universities reward research and publication to a greater extent than they do either service or teaching.

Generally, the university system does not interfere with how a professor conducts business as long as it is legal and ethical. Of course, there are limitations regarding the scheduling of classes and guidelines for course content, but most often, textbook selection and teaching methodology is left to the decision of the professor. Also, how a professor advises or interacts with students, the areas of research or type of professional involvement is pretty much determined by the professor. Robert Sullo, in his excellent book, Inspiring Quality in Your School, suggested that the teacher is the primary person in implementing CT/RT principles in a school. I would agree that in a university with so much autonomy and independence, individual professors have the freedom to choose to use or not use CT/RT concepts as they attempt to do professer. Support from a dean, chairperson or colleagues would be helpful, but may be difficult to obtain in a major research university, although, I believe this may occur more frequently in smaller, private colleges. Therein lies the challenge to teach CT/RT principles whenever and wherever we can. In this article, I will present the strategies and procedures that I have utilized throughout my professional career as a professor in the university setting.

I will discuss the use of CT/RT in each of the three areas regarding university expectations. Some of the procedures are self explanatory and will be listed as results. When appropriate, I will elaborate on specific strategies and the challenges in implementing CT/RT concept. I hope the information will be useful in assisting the reader to understand the professional role of a professor and how CT/RT ideas can be used.

Teaching

The most significant activity I have done in the teaching, advising, and curriculum development area was the development of correspondence courses in consort with intensive weeks of the William Glasser Institute. This process included convincing the continuing education people of the merits, writing the study guide, getting department acceptance, chairperson support, Dean’s endorsement, curriculum committee approval, and finally, the university academic council’s permission to offer the courses. Each step was like walking through a mine field and required using the R.T. process to persuade everyone of the academic rigor and usefulness of the intensive weeks and study guide lessons.

In regard to classes I teach in the counselor education program, I utilized the CT/RT concepts of class meetings, learning teams, peer review, and self evaluation. Self evaluation includes both the students and myself as instructor. Multiple choice exams are only used as practice exercises in preparation for comprehensive exams or state licensing exams. Class projects such as opinion papers, research papers appropriate for publication, and essay exams are used to self-evaluate quality work.

A major complication of not using multiple choice exams is the issue of objectivity. It seems that graduate students are very skilled and comfortable with multiple choice exams. They tend to be traditional thinkers and have had success with traditional exams. I have had students cry and accuse me of shirking my duty when I have suggested the notion of self-evaluation. By the end of the semester, they usually say they have never learned so much useful information. Students have convinced me, however, that giving multiple choice questions as practice for comps and state exams has merit and is useful activity for them.

Learning teams are perceived to be quite productive by most graduate students. Although some students think they do more work than their peers do. I teach them to implement the RT process in dealing with their concerns. The RT process is taught as a tool for self-evaluation. The self-evaluation works best for class projects, papers, and
assignments. I also use this method extensively when advising students regarding career choices, degree plans and conflict resolution. Grading is less conducive to this type of internal focus since some students (and universities) still put a major emphasis on class rank.

Research

Most of the CT/RT research I have conducted has involved the development of the “Pete’s Pathogram” as a clinical and research tool measuring the intensity, time invested, and success regarding the basic needs. I have encouraged several graduate students to apply research procedures by assisting me. Some of my doctoral students have even completed dissertations using CT/RT as a component of their treatment. I have had one funded research grant to study the effect of the CHOICE Drug Education Program for sixth grade students. My CT/RT research efforts have resulted in twelve publications and several presentations at professional meetings. Currently, I am in the process of developing another needs assessment instrument and correlating those results with “Pete’s Pathogram” profiles.

Time management and collection of data are the major difficulties in doing quality research.

Service

My professional service using CT/RT has included membership and active participation in the William Glasser Institute and the Sunbelt Region for Reality Therapy. I have served as board member, chairperson, president, convention co-chairman, convention presenter, certification week and faculty program instructor.

I use CT/RT concepts and strategies in conducting many staff development inservice seminars, giving professional presentations and conducting workshops in many states and several foreign countries. I try to help schools, government agencies, businesses and professional organizations utilize CT/RT in their unique environments. A state funded grant allowed me to provide a basic week for over 300 teachers in a 12 month period. Another major project was teaching intensive weeks to the faculty of another state university. Additionally, as a senior faculty member, I have had the opportunity to be involved with a number of training programs with the William Glasser Institute. Many graduate students have made CT/RT presentations under my supervision.

There are numerous opportunities for using CT/RT concepts in providing quality community and professional service.

Conclusion

In most major research institutions, you will not have the luxury of departmental, college or university commitment to any one approach to getting things done. Most universities are very integrated in how they go about conducting their business. Traditional policy and procedures prevail, although individual professors do have a lot of individual autonomy and academic freedom. Professors schooled in the concepts of CT and the process of RT have the opportunity to implement, teach, model and practice the ideas in the realm of their own classroom, research and service commitments. Using CT/RT principles has provided me with the tools to function within the university bureaucracy in a manner that is self satisfying and beneficial for my students.
Students and Self-Evaluation

Josipa Basic

The author is a Professor of Special Education and Rehabilitation at the University of Zagreb in Zagreb, Croatia.

Abstract: The goal of this work is to briefly show one of the ways of teaching students using self-leading and self-evaluation during their studies in the Department for Behavioral Disorders of the Educational-Rehabilitation Faculty of the University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia.

Introduction

Working as a professor on the Educational Rehabilitation Faculty of University of Zagreb, Croatia over many years, I have continuously tried to advance methods of studying and teaching students in order to increase the level of their knowledge on one side and the practical use of that knowledge on the other. From the beginning of my work (1983), from RT, CT+QM, I have implemented many ideas into work with students. My lectures have referred to showing one year of work with students according to the principles of RT, CT+QM.

The work that is presented here refers to students who entered the study of behavioral disorders of children, young adults, and adults. Students who I lectured to were third and fourth year students, which means that they have already passed many lectures, seminars and exercises, and passed many exams, which, in other words, means that their education is significantly greater than those students just beginning their studies.

The subject that I teach is called the Theory of Prevention, which lasts over three semesters in the last two years. The course began as a need of the professors to significantly enrich the substance of their classes with new sciences and with results of research, and the method of studying by the students was reorganized into something new and different, which provided a creative challenge, and, allowed the professors to establish quality and satisfaction of both their needs and the students' needs.

How to Achieve new methods of studying and self-evaluating students:

The students to whom this work refers to were the students who began according to the new vision of studying in the academic year of 96/97 and 97/98. My challenge was over 3 semesters to allow/assist students to study through a maximum of their own arrangements, and continuous self-evaluation achieved along with qualitative leadership and supervision from the professor.

We began with an agreement about the method of work, of my and their roles, and of my and their expectations. The agreement consisted of:

- selection of the method of work (classic professor lectures and seminars with students in the manner that they were kept up to date by selected lectures of the professor, and the freedom of students to choose the contents for which they would have to prepare and about which they would have to report when the time came.)
- Approval of the chosen selection (for the selection of the method of work, it was necessary to commit effort to explain the new method of work, for thoughts and results of things to follow, and finally to choose and accept responsibilities.)
- Selection of students (who will over 3 semesters work together and report on the results every week.)
- Continuous supervision of students (continuous period/set hours when continuous support is given to completed tasks, conversations about how things could be better, or more specifically, how to increase the quality in order to increase satisfaction.)
- Help and support in the selection and building of the project, in the project contents, and in seminars and theses.
- Help and support in conceptualizing the display, creation of material for presentation, and presentations of individual projects by the group of students.

I was aware of my role, and I wished to provide lectures which consisted of entirely new science/information, to work on motivating students to solely search to satisfy their needs, from every situation through conversation that they find as a challenge to bring in a new method to achieve knowledge and its strengthening.

The role of the students to me was very clear, but for them for a long time, (even though they accepted the self-evaluation project), it was unclear until they slowly became aware of their own creativity and the growth in the field through which they solely uncovered things by themselves; therefore, the findings remained solely theirs.

I knew what I wanted. The students of the first group listened to the Theory of Prevention, in an environment of unity, cooperation and difficult work, comfortable environment and continuous questioning: what do we want? How far have we gotten? How will we proceed? The results of the study are quality, and were more valuable than the usual study along the classic manner. In this way, the wants and the small steps of the plan for the success of the project became clearer.

The instructions continued with the students from week to week. As I lectured on my works, they often involved their
works in the exercises so that the subject of the lectures became clearer to them. The hours of supervision in the beginning were spent in search. Students searched for concrete requests of them (for example: a list of literature used to write up the seminar) and I returned all the questions back to them in order for them to answer, obviously assisting them with their answers without which this would have been pointless.

Weeks passed. I occasionally thought that this project was pointless, the students looked at emptiness, and they advanced slowly (which they said themselves). I persisted. I didn’t give up, and every week brought results. I attempted to bring those results out into the light, and used them to motivate my students who slowly began to realize the beauty of discovering on their own. The students often wanted to compensate for my occasional absence from lecturing (due to other important tasks related to the Faculty), which had never occurred before. It became obvious that the students courageously and happily continued with their tasks after each group presented its results (updates) and after receiving feedback from other student colleagues. That is why they awaited the lectures which became equally as important as the hours of supervision.

This continued over two semesters. At the end of this, the students shortly presented what they had done. The time in the third semester was entirely for them. This was followed by their presentation of their best results. Four hours of school in one block passed by faster than the hours of my lectures. Students were so involved that the professors became almost unnecessary, although students requested the presence of a professor. Each group had its own specific manner of presentation, each presentation was done with an increase in quality which was felt also in the verbal manner of the feedback given by myself and the students. The presented subjects often, along with theoretical details, consisted of various types of research of some practice which became an obvious part of themselves.

An account of the students’ evaluation notes:

The title of this work, Students and self-evaluation, requires that the students be given an opportunity to comment on this study. With this in mind, some feedback by the students on the evaluation after a semester’s work and on the presentation of their work is enclosed. One of the ways of evaluation was to give a response (verbally and in writing) to the following question: What am I thankful for for others and myself?

I am thankful for myself and others that we created together an atmosphere for the subject. What specifically helped this was the free space provided for creative ideas and new insights into the problems that we have been addressing from the beginning of the study. It’s possible that the efforts and work on this project will be the crowning moment of our studying and gathering experiences which will be the basis of our future work, and for the advancement of this field.

With this manner of work, I expressed my creativity and I have been opened up to many fields which I will continue to work on in the future. For this reason, everything that I achieved in the field that I entered into is just a path towards something better and with more quality. I said this to my group because it really supported me with the maximum tolerance and with many interesting ideas. I am also thankful to the correct leadership which was done exactly as it should have; you have led us, given us directions, and also simultaneously given us maximum freedom that transfers our ideas into work. Thank you!

I received a lot both personally and in a professional sense. I think that it is really good for this type of subject, with complete support of and allowing the students to create their own discussion themes. I am similarly thankful of myself for holding out until the end, because it was difficult, but I also thank the others for giving me much support and assistance.

I’m thankful to myself and the others for the feedback which is very important in light of things accomplished, and in the sense of those things that could possibly been done better.

I am grateful to the Professor for her excellent leadership and supervision. I am thankful that she allowed us to work hands free, meaning that she gave us the space for maximum creativity, that we were able to work as we wished. The quality of the work was greater because of the fact that we were allowed maximum freedom in our choices.

It is wonderful to have created something that will forever be a reminder of our work.

That we have through all our work created something that will be proud of for the rest of our lives.

One group of students continued, motivated by the results, with me on one more student project. Working with them, I asked for written feedback on the recently finished work on the subject of theory of Prevention. Here are their evaluation notes, without any changes to their words:

As an introduction into the subject we had a lecture, but not in the classic sense, but rather the lectures were done along with various exercises which required our input which obviously brought greater understanding of what we learned within a team, we learned how we can achieve the best results working together and also how to realize such in the easiest and most economical manner, and all this with the goal of achieving our own (personal) maximum at the moment and for that assignment. Ideas came, we worked them out, we were pleased with our results, and we felt our advance. The professor touched on our creativity, allowing us to do what we wanted. But was still there when we needed her. Such a manner of work brought excellent results for all of us. The seminar was very good, interesting and had real quality. In this work we were introduced to our own capabilities which we were not aware of before, because we had never worked before in such a manner. The fact that we completed the seminar practically on our own, gives it all greater value because it is all experience which has enriched us.

In any case, I can say that this period of time helped me build my own personal character and a different view of everything surrounding me. Confrontation with my own world quality in the beginning made me very unhappy because I became aware of things that I had missed before. It seemed that I had vegetated. At the same time, I was confused.
and scared, because I realized I would have to change my way of life. And I was very afraid of those changes. There are some words that I can associate with this period: discovery, creation, putting a puzzle together. It is difficult to describe the sense of improvement that I feel in such a few sentences.

