

VALIDATION OF BASIC PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA
FOR EVALUATING THE ORGANIZATION AND
ADMINISTRATION OF STUDENT-TEACHING
PROGRAMS

2125 AT
L 311
V 311 M

By

HERBERT S. MADAUS

Bachelor of Science
Southwest Missouri State College
Springfield, Missouri
1939

Master of Science
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1949

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1957

OKLAHOMA
AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL COLLEGE
LIBRARY
AUG 12 1957

VALIDATION OF BASIC PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA
FOR EVALUATING THE ORGANIZATION AND
ADMINISTRATION OF STUDENT-TEACHING
PROGRAMS

Thesis Approved:

James W. Richardson
Thesis Adviser
Andrew Holley
Ida F. Smith

Millard Scherich

Robert Maudsion
Dean of the Graduate School

383114

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author desires to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. James W. Richardson for serving as chairman of the doctoral committee; and, to Dean J. Andrew Holley, Dr. Millard Scherich, and Dr. Ida Townsend Smith for serving as members of the committee.

H.S.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE GENERAL NATURE OF THE PROBLEM	1
Need for the Study	2
Hypotheses	4
Purposes of the Study	4
Basic Assumptions	5
Scope of the Study	6
Sources of Data	6
Definition of Terms	7
Organization of the Study	10
II. BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY	12
Background for the Basic Concern of the Study	12
Procedures Used in Related Studies	15
Summary	17
III. GENERAL PROCEDURE	19
IV. DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHECKLIST	22
Selection of Basic Principles	22
Selection of Descriptive Statements	26
Selection of Jury Nominators and Alternates	27
Revision of the Checklist	36
Summary	42
V. FINDINGS OF FACT	43
Composition of Jury Nominees	43
Jury Response to the Checklist	44
Competence of the Jury Members	46
Tabulation of Responses to the Checklist	48
Statistical Treatment of the Responses	48
Analysis and Interpretation of Jury Responses	52
Summary	87
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	91
Summary	91
Conclusions	92
Weaknesses of the Study	93
Recommendations	93
BIBLIOGRAPHY	95
APPENDIX	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Geographic Location of Persons Asked to Serve as Jury Nominators	28
II. Professional Positions Held by Jury Nominators	35
III. Geographical Classification of Jury Nominees	45
IV. Professional Positions Held by Jury Members	47
V. Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle I and Descriptive Statements	53
VI. Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle II and Descriptive Statements	56
VII. Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle III and Descriptive Statements	60
VIII. Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle IV and Descriptive Statements	62
IX. Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle V and Descriptive Statements	65
X. Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle VI and Descriptive Statements	66
XI. Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle VII and Descriptive Statements	72
XII. Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle VIII and Descriptive Statements	75
XIII. Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle IX and Descriptive Statements	77

XIV.	Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle X and Descriptive Statements	80
XV.	Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle XI and Descriptive Statements	81
XVI.	Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle XII and Descriptive Statements	82
XVII.	Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle XIII and Descriptive Statements	86
XVIII.	Number and Per Cent of Accept Responses and Number and Per Cent of Reject Responses to Basic Principle XIV and Descriptive Statements	88

CHAPTER I

THE GENERAL NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Student teaching, according to Baugher,¹ is not only "the best single type of professional training to integrate theory, subject matter, and practice," but also has long been a vital part of the pre-service education of teachers. Some teacher-education institutions have maintained campus schools, directly supervised by college personnel, as laboratories in which students could have student-teaching experiences. Other teacher-education institutions have sent their students to cooperating public schools for student-teaching experiences under the direction of supervising teachers. The plan that is used should be organized and administered so as to provide the most adequate and effective program for student teaching.

If the physical facilities and personnel which constitute the elements of an organization are provided for the realization of a purpose, but the administrative or management phase of the plan does not function, the purpose obviously cannot be accomplished. Therefore, the elements of organization and administration of student-teaching programs should be evaluated simultaneously because they cannot easily be separated. Moreover, the effectiveness of the organization and admin-

¹Jacob I. Baugher, Organization and Administration of Practice-Teaching in Privately Endowed Colleges of Liberal Arts. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931, p. 3.

istration of the student-teaching program should be evaluated frequently and as accurately as possible so that strong points may be emphasized and weak points strengthened. In order to evaluate a program, clear conceptions must be developed as to the principles that are basic to effective organization and administration, and, criteria must be developed that will determine whether or not the basic principles are present in a student-teaching program. Therefore, this study was concerned with the problem, "What principles basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program can be validated; and, what criteria can be developed and validated that will give evidence of the presence of these basic principles in a student-teaching program?"

Need for the Study

Basic principles to the organization and administration of a student-teaching program, for which the validity has been confirmed, and validated criteria that give evidence of the presence of these principles in a student-teaching program could form the basis for an effective evaluative instrument.

In 1945 the Committee on Standards and Surveys of the American Association of Teachers Colleges appointed a subcommittee to make a study of student teaching in the professional education of teachers. One outcome of this study was a list of nine basic principles underlying a functional program of student teaching.²

In 1953, Blanton, in a study of the student-teaching program for industrial arts at North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, compiled

²John G. Flowers, and others, School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Oneonta, New York, 1948), pp. 16-36.

a list of fourteen principles³ basic to a sound student-teaching program. The fourteen principles included the nine listed in the study mentioned in the preceding paragraph, as well as five from other studies in the field of teacher education. The validity of each principle had been previously established through the use of the jury technique, or by group judgment, or by thorough use of previous research and documented statements made by authorities in the field.⁴ However, since these fourteen principles were taken from different sources, and different methods of validation were used, there was a need for confirmation of their validity. There was also a need to determine whether there might be other basic principles that should be added to the list in order to insure that all important phases of the organization and administration of a student-teaching program were included.

Blanton reported three studies in which basic principles had been developed and validated; but found no reference concerning evaluative criteria for use in making an analysis of the organization, administration and implementation of student teaching.⁵ He stated in the conclusions of his study that the validity of the principles selected and used in his study had been established in other research studies; but, the validity of the criteria formulated in his study was unknown.⁶ Therefore, since

³Earle B. Blanton, "An Analysis of the Organization, Administration, and Implementation of the Student-Teaching Program for Industrial Arts Students at North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, with Evaluative Criteria." (unpub. Ed.D. thesis, Oklahoma A & M College, 1953), Appendix B.

⁴Ibid., p. 104.

⁵Ibid., p. 128.

⁶Ibid., p. 130.

the validity of such criteria had not been previously established, there was a need for criteria to be developed and validated that would give evidence of the presence of each basic principle in a student-teaching program. Furthermore, no list of such criteria was to be found elsewhere in the literature.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested by this study were:

The validity of the principles presented in Blanton's list⁷ as basic to the organization and administration of a sound student-teaching program can be confirmed.

If additional principles basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program can be formulated, their validity, too, can be established.

Criteria can be developed and validated as giving evidence of the presence of a basic principle in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.

Purposes of the Study

The two main purposes of this study were:

To confirm the validity of the basic principles presented by Blanton⁸ and to identify additional principles basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program and validate them.

⁷Ibid., Appendix B.

⁸Ibid.

To develop a list of descriptive statements and validate them as criteria that give evidence that a basic principle is present in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.

Basic Assumptions

The jury technique was assumed to be a valid procedure for identifying a consensus; and, it was further assumed that consensus thus established could be accepted as validation. The jury technique was assumed to be applicable for validating criteria for use in evaluating the organization and administration of student-teaching programs. One principal objection to this technique is that bias of the investigator might be reflected in the selection of the jury. With regard to studies employing survey-appraisal procedures, however, Good, Barr, and Scates has stated, "In these areas one has to choose between loyalty to formalism and the desire to do something of practical worth, even though it is not entirely above criticism."⁹ The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study¹⁰ provided an illustration of the jury technique used satisfactorily on a large scale study.

For this study the assumption was made that descriptive statements which have been validated as giving evidence of the presence of a basic principle in a student-teaching program would be acceptable as criteria.

⁹Carter V. Good, A. S. Barr, and Douglas E. Scates, The Methodology of Educational Research (New York, 1941), p. 410.

¹⁰W. W. Charters and Douglas Waples, The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study (Chicago, 1929), p. 666.

Scope of the Study

As has been previously stated, this study was concerned with confirming the validity of certain principles basic to the organization and administration of student-teaching programs; formulating and validating additional basic principles for the same purpose; and, validating criteria as giving evidence of the presence of certain basic principles of organization and administration in a student-teaching program.

No attempt was made in this study to develop an instrument for use in evaluating the organization and administration of student-teaching programs, nor was the study concerned with the evaluation of any specific student-teaching program.

Sources of Data

The first source of data for this study was an unpublished Doctor of Education thesis, "An Analysis of the Organization, Administration, and Implementation of the Student-Teaching Program for Industrial Arts Students at North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, with Evaluative Criteria," by Earle B. Blanton. This thesis was found in the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College Library, Stillwater, Oklahoma. This thesis furnished the original list of basic principles of the organization and administration of student-teaching programs. The criteria presented in Blanton's study had not been validated. They, however, provided the basis for many of the descriptive statements presented in the present study.

Educational literature and additional research studies with regard to organization and administration of student-teaching programs provided

other sources of data for this study. This material suggested additional descriptive statements and additional principles that might be validated as basic to the organization and administration of such programs.

The final source of data for this study was information obtained from responses of two groups of people, one of thirty-seven persons and the other eighty-six, to a checklist.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they were used throughout this study.

Organization and Administration, as used in this study, are two phases of the process of effectively accomplishing a purpose. The organizational phase is chiefly concerned with making arrangements that permit the beginning of purpose realization. When effective organization has been done, each need involved in the accomplishment of purpose is met in proportion to all other needs. In addition, a plan of operation must be contemplated that can result in the effective, continuous achievement of the purpose whose accomplishment is sought. The organization is the formal structure or framework of authority that is established, arranged, defined, and coordinated for the accomplishment of the defined objectives. The administrative phase of the process is concerned with the conduct, operation, and management of the enterprise as organized so that the purposes continue to be effectively achieved. Good organization supplies the possibilities for achieving the desired results. Good administration is required to ensure continuous realization of the possibilities of good organization.¹¹

¹¹Will French, J. Dan Hull, and B. L. Dodds, American High School Administration (New York, 1951), p. 15.

College Supervisor has been defined as an individual employed by a teacher-education institution to work cooperatively with supervising teachers and/or cooperating teachers to assist the student teacher in deriving the greatest possible values from the student-teaching experiences.¹²

Criterion was defined as a standard, norm, or judgment selected as a basis for quantitative and qualitative comparison.¹³

Evaluation has been defined by Tyler as, "the process by which we find out how far the objectives of the school program are being realized."¹⁴ Evaluation was used in this study to mean a fair and valid appraisal of a student-teaching program in terms of the objectives which the program is expected to attain.

Laboratory School has been defined as any school, public or private, which a teacher-education institution utilizes as a resource for professional laboratory experiences. There are two main types of laboratory schools. The first is the college-controlled school, largely or entirely under the control of the college, located on or near the college campus and organized for the specific purpose of preparing teachers, with staff and facilities designed to serve this purpose. This definition includes schools sometimes entitled "campus school," "demonstration school," "model school," or "training school." The second type of laboratory school is the cooperating school. This is a school used by the college

¹²Alex F. Perrodin and others, Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education. Thirty-fourth Yearbook of the Association For Student Teaching. (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1955), p. xii.

¹³Good, Barr, and Scates, p. 110.

¹⁴Ralph W. Tyler, "Evaluation as a Function of Supervisors." Elementary School Journal, XLIV (January, 1944), pp. 264-273.

to provide certain guided professional laboratory experiences for college students. This school is not administered, staffed, or under the major legal jurisdiction of the college. This definition includes schools sometimes designated as "off-campus schools."¹⁵

Principle has been defined as the first proposition of an argument, upon which other propositions depend for their validity; now used to signify a generalized statement through which otherwise unrelated data are systematized and interpreted.¹⁶ Principle was used in this study to mean an element of the organization and administration of a student-teaching program that is essential for effectiveness.

Student Teaching has been defined as observation, participation, and actual teaching done by a student preparing for teaching under the direction of a supervising teacher or general supervisor; part of the pre-service program offered by a teacher-education institution. Other terms sometimes used synonymously are practice teaching, directed teaching, and supervised student teaching.¹⁷

Supervising Teacher has been defined as a regular teacher in a laboratory school, as defined, in whose classes college students observe, participate, or do student teaching. This definition includes those teachers sometimes titled "laboratory teachers," "critic teachers," "demonstration school teachers," or "training teachers." Cooperating Teacher has been defined as a regular teacher in a cooperating school, as defined, in whose classes college students observe, participate, or

¹⁵Perrodin and others, pp. xi-xii.

¹⁶Good, Barr, and Scates, p. 308.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 392.

do student teaching. This definition includes teachers sometimes titled "master teachers," or "critic teachers."¹⁸ Supervising Teacher as used in this study, included both the definition given for Supervising Teacher and the definition given for Cooperating Teacher.

Validity was used in this study as defined by Garrett in the following statement, "The validity of a test, or of any measuring instrument, depends upon the fidelity with which it measures whatever it purports to measure."¹⁹

Organization of the Study

The general nature and description of the problem with which this study was concerned are presented in Chapter I.

Reference to other research studies that were related to the present study is made in Chapter II. The contributions made by the related studies to the present study are also mentioned.

Chapter III is devoted to an explanation of the procedure followed in conducting the study.

An explanation of the selection of the basic principles and descriptive statements, a description of the method of selection of the jury nominators and alternate jury nominators, and a report of the responses from the jury nominators and revision of the checklist are given in Chapter IV.

Chapter V includes the statistical treatment applied to the data and a report of the analysis and interpretation of the findings.

¹⁸Perrodin and others, p. xii.

¹⁹Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York, 1953), p. 344.

A brief summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations for further study are presented in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

Three studies were found that furnished background for the basic concern of the present study with the development and validation of criteria and for the confirmation of the validity of certain principles basic to organization and administration of student-teaching programs. Certain studies also established precedents for the procedure followed in conducting this study.

Background for the Basic Concern of the Study

For twenty-five years prior to 1945, the standards governing student teaching had not been revised. In 1945 the Committee on Standards and Surveys of the American Association of Teachers Colleges appointed a subcommittee to make such a study.¹ This subcommittee first agreed to develop all phases of the study with reference to a set of basic principles or "guide lines" and to be concerned with the implementation of principles rather than specific techniques or patterns alone, recognizing that a variety of patterns appropriate to different institutions might be used in arriving at the same goals. Second, the subcommittee decided to undertake the development of two types of related material. One was a brochure which would set forth basic principles underlying a functional program of student teaching. The other was a series of schedules which

¹Flowers, et al., p. 5.

was an elaboration of the statement of Standard IV and was designed to serve as an aid in the interpretation of the briefer form used in the standard. These schedules indicated ways in which different colleges were developing aspects of the student-teaching program and their practices were described to show the principles in action. To evaluate a student-teaching program with reference to a set of basic principles rather than specific techniques or patterns alone, criteria are necessary to give evidence of the presence of the basic principles in the program. The present study was conducted to develop and validate such criteria.

A study by Blanton in 1953 at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College was concerned with analyzing the organization, administration, and implementation of the student-teaching program for industrial arts students at North Texas State College, Denton, Texas. For his analysis to be effective, he made the assumption that sound principles of student teaching and criteria must be developed to guide the study and to analyze these aspects of the industrial arts teacher-education program. The study was confined to the organization and administration of the student-teaching program at one school. Blanton developed a list of principles² basic to sound student-teaching programs from the available professional literature, including the Flowers study reported in the preceding paragraph and others. These principles had been validated through the use of the jury technique, or by group judgment, or by thorough use of previous research and documented statements made by authorities in the field.³ Blanton also developed a list of descriptive statements,

²Blanton, Appendix B.

³Ibid., p. 104.

referred to in his study as criteria, to accompany each basic principle. These descriptive statements were considered adequate to serve as a guide for making an analysis of the student-teaching program in industrial arts at North Texas State College. He recommended, however, that these statements should be validated for use in an instrument to be generally acceptable for evaluating the organization and administration of student-teaching programs.

The problem for the present study grew out of Blanton's recommendation. In addition to developing and validating criteria to give evidence of the presence of these principles in a student-teaching program, this study sought to confirm the validity of the basic principles and to determine whether there might be other basic principles that could be validated and added to the list.

In 1931, Baugher⁴ completed a study to ascertain the practices of liberal arts colleges with regard to organization and administration of practice teaching, to compare his findings with practices in teachers colleges, and to make the best possible proposals for the improvement of practice teaching in privately endowed colleges of liberal arts. Baugher said that teachers colleges have come to recognize the features advantageous to secondary school teachers in a liberal arts curriculum and are adopting many of them. He recommended that liberal arts colleges should also recognize that there are certain features of the normal school curriculum in general and of practice teaching in particular that are considered essential in a scientific program of teacher training.⁵

⁴Jacob I. Baugher, Organization and Administration of Practice-Teaching in Privately Endowed Colleges of Liberal Arts (Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931.

⁵Ibid., p. 98.

Although the Baugher study was concerned primarily with practice teaching in liberal arts colleges, this writer believes that principles that are basic to the organization and administration of student-teaching programs in liberal arts colleges would apply also to student-teaching programs in other types of teacher-education institutions.

Procedures Used in Related Studies

That consensus established by jury can be accepted as validation was an assumption basic to the present study. The best use of the jury technique for establishing a consensus occasioned a survey of studies related to the procedure to be used in the one currently being made.

The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study⁶ was undertaken to develop a list of certain types of teachers' activities that might be useful to teacher-training institutions in the selection of material for professional courses. Rough and tentative standards can be drawn up with little trouble, but the Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study revealed that if standards are to be precise, they must be based on continuous and searching study of the educational process they are designed to regulate. Although the Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study was made for purposes different from the present study, the study provided an illustration of an investigation in which a large number of people cooperated. This approach consisted of asking experts to secure the facts and principles from underlying and related fields that were believed pertinent to the problem under investigation. This study represented, at the time of its publication, an extensive application of this approach to the problems

⁶W. W. Charters and Douglas Waples, The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study (Chicago, 1929).

of professional education. Establishing standards by enlisting the help of competent persons, the procedure used in the Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study, suggested the procedure followed in the present study.

Thomas⁷ conducted a study in 1951 to develop a criterion for the measurement of shorthand transcription production. Thomas stated, "That the jury technique of research was the most practical, if not the only, technique to use in selecting the elements which were to constitute the criterion."⁸ He indicated some of the problems involved in the use of the jury technique. One problem was that the jury must be selected in such a way as to eliminate any bias that might exist on the part of the investigator. Another problem was that the jury members must be qualified experts in the area in which the investigation was being undertaken. This writer believes that bias of the investigator would not be reflected in the persons selected as jurors if the jurymen were selected by other persons interested in student teaching. Selection of the jury nominators by a method of random sampling would further serve to eliminate bias of the investigator. The method of having jury members nominated by persons interested in and working in the field of student teaching also seemed to be the best method of selecting competent jurors.

Shepherd⁹ used the jury technique to obtain consensus of persons qualified to pass judgment on problems of in-service education. Some of

⁷Archie Carithers Thomas, "The Development of a Criterion for the Measurement of Shorthand Transcription Production" (unpub. Ed. D. dissertation, Oklahoma A & M College, 1951).

⁸Ibid., p. 12.

⁹Byron L. Shepherd, "Development of Criteria For Evaluating The Effectiveness of In-Service Education Groups" (unpub. Ed. D. dissertation, Oklahoma A & M College, 1954).

the difficulties in using the jury technique were pointed out by Shepherd. One difficulty was developing statements that communicated the intended idea to a large number of jurors. Another was developing tentative statements that lent themselves to being judged as "accept" or "reject." Shepherd felt that the selection of a competent jury presented several problems. He, as well as Thomas, used the technique of having the jury of experts nominated by persons other than himself. Shepherd constructed the instrument to be used in his study and then submitted it to several qualified persons for criticisms and suggestions. He also had a graduate class in education respond to the instrument. This procedure was used in order to have clearly worded and understandable statements for submission to the jury of experts.

Summary

The review of related studies, as discussed in this chapter, pointed out that basic principles and criteria for evaluating the organization and administration of student-teaching programs should be universally applicable to all student-teaching programs. Related studies pointed out that evaluation should be made on the basis of presence of basic principles in a sound program of student teaching rather than the employment of any specific techniques or patterns of student teaching. Different institutions might employ different patterns of student teaching and still be effective.

The basic principles given in Flower's study provided much of the basis for the list of basic principles presented in the Blanton study. The Blanton study in turn made a major contribution to the list of basic principles presented in the present study. The Flower's study, as well

as the Blanton study, suggested many of the descriptive statements presented in the present study.

Blanton indicated that the basic principles presented in his study had been validated by documentation. In planning the present study, it seemed advisable to confirm the validity of the basic principles and to determine whether there might be other basic principles that might be validated and added to the list. Also, a need was shown for developing and validating criteria to give evidence of the presence of the basic principles in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.

The practicable method for conducting this study seemed to be the jury technique. Precedents had been established for this procedure by studies made by Charters and Waples, Thomas, and Shepherd. These studies suggested ways of selecting competent jurors and pointed out some of the difficulties in constructing an instrument for submission to a jury. The suggestion, or warning, as to the difficulty of communicating the intended idea to the jury for an "accept" or "reject" response was helpful in the construction of the descriptive statements for the present study.

CHAPTER III

GENERAL PROCEDURE

The general problem with which this study was concerned was one of validating principles as basic to the organization and administration of a student-teaching program and validating criteria that give evidence of the presence of a basic principle in a student-teaching program. In general, the procedure used in the study involved the formulation of statements of principle basic to the organization and administration of a student-teaching program, and then associating with each principle such statements as were believed to give evidence of the presence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program. Consensus of a jury of experts in student teaching was depended upon for establishing the validity of the statements of principle and of the validity of the descriptive statements as criteria. The specific steps in the procedure follow.

A checklist of fourteen statements of principle with their associated descriptive statements was formulated. Blanton's study¹ was the source of most of the statements of principle, which were reworded and rearranged. The same study also contributed many of the descriptive statements. Additional descriptive statements were formulated by the investigator from various sources, including professional literature. Each principle and descriptive statement was expressed in such a way that a respondent

¹Blanton, Appendix B.

could indicate his acceptance or rejection of it by placing a check in spaces provided.

The check list and a cover letter were sent to each of a group of forty persons, referred to in the study as jury nominators, who were selected to pass judgment upon the various items included in the checklist and to add any which they believed should be included. Each jury nominator was also asked to nominate three people whom he believed to be competent to pass judgment upon the items in the checklist in its revised form. The jury nominators were selected at random from the 1955 roster of the Association For Student Teaching, five from each of eight geographic divisions of the United States. In the event a jury nominator could not or would not participate, an alternate was selected at random from the same roster. Where the responses of the jury nominators indicated the need, items in the checklist were deleted, added, or restated.

The revised checklist was then sent, with an appropriate letter of transmittal, to persons designated by the jury nominators as qualified to pass final judgment upon the various aspects of the organization and administration of student-teaching programs as represented in the final draft of the checklist.

The number of respondents who rejected or accepted each principle and its associated descriptive statements was tallied, and the difference between the reject and accept responses determined. The differences were treated statistically by Chi-square to ascertain the significance of each. Whenever a difference favored acceptance of a principle to no more than the .05 level of confidence, that difference was accepted as evidence of consensus among the respondents that the principle is basic

to the organization and administration of a student-teaching program. Likewise, differences which favored the descriptive statements associated with the principle to the same level of confidence were accepted as evidence of consensus that the statement gave evidence of the presence of the principle, with which it was associated, in a student-teaching program. In this way, descriptive statements were validated as criteria. The checklist was finally revised to include only the validated basic principles with descriptive statements as criteria.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHECKLIST

Three of the more important aspects of the general procedure followed in developing the checklist are described in detail in this chapter. First, the selection of the basic principles and descriptive statements is described. Then the selection of the group of jury nominators and alternate jury nominators is explained. The last part of this chapter is concerned with the refinement of the instrument based on the responses from the jury nominators to the checklist.

Selection of Basic Principles

The basic principles and descriptive statements found in the Blanton study¹ were accepted for use in the present study. These principles and descriptive statements were revised, and in some instances combined, for use in the checklist. The basic principles and descriptive statements taken from the Blanton study provided much of the basis for the basic principles and descriptive statements for the present study, with the exception of Basic Principle XIV, and may be found in the appendix of this study as Appendix A. The formulation of Basic Principle VI of the present study warrants special explanation at this point. Since Principles VI and IX of Blanton's list were both concerned with provision for continuous and correlated sequence of experiences

¹Blanton, Appendix B.

prior to and during the student-teaching experiences, both were combined, along with the follow up, or post student teaching phase, into Principle VI, "The organization and administration of the teacher-education program should provide a continuous and correlated sequence of experiences leading to and following the student-teaching experience." Moreover, there is ample justification for considering the experiences that follow the actual student-teaching experience to be a part of the student-teaching program. In this regard Spencer and Dolio said,

One area in many teacher-education programs where experimental study seems appropriate and necessary is that of post student-teaching laboratory experiences. This is particularly true in those institutions where the basic student-teaching period is relatively short, and where scheduling difficulties tend to limit the extent to which student-teaching plans can be adapted to variations in the needs of individual students.²

Concerning the follow-up phase of a teacher-education program, Booker made the following statement:

There are three essential aspects of a follow-up plan in teacher education.

- a. Campus in-service conferences and/or seminars.
- b. "On-the-job," in the classroom consultative assistance provided by representatives of the college's Department of Education.
- c. Counseling and guidance services handled by correspondence from the office of the Director of Teacher Education.³

Flowers stated that there were two factors of significance with regard to professional laboratory experiences following the student-teaching period. These two factors were:

Student-teaching contacts are so placed in the professional sequence that:

²William C. Spencer and Ardwin J. Dolio, "Post Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences." The Journal of Teacher Education, V (1954) 237-239.

³Ted W. Booker, "Follow-Up Services at Valdosta State College." The Journal of Teacher Education, V (1954), 235-236.

1. There is opportunity for contact with teaching-learning situations following student teaching to meet special weaknesses.
2. There is opportunity for contact with teaching-learning situations following student teaching to further special interests or abilities.⁴

Need seemed to be evidenced that some provision should be made for selection of students to enter the teacher-education program and continued study should be made to determine whether a person should be retained in such a program. In no place in Blanton's study was provision made for selection of students. Accordingly, Basic Principle XIV, "Provision should be made for the selective admission of students to the student-teaching program," was developed and added to the list of basic principles adapted from Blanton's list.

There seemed to be justification for the inclusion of Principle XIV. Ohlsen and Shultz⁵ pointed out that teacher-education institutions should use the research findings which are now available to them in developing screening procedures. "Before a student is ever admitted to a teacher-education program, appropriate personal data and test scores should be secured with reference to his attitude toward others and life in general, scholarship, mental ability, personal ambitions, and emotional adjustment. After he has been admitted to a teacher-education program, the staff should continue to study these factors as the candidate works with children and adults. In other words, selective retention should also be practiced.

In a description of principles and procedures of selection concerning the program in teacher education of the College of Education at the

⁴Flowers, et al., p. 189.

⁵Merle M. Ohlsen and Raymond E. Schultz, "A Study of Variables for Use in Selection." The Journal of Teacher Education, V (1954), 279-282.

University of Minnesota, the Yearbook of the Association For Student Teaching held that continuous selection and counseling in teacher education should allow for active participation and cooperation of the student who is primarily affected. The process should help each student attain a better self-understanding of his fitness for teaching. Such a program is a cooperative process involving the administration, the faculty, the counselors, and the students themselves. In the final analysis, job selection for teacher-education is a matter of considerable interest not only to the institution and the profession, but also to the individual student. The same reference described the nine-point program of selection and counseling as applied in the College of Education, University of Minnesota, and it included the following practices:

1. Selective admission.
2. Orientation-registration program.
3. Continuous individual appraisal and cumulative records.
4. Health and physical examination.
5. Speech tests.
6. Counseling and selective retention.
7. Case study conferences.
8. Periodic re-evaluation.
9. Placement and follow-up.⁶

Blyler,⁷ in a study of the selection of students for admission to the teacher-education program, found the most often used bases for admission to a teacher-education program were:

<u>Basis for Admission</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>
a. High school scholarship	61
b. Personal interview	70

⁶Paul R. Grim, et al., The Evaluation of Student Teaching. Twenty-Eighth Yearbook of the Association For Student Teaching (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1949), p. 33.

⁷Dorothea Blyler, "The Pre-training Selection of Teachers." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXIV (May, 1948), pp. 275-284.

c. Personality	70
d. Appearance	60
e. Cumulative records	52
f. College scholarship	72
g. Tests	
1. Intelligence	74
2. Scholastic aptitude	38
3. Personality tests or scales	18
4. English usage	39
5. Contemporary affairs	15
6. Speech	31
7. Health	88
8. General culture	0
9. Subject matter in chosen field	16
10. Reading	0
11. Interest inventories	0
12. Vocational interest	0
13. Entrance examinations	0
14. General achievement	25
h. Professional attitudes	32
i. English usage evidenced by other means than tests	17
j. Teaching aptitude tests	5

In all, fourteen principles were selected and stated in Appendix C to this study.

Selection of Descriptive Statements

The criteria presented by Blanton provided the basis for many of the descriptive statements presented in this study. Other descriptive statements were obtained from the professional literature. The claim was not made that the descriptive statements presented in this study was an all-inclusive list, or that they covered every aspect of each basic principle. Effort was made, however, to devise a list of descriptive statements that would be reasonably representative of the different aspects of each basic principle.

The following points were kept in mind during the development of the descriptive statements. In rewording and rearranging Blanton's statements, and in adding other descriptive statements, effort was made to:

1. Avoid repetition of the basic principle in the descriptive statements.
2. Have positive statements that could be easily understood and could be checked ACCEPT or REJECT.
3. Avoid having statements that were ambiguous.
4. Use terms that were acceptable to the profession and used in the professional literature.
5. Have statements that did not suggest an answer.
6. Have descriptive statements that would provide a representative coverage of each basic principle.

The beginning list of basic principles and descriptive statements, which included those adapted from the Blanton study, may be found in Appendix C.

Selection of Jury Nominators and Alternates

One important aspect of the development of the checklist was the critical review given it by the jury nominators, who also performed the second task of nominating qualified persons to pass final judgment upon the validity of the items in the revised checklist. The 1955 roster of the Association For Student Teaching was selected as an obvious source of qualified jury nominators, who were chosen at random from the membership of 1,953 persons. In order to make the sampling from members in the Association For Student Teaching geographically representative of the entire United States and the foreign countries, the members were divided into eight groups and five members were selected from each group. The geographical representativeness of the sample is indicated in Table I, page 28. Examination of Table I shows that persons from twenty-nine different states were asked to serve as jury nominators.

TABLE I

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF PERSONS ASKED TO SERVE AS JURY NOMINATORS

State	Number	State	Number
<u>New England</u>		<u>East North Central</u>	
New Hampshire	1	Ohio	1
Massachusetts	2	Michigan	2
Connecticut	2	Illinois	1
		Wisconsin	1
<u>Middle Atlantic</u>		<u>West North Central</u>	
New York	1	Iowa	1
Pennsylvania	3	Missouri	1
District of Columbia	1	North Dakota	1
		Kansas	2
<u>South Atlantic</u>		<u>Mountain Southwest and Foreign</u>	
North Carolina	2	Puerto Rico	1
Georgia	2	British Columbia	1
Florida	1	Wyoming	1
		New Mexico	1
		Montana	1
<u>South Central</u>		<u>Pacific</u>	
Kentucky	1	Oregon	1
Tennessee	1	California	3
Louisiana	2	Nevada	1
Texas	1		

Three persons were selected from two states, two from seven states, and one person from each of the remaining twenty states.

The forty persons who were asked to serve as jury nominators are listed in Appendix D to this study. Persons indicated by numbers one through five in Appendix D were selected from the first, or New England, group. Persons indicated by numbers six through ten were selected from the second, or Middle Atlantic, group. This procedure was carried out for each of the eight groups. All of the states included in each of the eight groups are indicated, with the number from each state who were members of the Association For Student Teaching.

<u>New England</u>	<u>Members</u>
Maine	4
New Hampshire	16
Vermont	3
Massachusetts	31
Rhode Island	4
Connecticut	24
Total	<u>82</u>

From the total of 82, every 16th person was identified. Maine had four members and New Hampshire had 16 members. Thus, the first person to be asked to serve as a jury nominator was the 12th member listed from New Hampshire. The third state, Vermont, had a total of three members. The ninth member listed from Massachusetts determined the 32nd member, who was selected as the second prospective jury nominator. The same procedure was followed for selection of the third, fourth, and fifth prospective jury nominators.

<u>Middle Atlantic</u>	<u>Members</u>
New York	62
New Jersey	4
Pennsylvania	114
Delaware	2
Maryland	9
District of Columbia	9
Total	<u>200</u>

Selection of every 40th person resulted in the selection of five members of the Association For Student Teaching from the 200 members from the Middle Atlantic group of states. The District of Columbia was included.

<u>South Atlantic</u>	<u>Members</u>
Virginia	6
West Virginia	43
North Carolina	77
South Carolina	6
Georgia	99
Florida	21
Total	<u>252</u>

The South Atlantic group had a total of 252 members. To select five of this number, it was necessary to identify every 50th member.

<u>South Central</u>	<u>Members</u>
Kentucky	85
Tennessee	67
Alabama	6
Mississippi	2
Louisiana	123
Texas	53
Total	<u>336</u>

Since the South Central group of states listed a total of 336 members, prospective jury nominators 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 were selected by identifying every 67th member of the group.

<u>East North Central</u>	<u>Members</u>
Ohio	95
Indiana	75
Michigan	116
Illinois	128
Wisconsin	40
Total	<u>454</u>

The East North Central group of states listed a total of 454 members. By identifying every 90th member, the names of the five prospective jury nominators from this region were obtained.

<u>West North Central</u>	<u>Members</u>
Minnesota	75
Iowa	75
Missouri	13
Arkansas	40
North Dakota	33
South Dakota	20
Nebraska	5
Oklahoma	16
Kansas	105
Total	<u>382</u>

The group of states in the West North Central group listed 382 members of the Association For Student Teaching. In order to obtain the five members from this group, every 76th person was identified.

<u>Mountain Southwest and Foreign</u>	<u>Members</u>
Puerto Rico	25
Canada	2
Foreign	5
Wyoming	8
Colorado	5
Utah	2
Arizona	3
New Mexico	11
Montana	8
Total	<u>69</u>

Association members from the Phillipine Islands, Hawaii, Turkey, Eastern Caroline Islands, Puerto Rico, and Canada were included with the states of the Mountain Southwest group because of the small number of members listed from those states. Every 13th member of the total of 69 members was selected.

<u>Pacific States</u>	<u>Members</u>
Washington	27
Oregon	42
California	105
Nevada	1
Idaho	3
Total	<u>178</u>

Nevada and Idaho were included in the Pacific States group because of their nearness geographically and because of the small number of members listed. Selection of every 35th member of the total of 178 supplied the names of the last five prospective jury nominators.

An alternate was chosen for each person who was asked to serve as a jury nominator by the method of random sampling described below. In case the latter did not respond to the instrument, a postal card was sent as a reminder asking him to return the completed checklist. In the event that he could not or would not reply to the follow-up postal card, the checklist was then mailed to his alternate.

<u>New England</u>	<u>Members</u>
Maine	4
New Hampshire	16
Vermont	3
Massachusetts	31
Rhode Island	4
Connecticut	24
Total	<u>82</u>

There were 82 members in the New England group, and in order to select five persons, it was necessary to identify every 16th person. Since the prospective jury nominators were selected from the New England group by identifying the 16th, 32nd, 48th, 64th, and 80th members, their alternates were selected by designating the 1st, 17th, 33rd, 49th, and 65th members of the group. This method prevented duplication, or the selection of a person as his own alternate.

Alternates were selected from each of the other seven groups by the same method as used with the New England group. The list of forty alternates for persons asked to serve as jury nominators appear as Appendix E to the study.

A copy of the list of basic principles and descriptive statements, with a letter of transmittal, was sent to each of the forty persons asked to serve as jury nominators. A copy of this letter appears as Appendix B to the study. This letter asked the forty persons to respond to the instrument in accordance with the instructions preceding the list of basic principles and descriptive statements. This writer believed that responses from this group would be of help in pointing out any needed changes in the wording of the statements for clarity as well as suggesting additional principles or descriptive statements that should be included in the list.

At the end of the checklist space was provided for the persons asked to serve as jury nominators to write the names and addresses of the three persons they considered to be best qualified to pass final judgment on problems relating to the organization and administration of student-teaching programs. The persons nominated were to constitute a group of qualified persons to be asked to pass final judgment upon the

contents of the final draft of the checklist. This procedure was designed to avoid influence of the bias of the investigator in the selection of the jury.

Seventeen, or 42.5 per cent, of the jury nominators responded to the initial mailing of the checklist. After three weeks, follow-up letters were sent to the remaining twenty-three. The follow-up resulted in responses from nine additional persons. Twenty-six, or 70 per cent, of the forty persons responded to the checklist.

When it became apparent that the remaining fourteen could not or would not participate in the study as jury nominators, checklists were mailed to their alternates. This procedure resulted in nine additional responses. After the checklists were mailed to the alternates, two additional responses were received from the original group. These responses were included in the study for the additional help they might give in refining the instrument as well as the additional persons that they nominated as members of the final jury. Thus, a total of 37 jury nominators responded to the checklist and nominated persons to serve on the final jury.