I often have an opportunity to hear people talk about how difficult it is to transfer thoughts. They say that language is often too poor or too dry to do this. Have you ever thought about this? I think this is exactly what is happening to me now. It is my aim to show my growth and development during the two years of listening to the Theory of Prevention at the Educational-Rehabilitation faculty. Growth and development is exactly what I meant to say. I can't even imagine in what ways this subject and the ways that I participated in it have changed my life. Exactly that. Changed it. Nonbeliever in the beginning. What is this now? Perhaps I'm only a little kid and I still understand things.

Is Professor Basic even aware of the ways that we had listened to classes before? Seminar? So what! I'll read a couple of works, write up a couple of pages and that will be that. But, and this isn't it, I feel some changes. I am growing.

Why is this so different from everything before? Sometimes it is difficult to follow and endure. A complete mess in my head. Some describe this as a creative mess, but I'm developing and beginning to understand. The professor leads us with her expertise, and leading is the right word, because we actually do everything ourselves, as we need to. I only now see how difficult freedom can be. I'm developing. And I'm changing. Step by step, I am accepting the way I am and I'm beginning to feel a sense of liberation within myself. I'm moving about. This kind of seminar is something completely new. The experience of working in a group is unforgettable.

Professor Basic sometimes insists too much (how far did you get?) Which suits me well so that I did way too far in my thoughts. And finally, a presentation of almost two years of work. Again a mess! How much I've developed! All of a sudden, I'm so big and strong. It seems as if! might perform a miracle. Emotions are running wild. I want to show myself in the sense of improvement that I feel in such a few sentences.

The climax?! Must we stop?! Not a chance. I'm still developing. Did Professor Basic grow up along with all of us?

I've discovered so much about myself. No one is as happy about this. I am going further. And I am going back to the beginning. It's difficult to describe all of this. If this isn't clear to you, I understand. You obviously didn't participate in creating this subject and in growing along with Professor Basic.

We didn't know how a three semester subject could be treated as a seminar. We thought again: Oh no, another boring seminar, copying out updated books written by long forgotten authors. But, this wasn't the case. Each chose its own theme along the lines, find your own literature. I was first skeptical but as we swam into the big world, the interesting themes and wisdom of books overwhelmed me. We swam through the world of ideas; we gave in and created. Professor Basic was there just to help us out every once in a while. She was careful to allow us our freedom, but not to let us get lost. It was to be given too, along with our enthusiasm, for every new discovery. I worked with a desire and with a belief in the truth of every word. We read the seminar work often and chose those points and ideas that we agreed with. Many of those thoughts and ideas stuck with me. Sometimes I feel as if they are from me. It was wonderful to hear my colleagues talk about their seminar works in an entirely different way. We opened ourselves up and created a strong structure, many interesting discussions arose as well as inspiring feedback.

At one point, we became very creative young people. This experience is unrepeatable. Receiving the Dean's award made this entire thing more meaningful and festive.

A new subject. This is the second time that I'm in contact with Professor Basic. The first experience through which she led us was very meaningful. It was a training course in communication skills. But I think that it turned out to be much more than that. I can say that I expect a lot. Both from the subject and from Professor Basic.

You will create this subject by yourselves. I remember this sentence very well. My reaction? Surprise, worry, somewhat disappointment. Disappointment in regards to my expectations about the great theories, projects, and knowledge that have been served to us.

I was greatly confused about that service, the knowledge is another story. We chose a theme, created our own groups and expected to complete our seminars in the manner similar to the way it was done for other subjects. We were given a literature list and that's all. In a month's time, everything would be done. Oh, how wrong we were! We reviewed the literature. It was quality work, mainly written in English. It took us nearly a whole month just to translate the articles, separate the important points, and make footnotes. During the team's last meeting that month, we became aware of one thing; the articles were not applicable for the conditions in our country. We needed more. So that was when the search through various libraries began.

Libraries were a daily stop. Computer searches, article searches, books, and photocopies. We collected a huge pile of papers, still not aware of any end to all this. We read all this and got an idea of what we wanted the seminar work to be. And then, now that we were armed with all these articles and books, we began to transfer some of the ideas to paper, and slowly formed the seminar work. After a few meetings, with the assistant and a few of their suggestions, we now had a concept and began to work seriously.

The next problem that we came across was teamwork. We didn't expect this to be a problem; we soon realized that this was not that easy. Teamwork that we had done previously had only one dimension. I don't need to say that there was enough work, and that various ideas and thoughts existed, as well as various angles and perspectives; somebody was interested in more. Tolerance and patience, and understanding of somebody's needs were all needed, as well as many hours of discussion.
As we began to understand each other better, things progressed easier. At that point, we had collected enough quality information. The assistant read our first draft. There were many comments that we accepted and then attempted to correct. For one week, we sat together and corrected the work. In the end, we were all satisfied.

Now we had to do a presentation. I was afraid of this. I never felt comfortable presenting the seminar in an auditorium. I should say that we didn’t really worry about the manner of presentation, but instead, just did it in the regular way. The presentation was done so that we read out important points of our work.

We were the first group so in some way we broke the ice. The presentation did not go that well and the feedback was not the best. Today when I think about that day, it no longer hurts. I’m glad that I heard all the feedback that has helped us in our future projects. This is how the first semester passed by. We had two more semesters ahead, which meant two more seminar workshops.

The new academic year began with an assignment to raise our work to the second level. That was deeper research and create something better. I’d say now that we question our abilities, eager to see where we stood in a professional sense, to find (to determine) fields which attracted us. The challenge was great. We wanted to drop the good material from last year’s research and to work practically. We had lots of ideas, we wanted to break the monotony of our previous work.

This year, the leadership was different. We worked with Professor Basic every week, which meant that we had to show up with new results each week, and then discussed possible ways to improve our work or ways to achieve what we wanted. Professor Basic also warned us of possible problems that might arise, especially on carrying out the practical part of our work. The pressure was greater, but the results were better. Professor Basic encouraged us to keep all of last year’s materials, that we filter the materials, and that we support our work with the practical work that we so much desired.

We no longer went to libraries. We tried to find out what was going on in our city (and other places in our country) in regards to our field of research. Various conversations with leaders of various organizations and group leaders followed, we also participated in several programs ourselves. Through continuous consultation with Professor Basic and with other students from the same year (consultations were done so that every student knew what other groups were doing so that they could give their suggestions), we decided to construct a half structured interview with every expert leader, and other persons that we had previously talked to. I must say that creating such an instrument was not an easy task. We had to be direct, ask precise questions, and present everything so that the person would take us seriously, and realize what we were doing had a positive effect in order to get their cooperation.

We were now at the end of the practical part. The huge task of organizing materials, connecting practical knowledge with theories (which required more digging in libraries) and connecting old parts to the new was at hand. There were many sleepless nights and debates with the goal of finding the best way, but there were also lots of smiles and better relations with the people we worked with.

We gathered the materials to our best knowledge and reluctantly turned our work to Professor Basic. We were satisfied with what we did, we worked hard, thought hard, and researched. We all were somewhat tense before our first contact with the Professor after she read our work. We were pleased to hear that the mistakes had occurred basically in the way of addressing our sources, quoting and such. But, that was just one more thing to grasp.

The result of our hard work was 70 pages of text and 30 references. But what seemed most important was the experience working in a team, in the methods of creating a seminar, relating with people that we worked with, clearly presenting ideas to others, writing the actual seminar work, creation of the instruments which we used, and lots of knowledge for which we had worked to attain more actively than at any other time in the four years of our studies.

But that wasn’t the end. We still had waiting for us what we feared the most, the presentation. This time we decided to be better prepared. We wanted to present what we did, and what we learned, in the best possible manner. At this point, this was even harder because we actually thought about this. We were more nervous each day closer to the day of our presentation.

That morning we had our last discussion with Professor Basic. We created our projection sheets and talked about our strategy. My mood changed from one moment to another. From nervousness to outright laughter. About 15 minutes before the presentation, the Professor asked me how I was. I honestly told her that I was frightened. She smiled and told me about a situation from her own life. She did relax me somewhat. What relaxed me most was to see that she understood us and that she meant to say something like: I believe in you, everything will be fine. And everything was OK. The situation was even better to me. I felt good, and I was proud. We did well and we were rewarded. The interested faces of our colleagues, questions, discussion, and more questions. That ended up being one of the nicest days of my entire academic career.

A few months later, when we received the Dean’s award for that same work, many memories of moments from creating that work shot through my head. The Dean began his speech saying, "You are the elite". Whether we are or not, I couldn’t help smiling. Only one face was missing from the crowd, the face of Professor Basic.
Journaling to Self-Evaluation:
A Tool for Adult Learners

by William A Howatt

Abstract: Teaching adult learners to take responsibility for their schedules and their personal lives is a challenge to many instructors in community college and university programs. This article outlines the concept of using a cognitive-behavioral journal program to introduce Choice Theory, and to assist adult learners to separate fact from opinion in regard to how their actions will create their success. Once the learners have this knowledge and skill, they appear to find it much easier to learn, and they are much more able to take charge of their own lives.

Choice Theory explains that for all practical purposes, we choose everything we do. (Glasser, 1998)

Each fall, when new students came in for another exciting year of study in my community college Human Services program, it was predictable that by November many who started out the year with no concerns suddenly found themselves engaged in a crisis such as academic pressure or life-balancing issues. Helping students to become active and knowledgeable in self-evaluating their progress was a challenge common to both the community college and university levels.

I have addressed this issue by incorporating William Glasser’s Choice Theory into a tool I created to enable my students to learn Locus of Control, and to understand that they are at CAUSE for all of their choices. My Personal Change Journal, a 51-day program, helps them refocus, and learn new behaviors, so they are able to enjoy new success, and experience positive personal change. I have found that teaching Choice Theory early in the school year is one of the most empowering pieces of knowledge I can pass on to the students. It gives them a new model to challenge the years of ineffective programming, known as Stimulus Response Psychology, that they have been living.

The focus of My Personal Change Journal is a daily template, which includes a time log, a space to keep an accurate record of the four physiological pillars I promote, of rest, diet, exercise, and relaxation (Figure A); a reminder to check off completion of their daily change work; and space to record a few high points of their day. (Figure C)

I believe that the daily measurement of rest, diet, exercise, and relaxation is very important. Many students do not take care of their health, but because of my background in physical education, I encourage them to keep track of this important aspect of their lives. The Journal has active daily learnings on how to achieve health, and four different days focus on learning how to relax.

Using yellow (to indicate pleasure) and pink (pain) highlighters, students are asked to mark a color beside each hour of their daily planner, to provide a visual review of their day. This provides evidence of how many hours a day they are in either mood, to help form accurate conclusions. A selection of daily affirmations is provided, and they are encouraged to add their own statements which are particularly meaningful to them.

My Personal Change Journal teaches the basic ideas of Choice Theory, for example, Page 22 has them measure their Locus of Control. For the next few days, I have different breakdowns of Choice Theory, to give them the fundamental principles of this concept. (Figure B)

One of the basic tenets of Choice Theory is that we are all responsible for our choices and actions. This is why very early in the Journal students are given the opportunity to design their own individual treatment plan to achieve the life balance they want and need. They do this on the first day of the Journal, during the first week of school. I find this gets the students off in a proactive direction, thinking out, and writing out their personal goals, with an action plan.

I really believe students will greatly benefit from Choice Theory, and will be more successful by learning Glasser’s work, so they become cognizant of their behavior. This is why I have them evaluate their total behavior on a daily basis, so they can be empowered by learning to take positive actions.

As Glasser teaches, we have little direct control over policy, however, through the actions we take, we truly have control over how we feel. Too many students become mired in a quagmire of negative feelings, but once they learn total behavior, they can progress to a new future.

I also encourage them to practice positive self-talk through daily positive affirmations. Since too many get caught up in negative emotions, I like using positive affirmations to support total behavior, and this gets students thinking that way as well. I also like using the mood rating to help point out how their actions will be a predictor to feelings, as well as to separate fact from opinion. This helps prevent them from catastrophizing the entire day, based on a ten-minute unpleasant incident.

Through journaling, many students have learned to move from the old traditional stimulus-response psychology to learning how free they can be by living day-to-day with choice. If My Personal Change Journal does anything, it teaches Locus of Control, which is invaluable.

My staff has seen the value of this tool, so that in 1998 all of the 150 students in Human Services used the Journal, which also includes goal setting, and making a Mission Statement, with many more daily learnings. The 51-day program may be...
followed with another text, Journaling My Journey, in which they can plan their days, and monitor their progress indefinitely.

In conclusion, it is very important to help students to self-evaluate, and take control of their lives. I have found that using this Journal in September gets the year off to a good start, and teaches students how to achieve personal balance. It is very useful for them to quickly learn that they do have a choice, and can take action.

References
PERSONAL IMPROVEMENT TREATMENT PLAN:

Please write in your personal change plan in the space provided. This is to ensure that you have the details of what your treatment plan involves. One of the biggest factors about personal growth is to ensure that you have the details of what your change is clear, and you fully understand the steps of your personal treatment plan. Realize this plan is designed for you, for what you want for yourself now. You can always update it, or make a new one. Take small steps for long-term success.

The purpose of a personal treatment plan is to allow you to identify your counselor or by yourself, your unique areas of your life that you would like to focus on, and improve. A personal treatment plan is a powerful instrument which helps you account for all of your unique needs. It should have one rule: always learn to become happy and healthy, but never at the expense of others. I believe this to be Step One to your personal treatment plan is a powerful instrument which takes into account all of your unique needs, your personal treatment plan is a powerful instrument which takes into account all of your unique needs.

Areas of a personal treatment plan is to identify the counseling or counseling areas that you would like to focus on, and improve. The following few days will give you a brief introduction to Dr. Glasser's Choice Theory, based on ILOC, which will provide you with an explanation of why we do what we do. Because the way to ensure that we make personal changes which are permanent is to be clear about how you can always take full control of your behavior. In Day 8, I will start to explore Choice Theory, which is based on an Internal Locus of Control.

**Definition:** Internal Locus of Control is internalizing the events of the world, and taking responsibility for our own action of how we will respond to the world (e.g., parents are not the cause of my problem, I need to learn more skills).

External Locus of Control involves blaming your problems on the outside world, (e.g., my parents are the cause of my problem).

**Where do you fit today?**

Mark with an X where you fit on the continuum today.

**SELF EVALUATION OF LOCUS OF CONTROL (ILOC):**

This exercise is intended for self exploration, to show you if you are an Internal Locus of Control (ILOC) individual, or an External Locus of Control (ELOC). I believe we need to be ILOC to make lasting personal change. The following few days will give you a brief introduction to Dr. Glasser's Choice Theory, based on ILOC, which will provide you with an explanation of why we do what we do. Because the way to ensure that we make personal change which is permanent is to be clear about how you can always take full control of your behavior. In Day 8, I will start to explore Choice Theory, which is based on an Internal Locus of Control.

**Where do you fit today?**

Mark with an X where you fit on the continuum today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern Area</th>
<th>Long Term Objectives</th>
<th>Short Term Objectives</th>
<th>Interventions/ Resources Using/ Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Concern Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Daily Journal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Planner</th>
<th>Day Planner</th>
<th>Day Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time: 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical Pillars Record**

1. Rest bedtime: 10:00
2. Diet (no of healthy meals): 3
3. Exercise Activities: Time: 60 min.
   - Stair Master & Walk
4. Relaxation Activities: 20 min. Meditation

**Total Behavior Daily Record**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Physiological</th>
<th>Thinking</th>
<th>Behavioral Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 1**

**Active Daily Change Work**

**Benefits (what did you learn?)**

**Personal Treatment Plan Completed**

**Summary of Actions Taken**

**External Locus of Control**

1. Things may not always go my way, but I always have a choice about how to react.
2. People are not my problem; how I choose to respond is.
3. The world is challenging, and I can learn what I need to choose to do well.

Wherever you fit on the above graphic is where you are today. Right now, think of one thing you thought was controlling you, and explore from an ILOC position three alternatives you could do instead. You may need to do some research, but you will find alternatives, because once you are able to see you have choice, you are working from an ILOC, and are now in the position to start to consider how to choose more personal success!
A Goal-Oriented, Self-evaluation Model for Annual Review of Faculty in Higher Education

Mary E. Watson

Abstract: The process of annual review for faculty has been an ongoing concern for faculty and administrators in higher education. This article describes some of the literature related to the elements of a meaningful evaluation system that has the goal of enhancing faculty development, and presents a model that incorporates these principles and has self-evaluation at the core of the review process.

Introduction

Evaluation in higher education has always been an important concern for faculty. Faculty often view evaluation as a burdensome and meaningless process that does little to help them achieve career goals, especially after tenure is awarded. Annual review in higher education is frequently a stressful time for faculty as they try to present what they have done in a way that shows them in the most positive light. Sharing these concerns, the Department of Cardiopulmonary Sciences at Northeastern University developed a system that was aimed at improving quality within the department through self-evaluation as opposed to a system that emphasizes people trying to outdo their peers. This system came about as faculty expressed discontent that the former review system only led to competition which did not help improve the quality of what was done as individuals or as a department.

Review of the Literature

Faculty evaluation systems vary widely among and even within institutions of higher education. Some systems amount to little more than faculty members reporting to the chairperson what they have accomplished in the traditional areas of responsibilities such as teaching, research and service. Other review processes may include peer evaluation. At some institutions, evaluations may be connected to pre-determined goals and objectives. Regardless of what evaluation process is used, often evaluation is very impersonal and perfunctory which many faculty members consider meaningless and unworthy of their time (Eldridge, 1997). What is learned from this is that an essential component of any evaluation system is that faculty must perceive that the process is useful for them as individuals.

Being mindful of this problem in higher education, colleges and universities have strived to improve their faculty evaluation systems to be worthwhile. In doing so, an important component to delineate is the purpose of evaluation (Haslam, Bryman, & Webb, 1993). Is the purpose to improve faculty performance or to make decisions about renewal of contracts? Miller (1987) defines faculty evaluation as two fold; a developmental process designed to improve faculty performance and a reviewing process which is a procedure that assist in making personnel decisions. It is important to point out that there is disagreement in the literature about whether one system can serve both purposes of improving performance and for making personnel decisions (Neal, 1988). The intent of this paper however, is not to decide the answer to that question. Nevertheless, it is important to point out that when designing a faculty evaluation system the purpose should be clearly stated and that all aspects of the evaluation plan should directly tie to the established purpose (Licata, 1987). The purpose of this paper is to describe some of the literature related to the elements of a meaningful evaluation system that has the goal of enhancing faculty development and to describe a model that incorporates these principles and has self-evaluation at the core of the review process.

Moomaw (1997) suggests that most evaluation systems do not stimulate and support faculty development. The disconnection between evaluation and developmental activities and the lack of faculty involvement in the process of evaluation are major reasons for ineffective evaluation programs. Faculty involvement in the model presented here began with the system development. Creating goals for the department and for individuals is considered a faculty responsibility as participating in a self-evaluation process at the end of the year. The major aim of the system is to provide for faculty improvement.

The faculty evaluation system in the College of Education at the University of Northern Colorado described by Eldridge (1997) promotes the idea that enhancement should be the basis for an evaluation system. The goal should be to provide each faculty member with opportunities to realize his/her potential. Faculty evaluation systems should be interactive, involve faculty in the designing of the plan and provide for faculty self-improvement and continuous career development (Eldridge, 1997; Licata, 1987; Wheeler, Quisenberry, Read, Russell, 1997). This is important at all levels of university functioning because self-improvement of a faculty member will eventually lead to the growth of the faculty member's department, school, college and university (Eldridge, 1997).

It follows therefore that for self-improvement to positively impact all university levels, the planning and evaluation should connect to stated goals. A structure for this type of planning is described by Dilts, Haber, and Bialik (1994). In
their model, the university develops very broad goals and objectives with very broad criteria for evaluation providing general guidance to what is expected. The school/colleges then develop goals and objectives that connect to those of the university with more specific criteria for evaluation. The department goals and objectives are narrower with very specific evaluation criteria. The individual goals and evaluation criteria are then created to fit into the plans of the department. This type of structure provides for the accomplishment of the university's broad goals while permitting flexibility at the various unit levels (Dilts, Haber, & Bialik in 1994). The system described in this paper included goals developed at the college and department levels. This year the university leadership has developed goals that will be incorporated into the system for the next academic year. Considering institutional needs at all levels will become a more fundamental part of this model.

Suggested guidelines for faculty evaluation described by Neal (1988) included involving faculty in all aspects of evaluation, and balancing institutional needs with individual faculty needs. The primary goal of an evaluation process is to provide faculty members with maximal opportunities to realize their potential as a professional (Eldridge, 1997). For this intent to be realized, emphasis should be on continuous career development (Wheeler, Quisenberry, Read, Russell, 1997). It follows that evaluation must respond to the transitional stages in an academic's life, which are a natural part of one's career (Licata, 1987; Schuster, Wheeler, 1990; Wheeler, Quisenberry, Read, Russell, 1997). To incorporate this into our system, faculty has flexibility in developing goals that connect to their interests, taking into account individual career goals as long as they in some way fit into the goals of the larger units.

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln's Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources developed a new process for planning and evaluation to address concerns of faculty and administrators that there was a disconnection between the institution and individuals (Wheeler, Quisenberry, Read, Russell, 1997). In their new system, faculty developmental goals and accomplishments are used to assess faculty growth on an annual basis. Their system is impact focused and asks questions such as "Even if the goals and objectives were accomplished, what difference does it make?" "Has the accomplishment affected the direction of research on a wider basis?" "Are others adopting and adapting this strategy or technology?" These questions require data collection as well as self-reflection to answer in a meaningful way.

The purpose of the evaluation system described in this paper was to improve the quality of everything that was done by the individual and the department. In developing this model, the "conditions of quality" that is so central to lead-management were incorporated into the system. First, if high quality work is the goal, fear is the worst strategy (Glasser, 1998). If people are to take an honest look at what they are doing and plan to do better, it is essential that the outcome is not punishment but that the goal be to improve performance. Quality work is never the product of the evaluation from others, it is always the product of self-evaluation and the commitment to continual improvement (Glasser, 1994). The role of a lead-manager is to encourage people and offer suggestions that will improve the quality of what they do. Understanding these principles, self-evaluation is at the core of the review process of the model described in this paper.

Many colleges and universities are incorporating self-assessments into their review process (Eldridge, 1997; Haslam, Bryman & Webb, 1993; Hutchinson, 1995; Neal, 1988; Wheeler, Quisenberry, Read, & Russell, 1997). Haslam, Bryman, and Webb (1993) report that the self-appraisal procedure was found to be the most useful and revealing part of the process by the vast majority of staff in United Kingdom universities. Individuals became aware of the excessive work they were doing and realized that the goals they were setting for themselves were often unrealistic.

Eldridge (1997) points out that faculty must take an active role in their own evaluation if they are to actualize their own personal and professional potential. Among the many principles that serve as a foundation in the evaluation system he describes is that evaluation is not merely a product, and that the concept of self-evaluation must be an integral part of the overall evaluation plan of the faculty member. This supports the idea in the model described in this paper that it is not just the outcome but the process of reflecting on what one has done and developing plans to improve the quality of one's work that is important.

Self-evaluation is not without controversy. Somers and Birnbaum (1991) conclude that results to date regarding self-appraisals are disappointing and that there is little support for their use in the evaluation process. Braskamp and Ory (1994) believe that self-appraisal has been suspect as evidence in faculty assessment but they argue that self-assessment is essential to self-reflection and in conversing with faculty peers. They conclude that faculty should give more trust to self-evaluation as incorporated with colleague assessment. Centra (1993) points out that although certain types of self-evaluation may not be useful, self-reflection requiring thought about what one is doing can result in improvement. Peterson (1995) concurs that self-assessment can provide information useful for planning and improvement and that self-reports are valuable. Others support self-evaluation when done in collaboration with colleague assessment and evidence such as student ratings (Dilts, Haber, and Bialik, 1994; Peterson, 1995).

Although self-evaluations are sometimes criticized as not very useful, this appears to be related to how they are done. Often they are just a reporting of results related to student ratings or the quantity of what one has accomplished. The model described in this paper encourages faculty to reflect on their work and from this self-reflection, make plans to improve performance. Included in this process should be providing the evidence and information about the impact. For example, faculty who conclude that they have had a successful year teaching need to provide documentation that this is so. Determining measures of success and what types
of evidence are acceptable is an important part of developing the system and should be considered by the department as a whole.

The elements of useful evaluation systems appear to be that they involve faculty in the development of the process; connect to stated goals while balancing institutional needs with faculty needs; are helpful to individuals and promote faculty development; and that the concept of self-evaluation is a central part. Useful self-evaluations require faculty to reflect on their work, focusing on the impact of their accomplishments, with the goal of formulating plans for improvement. Self-evaluations should be done in collaboration with peers, in a positive setting and without the capacity to punish. Providing an environment where faculty members can take risks to experiment with new ideas is important in promoting faculty development.

**Getting Started on a New System**

A new process for faculty evaluation began during a year when there was not any money available for merit awards. Faculty had been expressing their dissatisfaction that annual review was competitive, with the emphasis on numbers; number of publications, number of committees served on, and number of courses taught. Often some accomplishments were perceived to be more valuable than others without any evidence. The impact on the department and the evaluation of the quality of work was missing from the review process. There was not an incentive to work together as a team, since annual review was based on individual accomplishments. During a year when no merit funds were available seemed to provide the perfect opportunity to begin development of a new system.