The level of competence of the jury nominators may be determined by examination of Table II, page 35, which indicates the professional positions held. Five different positions were held by persons in the jury nominator group. Since each position represented was directly related to student teaching, the competence for serving as jury nominators appeared to be reasonably satisfactory. The three jury nominators for whom the position held was unknown were members of the Association For Student Teaching and two of the three were college teachers.

TABLE II
PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS HELD BY JURY NOMINATORS

Position	Number
Professor of Education	15
Supervising Teacher	10
Head of Department of Education	4
Director of Student Teaching or Teacher Education	3
Director of Laboratory School	2
Unknown	3
Total	<u>37</u>

After the persons nominated as final jury members were listed and duplications removed, there were ninety-four persons nominated as qualified to serve on the final jury for this study. These persons are listed in Appendix H to the study.

Revision of the Checklist

The jury nominators were requested to respond to the checklist in order to provide help in developing an instrument that would be free from ambiguities; in eliminating items that were irrelevant; and in adding items where necessary to provide a more adequate description of the presence of a principle in a student-teaching program. Statistical treatment of the responses from the jury nominators was not considered necessary.

The first basic principle, "The general framework of the organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be determined by objectives," was acceptable to all jury nominators, as were most of the descriptive statements. Four persons objected to the statement, "The objectives are clearly stated in writing." They believed that the general framework of the program should be determined by objectives, but did not consider it necessary to have the objectives in writing. Since the number objecting to this item was small, it was not changed. Six persons rejected the descriptive statement which read, "Provision is made for approval of objectives as stated." Three others did not respond to this item. Since this statement apparently furnished no additional evidence of the presence of the principle, it was removed from the list. Suggestions from jury nominators resulted in the wording of the second descriptive statement, "Formulation of the objectives is the result of

the cooperative effort of all personnel, including students, working with the program," to be changed to, "Formulation of the objectives is the result of the cooperative effort of all personnel working with the program.

The second basic principle, "The organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be flexible," was accepted by all jury nominators. The seventh descriptive statement, "The scheduling of college classes other than student teaching permits the student to do student teaching for a half day or a full day at a time, according to the needs of the student," was changed in order to provide for a choice of responses by jury nominators. This item, therefore, was changed to read:

7. The scheduling of college classes other than student teaching permits the student to do student teaching, determined by his needs, for a
 - a. Half day at a time.
 - b. Full day at a time.

Two descriptive statements, the eighth and ninth, were suggested by respondents for addition to the list for Basic Principle II. These were:

8. Provision is made for laboratory school staff members to study the college courses to determine their adequacy for meeting the individual needs of students.
9. Time is provided in staff load to permit adequate supervision of student teachers by college supervisors.

Basic Principle III was accepted by all jury nominators. A fourth response choice, "Of different age and grade levels," was added to both the first and second descriptive statements for this principle, which was concerned with providing student teachers with contacts with children and youth of different types and under different circumstances.

The fourth basic principle was concerned with provision of opportunities for the student teacher to participate in both in-school and out-of-school activities and was generally acceptable to all but one of the jury nominators. However, marginal notes and deletions made it advisable to change the wording of this principle. Some jury nominators felt that it was desirable for the student teacher to attend some faculty meetings and participate in some conferences with parents, but attendance at all such meetings should not be necessary to provide evidence of the presence of the basic principle. Therefore, Basic Principle IV was revised as follows:

The student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to participate in important phases of a teacher's in-school and out-of-school activities of the school.

The fifth basic principle, "The student-teaching experiences should be cooperatively planned and developed by the student teacher and his advisers," was accepted in general by all jury nominators, but some thought that the word "supervisor" should be included so this change was made in the statement of the principle. No changes were made in the descriptive statements.

Basic Principle VI was concerned with provision for a continuous and correlated sequence of experiences leading to and following the student-teaching experience, and was accepted by the jury nominators as stated. Responses from the jury nominators pointed out that there were two choices included in each of three descriptive statements, each of which might provide evidence of the presence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program. Accordingly, the third, fourth, and eighth descriptive statements were reworded and presented so that a respondent could accept one choice and reject the other if he so desired.

The revised statements were as follows:

3. The courses which are concerned with supervised observation
 - a. Precede the student-teaching assignment.
 - b. Are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment.
4. The courses concerned with the methods and techniques
 - a. Precede the student-teaching assignment.
 - b. Are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment.
8. Time and money are provided for the college supervisor, or some other qualified person, to study the student-teacher graduates after placement to evaluate their
 - a. Fitness for their positions.
 - b. Adjustment to their positions.

The seventh basic principle, "Adequate physical facilities and personnel should be provided for conducting an effective student-teaching program," was generally acceptable to the jury nominators. The third and the seventh descriptive statements were added as a result of suggestions by jury nominators. These statements were:

3. Schools with inadequate equipment and facilities are used as laboratory schools in order that student teachers have opportunity to learn how to overcome such handicaps.
7. Schools other than a college campus school are used so as to insure student-teacher contact and work with typical rather than atypical groups of children.

Basic Principle VIII, "The staff members of the teacher-education institution and of the laboratory schools who are concerned with the student-teaching program should have adequate preparation for all of the major phases of student teaching," was accepted by all of the jury nominators. There was some difference of opinion, however, with regard to the third and fourth descriptive statements, so they were revised. Originally, they appeared as:

3. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers in the laboratory schools have had successful teaching experience in

- a. College teaching.
 - b. Public school teaching.
 - c. Privately supported schools below college level.
4. The college staff members who work with student teachers have had successful teaching experience in
- a. College teaching.
 - b. Public school teaching.
 - c. Privately supported schools below college level.

They were revised as follows:

3. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers in the laboratory schools have had successful teaching experience in the area in which they are supervising.
4. The college staff members who work with student teachers have had successful teaching experience in
- a. College teaching.
 - b. Public school teaching.

The descriptive statement, "Supervising teachers in the laboratory schools have had special training in supervision," was suggested by jury nominators and added to the list as number seven.

Basic Principle IX was concerned with the necessity of a clearly stated agreement between the teacher-education institution and each school used as a laboratory school. This principle and the associated descriptive statements were so widely accepted that it was not considered necessary to make revisions.

Basic Principle X, "The work done in connection with the student-teaching program in the teacher-education institution and in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories should be considered as a part of, rather than in addition to, the regular teaching load of all personnel," was accepted by all jury nominators. The descriptive statements also met with general acceptance. No revisions, therefore, were considered necessary.

Basic Principle XI was concerned with the evaluation of the student-teaching experience, and was accepted with its descriptive statements.

Two sub-parts, "His growth in professional habits" and "His development of a professional attitude," were added to the first descriptive statement as a result of suggestions by the jury nominators. The revised form of the first descriptive statement was:

1. The individual growth of the student teacher is evaluated in terms of
 - a. His acquisition of essential knowledge for effective teaching.
 - b. His development of abilities and skills essential for effective teaching.
 - c. His growth in professional habits.
 - d. His development of a professional attitude.

Basic Principle XII was concerned with compensation for teachers who serve as supervising teachers and was rejected entirely by four of the jury nominator group. The first sub-part of the first descriptive statement indicated compensation by a reduced teaching load; the second, compensation in terms of a stipulated amount of money; and the third, compensation by means of both a reduced teaching load and a stipulated amount of money. All three parts of this statement were rejected by approximately one-third of the jury nominators and accepted by approximately two-thirds. Although the per cent of rejections was regarded as rather high, the decision was made to leave the statements as they were in order to ascertain the reactions of the final jury group. Although the second descriptive statement, which indicated compensation of the supervising teachers by other means--such as recognition in college catalogs--was rejected by six of the group, it was not changed before the submission of the checklist to the final jury.

Basic Principle XIII was concerned with provision for evaluation of the student-teaching program for the purpose of strengthening and improving it. This principle and all the accompanying descriptive statements were accepted by almost all the jury nominators and therefore were not changed.

Basic Principle XIV, "Provision should be made for the selective admission of students to the student-teaching program," was accepted by all of the jury nominator group. Listed as descriptive statements were different factors that could be used in making the selections. One of the factors, which was concerned with the use of the high school scholarship record as a factor to consider in selection of the students for admission to the student-teaching program, was rejected by ten persons. The item concerning interviews with advisors was unanimously accepted. The other items were rejected by from one to six jury nominators, but all were retained in the checklist for submission to the final jury. There were three additional items suggested by some of the jury nominators, which were added to the list. These were:

- m. Language usage test.
- n. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.
- o. Completion of pre-requisite courses.

Summary

The preliminary aspects of the procedure followed in the study were described in this chapter. These were: selecting the basic principles and descriptive statements which comprised the original checklist; securing the aid of jury nominators, whose responses contributed to the revision of the original draft of the checklist and who nominated qualified persons to serve as members of the final jury; and the revision of the original draft of the checklist into final form. The final evaluation of the basic principles and descriptive statements follow in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS OF FACT

The findings of fact from the study resulted in the validation of certain principles basic to the organization and administration of a student-teaching program; and, in the validation of certain descriptive statements as criteria indicating the presence of the basic principle, with which they are associated, in a student-teaching program. The final jury was considered to be fairly representative of the total population of competent persons in the field of student teaching. The per cent of responses from the final jury was considered to be unusually high, since over 90 per cent of the jurors responded. The responses of the jury were tabulated and treated statistically in order to identify the items concerning which a consensus existed. The responses of the jury were then analyzed and interpreted.

Composition of the Jury Nominees

The jury nominators were selected from eight different geographic regions, as described in Chapter IV, in the belief that the jury nominated might be representative of the total population of persons qualified to pass judgment on problems of organization and administration of student-teaching programs. The persons who were designated by the jury nominator group are listed as Appendix H. The number and per cent of persons that were nominated from each of the eight geographic regions are shown

in Table III, page 45. Seventy-one, or 66 per cent, of the total were nominated by nominators residing in the same geographic region as the nominee. Thirty-seven, or 34 per cent, were nominated from a region different from that in which the jury nominator lived.

There was some agreement among jury nominators with respect to certain jury nominees. One person was nominated by five different nominators, two were nominated four times, and two others were nominated three times. After the duplications were removed from the list of 108 persons, ninety-four different persons nominated as being qualified to serve on the jury for this study remained.

Jury Response to the Checklist

The checklist, which was developed and revised as described in Chapter IV, was mailed to the ninety-four persons nominated to serve on the jury. A copy of the revised checklist appears as Appendix G to the study. A copy of the letter of transmittal, which accompanied the checklist, appears as Appendix F.

Although the checklist required the reading and checking of 121 items, it was designed to require the minimum time in reading and checking. This fact was no doubt a contributing factor in obtaining such a high per cent of responses. Some jury nominators and jury members wrote notes in the margins commenting on the format and appearance of the checklist. Some of these comments were:

May I congratulate you upon the form and organization of your questionnaire. I answer many of these each year and this is a refreshing change from the usual poorly duplicated instrument.

First, let me say that the collection of principles is one of the best I have seen--and I have a large collection. In addition to general soundness there are several which do

TABLE III
GEOGRAPHICAL CLASSIFICATION OF JURY NOMINEES

Geographical Region	Number	Per Cent
New England	6	5.5
Middle Atlantic	25	23.2
South Atlantic	15	13.9
South Central	10	9.2
East North Central	14	13.0
West North Central	19	17.6
Mountain Southwest and Foreign	8	7.4
Pacific	11	10.2
Total	108	100.0

not commonly appear. I will not take space to enumerate, but they are excellent.

The principles are sound. Most professional people who understand teacher education will subscribe to them. We recognize, of course, that a chasm exists between principles and what we have been able to accomplish in some of the categories.

I think your study is a very interesting one. You have certainly covered the issues and problems connected with practice-teaching programs.

Your inquiry is most complete, very well stated, and well thought through.

Beliefs--unfortunately, not practices.

Eighty-six, or 91.5 per cent, of the inquiries were returned. Sixty-four of the eighty-six were received in reply to the initial inquiry. When it seemed apparent that additional replies would not be received, a follow-up letter and a second copy of the checklist were sent to the thirty nominees who had not responded. A copy of the follow-up letter appears as Appendix I to the study. This procedure resulted in the receipt of responses from twenty-two of the thirty jury nominees receiving the second inquiry. Thus a total of eighty-six responses were received.

Competence of the Jury Members

The classification of jury members according to professional positions held is shown in Table IV, page 47. The three positions most frequently reported were professor of education, supervising teacher, and director of teacher education. Sixty, or 69.7 per cent, of the eighty-six members held one of these three positions. Three college presidents and one dean of a college of education were members of the jury. All the remaining positions shown in Table IV were those that would probably be held by persons with considerable background and

TABLE IV
PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS HELD BY JURY MEMBERS

Position	Number	Per Cent
Professor of Education	36	41.8
Supervising Teacher	14	16.3
Director of Teacher Education	10	11.6
Head, Department of Business Education	5	5.8
Assistant Superintendent of Schools	4	4.7
Director of Student Teaching	3	3.5
College President	3	3.5
Head, Department of Education	2	2.3
Director of Training School	2	2.3
Municipal School Inspector	2	2.3
Superintendent of Schools	2	2.3
Junior High Principal	1	1.2
Dean, College of Education	1	1.2
Unknown	1	1.2
Totals	86	100.0

knowledge of the problems related to student teaching. The one jury member whose position was unknown held the doctor's degree. This writer believed that a consensus of such a jury should be readily acceptable as representative of the best thinking with regard to student-teaching programs.

Tabulation of Responses to the Checklist

The number and per cent of the jury members checking ACCEPT and REJECT for each basic principle and each descriptive statement were determined and a table was prepared showing the responses to each basic principle and its descriptive statements.

Some responses were discarded and not included in the final tabulation because of some irregularity. The following criteria were used in determining whether or not a response was irregular and to be discarded:

1. When all or nearly all of the descriptive statements were marked ACCEPT, but for some unknown reason the juror did not respond to the basic principle, it was assumed that the principle was also accepted and was so tabulated. The writer assumed that the juror implied acceptance of the basic principle by accepting the descriptive statement.
2. When the basic principle was marked REJECT, but the juror acted contrary to instructions and checked the descriptive statements as either ACCEPT or REJECT, the response to that particular basic principle with its descriptive statements was discarded as being irregular and inconsistent.

Statistical Treatment of the Responses

The problem confronting the investigator at this stage of the study was that of establishing a consensus. One of the assumptions basic to this study was that the jury technique was a valid procedure for identifying a consensus, and that consensus thus established could be accepted as validation. The extent to which a difference between

ACCEPT and REJECT responses to an item exists is the extent to which a consensus exists with regard to that item. For this study, the writer assumed that a consensus had been established only when the difference between the ACCEPT responses and the REJECT responses to an item had been shown to be statistically significant.

In order to determine the statistical significance of the differences between ACCEPT responses and REJECT responses from the jury, or in order to establish a consensus, the chi-square test was used. The use of the chi-square test was based on the assumption that responses from the total population would be in agreement with the responses from the representative sample.

The hypothesis of equal probability, or null hypothesis, was accepted. According to this hypothesis, there would be no difference between the reported or observed results and the expected results other than that which might occur by chance. If a respondent had no knowledge of the item, or did not read carefully the item, 50 per cent ACCEPT responses and 50 per cent REJECT responses could be expected. A given difference is called reliable or significant when the probability is high that it cannot be explained away as temporary or accidental.¹ When the null hypothesis can be rejected upon the basis of the application of chi-square, the difference between responses cannot be fully explained as temporary or accidental.

According to Garrett,² the X^2 (chi-square) test represents a useful method of comparing experimentally obtained results with those to be expected theoretically on some hypothesis. The formula for

¹Garrett, p. 212.

²Ibid., p. 254.

chi-square (χ^2) is stated as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \left[\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} \right]$$

f_o = frequency of occurrence of observed or experimentally determined facts

f_e = expected frequency of occurrence on some hypothesis

The differences between observed and expected frequencies are squared and divided by the expected number in each case, and the sum of these quotients is χ^2 . The more closely the observed results approximate to the expected, the smaller the chi-square and the closer the agreement between observed data and the hypothesis being tested. Contrariwise, the larger the chi-square the greater the probability of a real divergence of experimentally observed from expected results. To evaluate chi-square, Table E according to Garrett³ was used. The computed value of chi-square and the appropriate number of degrees of freedom, when applied to Table E, shows the P value or the probability that the obtained χ^2 is significant.

When a difference is to be taken as statistically significant depends upon the probability of the given difference arising by chance. Judgments of significance are never all-or-none but range over a wide scale of probabilities, and confidence increases as the probability of error decreases. The .05 and the .01 levels of significance are analogous to the .05 and .01 levels of confidence used in estimating the reliability of the mean and other statistics. The .01 level of significance is more exacting than is the .05 level. When Table E shows the P value for an item to be significant at the .05 level, it means

³Ibid., p. 428.

that should the experiment be repeated, only once in 20 trials would a X^2 that large occur if the null hypothesis were true. Such a result may be marked "significant at the .05 level" on the grounds that divergence of observed from expected results are too unlikely of occurrence to be accounted for solely by sampling fluctuations. In general, the null hypothesis may be discarded or rejected at the .05 level. The .05 level of significance is useful in studies of this type, although not so exacting as the .01 level. When the X^2 in the present study was beyond the limits of Table E, the P value was listed as less than .01.

For this study, the null hypothesis has been discarded at the .05 level. Those items that were significant at the .01 level were pointed out as significant at the lower level. A consensus was considered to have been established when the statistical treatment of the jury responses to an item refuted the null hypothesis. Although the chi-square test results did not indicate whether a consensus, when established, was in favor of ACCEPT or in favor of REJECT;⁴ this fact was easily determined by inspection of the table for that item. The consensus, thus established, constituted the confirmation of the validity of the basic principles presented by Blanton⁴ and validation of the additional principles as basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program. The consensus also constituted validation of descriptive statements as criteria that give evidence of the presence of a basic principle in a student-teaching program.

The chi-square formula was applied first to the item in each table for which there was the least difference between the number of ACCEPT responses and the number of REJECT responses. If this item showed a

⁴Blanton, Appendix B.

difference that was statistically significant at the .05 level or less, then all other items having greater differences between ACCEPT and REJECT responses would obviously be significant at the same level or less. Nothing of value would have been added to the study by applying the chi-square formula to items which were obviously significant at the .05 level of significance or less.

If the item with the least difference between the number of ACCEPT and the number of REJECT responses proved to be not significant at the .05 level, the chi-square formula was then applied to the item showing the next smallest difference between the number of ACCEPT responses and the number of REJECT responses. This procedure was continued until the formula was applied to an item that proved to be significant at the .05 level or less. By this procedure, the information was obtained as to whether a consensus had been established in favor of acceptance of the item or rejection of the item, or that no consensus existed with regard to that particular item.

The tabulation of the responses to the first basic principle and its associated descriptive statements, along with the statistical analysis and interpretation, is given in Table V, page 53, and the following paragraphs. Details of the statistical treatment are not given for the remaining thirteen basic principles and their descriptive statements; however, the P values for the items in the checklist having the least difference between ACCEPT responses and REJECT responses are shown in Appendix J to the study.

Analysis and Interpretation of Jury Responses

The number and per cent of ACCEPT responses and the number and per cent of REJECT responses to the first basic principle and the associated

TABLE V

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE I AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept		Reject		Omit	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Basic Principle I</u>						
The general framework of the organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be determined by objectives.	86	100				
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle I</u>						
1. The program operates from a frame of reference established by a set of specific objectives.	75	87	9	11	2	2
2. Formulation of the objectives is the result of the cooperative effort of all personnel working with the program.	83	97	2	2	1	1
3. Provision is made for continuous evaluation of objectives for revision in light of changing needs.	84	98	1	1	1	1
4. The objectives are clearly stated in writing.	78	91	7	8	1	1
5. Provision is made to assure opportunity for all personnel working with the program to understand the objectives.	81	94	3	4	2	2

descriptive statements appear in Table V, page 53. Eighty-six, or 100 per cent, of the jurors accepted the principle as basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program. The first descriptive statement for the first basic principle was the item in Table V which had the least difference between the number of ACCEPT and REJECT responses. There were 75 ACCEPT responses and 9 REJECT responses to this statement. The chi-square formula was applied to the difference between the ACCEPT responses and the REJECT responses to obtain the significance of the differences as follows:

	ACCEPT	REJECT	
Observed (f_o)	75	9	86
Expected (f_e)	43	43	86
$f_o - f_e =$	32	32	
Correction (-.5) =	31.5	31.5	
$(f_o - f_e)^2 =$	992.25	992.25	
$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} =$	23.05	23.05	
$\chi^2 =$	46.10		

Table E, according to Garrett,⁵ shows a χ^2 of 6.635 to be significant at the .01 level, so it is obvious that the χ^2 of 46.10 obtained for the first descriptive statement was statistically significant at a level considerably less than the .01 level. Since the other items in Table V showed greater differences between ACCEPT responses and REJECT responses than the first descriptive statement, their differences were also statistically significant at less than the .01 level.

While the fourth descriptive statement, "The objectives are clearly

⁵Garrett, P. 428.

stated in writing," was accepted by 78, or 91 per cent, of the jurors, some jurors expressed the feeling that the writing was not necessary to provide evidence of the presence of the principle. One juror commented, "This may be desirable--but not always done. More readily subject to review and revision if not written." Another juror said, "Helpful, not necessary; but would be evidence." Still another juror indicated that this statement was acceptable so long as the objectives were not made so rigid that they prevented the flexibility mentioned in Basic Principle II.

Thus, the validity of the first basic principle was confirmed as basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program and the five descriptive statements were validated as criteria that give evidence that the basic principle is present in a student-teaching program.

The number and per cent of ACCEPT and REJECT responses for the second basic principle and associated descriptive statements appear in Table VI, page 56. The principle was accepted as basic by consensus of the jurors. All, except one part of the seventh, descriptive statements were accepted by consensus as giving evidence of the presence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program. However, some jurors expressed concern regarding the use of the word "definite" in the third descriptive statement, "Supervising teachers in laboratory schools provide a definite sequence of student-teaching experiences that will meet the individual needs of the student." One juror said, "Flexibility within sequence. Definite seems contradictory." Another said that a definite sequence would not meet the individual needs of students. A juror who objected to the statement said, "'Definite sequence of student-teaching experiences' and 'meet the individual needs of the student' are

TABLE VI

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE II AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle II</u>			
The organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be flexible.	84 98		2* 2
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle II</u>			
1. The program is organized so as to provide more than one student-teaching assignment for those students who appear to need or desire additional supervised teaching experience.	80 95	4 5	
2. The student-teaching assignments vary in length according to the needs of the individual student.	67 80	17 20	
3. Supervising teachers in laboratory schools provide a definite sequence of student-teaching experiences that will meet the individual needs of the student.	74 88	10 12	
4. Time and facilities are provided for the college staff to study individual students to determine their individual needs.	80 95	4 5	
5. Time is provided in staff load so that competent college staff members may study the laboratory schools to ascertain their adequacy to meet the needs of individual students.	77 92	7 8	
6. The budget provides money for the college staff members to study the laboratory schools to determine their adequacy for meeting the individual needs of students.	63 75	21 25	
7. The scheduling of college classes other than student teaching permits the student to do student teaching, determined by his needs, for a			
a. Half day at a time.	35 42	37 44	12 14
b. Full day at a time.	75 89	6 7	3 4

TABLE VI (Continued)

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept		Reject		Omit	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
8. Provision is made for laboratory school staff members to study the college courses to determine their adequacy for meeting the individual needs of students.	73	87	8	9	3	4
9. Time is provided in staff load to permit adequate supervision of student teachers by college supervisors.	78	93	5	6	1	1

*Two responses were discarded as unusable

incompatible." Another juror pointed out that planning of student-teaching experiences should be cooperative and cannot or should not be viewed as a definite sequence provided by the supervising teacher. Table VI shows that 74, or 88 per cent, of the jurors accepted this statement as giving evidence of the presence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program, while 10, or 12 per cent, rejected the statement. The difference between the ACCEPT responses and the REJECT responses was statistically significant at less than the .01 level.

No consensus existed with regard to a part of the seventh descriptive statement, which was stated in full as follows:

The scheduling of college classes other than student teaching permits the student to do student teaching, determined by his needs, for a

- a. Half day at a time.
- b. Full day at a time.

The statement was presented in this way in order to give the respondent a choice of two answers. Some of the jury nominator group had suggested that provision should be made for either a half day or full day of student teaching, as needed by the student. The jury members, when responding to the checklist might have been thinking in terms of the more desirable characteristic of an effective student-teaching program, rather than what would give evidence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program. As shown in Table VI, 35, or 42 per cent, of the jurors accepted the half day provision, while 37, or 44 per cent, rejected this provision. The difference between the number of ACCEPT responses and the number of REJECT responses to this item was not found to be statistically significant. Therefore, no consensus existed in regard to the half day provision, and the null hypothesis must be retained. The full day provision was accepted by 75, or 89 per cent, of the jurors. Some jurors commented that a flexible program demanded the

provision for either a half day or a full day of teaching. Others indicated that a full day of student teaching was more desirable than a half day if only one student-teaching experience was provided. Other jurors accepted the statement, but indicated that the full day student teaching was more desirable than the half day. A full day at a time for student teaching was apparently acceptable to the jury. Although no consensus existed as to provision for a half day at a time for student teaching, comments made by jurors seem to justify the belief that provision for either length of time might give evidence of flexibility in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.

Tabulation of the number and per cent of both the ACCEPT and the REJECT responses regarding the third basic principle and its accompanying descriptive statements are presented in Table VII, page 60.

Basic Principle III, "The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to develop a better understanding of individual differences, child growth, and development," was accepted by all jurors. Some jurors expressed the belief that the provisions of this principle should be developed before student teaching. If these provisions were developed prior to student teaching, they could then be applied during student teaching. One juror, who accepted the principle, commented, "This is not the only time the student should study human growth and development." Another pertinent comment was that, "This can be done only if the assignment is longer than just a few days."

All descriptive statements relating to the third basic principle were accepted as giving evidence of the presence of the principle in a student-teaching program.

The number and per cent of ACCEPT responses and the number and per

TABLE VII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE III AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle III</u>			
The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to develop a better understanding of individual differences, child growth, and development.	86	100	
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle III</u>			
1. The organization of the student-teaching program provides each student teacher opportunities for guided contacts with children and youth:			
a. Of different socio-economic backgrounds.	83	96	3 4
b. Of different abilities.	84	98	2 2
c. Of different maturity levels within their age group.	84	98	2 2
d. Of different age and grade levels.	80	93	6 7
2. The administration of the student-teaching program assures that student teachers will have guided contacts with children and youth:			
a. Of different maturity levels.	83	96	3 4
b. Of different abilities.	83	96	3 4
c. Of different socio-economic backgrounds.	82	95	4 5
d. Of different age and grade levels.	82	95	4 5
3. The length of the student-teaching assignment is sufficient for the student teacher to observe and study human growth and development.	76	88	10 12

cent of REJECT responses for the fourth basic principle and associated descriptive statements are presented in Table VIII, page 62.

The fourth basic principle was concerned with provision of opportunities for the student teacher to participate in both in-school and out-of-school activities connected with the school. This principle was accepted by 85, or 99 per cent, of the total as being basic to an effective student-teaching program. The response of one juror to this section was discarded as unusable.

The descriptive statements accompanying the fourth basic principle were all accepted as giving evidence of the presence of the principle in a student-teaching program. The first descriptive statement provided for the student teacher to participate with the supervising teacher in planning class work for the students. This statement was accepted and described as important by jurors. One juror wrote, "Yes, but it must provide also for much planning by the student on his own." The fourth descriptive statement for this principle provided for the student teacher to participate in conferences with individual students concerning the student's problems. One comment concerning this statement was, "He should get to the place where he conducts some himself." Juror comment clearly indicated that the conditions described by these descriptive statements would be acceptable as evidence of the presence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program. These comments further indicated that the objective behind this basic principle would be to develop in the student teacher the ability to carry on these functions independently as a teacher. There was some concern evidenced by jurors that if the student teacher took part in all the activities listed in the descriptive statements, the student teacher would be overloaded. One juror commented, "Would be evidence, but question whether any one student

TABLE VIII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE IV AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle IV</u>			
The student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to participate in important phases of a teacher's in-school and out-of-school activities of the school.	85 99		1* 1
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle IV</u>			
1. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to participate with the supervising teacher and others in planning class work for the students.	84 99		1 1
2. The student-teaching program provides opportunities for the student teacher to:			
a. Attend and participate in some faculty meetings of the laboratory school.	84 99	1 1	
b. Work with other laboratory school staff members and students on various school committees and out-of-school projects.	80 94	5 6	
c. Work with student groups such as home rooms, student councils, and other school clubs.	84 99	1 1	
d. Participate in school-community groups who are concerned with civic and educational problems concerning the school.	73 86	12 14	
e. Work with out-of-school youth activities and organizations such as Boy Scouts, inter-community competitive sports, religious organizations, and teen-age clubs.	71 84	14 16	

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept		Reject		Omit	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to be present and participate in some of the conferences with individual parents concerning the students and their problems.	81	95	4	5		
4. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to be present and participate in conferences with individual students concerning the student's problems.	81	95	4	5		

*One response was discarded as unusable

should do all these things." Another said, "Desirable, but a line must be drawn in terms of time available." A third juror wrote, "Only if it does not overload the student teacher." Juror comment pointed out that these activities were important, but that perhaps some of them could be participated in by the student at a time other than the student-teaching assignment.

The tabulation of number and per cent of ACCEPT and REJECT responses for the fifth basic principle and descriptive statements is given in Table IX, page 65.

Basic Principle V, "The student-teaching experiences should be cooperatively planned and developed by the student teacher, his advisors, and supervisor," was accepted by 83, or 97 per cent, of the jury. A juror observed, "This principle is difficult to implement even in an institution whose major function is teacher education." The principle was accepted as basic although it might be difficult to implement in a student-teaching program.

All descriptive statements accompanying the fifth basic principle were accepted by consensus of the jury as giving evidence of the presence of the principle in a student-teaching program.

The tabulation of responses for the sixth basic principle, as well as the tabulation of responses for the descriptive statements associated with this principle, is given in Table X, page 66.

Basic Principle VI, "The organization and administration of the teacher-education program should provide a continuous and correlated sequence of experiences leading to and following the student-teaching experience," was accepted by 85, or 99 per cent, of the jurors. One juror's responses were discarded as unusable.

There was considerable difference of opinion of jurors with regard

TABLE IX

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE V AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle V</u>			
The student-teaching experiences should be cooperatively planned and developed by the student teacher, his advisers, and supervisor.	83 97	2 2	1* 1
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle V</u>			
1. The organization and administration of the program designates college personnel to participate in the supervision of the student teacher in actual laboratory work.	80 97	2 2	1 1
2. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program encourages the supervising teacher, college supervisor, and the student teacher to plan cooperatively the entire program of activities for the student teacher.	79 95	4 5	
3. The student-teaching program provides for continuous cooperative evaluation of the student teacher.	82 99	1 1	
4. Provision is made for revision of the student-teaching activities in light of the continuous cooperative evaluation.	83 100		

*One response was discarded as unusable

TABLE X

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE VI AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle VI</u>			
The organization and administration of the teacher-education program should provide a continuous and correlated sequence of experiences leading to and following the student-teaching experience.	85 99		1* 1
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle VI</u>			
1. Every college staff member engaged in the teacher-education program has an obligation to develop his courses so as to encourage continuous growth of the student with respect to the student's total program.	83 98	2 2	
2. There is a high degree of correlation among and continuity in all of the courses leading to student teaching.	77 91	8 9	
3. The courses which are concerned with supervised observation			
a. Precede the student-teaching assignment.	69 81	15 18	1 1
b. Are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment.	46 54	34 40	5 6
4. The courses concerned with the methods and techniques of teaching			
a. Precede the student-teaching assignment.	67 79	16 19	2 2
b. Are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment.	48 57	31 36	6 7
5. The student teacher receives proper preparation and counseling concerning his assignment prior to reporting to the supervising teacher.	81 95	4 5	
6. The student teacher is gradually inducted into the actual student-teaching experience by the supervising teacher, depending upon the student teacher's ability and readiness.	85 100		

TABLE X (Continued)

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept		Reject		Omit	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
7. The teacher-placement activity works directly with the college supervisor and supervising teachers to place the beginning teachers in appropriate positions.	81	95	3	4	1	1
8. Time and money are provided for the college supervisor, or some other qualified person, to study the student-teacher graduates after placement to evaluate their						
a. Fitness for their positions.	73	86	11	13	1	1
b. Adjustment to their positions.	79	93	6	7		
9. Time and money are provided for campus conferences or seminars for recent teacher graduates and college staff members.	78	92	7	8		
10. Provision is made for on-the-job visits to recent teacher graduates by the college supervisor or the supervising teacher.	75	88	10	12		
11. Provision is made for assistance by correspondence to recent teacher graduates from the Director of Teacher Education and other college personnel.	78	92	7	8		

*One response was discarded as unusable

to the descriptive statements for the sixth basic principle. The first descriptive statement, "Every college staff member engaged in the teacher-education program has an obligation to develop his courses so as to encourage continuous growth of the student with respect to the student's total program," was rejected by two jurors. One of these said, "Not a descriptive statement; a pious hope," and the other wrote, "This is so inclusive a statement that I believe it is totally unrealistic." These comments indicated that the jurors were not saying that the condition described would not indicate presence of the basic principle, but rather that they did not believe the described condition could or would exist. Since only two jurors rejected the first descriptive statement, consensus was for acceptance of the item.

No consensus existed with regard to a part of the third and a part of the fourth descriptive statements for the sixth basic principle. Based on the results of the application of the statistical formula, the differences between the ACCEPT and REJECT responses were not statistically significant. Since no consensus existed with regard to these two items, they could not be considered as validated criteria giving evidence of the presence of the principle, neither could they be entirely rejected as unsuitable for that purpose. Further study would be helpful in regard to the second sub-part of both the third and the fourth descriptive statement, which read in full as follows:

3. The courses which are concerned with supervised observation
 - a. Precede the student-teaching assignment.
 - b. Are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment.

4. The courses concerned with the methods and techniques of teaching
 - a. Precede the student-teaching assignment.
 - b. Are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment.

In each case, the second sub-part was the one concerning which no consensus existed, while the first sub-part was accepted as describing evidence of the presence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program. Several jurors indicated that they thought either or both parts of the statements would provide evidence of the presence of the basic principle, but preferred that the courses mentioned should precede the student-teaching assignment. Pertinent comments made by jurors were:

Either would be evidence. Both are helpful. Must we choose?

Both, but if only one is possible, then 'precede'.

Actually both (a) and (b) are necessary. Observation and method techniques are continuous.

Part (b) of Descriptive Statement 4 I definitely reject and have tried each. The student teacher is at a loss for too long a time. Just sitting in a classroom is not conducive to good work.

Should precede but be reevaluated as student-teaching experiences develop.

From the above comments it is not clear whether the jurors were indicating which characteristic they believed to be more desirable in a student-teaching program, or whether they were indicating whether or not the statement gave evidence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program. There was no general agreement with regard to these items.

The eighth descriptive statement associated with the sixth basic principle was concerned with the evaluation of the student teacher after placement to determine the teacher's fitness for the position and also the teacher's adjustment to the position. One juror indicated that he felt that this should be the job of the administrators of the school in which the student had been placed. He considered that the evaluation should be made, but did not believe it indicated presence of the basic

principle. Two other jurors indicated a somewhat different point of view. One accepted the statement as giving evidence of the principle, but said, "Desirable, would be evidence; we can't do it." The other also accepted the statement, but said, "Excellent idea, if could be." However, the statement was generally acceptable to 81, or 95 per cent, of the jurors.

The ninth and tenth descriptive statements for this basic principle described provision for campus seminars or conferences for recent student-teacher graduates and on-the-job visits to these teachers by college supervisors. Both statements were generally acceptable to the jury, but marginal comments indicated certain reservations on the part of some jurors. One comment, by a juror who rejected the statement, was, "This is rejected unless it means conferences that are generally held with anyone who has need for them. Special provisions at the expense of the college alone is not accepted." Another juror, who neither accepted or rejected the statement, said, "I question 9 under VI, as its value will depend upon how it is conducted. If the recent teacher graduates bring in the problems and a well-trained person handles the seminar, it could be worthwhile." Although these jurors did not accept this statement, they did not say that the condition described would not give evidence of the presence of the basic principle. Another juror, who rejected the tenth descriptive statement, said, "Depends on the people involved and the school being visited." This comment indicated that the visits, if properly carried out, might provide evidence of the presence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program. Another juror, who accepted the statement, pointed out that the on-the-job visit might also include some other follow-up person.

Tabulation of responses to Basic Principle VII, "Adequate physical facilities and personnel should be provided for conducting an effective

student-teaching program," and its associated descriptive statements are given in Table XI, page 72. This principle was accepted by 86, or 100 per cent, of the jurors as basic to an effective student-teaching program. The descriptive statements presented with this principle were not all acceptable to the jury.

The third descriptive statement, "Schools with inadequate equipment and facilities are used as laboratory schools in order that student teachers have opportunity to learn how to overcome such handicaps," was the only item of the checklist rejected by consensus of the jury. Fifty-five, or 64 per cent, of the jury rejected this item. The difference between ACCEPT and REJECT responses was found to be statistically significant at less than the .01 level. Marginal comments by jury members indicated that student teachers should have the ability to overcome handicaps, but that inadequate schools should not be used for the purpose of developing that ability. Some comments written by jurors rejecting this descriptive statement were:

Send medical internes into poor hospitals? No! Maybe-- send them out of teaching, too.

For observation only.

Are used because they are needed, not for reason stated.

I completely reject Item 3 under Basic Principle VII.

Most public schools provide this.

Should not be dependent upon, but know how to use.

Primarily, no. Secondarily, yes.

Descriptive Statement 2 is the goal. Descriptive Statement 3 is what is used, but not for the reason stated.