That year, as chairperson, I suggested trying a review process based on self-evaluation. With the department members supporting the idea, I developed forms for all areas of faculty responsibility to be completed by each individual (figure 1a-d). Overall feedback about the self-evaluation process was positive. However, it became apparent that to reflect back on accomplishments, individual goals needed to be documented. If individual accomplishments were to be valued, we would need to decide as a department what our overall goals would be for the year. Encouraged by the feeling that we were onto something more effective, department faculty developed the other essential part of the system, which was to incorporate department goals into the model.

The past several years have resulted in many modifications to the system but the basic underlying philosophy has not changed. The new system was based on developing department goals, emphasizing a cooperative work environment, and incorporating self-evaluation at the end of the year for merit review. The thought was that the department can accomplish more as a group than can be done as individuals and that work effort should be connected to the department goals. Developing and working toward goals should be a team effort and be connected to the merit review process. The major motivation of the system was to improve the quality of everything done in the department. For quality to improve, it was important that people reflect on their work and be involved in their own evaluation. Since quality requires continual effort, it is the process of moving in that direction that is important.

**The New System**

During the first week of the fall quarter, the department had a retreat to brainstorm goals for the year. The goals included all areas of responsibility that a faculty member would be involved with: teaching; advising; research and scholarship; service; curriculum development and administration. During the following week the goals were modified and then voted on by the department. Using the unit goals as a guide, faculty members developed a plan for their individual goals and activities for the year. The plans were discussed with the chairperson and modified to assure all departmental goals were incorporated. The challenge for the chairperson was to help people build on their strengths and interests and achieve their individual goals while considering the department as a whole.

During the spring quarter, each faculty member did a self-evaluation in all areas of responsibility. Emphasis was placed not only on what was accomplished but the impacts or potential impacts of their work. In doing the self-evaluations, the reflection is what is important, always thinking about how one can continue to work toward quality with the understanding that the process of reflecting is as important as the outcome.

Faculty members are encouraged to work in teams of two or three in a collaborative effort toward achieving goals and for evaluative purposes. If members are working in teams, the team members will review and give each other feedback related to accomplishments and future directions. This information is later shared with the chairperson. Faculty members who are not working as a team must choose another faculty member (other than the chair) to review the self-evaluation and provide feedback. This part of the procedure is in place to give people the opportunity for peer input that is needed for a balanced review.

After self-evaluations are completed, a co-evaluation meeting takes place with the chairperson to discuss progress in meeting individual goals; how an individual's activities contributed to the overall department goals; and individual plans for the future. The self-evaluations are used as a foundation for this discussion. Based on this meeting, a formal written overall evaluation is done by the chair to include areas of; planning, accomplishments, impacts of the work done, organizational competencies and overall evaluation (figure 2). (This evaluation form was adapted from a form developed by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources as described by Wheeler, Quisenberry, Read, & Russell, 1997). If individuals accomplished their goals, and a satisfactory overall evaluation was achieved, full merit is awarded. This means for example, that if 4% is allocated for merit, the faculty member will be awarded that amount.

In considering how well goals were accomplished, it is important to be flexible since there may be reasons beyond
control as to why a goal was not accomplished. Also, it is essential to consider that there are always unpredictable tasks that come up during the year that need attention. There may be times when individual plans will be adjusted to accommodate these new assignments.

Before the end of the year the department has a full day retreat to discuss how well the department goals were met; contributions of individuals to the department goals; what is needed to accomplish goals that were not met; and directions for the academic year.

Faculty Feedback

The response from the department faculty about this system has been positive. They feel that the competitive edge has been removed from the process and that working with this system feels more like a team effort. Working as a team is more personally fulfilling as well as the fact that much more can be accomplished. The process of developing department goals for the year gives more direction especially to newer faculty members. Meeting with the chairperson to discuss plans for the year and for review at the end of the year is an opportunity for open communication that was perceived to be positive.

The system of self-evaluation is less intimidating and a more positive approach. Having the opportunity to look at one's work critically without the fear of being punished is less stressful. This nonthreatening process in a supportive environment allows the type of reflection needed to improve the quality of one's work.

One drawback that some faculty members described with this new system was missing the opportunity to present to the whole faculty what they as individuals accomplished throughout the year. What was interesting about this observation is that this was exactly what people expressed that they did not like about the old system of annual review. Perhaps, however, thinking about presenting accomplishments in a less competitive environment where the outcome is not about money brings a new meaning to the discussion. To incorporate this missing part, contributions of individuals can be recognized at the end of the year meeting or throughout the year as accomplishments happen. Improving the quality of this part of the process is ongoing.

Discussion

One of the most significant questions in the self-evaluation for each area of responsibility is the question about what had the greatest impact of their work. This question gives people the opportunity to think what their accomplishments really mean and who is effected by their work. In this system, quantity is not as important as quality. For example, the philosophy is that it is better to make a significant contribution on a fewer number of committees than to be involved with a large number of committees without having made an important impact.

Another important self-evaluation question is about what was learned from the course evaluations and how this information will help in improving the quality of teaching for the individual faculty member. In the past system, to evaluate teaching, much weight was given to the results of the teacher evaluations done by students. While these results are still important, the self-evaluation questions encourage reflection on what the data really mean. As a result, a plan can be developed for how the information will help improve quality even for the best teachers. The idea is that we are always striving for quality and that everyone can improve, even the highest rated teachers.

Describing how activities in all areas of responsibility contributed to the department goals requires reflecting back on the direction of the department and assessing related individual accomplishments. The aggregate description from all faculty members forms the base for department self-assessment at a later faculty meeting.

Future Plans

Last year the College developed goals for the year, which were then considered by departments within the college in developing their goals. This year, the University has developed goals which are a reflection of the mission and values of the institution. The goals include quantifiable measures expressing progress toward the goal as well as action steps taken to meet the goal. The college will use the University goals as a foundation for developing more specific goals and the departments will do the same. This creates a system where the entire university community is working in the same direction.

The process of developing goals will occur at the college, department and individual levels in the spring quarter so that everyone will begin the academic year with a plan. Doing this in the late spring will be an improvement in the past practice of the Cardiopulmonary Sciences Department waiting until early fall to write their goals. However modification of goals may still need to occur in the fall to accommodate new initiatives or changing priorities that are likely to develop during the summer months.

Developing outcome measures and evaluating impacts is a process that will need continual work. Determining the value of one's work can be subjective. Deciding what evidence is acceptable will require ongoing communication among faculty and administrators. Braskamp and Ory (1994) point out that we often regard the product (for example a publication) as an indicator of the value of one's work. The prestige of a journal provides a measure of quality. Peer assessment, evaluation by experts, honors or awards from a profession, citation rate of published work is among ways to measure impact of the work. However, there may be less prestigious, yet significant, evidence of impacts. For example, the question of what difference was made by using new technology in the classroom might be answered by determining that students are better prepared for clinical practice. A short case study might have resulted in changes in hospital procedures, resulting in improved patient safety.

Improving this part of the evaluation will be an ongoing process.

Finally, it is important for faculty and administrators to understand that self-evaluation is a process that has to be learned. Faculty may need guidance and feedback as they
develop the skills of self-assessment. During this learning process, good examples of self-evaluations should be shared with other members of the team. While impacts and outcomes are important, it is the process of self-reflection that is more likely to lead toward growth and development of individuals as well as the faculty team.
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Self-Evaluation for Teaching and Curriculum Development

1. What did you set out to accomplish in the areas of teaching and curriculum development this year?
2. How well did you accomplish your goals? What is the evidence that your goals were met?
3. Describe the teaching accomplishment(s) of which you are the most proud or that had the greatest impact on students.
4. Is there anything that you needed that you didn’t have that would have helped you in achieving your goals?
5. What did you do to facilitate the students learning from each other?
6. How did you enhance the quality of your teaching over the past year?
7. Describe how your teaching activities contributed to the department goals.
8. What did you learn from the formal course evaluations? How will this information help you to improve the quality of your teaching?

Self-Evaluation for Advising

1. What are your advising responsibilities in the department?
2. Describe what you have accomplished this year in the area of advising. What is the evidence that your goals were met?
3. Describe the advising accomplishment(s) of which you are the most proud or that had the greatest impact on students.
4. Is there anything that you needed that you didn’t have that would have helped you in achieving your goals?
5. What did you do to facilitate the students learning to take a more active role in problem solving and being more responsible for their own progress?
6. Describe how your advising activities contributed to the goals of the department, college and/or university.

Self-Evaluation for Research/Scholarship

1. Describe your scholarship/research activities for the year.
2. Compare what you accomplished with your original goals. How well did you meet your goals? What is the evidence of your success?
3. Describe the research/scholarship accomplishment(s) of which you are the most proud or that made an important contribution to your profession.
4. Is there anything that you needed that you didn’t have that would have helped you in achieving your goals?
5. Describe how your research/scholarship activities contributed to the goals of the Department.
6. Describe how your research/scholarship activities contributed toward your own professional goals (short or long term).

Self-Evaluation for Service/Administration

1. Describe your service/administrative activities for the year.
2. Compare what you accomplished with your original goals. How well did you meet your goals? What is the evidence of your success?
3. Describe the service accomplishment(s) of which you are the most proud or that had the greatest impact.
4. Is there anything that you needed that you didn’t have that would have helped you in achieving your goals?
## Performance Evaluation and Professional Development Form

**Bouvé College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences**

**School of Health Professions**

**Northeastern University**

### Faculty Member's Name ____________  Evaluation Period: ____________________________

**Department: ____________________________  Date Prepared: ____________________________**

The performance level of the faculty member in each performance area and overall should be indicated with a (X) in the appropriate boxes. B = Below expectations; M = Meets expectations; E = Exceeds Expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Areas</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>B M E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Goals relate to University, College, School and Department vision and plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Strategies and action plans to accomplish goals have been established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Outcome measures of success have been delineated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-evaluation of Accomplishments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Accomplishments focused on stated goals and action plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Provided leadership to reach goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Demonstrated creativity/flexibility in meeting goals and carrying out action plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-evaluation of Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Potential impacts were described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Impacts and evidence of success were documented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Impacts were related to goals and action plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Information was used to make plans to improve the quality of work in all areas of responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Areas (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Areas</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Competencies</strong></td>
<td>B M E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Worked toward continuous improvement/professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Showed good problem solving and decision making skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Was flexible and open to change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Maintained positive relationships and communication with team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Teamwork was evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Worked toward goals of department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Evaluation

**Areas to focus on in planning for next year**

---

Performance Evaluation and Professional Development Form has been reviewed with the faculty member on ____________________________ (date).

Comments by faculty member ____________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Faculty signature ____________________________  Date ____________________________

Chair signature ____________________________  Date ____________________________
Using Basic Needs to Solve Relationship Issues on College Campuses

M. Patricia Fetter

Abstract: On college campuses, relationship issues have become one of the most common problems students bring to counseling centers. Young adults have not always had the opportunity to learn the skills needed in dealing with their relationship problems. This paper suggests a process for using the basic psychological needs to help college students discover what is missing in their lives and offers self-evaluation skills to assist them in looking at their interpersonal needs in other ways.

Relationships between loving individuals have been a “counselable” issue since the first couple met and decided to try their hand at bonding and living together. Even then, if Eve had a friend to talk things over with, the entire course of history might have been changed forever. Friends have been for the most part and still are those we turn to when our relationships begin to become stale, or boring or weak or just problematic. More recently, couple counseling has become a part of many counselors’ daily schedules as couples look to professional help to “put it all back together again.” On college campuses, relationship issues have become one of the most common problems students bring to counseling centers.

Many adults living in the 20th century have grown up with the notion that one “gets married and lives happily ever after.” This of course has been and still is being fostered by children’s storybooks which, for the well-being and glee of the child, most always have a happy ending. These stories are wonderful fantasies about the conflict between good and evil, good always prevailing and evil sulking off, head bowed, defeated and broken. The moral of the story is always filled with positive values and strong beliefs, and conveys to the reader a feeling that “all is right with the world.” “The good guys always win!” And then the child grows up!

A majority of adults are able as they mature to “put away the things of a child” and look at the world through eyes that reason why some things happen and that they cannot be all hoped that they’ll do it right and share happiness, even if just adulthood with very few coping skills to deal with falling in and out of love. We as a society haven’t done a very good job of helping young adults develop any of the skills necessary to negotiate a good relationship. So they go ahead blindly, hoping that they’ll do it right and share happiness, even if just for a short time. If statistics bear credibility, with the average length of a college relationship being just 6 months, college students do need help in sorting out what they give to a relationship and what they receive.

Often, in a search for the perfect relationship, the perfect person, the perfect love, individuals, both young and old, tend to base their expectations on the very fantasy stories they grew up with. Even today, film and television give the impression that relationships continue at the same level forever. The fire found in the beginning of the relationship is expected to continue on, and when it doesn’t, one or both members of this bond may look for another and another to fulfill their preconceived notion of what their relationship should be like. For some, this is a lifetime pursuit and always ends in disappointment. The disparity between perceived happiness in relationships and the reality of relationships is, in many ways, a result of those stories, told to us as children, which mold many of the expectations we have for life as adults.