The last comment referred to the second descriptive statement, "The physical facilities, equipment, tools, materials, and teaching aids necessary for effective teaching are present in the schools which are

TABLE XI

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE VII AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle VII</u>			
Adequate physical facilities and personnel should be provided for conducting an effective student-teaching program.	86	100	
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle VII</u>			
1. A sufficient number and variety of schools are used as student-teaching laboratories to provide adequate opportunity for each student teacher to observe and participate in the major activities of a teacher's regular work.	84	98	2 2
2. The physical facilities, equipment, tools, materials, and teaching aids necessary for effective teaching are present in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories.	83	97	3 3
3. Schools with inadequate equipment and facilities are used as laboratory schools in order that student teachers have opportunity to learn how to overcome such handicaps.	28	33	55 64 3 3
4. The program provides an adequate number of qualified personnel to guide effectively and supervise the student teachers in their student-teaching experience and to carry on the total student-teaching program.	85	99	1 1
5. The classes taught by student teachers are large enough to provide a practical teaching situation.	83	97	3 3
6. The classes taught by student teachers are small enough to provide opportunity for student teachers to work with individual students.	74	86	11 13 1 1
7. Schools other than a college campus school are used so as to insure student-teacher contact and work with typical rather than atypical groups of children.	75	87	10 12 1 1

used as student-teaching laboratories." Eighty-three, or 97 per cent, of the total accepted this statement as giving evidence of the presence of the basic principle in a student-teaching program. Other comments, also, indicated that the condition described by the second descriptive statement was preferable to the condition described by the third descriptive statement. Jurors indicated that there might be some value in the use of inadequate schools, but not for the reason mentioned in the third descriptive statement. One juror wrote, "Both kinds of situations are needed. If we can have only one, accept Descriptive Statement 2 and reject Descriptive Statement 3." Another juror wrote, "Both."

The sixth descriptive statement, "The classes taught by student teachers are small enough to provide opportunity for student teachers to work with individual students," was acceptable to 74, or 86 per cent, of the jury. Although the difference between the ACCEPT and REJECT responses was statistically significant, the following comments regarding this statement indicate the thinking of jurors regarding this item.

Not necessary. Small and large are such relative terms.

Could be done in large classes.

Both large and small class situations should be provided.

They must have both large and small class experiences. If possible, they should take place during the same practicum.

The seventh descriptive statement, "Schools other than a college campus school are used so as to insure student-teacher contact and work with typical rather than atypical groups of children," was acceptable to 75, or 87 per cent, of the jury. There was general agreement among jurors with the idea that student teachers should work with typical groups of children. There was considerable disagreement with the statement that typical children were found only in schools other than college

campus schools. One juror pointed out that the campus school might be the only one with atypical children, such as the orthopedically handicapped. Other juror comments regarding this statement were:

Are campus schools filled with atypical children? Come and see ours.

Reject because of the assumption 'so as to insure student-teacher contact and work with typical rather than atypical children' which is false.

Some of both.

Very important.

Both schools have a purpose and place in the program.

This need not be true--use both.

Lab school might be just as typical.

On the secondary level we take care of most of our practice-teaching assignments in our own lab school--these points you mention have merit.

A campus school can have as much by way of typical children as an off-campus school.

The other descriptive statements associated with the seventh basic principle were generally acceptable to the jury.

The tabulation of the responses to the eighth basic principle, which was concerned with the adequate preparation of the staff members of the college and the laboratory schools for all the major phases of student teaching, is given in Table XII, page 75. This principle, as well as the related descriptive statements, was generally acceptable to the jury although there was some feeling expressed by jurors that this principle and the conditions described by the descriptive statements should not be adhered to absolutely. In other words, there should be a willingness to make exceptions although the principle was generally acceptable.

The tabulation of responses to the ninth basic principle with its

TABLE XII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE VIII AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle VIII</u>			
The staff members of the teacher-education institution and of the laboratory schools who are concerned with the student-teaching program should have adequate preparation for all of the major phases of student teaching.	84 98	1 1	1* 1
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle VIII</u>			
1. The staff members who supervise student teachers in the laboratory schools are qualified from the standpoint of academic preparation.	82 98	2 2	
2. The college staff members who directly and indirectly work with the student-teaching program are qualified from the standpoint of academic preparation.	83 99	1 1	
3. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers in the laboratory schools have had successful teaching experience in the area in which they are supervising.	83 99	1 1	
4. The college staff members who work with student teachers have had successful teaching experience in			
a. College teaching.	64 76	18 22	2 2
b. Public school teaching.	81 96	3 4	
5. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers have exhibited evidence of continuous professional preparation and growth.	84 100		
6. The college staff members who work with student teachers have exhibited evidence of continuous professional preparation and growth.	84 100		
7. Supervising teachers in the laboratory schools have had special training in supervision.	75 89	8 10	1 1

*One response was discarded as unusable

associated descriptive statements is presented in Table XIII, page 77. Basic Principle IX, "The officials of the teacher-education institution should have a clearly stated agreement with each school that is used as a laboratory school," was accepted by 80, or 93 per cent, of the jury. The following comments by jurors indicate that there existed some concern as to the extent to which this basic principle should be carried out.

Neither accept nor reject as a basic principle. Written agreements are sometimes helpful, sometimes crippling.

A clearly understood agreement--possible a verbal one is sufficient.

Do you go so far as to have a legal agreement or contract? I have found this quite necessary sometimes. Does your agreement here with public schools set forth explicitly how the teachers are selected who are to take the student teachers? Any effective participation in this that the college can get is very desirable.

Don't know how to answer this. There certainly should be an understanding. Doubt if it is necessary to put in writing. Mutual respect and mutual concern about doing the job will enable all persons concerned to meet problems as they arise and to establish appropriate principles to guide action.

Too rigid a contract is undesirable.

All of the descriptive statements accompanying the ninth basic principle were generally acceptable to the jury. Although the sixth descriptive statement, "The kind and the amount of payment to the laboratory school for the supervising teacher's time used in supervising student teachers is clearly stated in the agreement," was accepted by 76, or 95 per cent, of the jurors, the opinion was expressed that compensation should not be necessary. Some jurors indicated that if payment were to be made it should be provided for in the agreement. Two jurors objected to this statement because they apparently understood it to mean compensation for the supervising teacher instead of for the school,

TABLE XIII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE IX AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept		Reject		Omit	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Basic Principle IX</u>						
The officials of the teacher-education institution should have a clearly stated agreement with each school that is used as a laboratory school.	80	93	3	3	3*	3
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle IX</u>						
1. The officials of the teacher-education institution have a clearly stated agreement with each school that is used as a laboratory school						
a. With respect to the assignment of student teachers.	78	97			2	3
b. With respect to the maximum number of student teachers.	75	94	3	4	2	2
c. With respect to the placement of student teachers.	77	97	2	2	1	1
d. With respect to the selection of the supervising teachers.	77	97	2	2	1	1
2. The responsibilities of the student teacher have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement.	74	93	5	6	1	1
3. The responsibilities of the supervising teacher have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement.	77	97	2	2	1	1
4. The responsibilities of the college supervisor and other college personnel working with the program have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement.	76	95	3	4	1	1
5. When such an agreement has been executed, provision has been made to assure that all personnel working with the program have had opportunity to understand the provisions of the agreement.	79	99			1	1

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept		Reject		Omit	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
6. The kind and the amount of payment to the laboratory school for the supervising teacher's time used in supervising student teachers is clearly stated in the agreement.	76	95	2	2.5	2	2.5

*Two responses were discarded as unusable

and they objected to the supervising teacher receiving additional compensation for supervision.

The tenth basic principle indicated that work done in connection with student teaching should be considered as a part of, rather than in addition to, the regular teaching load for all personnel. This principle was generally acceptable as basic to an effective student-teaching program, and the two accompanying descriptive statements were generally acceptable as giving evidence of the presence of the principle in a student-teaching program. The responses of the jury to this principle and its associated descriptive statements are presented in Table XIV, page 80.

Basic Principle XI, "The student-teaching program should provide for evaluation of the student-teaching experience in terms of individual growth," was accepted by 82, or 96 per cent, of the jurors. All of the descriptive statements associated with this principle were accepted by consensus as giving evidence of the presence of the principle. Tabulation of the responses to the eleventh basic principle and its associated descriptive statements are shown in Table XV, page 81.

The twelfth basic principle, "Teachers who serve as supervising teachers in schools used as student-teaching laboratories should be compensated for their services," was accepted as basic to an effective student-teaching program by consensus, however, some rather strong objections were expressed. Tabulation of the responses to the twelfth basic principle and its associated descriptive statements are shown in Table XVI, page 82. Twelve of the 86 responses to this section were discarded as irregular. In most cases, the respondent rejected the principle and the first descriptive statement and then accepted the

TABLE XIV

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE X AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle X</u>			
The work done in connection with the student-teaching program in the teacher-education institution and in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories should be considered as a part of, rather than in addition to, the regular teaching load of all personnel.	80 93	2 2	4* 5
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle X</u>			
1. The work done by college personnel with respect to the preparation, guidance, and supervision of student teachers is considered in determining their regular teaching loads.	78 97	1 1.5	1 1.5
2. The work done by teachers in schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories with respect to guiding and supervising student teachers is considered in determining their regular teaching loads.	75 94	5 6	

*Four responses were discarded as unusable

TABLE XV

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE XI AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle XI</u>			
The student-teaching program should provide for evaluation of the student-teaching experience in terms of individual growth.	82 96	2 2	2* 2
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XI</u>			
1. The individual growth of the student teacher is evaluated in terms of:			
a. His acquisition of essential knowledge for effective teaching.	79 97	1 1	2 2
b. His development of abilities and skills essential for effective teaching.	82 100		
c. His growth in professional habits.	81 99		1 1
d. His development of a professional attitude.	82 100		
2. The evaluation of the student teacher's work is carried on continuously throughout the program.	81 99	1 1	
3. The evaluation of the student teacher's work is a cooperative enterprise which involves the student teacher, supervising teacher, and college supervisor.	82 100		

*Two responses were discarded as unusable

TABLE XVI

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE XII AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept		Reject		Omit	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Basic Principle XII</u>						
Teachers who serve as supervising teachers in schools used as student-teaching laboratories should be compensated for their services.	66	77	7	8	13*	15
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XII</u>						
1. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides for the compensation of the supervising teachers in the laboratory schools for their services in terms of:						
a. A reduced teaching load.	38	58	24	36	4	6
b. A stipulated amount of money.	43	65	19	29	4	6
c. Both a reduced teaching load and a stipulated amount of money.	27	41	37	56	2	3
2. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides that compensation be provided for supervising teachers in laboratory schools in terms of recognition in college catalogs, or other similar compensation.	52	79	12	18	2	3

*Twelve responses were discarded as unusable

second descriptive statement. According to the instructions to the jurors for responding to the checklist, a descriptive statement could not be accepted unless the basic principle had first been accepted. Some jurors favored compensation for the supervising teacher, while others opposed such compensation. Some jurors expressed the feeling that some non-monetary compensation should be sufficient for the supervising teacher. The length of the following comments, written on a checklist which had not provided for marginal comments, indicate that jurors felt strongly with regard to compensating supervising teachers.

By all means compensation in one or more forms should be given. I strongly favor reduced loads and time so that conferences can go on. We are the only country so far as I know where student teaching, in fact all of teacher education is not regarded as a regular part of the public school task. The schools receive definite aid from having students around if these are carefully selected. (I know you'd probably have to duck into the storm cellar if you suggested payment--in some systems.)

I'd like to say REJECT to this, excepting for descriptive statement 2.

Cooperating public schools should encourage teachers to accept the assignment of supervising teacher as a professional obligation. Cooperating public schools may recognize the works of the cooperating teacher in some appropriate manner.

All of the items under Principle XII are dependent upon the kind of program. If student teaching is confined to a single local school system, compensation probably needs to be in money in order to insure cooperation. If the program can be carried on in several communities, compensation probably can be in terms of professional recognition, free courses, opportunity to teach in summer sessions or other non-monetary values. Consequently, my real answer here is that off-campus cooperating teachers should be compensated in a manner made necessary by the local program. Campus laboratory-school supervisors should be treated as regular faculty with academic status and remuneration.

Good student teachers may be an asset rather than a liability and can make a contribution to the classroom situation without being subsidized. Other than token payment operates negatively in institutions which also require experience in campus schools prior to public school experience.

Reject if only money is meant for compensation. Principle would be better if it read, "Should have services recognized in professional ways." There are many other types of compensation or recognition.

Definitely inimical to the best programs.

Should this not be part and parcel of the supervising teacher's duty to his or her fellow teachers and to the system in which they teach? Unless, of course, it is a rule of the system that teachers be paid extra for anything they do beyond their regular teaching duties.

The first descriptive statement for the twelfth basic principle was accepted only in part. This statement, as it appeared on the checklist, was

1. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides for the compensation of the supervising teachers in the laboratory schools for their services in terms of
 - a. A reduced teaching load.
 - b. A stipulated amount of money.
 - c. Both a reduced teaching load and a stipulated amount of money.

The second part of the first descriptive statement, "A stipulated amount of money," was accepted by consensus as giving evidence of the presence of the principle in a student-teaching program. The difference between ACCEPT responses and REJECT responses to the other parts of this statement was not great enough to be statistically significant. Therefore, the first part of the statement, "A reduced teaching load," and the third part, "Both a reduced teaching load and a stipulated amount of money," were neither accepted or rejected by consensus. The fact that no consensus existed indicates a need for further study of what provides evidence of compensation for supervising teachers. Some of the comments made by jurors regarding the first descriptive statement were:

This never happens. (Reference to 'a reduced teaching load').

If this 'a reduced teaching load' means fewer children, I reject. If it means recognition of service, I accept.

'A reduced teaching load' and 'both a reduced teaching load and a stipulated amount of money' are rejected on the assumption that in a school where teachers are regularly scheduled for five or six periods per day, the supervising teacher will be scheduled for less than this number of periods.

The school has no authority to do so without permission from the public schools, however, I believe item c, 'both a reduced teaching load and a stipulated amount of money' to be desirable.

In the elementary area, it would be difficult to reduce the teaching load and still have a regular program of work for the student teacher. If the normal program could be had, I would be in favor of reducing the teaching load.

The second descriptive statement, "The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides that compensation be provided for supervising teachers in laboratory schools in terms of recognition in college catalogs, or other similar compensation," was accepted as giving evidence of the presence of the principle, however, the following comments were written by jurors:

This is accepted on the assumption that it means in addition to 'a stipulated amount of money'.

However, supervising teachers in the laboratory school should also be compensated in terms of 'both a reduced teaching load and a stipulated amount of money'.

Desirable, but not adequate in itself.

They should have regular professorial rank, tenure, and faculty status--if the laboratory school is on the campus.

The tabulation of the responses to the thirteenth basic principle and its associated descriptive statements is presented in Table XVII, page 86. Basic Principle XIII, "The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide for evaluation for the purpose of strengthening and improving the program," was accepted by all jurors as basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program. All of the descriptive statements for this

TABLE XVII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE XIII AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept No. %	Reject No. %	Omit No. %
<u>Basic Principle XIII</u>			
The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide for evaluation for the purpose of strengthening and improving the program.	86 100		
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XIII</u>			
1. The organization of the student-teaching program provides for continuous study of the program in all of its various phases.	85 99	1 1	
2. The administration of the student-teaching program encourages and assists in conducting continuous study of the program in all of its various phases.	84 98	1 1	1 1
3. Methods and techniques used in the evaluation of the program are generally acceptable to the profession.	80 93	4 5	2 2
4. The information resulting from the evaluation of the student-teaching program is actively used for the improvement of the program.	84 98	1 1	1 1
5. Time and money are provided for study and evaluation of the program.	79 92	6 7	1 1
6. The continuous evaluation of the program is a cooperative enterprise involving all personnel working with the program, including the student teachers.	84 98	1 1	1 1

basic principle were accepted by consensus as giving evidence of the presence of the principle in a student-teaching program.

Basic Principle XIV, "Provision should be made for the selective admission of students to the student-teaching program," was the one principle of the fourteen in the checklist for which the validity had not been previously established. Eighty-four, or 98 per cent, of the jurors accepted this principle as basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program, as shown in Table XVIII, page 88. Two jurors rejected this principle on the basis that provision for admission to a student-teaching program should be done prior to student teaching.

Several factors were listed in the first descriptive statement that might be used in considering the selection of students for admission to a student-teaching program. One item, a personal ambitions test, was neither accepted or rejected on the basis of consensus as giving evidence of the presence of the principle in a student-teaching program. Another item, a social distance scale, was accepted by consensus, although the difference between ACCEPT and REJECT responses was found to be significant only at the .035 level. All of the remaining items in the descriptive statement were accepted by consensus as giving evidence of the presence of the principle in a student-teaching program.

Summary

In the first part of this chapter, the jury nominees were classified according to the geographical region in which they lived and also were classified according to professional positions held. This was done in order to show that the jury invited to participate in this study was a representative sample of the total population qualified to pass judgment

TABLE XVIII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ACCEPT RESPONSES AND NUMBER AND PER CENT OF REJECT RESPONSES TO BASIC PRINCIPLE XIV AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

Basic Principle and Descriptive Statements	Accept		Reject		Omit	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Basic Principle XIV</u>						
Provision should be made for the selective admission of students to the student-teaching program.	84	98	2	2		
<u>Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XIV</u>						
1. Factors considered in the selection of students for admission to the program of student teaching include:						
a. High School scholarship record.	56	67	23	27	5	6
b. Aptitude tests.	67	80	14	16	3	4
c. Interest inventory tests.	65	78	17	20	2	2
d. Interviews with advisors.	84	100				
e. Requirement of a minimum grade point achievement in college.	77	92	4	5	3	3
f. Speech tests.	78	93	6	7		
g. Physical examination.	82	98	2	2		
h. Mental ability test.	71	85	10	12	3	3
i. Emotional adjustment test.	75	89	8	10	1	1
j. Personal ambitions test.	47	56	30	36	7	8
k. Social distance scale.	49	58	29	35	6	7
l. Short autobiographical statement.	66	79	14	16	4	5
m. Language usage test.	74	88	8	10	2	2
n. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.	53	63	26	31	5	6
o. Completion of pre-requisite courses.	79	94*	5	6		

on problems related to the organization and administration of student-teaching programs.

The response of the jury to the checklist used in this study was described and pertinent comments concerning the checklist were presented.

The chi-square formula, which was applied to the differences between the number of ACCEPT responses and the number of REJECT responses to items in the checklist, was explained.

The number and per cent of ACCEPT responses and the number and per cent of REJECT responses were tabulated and presented in this chapter. There was one table for each of the fourteen basic principles, which included the descriptive statements associated with each principle. These tables were analyzed and interpreted and presented along with comments made by jurors regarding some of the statements. This analysis revealed that one descriptive statement, "Schools with inadequate equipment and facilities are used as laboratory schools in order that student teachers have opportunity to learn how to overcome such handicaps," was rejected by consensus of the jury as giving evidence of the presence of the basic principle with which it was associated, which was, "Adequate physical facilities and personnel should be provided for conducting an effective student-teaching program."