William Glasser (1998) bases Choice Theory on the premise that we are all born with basic psychological needs: belonging, power, freedom, and fun. If one or more of these elements are missing from someone’s life, he/she will be off track and unable to enjoy life to the fullest. It seems that dynamic and fulfilling loving relationships are also based on these basic needs, and when a relationship is failing, or is weak, or when one or both parties are feeling useless or hopeless, the basic needs are just not being met. When working with couples (or individuals) who express frustration with their ongoing relationship, it is important to examine each of the basic needs to see where and if they are being met. It is important to work with the persons involved and ask them to identify where they see each of the needs being a part of their life. For example, how do you feel power in your relationship; how do you experience freedom; where do you have fun in your relationship? Just asking the questions often stimulates enough contemplation on the part of clients so that they realize that certain important needs should be addressed.

Appendix A, Building Relationships Through The Basic Needs, appearing at the end of this article, asks clients to examine their basic needs and assess the satisfaction that they feel in their relationships. Clients can complete the chart either alone or with their partner. This often is an initiator of discussion of feelings and conditions that are currently missing in a relationship and can help the university counselor establish a pathway through which to help the young adult develop more positive interpersonal skills.
Glasser (1989) contends that clients seek counseling because they lack coping skills to deal with issues going on in their life. They think that they are victims of people over whom they have little control. Believing this, relationship issues often appear overwhelming to clients. Confronting problems is too painful and often avoidance is the only recourse they see. So this is the choice that is made: to avoid confrontation to avoid pain. Peck (1979) talks about love in relation to attention - the attention we give to our partners or our relationship. “When we love another, we attend to their growth, when we love ourselves, we attend to our own growth.” So, if the clients truly want to make a change in their lives, then a thorough examination of the basic psychological needs is an approach which has a good possibility of being successful. When our clients’ needs are met, their relationships should become more rewarding and needs satisfying. For young adults, this would then give them an opportunity to deal more effectively with other issues in their lives so that they can focus appropriately on a good education, good grades and developing into a highly effective professional.
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Building Relationships through the Basic Needs

Reality Therapy is based on the belief that we all choose what we do with our lives and that we are responsible for these choices. Responsibility involves choosing behaviors that satisfy our needs and at the same time do not deprive others of a chance to do the same. Key components in the Reality therapy process involve helping people take an honest look at both what they want and what they are doing to get what they want. Assuming they are frustrated, or are frustrating others, they are helped to evaluate what they are doing. From this evaluation people can learn to put into practice more effective, responsible, needs-satisfying behaviors. (B. Sullo).

Relationships are also a choice. We really do choose who we fall in love with and who we eventually settle with. Even in marriages the choices are made by the individual - no one can make us do anything we do not want to do!

Basic Needs

William Glasser believes that humans are born with four basic and genetic psychological needs which include belonging, power, freedom and fun. It is the belief that we are in more effective control of our lives when all of our basic needs are to some degree met.

Belonging: the need to be connected to people through personal relationships, groups, memberships, etc. Each of us needs at least one person in our lives to whom we have developed some kind of relationship. Often that becomes a primary intimate relationship. Work relationships are also essential and need nourishment to sustain a positive work environment.

Power: the need to feel good about oneself, to believe that we matter and have worth and recognition. A positive self-concept is an example. We humans need to feel that we make a difference to someone, at home, at the workplace or in the world. For some of us the need is very high; for others fairly basic, but, in every intimate relationship, there is an issue of power.

Freedom: the need to feel in control of our lives; to make our own decisions, to function independently and to make choices in our personal and professional lives.

Fun: the need to do as the term implies ‘have fun.’ To laugh, to play, to take joyful risks, all involve fun. Implied in fun is the ability to every day just have a good time; good meal; a good conversation; a thrilling experience.
SELF EVALUATION OF RELATIONSHIPS

Relationships do not last very long if both parties involved do not participate in tending to them now and then. This exercise should be useful to you and your partner in periodically evaluating how well the relationship is meeting your Basic Needs and offers an opportunity for you both to talk about it afterwards. It is often easier to talk about perceptions if you've already responded to some questions in writing. Use the table below to jot down perceptions about your relationship. If you are in a relationship please share your response with your partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WANTS Basic Needs Met?</th>
<th>CURRENT BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>EVALUATION Is what you're doing getting you what you want?</th>
<th>PLANS What are you going to change</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELONGING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationships and The Basic Needs

Place an “x” on the scale nearest the number that best represents your interpretation of how your last (current) relationship best met (meets) your Basic Needs. 1 represents needs met at the highest level; 9 represents needs met at the lowest level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEARING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loving, Cooperating, Being Part Of...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Competing, Achieving, Gaining Importance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Moving, Choosing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Learning, Playing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program
Reducing Damage By Increasing Involvement
Annamaria Wenner

The author is the Senior Residence Director at Wentworth Institute of Technology, Boston, Massachusetts. In her position, she is the coordinator of The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program and the community Connections Program, and co-advises the First Year Experience Program.

Abstract: Wentworth Institute of Technology has a history of damage caused by students within residence halls. Over the past several years, the amount billed for damages ranged from $40,000 to $65,000 per academic year. In response to this problem, as well to the identified needs of resident students, a proposal for The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program: Creating a Healthy, Open-minded, Involved, and Conscientious Environment was implemented for the 1998-1999 academic year. After implementing The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program for one semester, an approximate reduction of damage in the amount of $15,000 was seen. Additionally, in the course of one semester, approximately 600 students attended RA. programs and Hall Council meetings, a significant increase from previous years.

The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program was designed to decrease damage by increasing student involvement, the level of pride in their living environment, and the amount of respect, responsibility, and a sense of pride among the residents. Allowing students to have choices and ownership of the hall, through Hall Council and weekly meetings with the Residence Director, placed the responsibility of ensuring a healthy and productive environment back on the students. Additionally, The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program sought to continue the students’ learning process outside of the classroom through Resident Assistant (R.A.) programs. By allowing residents to actively participate in the running of the building and offering purposeful programs, it was hoped students would develop socially, emotionally, and intellectually, as well as become effective members of the community.

Five Basic Needs

The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program, in order to work effectively, had to address the basic needs of students. Universally, students have five basic needs: Love/Belonging, Power, Freedom, Fun, and Survival. If these needs are not met, students will not perform to their fullest potential, either academically or socially. The lack of basic needs will result in negative behaviors or exclusion from the community. Creating an atmosphere which directly focuses on these needs is the beginning of a successful relationship between students and the building staff.

Survival. Before any of the other needs can be addressed, residents must feel as though they will be safe, housed, and fed. During the summer, students received information on where they would be living, which food plan they wanted to purchase, and information on health insurance. Before opening, the building staff conducted building preparation. The following steps were followed during building preparation:

- Made sure each room had the correct furniture.
- Reported any maintenance problems to Physical Plant.
- Checked each key to make sure it opened the door that it was assigned to open.
- Placed a roll of toilet paper in each bathroom.
- Checked all windows to see if they had screens and that they were secure.
- Students’ I.D.s were activated so they could gain access to the building.
- Elevators received a precautionary inspection to ensure proper working conditions.
- Medical services were available during opening in case of any medical emergencies.

Love/Belonging. When students come to college they are leaving a place of comfort and love and moving to a place filled with unknowns. They are not familiar with the city, the students, or the faculty and staff. Within the residence halls, it is essential to make every effort to ensure students feel comfortable and have a sense of belonging. The following steps were implemented:

- R.A.s designed a floor theme. This theme was used in creating door decorations that had each student’s name on them.
- Floor themes were used in bulletin boards. The bulletin boards needed to be warm, inviting, personal, and educational. They emphasized community and involvement.
- R.A.s had time during training to look over the floor plans for their floor in order to become familiar with the names and locations of all of their residents.
- R.A.s planned a floor meeting which took place the night that the students arrived. During this meeting an ice breaker initiated interaction between residents.
- The first week of classes, the R.A., Resident Director (R.D.) and Graduate Assistant (G.A.) visited each suite on a regular basis.

Building staff were available and visible to the students.
Fun

Because a large portion of their day is spent in classrooms, residents need a chance to have fun when they return back to the hall. By allowing students to unwind and relax, they will be able to be more focused when they sit down and concentrate on their academic requirements. Although students will seek out things which are enjoyable and pleasurable, these steps were implemented to promote an element of fun within the residence halls:

- Brochures on area activities, including comedy clubs, dance clubs, beaches, and amusement parks were posted on bulletin boards on the floor.
- Each R.A. planned and implemented a social program that was held during the first two weeks of school (i.e. Boston area scavenger hunt, trip to a museum, pizza and movie night).
- Discount tickets to museums, movie theaters, concerts, and plays were available to students through the Office of Student Activities and Multicultural Programs.
- Weekly movie nights were held in the TV Lounge.
- Students were encouraged to use the Fenway Shuttle for a free means of transportation.
- A pool table was installed in the TV Lounge for students to use.

Freedom. Student are expecting a higher degree of freedom now that they are no longer living under the supervision of their parents/guardians. Although it is the responsibility of the building staff to be available and visible to students, residents must be given freedom and responsibility to make their own decisions. Letting residents make their own choices and making them responsible for the outcome of those decisions will allow them to develop into conscientious adults. The amount of choices students have while living on campus are far too numerous to name; however, the following are a few rights that students have as members of the residence hall:

- Students are allowed to leave and enter the building at all times.
- Students are allowed to have off-campus guests stay on campus for three nights per month.
- Students can use any of the equipment within the residence hall during posted hours.
- All students have access to the Network system, including the Internet, email, and creating their own websites.
- Students have access to a suggestion box where they can put ideas for programs that they would like to see.

Power. With freedom comes power. Students must be given a certain amount of power in order for them to develop a sense of ownership of the building. By giving students a chance to participate in the running of the building, they will take responsibility for what occurs within it's walls. To foster a sense of power, the following steps were put into effect:

- A Hall Council was established in which students had the opportunity to have a voice regarding what happens in the building. They were given a budget to plan programs.
- A weekly open forum with the R.D. and G.A. was held. Students were able to raise concerns and have questions answered regarding the progress of the building.
- Students who are involved within the community were recognized by the R.D. and their R.A. They received a certificate thanking them for their hard work and commitment to the building.
- R.A.s respected students as individuals and maintained a peer-like level during interactions.

The Role of Resident Assistants

The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program's success depended largely on the role of the Resident Assistants (R.A.). The R.A.s are the direct link to the residents and have the responsibility of maintaining an open relationship with them in order to ensure comfort and membership within their community. The R.A. position is designed to be more than the "building police." The major roles of the R.A. staff are mentor, resource person, liaison to the administration, friend, and community builder. During fall training, R.A.s were taught to identify the needs of their residents and gained the tools required to meet these needs.

Program Topics

In addition to providing an element of fun to the lives of students, programming is an essential part of the learning process. It is the responsibility of the Residential Life staff to provide students with information on topics which are not covered within the classroom setting. Educating students on topics such as diversity, city safety, alcohol and drug awareness, and sexual assault provides the information they need to make beneficial choices. The programs listed below are several of the main topics on which The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program focused:

"Unity + Diversity = University". In this program, students learned to appreciate the different cultures, religions, races, genders, and sexual orientations that make up their community. Because ignorance is the major cause of discrimination, educating students will open the lines of communication between students of different backgrounds. The hope of this program was for students to embrace differences while searching for similarities.

"He Said, She Said". This program was designed to show men and women the different communication styles associated with each gender and how misunderstandings can occur. Concentrating on the "no means no" theme, this program covered sexual assault/date rape and the precautions both genders need to take to ensure it does not happen. Additionally, students developed an understanding on the issues both genders face in today's society.

"Opening the Closet Door". This panel discussion addressed misconceptions and prejudices regarding gay,
lesbian, bisexual, and transgender populations. The panel consisted of individuals of each of the previous mentioned groups, who are “out” and willing to discuss their experiences. Students were able to ask questions, and information on support groups was available after the program.

“You Can Make A Difference”. A major goal of The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program was to promote involvement in the outside community through volunteering. At this program, students were able to meet with representatives of different area organizations to find out information on how they could volunteer their time to help make a difference. A booklet was designed and distributed to R.A.s and students with lists of area organizations that are looking for both short term and long term volunteers.

Hall Council
Hall Council is designed to give students a voice within the hall in which they live. By allowing students to come together with concerns and ideas, they will develop a sense of ownership of the building. Students are less likely to damage the place in which they live if they are committed to and proud of it. The Hall Council will consist of interested students who will nominate and vote for officers. One R.A. will be on the executive board and will serve as a liaison to the administration. The G.A. will serve as the advisor. The Hall Council was responsible for:

- Establishing a day and time for weekly meetings.
- Identifying resident concerns and recommended improvements.
- Organizing a large hall social each semester.
- Inviting the Director of Residential Life to a meeting twice a semester for an open forum.
- Meeting with the R.D. weekly to discuss concerns from the previous meeting.
- Creating a hall slogan and logo and designing T-shirts around that concept.
- Planning small programs, such as CD Swap, raffles, Monday Night Football.

Damage Reduction Plan
In the past, vandalism and damage have been choices that students have made. Educating students on choices and the consequences that accompany them is an important step in reducing damage and vandalism within the halls. Students need to make choices resulting in constructive behavior as opposed to destructive behavior. In order for this to occur, a series of steps needed to take place:

- A concrete damage and vandalism policy was put into effect and printed in the Student Handbook. The policy outlined the sanctions, both educational and punitive, that would be handed down to those individuals found responsible.
- Accurate room condition reports for each room must be completed by the R.A. staff and signed by both the student and staff member to ensure an effective damage tracking system.
- Clearly define what community billing is and why it is done.
- Monthly room inspections conducted by the R.D. and/or G.A. to assess problems in rooms.
- Post “Community Alert” notices on floors as damage occurred. (Figure A)
- Post “Community Recognition” notices on floors where no damage has occurred. (Figure B)
- Updated “Damage Board” each week indicating where damage had or had not occurred.
- R.A.s included vandalism and damage as an agenda item at all of their floor meetings.
- Implemented poster campaign to raise student awareness. (Figure C, D, E)
- Sponsored “Leopard Loot” in all the residence halls.
- Sponsor an annual Pride week in March.

“Leopard Loot”
Students had an opportunity to earn “Leopard Loot” by attending R.A. programs and Hall Council meetings. Every week a floor went damage free, members received “Loot.” Also, students earned “Loot” if they were acknowledged by their R.A., R.D., or G.A. as having contributed in a positive way to their community. A database was designed to keep track of the amount of “Loot” earned by students. At the end of the year, an auction was held at which students were able to bid on prizes with the “Loot” they earned during the course of the year.

By combining the basic needs of students, purposeful programs, and an extensive damage reduction plan, The C.H.O.I.C.E. Program is an effective way of increasing involvement, pride, responsibility, and respect of the residents. Books, tests, projects, and papers only represent a fraction of the possible ways for students to learn. Challenging students to take ownership of the building and become an active member within their community, students will not only learn the necessary information to survive in the working world, but they will also learn how to survive in the real world. Supplying students with the tools to develop themselves into contributing members of society will not only help the student, but it will benefit the Institute, as well.
Community Alert!

The following damage(s) and/or vandalism has occurred in YOUR community:

Date of posting: ____________________________

If you are responsible, or if you know who is, immediately contact your RA, RD, or GA.
If the responsible individual(s) is/are not found, then the entire floor/building will be held responsible through community billing for the necessary clean-up and/or repair.

If the responsible person(s) is/are not found, the floor/building will be billed the following: ____________________________

Wentworth Institute of Technology
Office of Housing and Residential Life

Community Recognition!

Congratulations!

YOUR community has had no incidents of damage or vandalism during this past week!
We commend you for your efforts to maintain a safe, clean, and positive living environment.

Keep Up The Great Work!

Date of Posting: ____________________________

Number of consecutive weeks without community billing: ____________________________

Wentworth Institute of Technology
Office of Housing and Residential Life
IT'S YOUR CHOICE...
HELP MAKE 1997-1998 A DAMAGE FREE YEAR FOR THE EVANS WAY COMMUNITY!

IT'S YOUR HALL!
IT'S YOUR COMMUNITY!
IT'S YOUR CHOICE!
CHOOSE TO BE DAMAGE FREE!

CHOOSE TO BE DAMAGE FREE!
Five Approaches to Psychotherapy: Analysis of the Lehigh Project

Mary E. Watson and Larry Litwack

Introduction

Over the course of 22 years, Everett Shostrom produced through Psychological Films a series of films illustrating three different psychotherapeutic approaches to working with a specific client. These films, Three Approaches to Psychotherapy I-Gloria (1965), Three Approaches to Psychotherapy II-Kathy (1977), and Three Approaches to Psychotherapy III-Richard (1987), received international recognition as valuable aids in the teaching and study of different psychotherapeutic modalities. The client in each of the three series was a real client who agreed to be filmed. In 1994, the American Psychological Association produced a new series of films, again illustrating a variety of therapeutic approaches. In this series, coached individuals served as the clients for each therapist. In 1998, a new series of videotapes was developed by Jon Carlson and Diane Kjos to accompany their book Introduction to Counseling and Psychotherapy. This series used actual counselees.

The Lehigh Project

In 1996, Lehigh University produced an important addition to the previous series. During a week long seminar entitled Advances in Integrative Psychotherapy, five different therapists each gave a daylong presentation before an audience of students and workshop participants.

Preceding the start of the actual workshop, a group of five doctoral students under the guidance of Tina Richardson, Ph.D. developed a detailed case scenario of a fictitious client named Linda including clinical history, current presenting problems, differential DSM-IV diagnoses, MMPI 2 results, and the Beck Depression Inventory. At the same time, a professional actress was employed to play the role of Linda and given the information for her role.

As part of each day’s presentation, the actress portrayed the role of Linda with the therapist scheduled that day. These sessions were designed to be considered the first psychotherapy visit with each therapist. Each session, running slightly over 50 minutes, was video-taped for future educational use. Each therapist was presented with the same case information described above; none had any other information or insights into Linda’s problems. None of the therapists were present during any of the other therapy sessions held with Linda aside from their own. Linda’s role remained consistent to her script throughout the week. As noted in the project manual accompanying the video series, any deviation in her dialogue with each therapist during the course of her sessions occurred as a result of what that particular therapist chose to focus on and what was facilitated in the session.

The Five Therapists

The five distinguished therapists that participated in this project included three diplomate psychologists and two psychiatrists. The following is an identification of each of the five therapists drawn from the viewer’s manual for the series with a brief description of the therapeutic orientation for each.

Marvin R Goldfried, Ph.D., ABPP is Professor of Psychology and Psychiatry at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. A diplomate of the American Board of Professional Psychology, a Fellow in the American Psychological Association, and editorial board member of several journals, he is co-editor, author and co-author of several books, some of which are listed in the reference section of this paper. His current research interests involve the study of the therapeutic change process, the objective of which is to delineate both common and unique contributions from different theoretical orientations.

In the first videotape Dr. Goldfried applies the Cognitive-Affective-Behavior model of therapy. Starting from a cognitive-behavioral base, he then brings in experiential influences, e.g. focusing on in-session processes as demonstrated during his session. This approach is integrative in that it addresses cognition (thoughts), affective areas which include feelings and emotions, as well as behavioral elements which arise during the session. Among the key characteristics of this model is that it is systematic, past-present-future-oriented, analytical, and comprehensive (Corey, 1990). An eclectic approach, it incorporates diverse techniques to fit the individual needs of the client.

Practitioners who support Integrative Psychotherapy are not bound by one theoretical school (Norcross, Goldfried,
They realize that there may be elements from a variety of approaches that may be drawn upon to contribute positively to psychotherapy, and there is a lack of research data indicating that one therapeutic orientation is superior to another. Some therapists use only one theoretical model at a time depending on the needs of the client, while others use a multifaceted approach that tries to incorporate different orientations for the same client (Norcross, Goldfried, 1992).

Arnold A. Lazarus, Ph.D., ABPP currently holds the rank of Distinguished Professor of Psychology at Rutgers University where he teaches in the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology. He is most noted throughout the world as the founding father of Multi Modal Therapy and is widely recognized as an international authority on effective and efficient psychotherapy. A poll published in the American Psychologist had listed Dr. Lazarus as the fourth most influential American psychologist. He has written 15 books and has over 200 professional and scientific articles to his credit.

In tape number two Dr. Lazarus demonstrates Multi Modal Therapy (MMT). This theory is a systematic approach which explores with the client questions relating to seven modalities. These modalities commonly identified through the acronym BASIC ID, include Behaviors - what people are doing, activities in which they are engaging; Affect - feelings and emotions; Sensations - what people sense through their sensory system; Imagery - visualizations, fantasies; Cognition - thoughts, beliefs, goals, philosophies; Interpersonal relationships - interactions with other people; Drugs/biology - exercise, sleep, nutritional habits. The approach is based on the premise that the BASIC ID comprises the entire range of human personality. In asking questions related to all these areas of human functioning, the therapist is able to help the client identify problem areas as well as areas of strength.

Multi Modal Therapy is a comprehensive process for assessing the client rather than a specific therapy. Multi Modal therapists draw upon a full range of therapeutic modalities for intervention, depending on the presenting needs of the client. Therapists attend to special problems or differences within a give modality as well as the interaction among the seven modalities. This process has been successful in dealing with a full range of client problems.

Frank M. Dattilio, Ph.D., ABPP, is a clinical associate in psychiatry at the Center for Cognitive Therapy, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, and is in the private practice of clinical psychology. A licensed psychologist, he is also a diplomat in behavioral psychology with the American Board of Professional Psychology and serves as a full Professor (Adjunct) at Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. He is co-editor and co-author of several books and has more than 75 professional publications in the areas of anxiety disorders, behavior problems, and marital and family discord.

Dr. Dattilio demonstrates Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy (CBT) in tape number three. Oriented toward cognition, behavior and action, CBT is didactic and aimed at re-deciding (Corey, 1990). In cognitive-behavioral therapy, the way individuals think about things has an impact on how they feel and behave. The cognitive-behavioral therapist helps clients modify how they process thoughts and consider different ways to think about things and develop new behaviors. Therapists assist clients in seeing the relationship between how one thinks and how one feels and that one can choose to look at things in a different way.

As teachers, therapists help clients gain insight into their problems. They work with the client to help plan strategies for behavior changes which are drawn from a wide variety of behavioral techniques. The therapist teaches clients that if they want to change they have to take the responsibility to do something differently. The goal of therapy is then to enable a client to practice new behaviors that are aimed at changing self-defeating behaviors. Cognitive-Behavioral therapy has been applied to a wide range of problems including; sex-therapy, education, group work, assertion training, depression, child therapy, crisis intervention, and personality disorders (Corey, 1990; Dattilio, 1994).

William Glasser, M.D. is a board-certified psychiatrist who initially became well known through his book, Reality Therapy, a method of psychotherapy that can be applied to all human problems that is now taught all over the world. Midway through his career he became involved with a new theory of how human beings function, which has come to be known as Choice Theory. His most recent book is, Choice Theory: a new psychology of personal freedom, which provides an explanation of the theoretical base for his therapeutic practice. He is the author of many books on this theory as it relates to quality schools in education, lead-management and the process of Reality Therapy in counseling. He is President and Founder of the William Glasser Institute.

Dr. Glasser demonstrated Reality Therapy in tape four. This is a process aimed at helping people gain more effective control over their lives in a supportive and caring environment. Choice Theory (CT), the theoretical basis for Reality Therapy, is based on the belief that all individuals have five basic genetic needs: love and belonging, power, fun, freedom and survival. Choice Theory is a biological theory which explains how and why all living organisms behave. All behavior is believed to be internally motivated and purposeful and individuals are genetically instructed to behave in ways that satisfy their needs. Individuals are in more effective control of their lives when all basic needs are being met.

Choice Theory teaches us that we all choose what we do, we are responsible for the choices we make and that we have the ability to make better choices that will lead us in a more successful direction. Key components of the Reality Therapy process involve helping people to take an honest look at both what they want and what they are doing to get what they want. Through self-evaluation, people develop a plan supported by the helper which puts into practice more effective need-satisfying behaviors. This approach is used in counseling, education and management and can be useful when people need to learn how to satisfy their needs in responsible ways.
James F. Masterson, M.D. a board-certified psychiatrist, pioneered the developmental, object relations approach to the psychotherapy of Personality Disorders through clinical research over the last thirty years. He is the Founder of the Masterson Group, P.C. for the Treatment of the Personality Disorders and the Director of the Masterson Institute which conducts post graduate training programs. He is best known for his pioneering work in the field of The Self, representing a breakthrough in treatment of Borderline and Narcissistic Disorders. He is a recognized international authority on Personality Disorders, is on the editorial boards for numerous journals, and is author of nine books and editor of five. He is in private practice and is adjunct Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Cornell University Medical College.

Dr. Masterson demonstrated Object Relations Therapy in the fifth tape. Object Relations looks at the relationships among people and how interpersonal relationships have changed over time (Ivey, Ivey, & Simek-Morgan, 1997). Object Relations theory refers to the relationship between an individual’s internal and external object (people) worlds. The external object is the real person while the internal object is a mental representation of the person which may or may not be an accurate representation of reality (Okun, 1990).