There were three descriptive statements and parts of three other descriptive statements concerning which no consensus existed. Since these items were neither accepted^{or} rejected by consensus, it is clear that they were controversial items. Further study, perhaps with samples of another population, might help to clarify the thinking with regard to these items so they could be either accepted as criteria giving evidence of the presence of a basic principle in a student-teaching program or rejected as unsuitable for that purpose.

The validity for thirteen principles basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program was confirmed, and the validity of a fourteenth basic principle was established by consensus of the jury. Certain descriptive statements were validated, also by consensus of the jury, as criteria that give evidence of the presence of the basic principle with which they were associated in a student-teaching program. These fourteen basic principles, with criteria associated with each, appear as Appendix K to the study.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study, which grew out of the need for criteria to be used for evaluating the organization and administration of student-teaching programs, was concerned with the problem, "What principles basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program can be validated; and, what criteria can be developed and validated that will give evidence of the presence of these basic principles in a student-teaching program?" Specifically, there were two basic purposes of the study. First, "To confirm the validity of the basic principles presented by Blanton¹ and to identify additional principles basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program and validate them." Second, "To develop a list of descriptive statements and validate them as criteria that give evidence that a basic principle is present in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program." Moreover, the procedure of the study involved the testing of the following basic hypotheses:

The validity of the principles presented in Blanton's list² as basic to the organization and administration of a sound student-teaching program can be confirmed.

¹Blanton, Appendix B.

²Ibid.

If additional principles basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program can be formulated, their validity, too, can be established.

Criteria can be developed and validated as giving evidence of the presence of a basic principle in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.

Conclusions

The first general conclusion drawn from the findings of this study was that fourteen basic principles exist which can be accepted as guides to the organization and administration of student-teaching programs. Validity had been established for thirteen of the principles by previous research and documented statements made by recognized authorities. The need for confirming the validity of these basic principles seemed apparent since the principles were developed by different sources and validated by different methods. Through use of the jury technique, the validity was confirmed for thirteen principles and validity was established for the fourteenth. The validity of these basic principles was established by consensus of a jury of eighty-six competent jurymen who were nominated by people who were selected at random from the members of the Association For Student Teaching.

The second conclusion was that criteria do exist which can be accepted as giving evidence of the presence of the fourteen basic principles in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program. The validity of these criteria was established by consensus of the same jury by whose judgment the validity of the basic principles was established.

The third general conclusion drawn from the findings of this study was that the procedure used in this study was reasonably effective, with

some qualifications, as a means of identifying a consensus. The effectiveness of the procedure was indicated by the high per cent of responses from the final jury. The summary of professional positions held by jurors gave reasonable assurance that the jury was competent.

Weaknesses of the Study

One possible weakness of the jury technique method of establishing a consensus was that there was no positive assurance that each jury member reacted to the checklist from the same frame of reference. Responses to some checklist items indicated that some jury members might have been thinking in terms of the desirable characteristics of an effective student-teaching program rather than whether or not a descriptive statement gave evidence of the presence of a basic principle in a student-teaching program.

Another possible weakness of the study was that consensus of the jury participating in this study might not be acceptable as consensus of the total population of competent persons in the area of student teaching. The total population might include school administrators, classroom teachers not engaged in working with student teachers, students, and any other persons who might be affected by the product of a student-teaching program.

Recommendations

The investigator recommends that the principles and criteria validated in this study be developed into an evaluative instrument that could be used by administrators to evaluate the organization and administration of student-teaching programs. In the meantime, the basic principles and criteria validated by this study could be useful as a

guide for establishing a new student-teaching program and later used in evaluating the program for the purpose of improving and strengthening it.

The recommendation is also made that further study be given to the descriptive statements concerning which no consensus existed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baughner, Jacob I. Organization and Administration of Practice-Teaching in Privately Endowed Colleges of Liberal Arts. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education, No. 487, 1931.
- Blanton, Earle B. An Analysis of the Organization, Administration, and Implementation of the Student-Teaching Program for Industrial Arts Students at North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, With Evaluative Criteria. Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Oklahoma A & M College, 1953.
- Blyler, Dorothea. "The Pre-training Selection of Teachers." Educational Administration and Supervision, 34:275-284, May, 1948.
- Booker, Ted W. "Follow-Up Services at Valdosta State College." Journal of Teacher Education, 5:235-236, September, 1954.
- Charters, W. W., and Douglas Waples. The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Flowers, John G., et al. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Oneonta, New York: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948.
- French, Will, J. Dan Hull, and B. L. Dodds. American High School Administration. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1951.
- Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.
- Good, Carter V., A. S. Barr, and Douglas E. Scates. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1941.
- Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York and London. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1945.
- Graham, Jessie. Evolution of Business Education in the United States and Its Implications for Business-Teacher Education. Southern California Education Monographs, 1933-34 series. California: The University of California Press, 1933.
- Grim, Paul R., et al. The Evaluation of Student Teaching. Twenty-Eighth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1949.

- Henderson, Elisha Lane. The Organization and Administration of Student Teaching in State Teachers Colleges. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education, No. 692, 1937.
- Holstine, Garold D., et al. Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Thirty-Third Yearbook of the Association For Student Teaching. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1954.
- Knippers, E. C. A Study of High School Commercial Teacher Preparation in Arkansas. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Arkansas, 1940.
- Malter, Morton S., and Troy L. Stearns. Off-Campus Student Teaching. Thirtieth Yearbook of the Association For Student Teaching. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1951.
- Ohlsen, Merle M., and Raymond E. Schultz. "A Study of Variables for Use in Selection." The Journal of Teacher Education, 5:279-282, December, 1954.
- Perrodin, Alex F., et al. Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education. Thirty-fourth Yearbook of the Association For Student Teaching. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1955.
- Shepherd, Byron L. Development of Criteria for Evaluating the Effectiveness of In-Service Education Groups. Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Oklahoma A & M College, 1954.
- Spencer, William C., and Ardwin J. Dolio. "Post Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences." The Journal of Teacher Education, 5:237-239, September, 1954.
- Strong, Earl P. The Organization, Administration, and Supervision of Business Education. New York: The Gregg Publishing Company, 1944.
- Tanruther, E. M., et al. Professional Laboratory Experiences. Twenty-seventh Yearbook of the Association For Student Teaching. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1948.
- Thomas, Archie Carithers. The Development of a Criterion For the Measurement of Shorthand Transcription Production. Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Oklahoma A & M College, 1951.
- Tyler, Ralph W. "Evaluation as a Function of Supervision." Elementary School Journal, XLIV (January, 1944), 264-273.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

PRINCIPLES AND DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS FROM

APPENDIX B OF THE BLANTON STUDY

Principle I

There should be objectives which determine the general framework of the organization and administration of the student-teaching program; these objectives should be stated, understood, and agreed upon by all personnel responsible for and working with the program.

1. Is the student-teaching program determined by specific objectives?
2. Are the objectives clearly stated?
3. Are the objectives understood by all personnel working with the program?
4. Are the objectives agreed upon by all personnel working with the program?
5. Are the objectives accepted by all personnel working with the program?

Principle II

The student-teaching program should provide for flexibility in the organization, administration, and implementation of the program so as to provide for the needs and abilities of student teachers.

1. Is the organization of the program flexible so as to provide for the individual needs and abilities of student teachers?
2. Does the organization and administration of the program provide for more than one student-teaching assignment for those who appear to need further supervised teaching experience?
3. Is the length of the student-teaching assignment the same for all student teachers?
4. Are the needs of the student teachers studied with respect to placing them with supervising teachers in laboratory schools which will provide a definite pattern of student-teaching experiences?

Principle III

The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide guided contacts with children and youth of different abilities, maturity levels, and socio-economic backgrounds for a period of time in order to provide opportunities for the student teacher to develop a better understanding of individual differences, child growth, and development.

1. Does the organization of the student-teaching program provide guided contacts with children and youth of different maturity levels?
2. Does the organization of the student-teaching program provide guided contacts with children and youth of different abilities?
3. Does the organization of the student-teaching program provide guided contacts with children of different socio-economic backgrounds?
4. Are the schools which are used for student-teaching laboratories typical American schools?
5. Do those who administer and supervise the student-teaching program study each student-teaching laboratory with respect to the selection of typical educational programs for student teachers?
6. Is the length of the student-teaching assignment sufficient for the student teacher to observe and study child growth and development?

Principle IV

The student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teachers to participate in all of the important phases of a teacher's activities which include both in-school and out-of-school activities.

1. Does the student-teaching program provide opportunities for the student teacher to observe and participate in the planning of the work with the students and other school personnel?
2. Does the student-teaching program provide opportunities for the student teacher to attend and participate in faculty meetings?
3. Does the student-teaching program provide opportunities for the student teacher to work with other staff members and students on various school committees and projects?
4. Does the student-teaching program provide opportunities for the student teacher to work with student groups such as home rooms, student councils, and other school clubs?

5. Does the student-teaching program provide opportunities for the student teacher to participate in community activities, such as working with lay groups concerned with civic and educational problems within the school community?
6. Does the student-teaching program provide opportunities for the student teacher to work with out-of-school youth activities and organizations such as Boy Scouts, inter-community competitive sports, religious organizations, and teen-age clubs?

Principle V

The student-teaching experiences should be cooperatively planned and developed by the student teacher and his advisers.

1. Does the organization and administration of the program permit designated college personnel to participate in the supervision of the student teacher in actual laboratory work?
2. Does the organization and administration of the student-teaching program permit and encourage the supervising teacher, college personnel, and the student teacher to plan cooperatively the general framework of the student-teaching experience?
3. Does the student-teaching program permit the college personnel to confer with the student teacher and laboratory teacher concerning the growth and development of the student teacher?

Principle VI

The student-teaching program should be organized and administered so as to provide a high degree of continuity and correlation of the student-teaching experiences with all of the major phases of the student teacher's professional education.

1. Is the student-teaching experience regarded as an unrelated segment of the professional preparation of a teacher and earmarked as a course to be completed under the sole direction of one designated individual?
2. Is there a high degree of correlation and continuity in all of the courses leading to and pre-requisite to student teaching?
3. Do the courses which are concerned with supervised observation immediately precede the student-teaching assignment?
4. Do the courses concerned with the methods and techniques of teaching immediately precede the student-teaching assignment?
5. Does the philosophy prevail that every staff member engaged in the teacher-education program has an obligation to develop his work and courses so as to provide and encourage continuous growth with respect to the total program of the student?

Principle VII

Adequate physical facilities and personnel should be provided for conducting an effective student-teaching program.

1. Are a sufficient number of schools used as student-teaching laboratories so as to provide adequate opportunities for each student teacher to observe and participate in all of the major activities of a teacher's regular work?
2. Are the necessary physical facilities, equipment, tools, materials, and teaching aids necessary for effective teaching present in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories?
3. Does the program provide enough qualified personnel to guide effectively and supervise the student teachers in their student-teaching experience and to conduct the total program?
4. Are the classes taught by student teachers typical classes with respect to the number of students?

Principle VIII

The staff members of the teacher-education institution and schools which serve as laboratory schools who work directly and indirectly with the student-teaching program should have adequate academic preparation and successful experience in all of the major phases of student teaching.

1. Are the staff members of the laboratory schools who supervise student teachers qualified from the standpoint of college preparation?
2. Are the college staff members who directly and indirectly work with the student-teaching program qualified from the standpoint of college preparation?
3. Have the supervising teachers in the laboratory schools who work with student teachers had successful teaching experience in public schools?
4. Have the college staff members who work with student teachers had successful teaching experience in public schools?
5. Have the supervising teachers who work with student teachers exhibited continuous professional preparation and growth?
6. Have the college staff members who work with student teachers exhibited continuous professional preparation and growth?
7. Are the college staff members who guide and supervise student teachers in their laboratory experiences qualified in their major teaching field?

8. Are the laboratory teachers who guide and supervise student teachers in their laboratory experiences qualified in their major teaching field?
9. Are sound and acceptable methods and techniques of teaching used by those who supervise and guide student teachers in their laboratory experience?

Principle IX

The student-teaching program should provide for the preparation and guidance of student teachers in their observation prior to student teaching and should provide for gradual induction into the actual teaching experience.

1. Does the program provide for directed and supervised observation in laboratory schools immediately prior to the student-teaching experience?
2. Does the student teacher observe the classes or class he is to teach prior to the actual student-teaching assignment?
3. Does the student teacher receive proper preparation and counseling concerning his assignment and work immediately prior to reporting to the supervising teacher?
4. Is the student teacher gradually inducted into the actual student-teaching experience by the supervising teacher depending upon the student teacher's ability and readiness?

Principle X

There should be a clearly stated agreement between the officials of the teacher-education institution and of each school which is used as a laboratory school for student teaching with respect to the assignment of student teachers, number of student teachers, placement of student teachers, and the selection of the supervising teachers; there should be a stated agreement with respect to the curriculum and methods of instruction, and the responsibilities of the supervising teacher, student teacher, and other personnel working directly or indirectly with the student-teaching program; this agreement should be clearly stated, agreed upon, and understood by all concerned.

1. Is there a clearly stated working agreement between the officials of the teacher education institution and each school which serves as a student-teaching laboratory?
2. Have the responsibilities of the student teacher been identified and clearly stated?
3. Have the responsibilities of the supervising teacher been identified and clearly stated?

4. Have the responsibilities of other college personnel working with the program been identified and clearly stated?
5. Have the policies and procedures with respect to the assignment of student teachers and the number of student teachers been determined and clearly stated for each school?
6. Have the policies and procedures with respect to the selection of supervising teachers been determined and clearly stated?
7. Is there a clearly stated agreement between the institution and each laboratory school with respect to the curriculum and methods of instruction?
8. If such an agreement has been executed, is the agreement and all of the provisions thoroughly understood and agreed upon by all personnel involved?

Principle XI

The work done by all personnel in connection with the student-teaching program in the teacher education institution and schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories should be considered as a part of the regular teaching load.

1. Is the work done by college personnel with respect to the preparation, guidance, and supervision of student teachers considered in determining their regular teaching load?
2. Is the work done by teachers in schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories with respect to guiding and supervising student teachers considered in determining their regular teaching load?

Principle XII

Evaluation of the student-teaching experience should be in terms of individual growth in the acquisition of knowledge and abilities and their application which are prerequisite and essential to effective teaching.

1. Is the student teacher and his work evaluated in terms of individual growth with respect to the acquisition of essential knowledge, the development of abilities and skills and their application, which are prerequisite to effective teaching?
2. Is the evaluation of the student teacher's work a phase of the program which is considered as continuous?
3. Is the evaluation of the student teacher's work a continuous and cooperative enterprise which involves the student teacher, supervising teacher, and other personnel directly concerned with the student teacher's growth?

Principle XIII

Teachers who serve as supervising teachers in schools used as student-teaching laboratories should be compensated for their services.

1. Does the organization and administration of the student-teaching program provide for the compensation of the supervising teachers in the cooperating schools by the college for their services either in terms of a reduced teaching load or a stipulated amount of money?

Principle XIV

The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide for and encourage systematic, continuous study and evaluation of the program in all of its various aspects for remedial purposes.

1. Does the organization of the student-teaching program provide for continuous study and evaluation of the program in all of its various phases?
2. Does the administration of the student-teaching program encourage and assist in conducting continuous study and evaluation of the program in all of its various phases for remedial purposes?
3. Are methods and techniques which are educationally sound used in the study and evaluation of the program?
4. Are the data and information resulting from the study and evaluation of the teaching program used for remedial purposes?



COE COLLEGE

CEDAR RAPIDS · IOWA

November 8, 1955

Dear

Will you help a fellow teacher? I am asking you, as a person who is interested in the improvement of teacher education, to do two things as contributions to a study that is being made for the purpose of validating principles basic to the organization and administration of student-teaching programs, with evaluative criteria. The enclosed pages contain a list of fourteen principles which are believed to be basic to an adequate and efficient program for student teaching. There may be others.

First, please read carefully the principles and descriptive statements and dispose of each in accordance with the instructions preceding the list. Listed under each principle are descriptive statements that might be acceptable as descriptions of evidence that a basic principle is present in a program for student teaching.

Second, please nominate the three persons whom you consider best qualified to serve on a jury to pass judgment on principles basic to the organization and administration of effective student-teaching programs. This jury would also select criteria that constitute evidence of the presence of these principles in a student-teaching program. This method of selecting the jury will serve to eliminate bias on the part of the investigator, which is one criticism of this type study.

Your contribution is vital to the satisfactory completion of this study, which is being made under the direction of the Graduate School, Oklahoma A & M College. I shall appreciate your cooperation in replying promptly.

Please use the envelope that is enclosed for your convenience in returning the checklist.

Sincerely,

Herbert S. Madaus, Chairman
Department of Business Education

mlp

Enclosures

APPENDIX C

BASIC PRINCIPLES
OF THE
ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION
OF
STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

A Study Being Conducted by

Herbert S. Madaus

Coe College

Cedar Rapids, Iowa

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RESPONDING TO THE CHECKLIST

1. Please read carefully each principle; and,
 - a. Place a check in the square under ACCEPT if you believe the principle to be basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program; or,
 - b. Place a check in the square under REJECT if you do not believe the principle to be basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program.
 - c. Add any principle that you believe to be basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program.

2. If you checked ACCEPT for the principle, then read carefully each descriptive statement; and,
 - a. Place a check in the square under ACCEPT if you believe the condition described by the descriptive statement as stated will provide evidence that a basic principle is present in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.
 - b. Place a check in the square under REJECT if you do not believe the condition described by the descriptive statement as stated will provide evidence that a basic principle is present in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.
 - c. If there are statements you are in doubt about as stated, please reword them so that you can check them either ACCEPT or REJECT.
 - d. Add any descriptive statement that you believe will describe evidence of the presence of a basic principle in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.

3. On the last page of the checklist, please write in the space provided the names and addresses of the three persons you consider best qualified to serve on a jury to pass judgment on problems of organization and administration of student-teaching programs. These persons may be either college personnel or public school personnel.

BASIC PRINCIPLE I

The general framework of the organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be determined by objectives

ACCEPT REJECT

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle I

1. The program operates from a frame of reference established by a set of specific objectives.
2. Formulation of the objectives is the result of the co-operative effort of all personnel, including students, working with the program.
3. Provision is made for continuous evaluation of objectives for revision in light of changing needs.
4. The objectives are clearly stated in writing.
5. Provision is made to assure opportunity for all personnel working with the program to understand the objectives.
6. Provision is made for approval of objectives as stated.
7. -----

BASIC PRINCIPLE II

The organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be flexible.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle II

1. The program is organized so as to provide more than one student-teaching assignment for those students who appear to need additional supervised teaching experience.
2. The student-teaching assignments vary in length according to the needs of the individual student.
3. Supervising teachers in laboratory schools provide a definite sequence of student-teaching experiences that will meet the individual needs of the student.
4. Time and facilities are provided for the college staff to study individual students to determine their individual needs.
5. Time is provided in staff load so that college staff members may study the laboratory schools to ascertain their adequacy to meet the needs of individual students.