Object Relations theorists focus on the relationships between individuals and real, observable external people; between individuals and their mental representation of those real external people, and between the internalized residues of individuals’ early significant relationships and their later ones (Okun, 1990). Object relations therapists focus on “object” relations conflicts such as experiences of attachment and separation, boundaries between self and others, and interpersonal relations. Transference and counter transference are dealt with as object relations during therapy. Therapy is oriented toward helping clients examine their relationships. The primary focus is to help clients become aware of relationship deficits and to help them discover ways to improve interpersonal functioning (Gilliland, James & Bowman, 1994).

Analysis of the Five Approaches to Linda

The authors of this article chose to take the analytical approach of comparing the similarities and differences of the four therapeutic approaches to Reality Therapy. This was done because we were writing for an audience who has an understanding of the Reality Therapy process. This analysis could be used to focus discussion in an academic counseling class about the similarities and differences among approaches. This might also provide some information to help answer questions that are often asked during Reality Therapy training about how RT compares to other therapies.

There seemed to be many aspects of the way that Dr. Goldfried worked with this client using Integrative Therapy that were similar to how Reality Therapy might be used. Dr. Goldfried made many statements that set a positive counseling environment. For example, he said that it was good that she made a decision to come into therapy and positively reinforced that she was doing a good job opening up even though she was reluctant to come into therapy. His tone and statements seemed to show supportive empathy. He worked to empower her by asking her to change “you” to “I” and said that she took risks today in coming into therapy. Dr. Goldfried took a collaborative approach toward helping her prioritize what she wanted to work on and in working out “strategies” (or a plan as we would say in reality therapy) to help her move in a better direction. They developed a plan for her to keep a journal of her thoughts and feelings to work toward seeing the connections. In Reality Therapy this would have included actions as well to make up total behavior.

Differences noted in this approach were that it was very reflective, looking at her past and at the themes in her life. In this session the therapist connects the past to the present more than one would do in Reality Therapy. Another distinction is that the therapist suggested that she not do anything before their next meeting except to keep the journal. Using the Reality Therapy approach one would tend to develop a plan to do at least one thing differently that would work toward getting more of what she wanted.

Dr. Lazarus, demonstrating Multimodal Therapy, established the counseling environment by asking the client what issues she wanted to work on and positively reinforcing that she seemed to have sensible goals. He asked for her reaction to things that he was saying, sharing his impressions and then checking them out with her. He worked toward empowering the client with statements such as... it is in your hands, we are the architects of our lives. He used a collaborative approach with statements such as ...the whole idea of therapy is that two heads are better than one; and talks about what they can do together to achieve goals. In response to her saying that “you seem to be putting a lot on me”, he states that “I don’t want you to do it, I want us to do it.”

Lazarus is action oriented and talks on several occasions about the importance of taking action to work toward goals. Choice is a theme throughout this session with statements about the fact that we are in control and that we choose many of the things that happen to us. Lazarus shows that he would do anything to help the client by stating that he would go to her home to see her husband if it would help. At the end of the session the therapist gets a commitment from Linda as to what she is going to do and schedules another appointment.

The similarities between Reality Therapy and the way Dr. Lazarus works with this client are very evident as described above. There were two differences noted. One is that he is more directive than a reality therapist might be, although this could be more related to style than orientation. Also, the approach taken to find out what is important to the client, what pictures are in her quality world and how she meets her needs were different. Dr. Lazarus demonstrates how the BASIC ID system is used to ask questions. This approach is an effective way to get at all aspects of human behavior and personality and could be incorporated into working with other types of orientations such as Reality Therapy.

Dr. Dattilio, demonstrating Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy, establishes a positive counseling environment by
Therapy. There is much discussion about feelings. He asks have of asking for approval. She does however, leave the should do. He helps her to see the pattern that she seems to herself.

Since Reality Therapy comes from a cognitive-behavioral base it follows that many similarities would be evident in this session with Dr. Dattilio. For example, he asked about what thoughts were going through her mind and tried to connect the idea that thoughts effect feelings by asking “how did that affect you” and “what were you thoughts and feelings.” He talks about connections between how we behave and how our life is going and asks the client about how changes in her thinking affect the way she feels. The therapist teaches the client that the way we perceive and think about things has an impact on how we feel and behave and that this is circular. This concept is similar to the car analogy in Reality Therapy. The idea that we have control over our choices and that we have responsibility for our thoughts is a theme in this session. He asks her to clarify what she wants in several ways and then re-confirms by asking about expectations of what she would like to see. Dr. Dattilio helps her to alter the way she looks at things several times during the sessions. He suggests that she consider that there are different ways of thinking about a situation and one of the things we can do is to “weigh the evidence and get a balanced perspective.” He helps her plan strategies and teaches her that if we don’t do something, nothing will change.

The one difference noted in this session compared to the approach that might be taken by someone using a Reality Therapy approach is the direct way of challenging the client’s belief system. However, this may be more related to the style of the therapist than theoretical orientation.

Dr. Masterson demonstrated Object-Relations Therapy. His approach throughout this session is empathic and he uses some positive reinforcement, for example, he points out that she doesn’t believe in therapy yet she is there. However, it is in this session that we see the biggest difference from Reality Therapy. There is much discussion about feelings. He asks questions about how down she gets when she feels down and what sort of emotional state she is in. A major theme is about making connections with the past. For example, he asks her questions such as, “do you know where this all came from” and later draws similarities between how her mother reacted and how she reacts to her husband. The process of therapy is interpretive as he elaborates on why she is the way she is and suggests that the fundamental problem is how she feels about herself.

On several occasions Linda asks Dr. Masterson what she should do. He helps her to see the pattern that she seems to have of asking for approval. She does however, leave the session with a plan for how she will try to get closer to her husband. The fact that she left the session with a plan was what was similar to Reality Therapy although the discussion in getting to that point was very different.

Dr. Glasser demonstrated Reality Therapy. From the beginning he focused on the positive. For example when stating that she does not have a lot in common with her husband, he asked about how long she did have a good relationship. Again, when Linda was describing some of the negative things in her life he turned to the positive, asking her to talk about some of the good things in her life, which she did. He asked her to clarify her pictures asking about what her picture of “happy” was. He helped her to clarify what she wanted and focused her on what she was going to do to make her life better. He helped her to understand that her happiness was up to her and that only she can control what she does. He empowered her and helped her to see that she has the capacity to do something with her life but she has to do something differently. Several times during the session he complimented her about such things as her creativity and her talents. Glasser also helped her to reframe her thinking at times. For example, when she talked about her husband not being very interested in her, Glasser responds that she may be very important to him and that perhaps he is afraid to be interested. The client seemed to learn that if she wants her life to be better she has to make the first move and by the end of the session they have a plan worked out. Dr. Glasser is very supportive by saying that he would help her pick up the pieces if she was hurt when the client expresses her fear of being hurt.

Discussion

As part of this project, each of the five therapists was contacted and asked three questions. All proved to be quite cooperative with this project. First, it may be helpful to give a little background. As previously mentioned, each of the therapists had been given a history, current status, and diagnosis for Linda. It is unclear what, if any, use was made of this material by the therapists. One (Glasser) made a specific point of not reading any of the material prior to the session, on the grounds that no information would normally be available to the therapist about a client coming in for the first time (this of course might differ for clients coming into an agency that uses an intake interview prior to assignment to a therapist or for clients coming in through referral from other therapists). Even though the background information stated that this would be a first session, one of the therapists (Goldfried) treated the session as a second session. Some material in the case information was not touched by any of the therapists during the sessions, e.g. information about a recurring dream that Linda had.

Linda was diagnosed in the case material as Axis I dysthymic disorder and Axis II dependent personality disorder with obsessive-compulsive characteristics. The MMPI 2 results supported this, while the Beck results also showed her to be moderately depressed. The first question asked of the therapists was to describe Linda. The responses ranged from:

- Mildly depressed (Goldfried)
- Unable to respond since this was an actress whose real world seemed to be mixed with her role (Lazarus)
- Dysthymic disorder with some obsessive compulsive features and elements of dependent personality (Dattilio)
- Unhappy woman (Glasser)
• Borderline Personality Disorder of the Self (Masterson)

The second question asked for the therapists’ prognosis for length of treatment. The therapists’ responses to this question varied somewhat:

• I can’t give a time frame, although I don’t see this as short-term therapy (Goldfried)
• Since this was an actress, unable to respond (Lazarus)
• Weekly psychotherapy for a minimum of about six months (Dattilio)
• Two to three times; she might call me and perhaps over the next several years I would see her 4-5 more times (Glasser)
• Perhaps 18 months for treatment (Masterson)

The third question asked for comments about the therapeutic modality used by each therapist. The responses followed the therapeutic modality identified with each therapist, so yielded little meaningful addition.

As a final question, the therapists were asked to make any additional comments they chose about the project. These include the following:

• I believe that the order effect played a huge role. Let’s say that Masterson had gone first, followed by Dattilio, the Glasser, and then Goldfried, and finally by me, I’ll bet a different scenario would have emerged. (Lazarus)
• We were told “Linda is skeptical about therapy. She has difficulty trusting and getting close to others especially males.” From this, my goal for session 2 was to have session 3. (Goldfried)
• In real life, the husband of the actress who played Linda was ill with cancer, something that did not come to light until the 11th hour. (Goldfried) (In the case scenario, Linda’s father was terminally ill with lung cancer).

Conclusion

The Lehigh project represents an important addition to the materials available for both students and practitioners of counseling and psychotherapy. There are several conclusions that are worth mentioning. First, the use of a simulated client can be viewed as a mixed blessing. Although it may not be possible for an individual to prevent his/her personal life from impinging upon the role, the individual might find it easier to maintain a consistent role (This seemed to be the case with Linda). What impact having a simulated client would make on the work of a therapist is unclear. The use of simulated clients as a part of professional training is not an unusual practice. On the other hand, the evolution for a real client experiencing five different therapists over a five day period might increase the effect of the order in which therapists present their demonstrations.

Second, the effect of gender differences is always an unknown quantity in any such project. Had the client been male, or had one or more of the therapists been female, it is unclear what the effect might have been in changing the interactions that emerged during the sessions. The Lehigh project had the same limitation as the Three Approaches to Psychotherapy I-II-III in that all the therapists portrayed were male. One positive aspect of the series prepared by the American Psychological Association and the Carlson-Kjos series was that they included some demonstrations by female therapists.

Third, the ways the five therapists viewed the client seemed to vary based on their theoretical orientations. In the opinion of the authors, this seemed to be the case with Linda.

Fourth, it is important to comment on the critical need for research into the theoretical foundation and practice of psychotherapy. Several of the participants in this project have histories of research data providing underpinnings for what they do and how they do it. Providing material such as these videos presents additional opportunities for detailed case analyses of psychotherapy in action.

Fifth, it might have been interesting to hear the reactions of the actress playing Linda to each of the five therapists following the conclusion of the project. This was done in the first two series of Three Approaches to Psychotherapy. If this had been done, it would be important to carefully focus the discussion on her feelings and thoughts during the sessions in retrospect rather than asking her to evaluate one therapist against another. Such a comparison at best would be valid for this client in this situation seeing therapists in the order she did. Finally, the creativity shown in developing the model and carrying out the Lehigh project is to be commended. It is hoped that such efforts will continue in the future with greater diversity in therapeutic orientations and gender interactions. It is also important to note that the Lehigh project tapes are available on loan for educational purposes. For information, contact the Department of Education and Human Services at Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.
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Credentialing For William Glasser Institute Instructors
Larry L. Palmatier

Abstract: Robert Wubbolding (1998) wrote an article reiterating the institute’s policy that Advanced Week instructors have at least a master’s degree and appealing to others to continue to grow in professional training and knowledge. The article reached out to basic level instructors, as well as general members to continue their professional education as a lifetime responsibility. Such formal academic study would help establish a fundamental credential base and would represent a minimal level of credibility that has become normative among today’s mental health professionals. Master’s level work would also serve as a conventional attestation to the instructors’ competency beyond institute certification, which is now available to qualified applicants with or without the MA degree. In this brief position paper, I wish to echo Wubbolding’s call, add some caveats and recommend that higher education instructor-members consider some new training opportunities that they may offer to others seeking instructor status.

Credentialing

To make a blanket requirement that all instructors have a master’s degree in psychology or even counseling, for example, would not fit my picture of what we need to do to strengthen our professionalism as a WGI faculty cluster. Too many programs still cling statically to the two timeworn external control ideas about psychology: psychodynamic (and its object relations-systems-update), or reinforce and punish behavioral methods. Flooding our ranks with instructors-turned-counter-choice practitioners would hardly help anyone in the broader enterprise.

I attended a presentation at an NCSIE (National Council of States on In-service Education) conference at which a veteran psychologist from New York discussed Glasser’s choice theory. He told the group that he had finished a Ph.D. in psychology, but had not learned anything of practical value until, after completing his advanced degree, he met William Glasser. He publicly stated that he had earned a Ph.D. in nonsense. My conclusion from that rueful remark was that learning more psychology is not inherently valuable because the benefits depend on the psychology and the premises that one studies.