- | | ACCEPT | REJECT |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 6. The budget provides money for the college staff members to study the laboratory schools to determine their adequacy for meeting the individual needs of students. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. The scheduling of college classes other than student teaching permits the student to do student teaching for a half day or a full day at a time, according to the needs of the student. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. ----- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE III

The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to develop a better understanding of individual differences, child growth, and development.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle III

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The organization of the student-teaching program provides each student teacher opportunities for guided contacts with children and youth: | | |
| a. Of different socio-economic backgrounds. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Of different abilities. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Of different maturity levels within their age group. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The administration of the student-teaching program assures that student teachers will have guided contacts with children and youth: | | |
| a. Of different maturity levels. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Of different abilities. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Of different socio-economic backgrounds. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The length of the student-teaching assignment is sufficient for the student teacher to observe and study human growth and development. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. ----- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE IV

The student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to participate in all of the important phases of a teacher's in-school and out-of-school activities of the type school in which the student teacher is preparing to teach.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle IV

ACCEPT REJECT

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to participate with the supervising teacher and others in planning class work for the students. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The student-teaching program provides opportunities for the student teacher to: | | |
| a. Attend and participate in faculty meetings of the laboratory school. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Work with other laboratory school staff members and students on various school committees and out-of-school projects. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Work with student groups such as home rooms, student councils, and other school clubs. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Participate in school-community groups who are concerned with civic and educational problems concerning the school. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Work with out-of-school youth activities and organizations such as Boy Scouts, inter-community competitive sports, religious organizations, and teen-age clubs. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to be present and participate in conferences with individual parents concerning the students and their problems. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to be present and participate in conferences with individual students concerning the student's problems. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. ----- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE V

The student-teaching experiences should be co-operatively planned and developed by the student teacher and his advisers.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle V

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The organization and administration of the program designates college personnel to participate in the supervision of the student teacher in actual laboratory work. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

	ACCEPT	REJECT
2. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program encourages the supervising teacher, college supervisor, and the student teacher to plan cooperatively the entire program of activities for the student teacher.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The student-teaching program provides for continuous cooperative evaluation of the student teacher.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Provision is made for revision of the student-teaching activities in light of the continuous cooperative evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. -----	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

BASIC PRINCIPLE VI

The organization and administration of the teacher-education program should provide a continuous and correlated sequence of experiences leading to and following the student-teaching experience.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle VI

1. Every college staff member engaged in the teacher-education program has an obligation to develop his courses so as to encourage continuous growth of the student with respect to the student's total program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. There is a high degree of correlation among and continuity in all of the courses leading to student teaching.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The courses which are concerned with supervised observation immediately precede or are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The courses concerned with the methods and techniques of teaching immediately precede or are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The student teacher receives proper preparation and counseling concerning his assignment immediately prior to reporting to the supervising teacher.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The student teacher is gradually inducted into the actual student-teaching experience by the supervising teacher, depending upon the student teacher's ability and readiness.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The teacher-placement activity works directly with the college supervisor and supervising teachers to place the beginning teachers in appropriate positions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | ACCEPT | REJECT |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 8. Time and money are provided for the college supervisor and the placement activity to study the student-teacher graduates after placement to evaluate their fitness for their positions. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Time and money are provided for campus conferences or seminars for recent teacher graduates and college staff members. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Provision is made for on-the-job visits to recent teacher graduates by the college supervisor or the supervising teacher. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Provision is made for assistance by correspondence to recent teacher graduates from the Director of Teacher Education and other college personnel. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. ----- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE VII

Adequate physical facilities and personnel should be provided for conducting an effective student-teaching program.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle VII

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. A sufficient number and variety of schools are used as student-teaching laboratories to provide adequate opportunity for each student teacher to observe and participate in all of the major activities of a teacher's regular work. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The physical facilities, equipment, tools, materials, and teaching aids necessary for effective teaching are present in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The program provides an adequate number of qualified personnel to guide effectively and supervise the student teachers in their student-teaching experience and to carry on the total student-teaching program. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The classes taught by student teachers are large enough to provide a practical teaching situation. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. The classes taught by student teachers are small enough to provide opportunity for student teachers to work with individual students. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. ----- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE VIII

ACCEPT REJECT

The staff members of the teacher-education institution and of the laboratory schools who are concerned with the student-teaching program should have adequate preparation for all of the major phases of student teaching.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle VIII

1. The staff members who supervise student teachers in the laboratory schools are qualified from the standpoint of academic preparation.
2. The college staff members who directly and indirectly work with the student-teaching program are qualified from the standpoint of academic preparation.
3. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers in the laboratory schools have had successful teaching experience in:
 - a. College teaching
 - b. Public school teaching
 - c. Privately supported schools below college level
4. The college staff members who work with student teachers have had successful teaching experience in:
 - a. College teaching
 - b. Public school teaching
 - c. Privately supported schools below college level
5. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers have exhibited evidence of continuous professional preparation and growth.
6. The college staff members who work with student teachers have exhibited evidence of continuous professional preparation and growth.
7. -----

BASIC PRINCIPLE IX

The officials of the teacher-education institution should have a clearly stated agreement with each school that is used as a laboratory school.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle IX

ACCEPT REJECT

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The officials of the teacher-education institution have a clearly stated agreement with each school that is used as a laboratory school | | |
| a. With respect to the assignment of student teachers. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. With respect to the maximum number of student teachers. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. With respect to the placement of student teachers. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. With respect to the selection of the supervising teachers. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The responsibilities of the student teacher have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The responsibilities of the supervising teacher have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The responsibilities of the college supervisor and other college personnel working with the program have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. When such an agreement has been executed, provision has been made to assure that all personnel working with the program have had opportunity to understand the provisions of the agreement. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. The kind and the amount of payment to the laboratory school for the supervising teacher's time used in supervising student teachers is clearly stated in the agreement. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. ----- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE X

The work done in connection with the student-teaching program in the teacher education institution and in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories should be considered as a part of, rather than in addition to, the regular teaching load of all personnel.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle X

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The work done by college personnel with respect to the preparation, guidance, and supervision of student teachers is considered in determining their regular teaching loads. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|

- | | ACCEPT | REJECT |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. The work done by teachers in schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories with respect to guiding and supervising student teachers is considered in determining their regular teaching loads. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. ----- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE XI

The student-teaching program should provide for evaluation of the student-teaching experience in terms of individual growth.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XI

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The individual growth of the student teacher is evaluated in terms of: | | |
| a. His acquisition of essential knowledge for effective teaching. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. His development of abilities and skills essential for effective teaching. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The evaluation of the student teacher's work is carried on continuously throughout the program. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The evaluation of the student teacher's work is a cooperative enterprise which involves the student teacher, supervising teacher, and college supervisor. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. ----- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE XII

Teachers who serve as supervising teachers in schools used as student-teaching laboratories should be compensated for their services.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XII

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides for the compensation of the supervising teachers in the laboratory schools for their services in terms of: | | |
| a. A reduced teaching load. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. A stipulated amount of money. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Both a reduced teaching load and a stipulated amount of money. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

ACCEPT REJECT

2. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides that compensation be provided for supervising teachers in laboratory schools in terms of scholarships, honorary recognition in college catalogs, or other similar compensation.
3. -----

BASIC PRINCIPLE XIII

The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide for evaluation for the purpose of strengthening and improving the program.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XIII

1. The organization of the student-teaching program provides for continuous study of the program in all of its various phases.
2. The administration of the student-teaching program encourages and assists in conducting continuous study of the program in all of its various phases.
3. Methods and techniques used in the evaluation of the program are generally acceptable to the profession.
4. The information resulting from the evaluation of the student-teaching program is actively used for the improvement of the program.
5. Time and money are provided for study and evaluation of the program.
6. The continuous evaluation of the program is a cooperative enterprise involving all personnel working with the program, including the student teachers.
7. -----

BASIC PRINCIPLE XIV

Provision should be made for the selective admission of students to the student-teaching program.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XIV

1. Factors considered in the selection of students for admission to the program of student-teaching include:
- a. High school scholarship record
 - b. Aptitude tests
 - c. Interest inventory tests
 - d. Interviews with advisors

	ACCEPT	REJECT
e. Requirement of a minimum grade point achievement in college	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Speech tests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Physical examination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Mental ability test.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Emotional adjustment test	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Personal ambitions test	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Social distance scale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Short autobiographical statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. -----	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The names and addresses of the three persons I consider best qualified to serve on a jury to pass judgment on descriptive statements that may be used as criteria with which to evaluate the organization and administration of student-teaching programs are:

1. Name -----
Title or Position -----
Address -----
City and State -----
2. Name -----
Title or Position -----
Address -----
City and State -----
3. Name -----
Title or Position -----
Address -----
City and State -----

I would like to receive a report of the findings upon completion of the study.

My name and address -----

APPENDIX D

PERSONS INVITED TO SERVE AS JURY NOMINATORS

1. Ann C. Peters
Professor of Education
Keene Teachers College
Keene, New Hampshire
2. Mary C. Donahue
Associate Professor of Education
State Teachers College
Boston, Massachusetts
3. Mary E. Stapleton
Director of Laboratory School
Jonathan Maynard Training School
State Teachers College
Framingham, Massachusetts
4. Esther Cohen
Assistant Professor of Education
Willimantic State Teachers College
Willimantic, Connecticut
5. Betty R. Tipton
Assistant Professor of Education
Willimantic State Teachers College
Willimantic, Connecticut
6. Josephine Palmer
Associate Professor of Education
State Teachers College
New Paltz, New York
7. Frederick A. Brown
Supervising Teacher
State Teachers College
Lock Haven, Pennsylvania
8. Catherine Kuster
Supervising Teacher
State Teachers College
Mansfield, Pennsylvania
9. Dr. Elizabeth Stadtlander
Professor of Education
Allegheny College
Meadville, Pennsylvania
10. Dr. Marjorie Parker
Associate Professor of Education
Miner Teachers College
Washington, D. C.
11. Mrs. Thelma B. Avent
Supervising Teacher
State Teachers College
Fayetteville, North Carolina
12. J. L. Memory, Jr.
Professor of Education
Wake Forest College
Wake Forest, North Carolina
13. Mrs. T. H. Climer
R #2 Bellsferry Road
Rome, Georgia
14. Alex F. Perrodin
Associate Professor of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
15. Dr. Mildred Swearingen
Associate Professor of Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida
16. Martha V. Shipman
Supervising Teacher
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky
17. Mrs. Anna Belle Powers
Supervising Teacher
Austin Peay State College
Clarksville, Tennessee
18. O. B. Fuglaar
Head, Dept. of Education
Louisiana College
Pineville, Louisiana

19. Irma Scott
Supervising Teacher
McNeese State College
Lake Charles, Louisiana
20. C. L. Wisseman
Head, Dept. of Education
Southern Methodist University
Dallas 5, Texas
21. Mary Ward
Assistant Professor of Education
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio
22. Mrs. Ava Bond
Supervising Teacher
Central Michigan College
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan
23. Constance Stegenga
English Supervisor
Mt. Pleasant High School
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan
24. Albert V. Maurer
Director of Teacher Education
Concordia Teachers College
River Forest, Illinois
25. C. Von Eschen
Head, Dept. of Education
Beloit College
Beloit, Wisconsin
26. Lucile E. Anderson
Supervising Teacher
Iowa State Teachers College
Cedar Falls, Iowa
27. John B. Ervin
Associate Professor of Education
Harris Teachers College
St. Louis 12, Missouri
28. Phyllis Ann Schleich
Vocal Music Supervisor
State Teachers College
Minot, North Dakota
29. Hilma R. Davis
Home Economics Supervisor
Kansas State Teachers College
Pittsburg, Kansas
30. V. E. Witten, Jr.
Mathematics Teacher
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas
31. Mrs. Betsabe L. Martorell
Principal, Munoz Rivera School
Step 25
Santurce, Puerto Rico
32. Kathleen E. Collins
Supervising Teacher
South Burnaby
British Columbia
33. Laurence A. Walker
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming
34. Mollie Cerney
New Mexico Western College
Silver City, New Mexico
35. Esther Oehring
Supervising Teacher
Northern Montana College
Havre, Montana
36. James Curtin
Assistant Professor of Education
Oregon College of Education
Monmouth, Oregon
37. M. D. Alcorn
Director of Teacher Education
San Diego State College
San Diego 15, California
38. Lois Haynes
Supervising Teacher
Micheltorena St. School
Los Angeles, California
39. Donald Perryman
Supervising Teacher
Los Angeles City Schools
Los Angeles 12, California
40. Burton C. Newbry
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

APPENDIX E

ALTERNATES FOR PERSONS INVITED TO SERVE AS JURY NOMINATORS

1. Mildred Peabody
Supervising Teacher
Gorham Teachers College
Gorham, Maine
2. Dr. Bernard Rabin
Professor of Education
Plymouth Teachers College
Plymouth, New Hampshire
3. Helen G. Drinan
Assistant Professor of Education
State Teachers College
Lowell, Massachusetts
4. Helen Suchara
Wheelock College
Boston 15, Massachusetts
5. Gertrude Gray
20 Washington Court
Hamden 14, Connecticut
6. Louise Abernethy
Professor of Education
State Teachers College
Cortland, New York
7. Martha A. Park
Professor of Home Economics
State Teachers College
Plattsburg, New York
8. Rosemary Carroll
Director of Teacher Education
Marywood College
Scranton 9, Pennsylvania
9. Mrs. Dorothy LeFevre
Associate Professor of Education
Franklin & Marshall College
Lancaster, Pennsylvania
10. Elizabeth Stalford
Supervising Teacher
State Teachers College
Mansfield, Pennsylvania
11. Cortlandt M. Colson
Head, Secondary Education
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia
12. Edgar Beaty
Supervising Teacher
East Carolina College
Greenville, North Carolina
13. Dr. Maurice Morrill
Professor of Education
Western Carolina Teachers College
Cullowhee, North Carolina
14. Mrs. A. M. Cochran
Director of Teacher Education
Morris Brown College
Atlanta, Georgia
15. Mrs. Helen L. Perry
Supervising Teacher
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
16. Estelle Adams
Supervising Teacher
University School
Lexington, Kentucky
17. Mary McKee Simmons
Director of Teacher Education
Centre College
Danville, Kentucky
18. Dr. Heber Eliot Rumble
Ch. Curr. & Instr.
Memphis State College
Memphis, Tennessee

19. John Garrett
Ass't. Prin., Lab School
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
20. Sara Smythe
Supervising Teacher
Southeastern Louisiana College
Hammond, Louisiana
21. Charles F. Alter
Assistant Professor of Education
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware 1, Ohio
22. Ennis C. Warrick
Professor of Education
Central State College
Wilberforce, Ohio
23. Ruth Boot
Coordinator of Guidance
Paw Paw Training School
Paw Paw, Michigan
24. Bess L. Stinson
Supervising Teacher
Western Michigan College
Kalamazoo, Michigan
25. Dr. Harry J. Merigis
Director of Laboratory School
Eastern Illinois State College
Charleston, Illinois
26. Amanda Aarestad
Supervising Teacher
Winona State Teachers College
Winona, Minnesota
27. Wayne O. Aurand
Instructor
Iowa State Teachers College
Cedar Falls, Iowa
28. Carl G. Haldiman
Director of Laboratory School
Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri
29. Aird C. Smith
Assistant Professor of Education
State Teachers College
Minot, North Dakota
30. W. S. Davison
Supervising Teacher
Kansas State Teachers College
Pittsburg, Kansas
31. Luisa Artud
164 Capetilla Street
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico
32. Margarita Matos
108 De Diego Street
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico
33. Velma I. Miller
Lecturer in Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
34. Clarice Whittenburg
Professor of Education
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming
35. Oscar H. Hosmer
Director of Laboratory School
New Mexico Western College
Silver City, New Mexico
36. Homer Boroughs, Jr.
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Washington
Seattle 5, Washington
37. Mary A. Donaldson
Supervising Teacher
Oregon College of Education
Monmouth, Oregon
38. Freeman Ambrose
Director of Teacher Education
UCLA
Los Angeles 24, California
39. Dr. J. Frances Henderson
Associate Professor of Education
University of Southern California
Los Angeles 7, California
40. Mrs. Persis Porter
University High School
Los Angeles, California



COE COLLEGE

CEDAR RAPIDS · IOWA

Dear

You have been nominated by persons in the field of teacher education as one who is qualified to pass judgment on student-teaching programs. This study is concerned with basic principles and criteria with which to evaluate the organization and administration of student-teaching programs.

The enclosed booklet contains a list of fourteen principles which are believed to be basic for adequacy and efficiency in a program for student teaching. Listed under each principle are descriptive statements that might be acceptable as descriptions of evidence that a basic principle is present in a program for student teaching.

I am asking you, as an authority in the field of teacher education, to read carefully each principle and the accompanying descriptive statements and to dispose of them in accordance with the instructions preceding the list.

Your cooperation in this phase of the study, which is being made under the direction of the Graduate School, Oklahoma A & M College, will be sincerely appreciated. A prompt reply will aid in the completion of the study.

Please use the stamped envelope that is enclosed for your convenience in returning the checklist.

Sincerely,

Herbert S. Madaus, Chairman
Department of Business Education

mlp

Enclosures

APPENDIX G

BASIC PRINCIPLES
FOR THE
ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION
OF
STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

A Study Being Conducted by

Herbert S. Madaus

Coe College

Cedar Rapids, Iowa

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RESPONDING TO THE CHECKLIST

1. Please read carefully each principle; and,
 - a. Place a check in the square under ACCEPT if you believe the principle to be basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program; or,
 - b. Place a check in the square under REJECT if you do not believe the principle to be basic to the organization and administration of an effective student-teaching program.

 2. If you checked ACCEPT for the principle, then read carefully each descriptive statement; and,
 - a. Place a check in the square under ACCEPT if you believe the condition described by the descriptive statement will provide evidence that a basic principle is present in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.
 - b. Place a check in the square under REJECT if you do not believe the condition described by the descriptive statement will provide evidence that a basic principle is present in the organization and administration of a student-teaching program.
 - c. Please check all items either ACCEPT or REJECT.
-

BASIC PRINCIPLE I

ACCEPT REJECT

The general framework of the organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be determined by objectives

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle I

1. The program operates from a frame of reference established by a set of specific objectives.
2. Formulation of the objectives is the result of the cooperative effort of all personnel working with the program.
3. Provision is made for continuous evaluation of objectives for revision in light of changing needs.
4. The objectives are clearly stated in writing.
5. Provision is made to assure opportunity for all personnel working with the program to understand the objectives.