Continuous Improvement

Keeping alive our commitments to work in unison in order to create quality experiences for our William Glasser community, we cannot avoid one simple responsibility that also harbors an opportunity: to plow ahead with our own studies so that we ensure continuous improvement in our information and experiential base.

No matter how widely we study, we must keep in mind our main mission-presenting Glasser (1998) and his thinking, even as he evolves and as his ideas become more lucid and powerful. Learning compatible methods need not separate us from our convictions about the heart of effective therapy. I think that I am in a good position to attest to the validity of this point. We all agree that learning choice theory and reality therapy can assist others in doing better whatever they are already doing. What if we adopt the corollary view that studying the wider therapeutic landscape can assist us in doing better what we do with choice theory and reality therapy?

Rank In The WGI May Have its Privilege But is not a Barrier

One attraction for me in maintaining a connection with the Institute has been that I could be somebody on my own merits and no one else ever had to play a lesser role because of my status. All of us could meet and mix as members of a family without the distancing effects of elitist barriers. All systems are rule governed and have natural orders, of course. Families present a natural hierarchy and the Institute’s structure contains certified persons, supervisors, and two levels of instructors. People move to these positions on the basis of their knowledge and competencies. We have, for the most part, retained a free and easy context for relationships that allows us to live out the theory we espouse. Many have written excellent books to guide our practice (Boffey, 1993; Crawford, Bodine, & Hoglund, 1993; Gossen & Andersen, 1995; Greene, 1994; McFadden, 1995; Sullo, 1997; Wubbolding, 1988; and Zunker, 1994), to name only a few.

At the Albuquerque international convention in 1996, I proposed the idea of establishing a special network. Those of us who affiliate directly with colleges and universities can offer opportunities to others and, in the process, we can enhance our mutual interests by demonstrating how much we value mentoring within our community. The little network that I suggested as we pulled our chairs into a circle at the foot of some impressive New Mexico mountains has given modest form to our services and has kept us all moving in the direction of quality and continuous improvement.

A University & College Quality Network (UCQN)

Many WGI members are university connected and are in a good position to brainstorm strategies for collaborating and contributing to our overall purpose. We can all talk over what we see as unique possibilities and, in the meantime, I propose the following ideas.

1. Post-Secondary Quality Network (PSQN). Organize a professional clearinghouse as a network for university-based RTC members to share ideas about courses, syllabi, teaching materials and methods, certificate options, and university programs. Collect in one place (e.g., at Northeastern University, the home of the Reality Therapy Journal and a research center on
both reality therapy and choice theory), a syntheses of
CT/RT/QM university workshops, accredited courses,
certificates, and degree offerings as a general
information for all institute members.

2. **Faculty Exchange Program.** Explore faculty
exchange opportunities and national and international
travel possibilities with the aim of carrying out projects.

3. **School Administrator Training.** Over and above the
WGI four-state Quality School consortium program,
and in conjunction with the more recent special training
for principals, interested colleges and universities may
opt to work more closely with the institute in co-sponsoring these training experiences.

4. **Offer a Doctoral Program.** Develop a Psy. D. in
counseling or in family psychology and a Ph.D or Ed.D.
in quality management for K to 12 administrators.
Brainstorming ways that a cluster of CT/RT university
faculty members could offer such a doctoral program
would be important. Institutions to emulate are NOVA,
the Union Institute, and the Fielding Institute. We could
set up this new program through a pre-accredited
institution, a consortium of schools, or a freestanding
school that we would establish.

5. **Coordinate Information on Selected Courses.** The
higher education network can become a forum where
WGI members consult university faculty members who
teach survey courses in psychological theory and other
topics and where instructors share their university
course syllabi. This point extends the correspondence
course package that is already available through Texas
Tech University.

6. **Collegial Mentoring.** Create a mentoring support
collaborative, dealing with grant applications, tenure
and promotion matters, dissertation topics and
methodologies, elective course work, cross-cultural
counseling programs and experiences, and other
university issues. We may coordinate these efforts
through the web site that John Radice has created in
New York or through the RJT editor, Larry Litwack at
NU.

7. **CT/RT Professional Forum on the Web.** Put one
another in touch with opportunities for writing book
reviews and chapters in books, delivering papers at
professional meetings, acquiring grants, conducting
national training, and publishing articles and
anthologies, and, thereby, keep one another at the
cutting edge. All of these activities will insure a greater
impact in the real world. One current high priority
writing project, for example, is Robert Wubbolding’s
book on Reality Therapy for the 21st Century,
containing a chapter presenting empirical data on
RT/CT applications.

8. **Advanced Counseling Training.** Provide special
support and academic guidance to certified WGI
members who show an interest in an advanced degree
or in a certificate program.

9. **Swift Action Resource Pool.** Form a Swift Action
Resource Pool (SARP) to serve as advisors to CT, RT,
& QM doctoral students in the innovative university
programs around the country and in places such as the
Dominican Republic. Announce various consulting
and training opportunities for traveling in the United
States and to other parts of the world.

**Continuing Education or Other Advanced Work**

Rather than adding barriers to our relationships, we can
establish solid opportunities that will help us all meet our
needs without the systemic threat looming overhead that
defines people by their degrees or by the number of their
post-bachelors units. Many believe that certification is
important even though Ivan Illich (1971), for one, condemned
the practice in his landmark book, *De-schooling Society*.

As a Belgian intellectual and Catholic priest working at a
cultural education center that he established in Cuernavaca,
Mexico, Illich devoted his life to society’s powerless. He had
witnessed the dangerous social effects of a certificated
society, especially as this layering oppressed the poor and
disenfranchised the ones who were already vulnerable. In
citing his perceptions and proposals here-often in paraphrased
form-I report his key views.

Illich aimed his criticism at those who confused process
with substance, teaching with learning, grade advancement
with education, a diploma with competence, and fluency with
the capacity to present something new. He believed that
students were “schooled” into accepting service in place of
value. Medical treatment was mistaken for health care, social
work for the improvement of community life, police
protection for safety, military poise for national security, and
the modern rat race for productive work. Once these topics
become blurred, he claimed that people begin assuming a new
logic: the more treatment people get, for example, the better
their results, or, more simply, expansion leads to success. He
identified the institutionalization of values as leading
inevitably to physical pollution, social polarization, and
psychological impotence: three dimensions in a process of
global degradation and modernized misery. The American
political scene is now playing out this same destructive
prescription by spouting the noble goals of family values
while brutalizing individual freedom and personal choice.

Illich especially decried transforming nonmaterial needs
into demands for commodities and defining health, education,
personal mobility, welfare, or psychological healing as the
result of services or "treatments." He pleaded for research that
would employ technology to create institutions, which would
serve personal, creative, and autonomous interaction and the
emergence of values that technocrats could not substantially
control. Illich's call for a "cultural revolution" through which
everyone would conduct a radical reexamination of the social
myths and institutions by which people in an industrialized,
mechanistic, and progressively less human world organize
their lives is not unlike Glasser's commitments. He is
devoting his energies to improving systems so that individual
freedom and personal autonomy will flower.
Ilich presented a startling view of schooling—in contrast to education—as the modern dogma or sacred cow which all must worship, serve, and submit to, while drawing little or no true nourishment. Schools have failed our individual human needs, supporting fallacious notions of “progress” and development that follow from the belief that ever-increasing production, consumption, and profit are proper yardsticks for measuring the quality of human life. Our universities have become recruiters of personnel for the consumer society, certifying citizens for service, while at the same time disposing of those the pompous few judge unfit for the competitive race.

Ivan Ilich called for the formation of skill centers where people can learn useful skills from persons best equipped to teach them; peer-matching by which the learned may share their knowledge with those seeking instruction. He felt that such radical measures were necessary to turn civilization from its headlong rush toward the violence frustrated expectations will certainly unleash so long as the school myth is allowed to persist. Again we can see that Glasser’s educational certification is in line with Ilich’s vision of what is useful and uplifting in human life.

Ilich was a purist who was intolerant of shallow fixes. He thought that neither new attitudes of teachers toward their pupils not the proliferation of educational hardware or software, in a classroom, nor, finally, the attempt to expand teachers’ responsibilities until these engulf the learners’ lifetimes, would deliver universal education. He stated that the search for new educational funnels must be reversed into the search for their institutional inverse: educational webs that heighten the opportunity for each person to transform each moment of living into one of learning, sharing, and caring.

Similar to Glasser, Ilich wanted to raise the general question of the mutual definition of human beings’ nature and the nature of modern institutions, which characterizes our worldview of language. Reformer Ilich saw the school paradigm as needing total and complete restoration just as the quality school project is designed to contribute in our time to the transformation of educational institutions. We, too, can avoid exclusionary thinking that builds bunkers and follow Ilich’s lead by sharing our knowledge and celebrating our continual growth.

Credentialing for Current Instructors

To ask everyone with instructor status to go back to school to obtain an advanced degree in counseling, counseling psychology, psychology, or a related field (e.g., clinical social work; marriage, family, and child counseling; or psychiatric nursing) strikes me as an after-the-fact mandate that would encourage paper chasing. What about those among us whose master’s degree may appear adequate on paper, but upon closer examination, shows up as rather slim or irrelevant? All senior faculty members must now have at least a master’s degree and no one has proposed a retroactive demand of basic instructors. Making the decision to seek a master’s degree optional for instructors at the first level seems more realistic in light of our interest in non-coercive relationships and in eliminating restrictive rules and sanctions. Still, we may be able to find a way to encourage and persuade continuing learning up to and including a master’s degree for all.

To make the option of pursuing a graduate degree, a specialist certificate, or any other advanced degree most attractive to current instructors, I propose collaborating through the UCQN and devising a highly attractive online program with a choice theory heart and a reality therapy mind. Therapeutic methods from compatible cognitive-behavioral and systems models, along with developmental psychology with a solution-focused thrust could form the rest of the content of such an initiative. We could prepare many of the courses for online delivery and arrange regional bases for interested instructors to meet for intensive live sessions paralleling our own institute model.

For those individuals not choosing a formal degree, for any reason, we could adopt the practice of almost all professional mental health groups in this country: require ongoing continuing education credit. What makes this requirement palatable is that the obligation applies equally regardless of rank or time-in-grade. The criteria for acceptance of CEUs or applied course work could emerge through open discussion, but the easiest method of determining such criteria could be adopting the standards of a reputable professional organization such as APA or ACA.

Credentialing for New Instructors

We could agree to adopt a minimum baseline for new instructors such as a 30-unit (or equivalent) specialist certificate, similar to the basic criteria for participants in the new Principals Training Program. Beyond a minimal requirement, I believe applying the same guidelines as current instructors face is a reasonable standard. Eventually, once we have put in place a high quality and fully accredited M.A. degree program, all new Basic Week instructors could end up with this entry-level degree in the process of life itself.

Final Word on Credentialing

Defining triangulation, undifferentiated ego mass, and symbiotic relationships may not be a suitable operational definition of readiness to represent the founder and president of the William Glasser Institute. Because two of these three concepts derive from a psychodynamic paradigm, most reality therapists would probably refuse to define these concepts even if they had the factual information. The value that I see in having a wider vision of the psychological turf is in a greater sense of confidence, a fuller perspective on a continually evolving field, and a corresponding credibility for being multi-dimensional while staying true to our educational mission.

No one wants to settle for playing a paraprofessional role in this business of serving as a WGI instructor, especially when the difference between being a paraprofessional and being a real professional is such a thin line. Often, both parties can do the same things, but a professional person can explain why. In the institute, all instructors can explain why. The problem seems to be that not all may be able to explain why not.
Remaining Fully Flexible
The Mentor's Maneuverability

Glasser has remained remarkably steady over a 40-year career to date, yet even he has shifted his thinking on many key areas and enlarged the scope of his understanding and practical application. Most key elements of theory and practice have remained the same, but many other shifts have occurred. We started with steps and evolved to more flexible thinking in two main areas: creating a friendly environment and applying effective therapeutic techniques. Earlier, we made friends as a beginning point. Later, we added, "Ask, What do you want." Still later, we established a positive environment.

Love and worth were the basic needs initially; now we have a list of four psychological or higher order needs and one primitive survival level need. Control theory moved us to a whole new level of understanding and adjustment in thinking to include the notion of systems. Choice theory helps us relax even more because of the more benign language and the comfort that comes from seeing how our leader has made the theory truly pragmatic and closer to reality therapy practices.

Power is an innate drive that may appear to many as always having been there, but this particular genetic code is a relatively recent arrival on the CT/RT scene. Understanding the linkage of what we teach with the new brain research is a current demand that we all must wrestle and resolve.

Behavior controls perception is our credo, yet many other therapies or methodologies have adopted this premise—even earlier. Through all these changes, we adapt and keep our focus. We can do it.
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