BASIC PRINCIPLE II

The organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be flexible.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle II

1. The program is organized so as to provide more than one student-teaching assignment for those students who appear to need or desire additional supervised teaching experience.
2. The student-teaching assignments vary in length according to the needs of the individual student.
3. Supervising teachers in laboratory schools provide a definite sequence of student-teaching experiences that will meet the individual needs of the student.
4. Time and facilities are provided for the college staff to study individual students to determine their individual needs.
5. Time is provided in staff load so that competent college staff members may study the laboratory schools to ascertain their adequacy to meet the needs of individual students.

- | | ACCEPT | REJECT |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 6. The budget provides money for the college staff members to study the laboratory schools to determine their adequacy for meeting the individual needs of students. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. The scheduling of college classes other than student teaching permits the student to do student teaching, determined by his needs, for a | | |
| a. Half day at a time. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Full day at a time. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Provision is made for laboratory school staff members to study the college courses to determine their adequacy for meeting the individual needs of students. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Time is provided in staff load to permit adequate supervision of student teachers by college supervisors. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE III

The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to develop a better understanding of individual differences, child growth, and development.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle III

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The organization of the student-teaching program provides each student teacher opportunities for guided contacts with children and youth: | | |
| a. Of different socio-economic backgrounds. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Of different abilities. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Of different maturity levels within their age group. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Of different age and grade levels. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The administration of the student-teaching program assures that student teachers will have guided contacts with children and youth: | | |
| a. Of different maturity levels. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Of different abilities. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Of different socio-economic backgrounds. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Of different age and grade levels. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The length of the student-teaching assignment is sufficient for the student teacher to observe and study human growth and development. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE IV

The student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to participate in important phases of a teacher's in-school and out-of-school activities of the school.

ACCEPT REJECT

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle IV

1. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to participate with the supervising teacher and others in planning class work for the students.
2. The student-teaching program provides opportunities for the student teacher to:
 - a. Attend and participate in some faculty meetings of the laboratory school.
 - b. Work with other laboratory school staff members and students on various school committees and out-of-school projects.
 - c. Work with student groups such as home rooms, student councils, and other school clubs.
 - d. Participate in school-community groups who are concerned with civic and educational problems concerning the school.
 - e. Work with out-of-school youth activities and organizations such as Boy Scouts, inter-community competitive sports, religious organizations, and teen-age clubs.
3. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to be present and participate in some of the conferences with individual parents concerning the students and their problems.
4. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to be present and participate in conferences with individual students concerning the student's problems.

BASIC PRINCIPLE V

The student-teaching experiences should be cooperatively planned and developed by the student teacher, his advisers, and supervisor.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle V

1. The organization and administration of the program designates college personnel to participate in the supervision of the student teacher in actual laboratory work.

- | | ACCEPT | REJECT |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program encourages the supervising teacher, college supervisor, and the student teacher to plan cooperatively the entire program of activities for the student teacher. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The student-teaching program provides for continuous cooperative evaluation of the student teacher. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Provision is made for revision of the student-teaching activities in light of the continuous cooperative evaluation. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE VI

The organization and administration of the teacher-education program should provide a continuous and correlated sequence of experiences leading to and following the student-teaching experience.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle VI

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Every college staff member engaged in the teacher-education program has an obligation to develop his courses so as to encourage continuous growth of the student with respect to the student's total program. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. There is a high degree of correlation among and continuity in all of the courses leading to student teaching. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The courses which are concerned with supervised observation | | |
| a. Precede the student-teaching assignment. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The courses concerned with the methods and techniques of teaching | | |
| a. Precede the student-teaching assignment. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. The student teacher receives proper preparation and counseling concerning his assignment prior to reporting to the supervising teacher. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. The student teacher is gradually inducted into the actual student-teaching experience by the supervising teacher, depending upon the student teacher's ability and readiness. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | ACCEPT | REJECT |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 7. The teacher-placement activity works directly with the college supervisor and supervising teachers to place the beginning teachers in appropriate positions. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Time and money are provided for the college supervisor, or some other qualified person, to study the student-teacher graduates after placement to evaluate their: | | |
| a. Fitness for their positions. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Adjustment to their positions. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Time and money are provided for campus conferences or seminars for recent teacher graduates and college staff members. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Provision is made for on-the-job visits to recent teacher graduates by the college supervisor or the supervising teacher. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Provision is made for assistance by correspondence to recent teacher graduates from the Director of Teacher Education and other college personnel. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE VII

Adequate physical facilities and personnel should be provided for conducting an effective student-teaching program.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle VII

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. A sufficient number and variety of schools are used as student-teaching laboratories to provide adequate opportunity for each student teacher to observe and participate in the major activities of a teacher's regular work. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The physical facilities, equipment, tools, materials, and teaching aids necessary for effective teaching are present in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Schools with inadequate equipment and facilities are used as laboratory schools in order that student teachers have opportunity to learn how to overcome such handicaps. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The program provides an adequate number of qualified personnel to guide effectively and supervise the student teachers in their student-teaching experience and to carry on the total student-teaching program. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | ACCEPT | REJECT |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. The classes taught by student teachers are large enough to provide a practical teaching situation. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. The classes taught by student teachers are small enough to provide opportunity for student teachers to work with individual students. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Schools other than a college campus school are used so as to insure student-teacher contact and work with typical rather than atypical groups of children. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE VIII

The staff members of the teacher-education institution and of the laboratory schools who are concerned with the student-teaching program should have adequate preparation for all of the major phases of student teaching.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle VIII

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The staff members who supervise student teachers in the laboratory schools are qualified from the standpoint of academic preparation. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The college staff members who directly and indirectly work with the student-teaching program are qualified from the standpoint of academic preparation. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers in the laboratory schools have had successful teaching experience in the area in which they are supervising. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The college staff members who work with student teachers have had successful teaching experience in: | | |
| a. College teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Public school teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers have exhibited evidence of continuous professional preparation and growth. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. The college staff members who work with student teachers have exhibited evidence of continuous professional preparation and growth. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Supervising teachers in the laboratory schools have had special training in supervision. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE IX

ACCEPT REJECT

The officials of the teacher-education institution should have a clearly stated agreement with each school that is used as a laboratory school.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle IX

1. The officials of the teacher-education institution have a clearly stated agreement with each school that is used as a laboratory school

a. With respect to the assignment of student teachers.

b. With respect to the maximum number of student teachers.

c. With respect to the placement of student teachers.

d. With respect to the selection of the supervising teachers.

2. The responsibilities of the student teacher have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement.

3. The responsibilities of the supervising teacher have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement.

4. The responsibilities of the college supervisor and other college personnel working with the program have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement.

5. When such an agreement has been executed, provision has been made to assure that all personnel working with the program have had opportunity to understand the provisions of the agreement.

6. The kind and the amount of payment to the laboratory school for the supervising teacher's time used in supervising student teachers is clearly stated in the agreement.

BASIC PRINCIPLE X

The work done in connection with the student-teaching program in the teacher education institution and in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories should be considered as a part of, rather than in addition to, the regular teaching load of all personnel.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle X

ACCEPT REJECT

- 1. The work done by college personnel with respect to the preparation, guidance, and supervision of student teachers is considered in determining their regular teaching loads.
- 2. The work done by teachers in schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories with respect to guiding and supervising student teachers is considered in determining their regular teaching loads.

BASIC PRINCIPLE XI

The student-teaching program should provide for evaluation of the student-teaching experience in terms of individual growth.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XI

- 1. The individual growth of the student teacher is evaluated in terms of:
 - a. His acquisition of essential knowledge for effective teaching.
 - b. His development of abilities and skills essential for effective teaching.
 - c. His growth in professional habits.
 - d. His development of a professional attitude.
- 2. The evaluation of the student teacher's work is carried on continuously throughout the program.
- 3. The evaluation of the student teacher's work is a cooperative enterprise which involves the student teacher, supervising teacher, and college supervisor.

BASIC PRINCIPLE XII

Teachers who serve as supervising teachers in schools used as student-teaching laboratories should be compensated for their services.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XII

- 1. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides for the compensation of the supervising teachers in the laboratory schools for their services in terms of:
 - a. A reduced teaching load.
 - b. A stipulated amount of money.

- | | ACCEPT | REJECT |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Both a reduced teaching load and a stipulated amount of money. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides that compensation be provided for supervising teachers in laboratory schools in terms of recognition in college catalogs, or other similar compensation. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE XIII

The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide for evaluation for the purpose of strengthening and improving the program.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XIII

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The organization of the student-teaching program provides for continuous study of the program in all of its various phases. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The administration of the student-teaching program encourages and assists in conducting continuous study of the program in all of its various phases. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Methods and techniques used in the evaluation of the program are generally acceptable to the profession. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The information resulting from the evaluation of the student-teaching program is actively used for the improvement of the program. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Time and money are provided for study and evaluation of the program. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. The continuous evaluation of the program is a co-operative enterprise involving all personnel working with the program, including the student teachers. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

BASIC PRINCIPLE XIV

Provision should be made for the selective admission of students to the student-teaching program.

Descriptive Statements for Basic Principle XIV

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Factors considered in the selection of students for admission to the program of student-teaching include: | | |
| a. High school scholarship record | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Aptitude tests | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	ACCEPT	REJECT
c. Interest inventory tests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Interviews with advisors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Requirement of a minimum grade point achievement in college	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Speech tests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Physical examination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Mental ability test.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Emotional adjustment test	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Personal ambitions test	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Social distance scale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Short autobiographical statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Language usage test	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. Completion of pre-requisite courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I would like to receive a report of the findings upon completion of the study.

My name and address.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX H

PERSONS NOMINATED TO SERVE ON THE JURY

1. Dr. Alex Perrodin
Professor of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
2. Dr. Dorothy McGeoch
Professor of Education
Teachers College
DeKalb, Illinois
- *3. Dr. Verna Dieckman
Professor of Education
Wayne University
Detroit, Michigan
- *4. Dr. Margaret Lindsey
Professor of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York 27, N. Y.
5. Dr. Ernest Milner
Director of Laboratory Experiences
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York
6. Dr. W. H. Burton
Professor of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
7. Dr. Lawrence Newell
Director of Student Teaching
State Teachers College
Framingham, Massachusetts
8. Miss Alice Scipione
Critic Teacher
Jonathan Maynard Laboratory School
Framingham, Massachusetts
9. Miss Mary Bond
Critic Teacher
Jonathan Maynard Laboratory School
Framingham, Massachusetts
10. Dr. Winifred Bain
50 Fallen St.
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts
11. Dr. Florence Stratemeyer
Professor of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York 27, N. Y.
12. Dr. Frances Mayforth, President
Wheelock College
110 Riverway
Boston, Massachusetts
13. Miss Elizabeth Stalford
Supervising Teacher
State Teachers College
Mansfield, Pennsylvania
14. Mrs. Marion Bennett
Supervising Teacher
State Teachers College
Mansfield, Pennsylvania
15. Mr. Harold Adams
English Teacher
Blossburg High School
Blossburg, Pennsylvania
16. Dr. Charles S. Miller
Professor of Education
Allegheny College
Meadville, Pennsylvania

*Nominated, but did not participate

17. Harold L. Nichols
First Assistant Superintendent
70 N. Broadway
Akron, Ohio
18. Dr. Ross McGill
Superintendent of Schools
Livingstone, New Jersey
19. Dr. Walter E. Hager, President
D. C. Teachers College
11th and Harvard Streets NW
Washington, D. C.
20. Mrs. Grace H. Smith
Supervising Teacher
Monroe School
Washington, D. C.
21. Hannah L. Cayton
Professor of Education
D. C. Teachers College
Washington, D. C.
22. Dr. James F. Nicholas
Professor of Education
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia
23. Mrs. Elsie C. Colson
Assistant Professor of Education
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia
24. Miss Dorothy N. Batts
Assistant Professor of Education
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia
25. L. D. Haskew
Professor of Education
University of Texas
Austin, Texas
26. Allen D. Patterson
Association For Student Teaching
State College
Lock Haven, Pennsylvania
- *27. Mr. Newton Whatley
Elementary School Principal
Route #2
Rome, Georgia
28. Miss Dora Lee Wilkerson
Social Studies Teacher
716 Avenue A
Rome, Georgia
29. Miss Nelle Dale
First Grade Teacher
#1 Forsyth Street
Rome, Georgia
- *30. Dr. Carl Brown
Professor of Education
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina
31. W. B. Runge
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
32. Dr. James Burr
Professor of Education
Ohio State College
Columbus, Ohio
33. Dr. Chiles Van Antwerp
Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee
34. Miss Willie Stevens
Professor of Education
Austin Peay College
Clarksville, Tennessee
35. Dr. Gaither McConnel
Head, Education Department
Newcomb College
New Orleans, Louisiana
36. Miss Grace Bailey
Supervising Teacher
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
37. Dr. T. J. Griffin
Director of Student Teaching
Louisiana College
Pineville, Louisiana
38. Dr. Ernest Cason
Professor of Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

*Nominated, but did not participate

39. Dr. Ted Booker
Professor of Education
Valdosta State College
Valdosta, Georgia
40. Dr. Edgar Beaty
Professor of Education
East Carolina State College
Greenville, North Carolina
41. Jesse Cardwell
Sec. Sch. Curr. Coordinator
School Administration Bldg.
Dallas, Texas
42. George P. Freeman
Associate Professor of Education
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
Ruston, Louisiana
43. Dr. Margaret Wasson
Director of Instruction
School Administration Bldg.
Dallas, Texas
44. Archie E. Hendricks
Professor of Education
Kent University
Kent, Ohio
45. Dr. Kenneth Hanson
Professor of Education
Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado
46. Dr. George Hill
Professor of Education
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio
47. Dr. R. M. Thomas, Director
Division of Education
Central State College
Wilberforce, Ohio
48. Dr. S. O. Andrews
Professor of Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
49. Dr. F. A. McGinnis, Registrar
Wilberforce University
Wilberforce, Ohio
50. Hugh G. Archer, Director
Paw Paw Training School
Western Michigan College of Education
Paw Paw, Michigan
51. Miss Jane S. Mervine
Supervising Teacher
State Teachers College
Indiana, Pennsylvania
52. Dr. L. Gordon Stone
Director of Student Teaching
Wisconsin State College
River Falls, Wisconsin
53. Bertha Bellis
Critic Teacher
Northern Illinois State Teachers College
DeKalb, Illinois
54. J. W. Carrington
Director of Student Teaching
Illinois State Normal University
Normal, Illinois
55. S. D. Fink
Director, Laboratory School
Northern Illinois State Teachers College
DeKalb, Illinois
56. Dr. Kara Jackson
Professor of Education
Grambling College
Grambling, Louisiana
57. Dr. Eva Mitchell
Professor of Education
Hampton Institute
Hampton, Virginia
58. Dr. R. D. Johnson
Professor of Education
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia
59. Miss Viola Parvin
Associate Professor of Education
Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri
60. Dr. Clay Jent
Associate Professor of Education
Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri

61. Dr. Kathleen Ranson
Associate Professor of Education
Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri
62. Dr. Olger Myhre
Director of Student Teaching
State Teachers College
Minot, North Dakota
63. Dr. O. A. DeLong, President
State Teachers College
Mayville, North Dakota
64. Dr. Frank Steves
Director of Student Teaching
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota
65. Miss Helen Kriegsman
Supervisor in Mathematics
Kansas State Teachers College
Pittsburg, Kansas
66. Mr. Howard Lundquist
Supervisor in Business Education
Kansas State Teachers College
Pittsburg, Kansas
67. Mrs. Laura Baxter
Assoc. Professor, Home Economics
Kansas State Teachers College
Pittsburg, Kansas
68. Dr. Ronald A. Alterman
Director, Audio Visual Dept.
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas
69. Dr. Ruth Glazebrooks
Trenton Junior College
Trenton, Missouri
70. Dr. Don Davis
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas
71. Mr. C. J. Frederickson
Inspector of Schools
So. Burnaby, British Columbia
Canada
72. Mr. R. C. Grant
Inspector of Schools
So. Burnaby, British Columbia
Canada
73. Professor Owen Thomas
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia
Canada
74. Paul Grim
Supervisor of Student Teaching
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
75. Miss Pearl Merriman
Supervising Teacher
Western Washington College of Education
Bellingham, Washington
76. W. J. Lincoln
Associate Professor in Commerce
New Mexico Western College
Silver City, New Mexico
77. Miss Inez Rhodes
Assistant Professor in Education
New Mexico Western College
Silver City, New Mexico
78. A. B. Fitch
Instructor in Commerce
New Mexico Western College
Silver City, New Mexico
- *79. Dr. Dwight G. Curtis
Director of Teacher Training
Iowa State Teachers College
Cedar Falls, Iowa
- *80. Dr. Dorothy Koehring
Supervising Teacher
Iowa State Teachers College
Cedar Falls, Iowa

*Nominated, but did not participate

81. Dr. Wm. T. Wagner
Director of Student Teaching
Oregon College of Education
Monmouth, Oregon
82. Dr. William J. Masson
218 University Hall
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa
83. Dr. Richard Hanson
Assistant Superintendent
City Hall--Courthouse
St. Paul, Minnesota
- *84. Dr. David Malcolm
Assistant Professor of Education
San Diego State College
San Diego, California
85. Dr. Ralph Troge
Junior High Principal
Woodrow Wilson Junior High
San Diego, California
86. Mr. Malcolm Brown
Assistant Superintendent of Schools
San Diego City Schools
San Diego, California
87. Dr. Wendell Cannon
Director of Teacher Training
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California
88. Dr. Louise Seyler
Associate Superintendent
Los Angeles Board of Education
Los Angeles, California
89. Dr. D. D. Lessenberry
Department of Business Education
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
90. Dr. McKee Fisk
Fresno State College
Fresno, California
91. Dr. Esby McGill
Emporia State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas
92. Dean Garold Holstine
College of Education
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada
93. G. W. Ford, Head
Secondary Education Department
San Jose State College
San Jose 14, California
94. Paul E. Kambly
Director of Teacher Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

*Nominated, but did not participate



COE COLLEGE

CEDAR RAPIDS · IOWA

April 9, 1956

Dear

Recently you received a copy of the checklist entitled, "Basic Principles For the Organization and Administration of Student-Teaching Programs."

This study is being made under the direction of the Graduate School, Oklahoma A & M College, as part of the work for the Doctor of Education degree.

Since only a limited number of these checklists were sent out, it is vital to the completion of the study that a high percentage of them are returned. All persons who have been asked to participate in this phase of the study were nominated because they are recognized as leaders in the field of student teaching.

Although the checklist is rather long, considerable effort has been made to present the items in such a way that you might respond to them in a minimum length of time.

Another copy of the checklist is enclosed in case you have misplaced or did not receive the first one.

Won't you please take a few minutes and check the items either ACCEPT or REJECT and return the checklist in the enclosed return envelope.

Please make a special effort to return the checklist by April 20 to assure your responses being included in the final report of the study.

I sincerely hope you will take time to participate in this study, since your contribution will add to the validity of the study.

Sincerely,

Herbert S. Madaus, Chairman
Department of Business Education

gs

Enclosures

APPENDIX J

RESULTS OF APPLICATION OF THE CHI-SQUARE FORMULA TO ITEMS IN THE CHECKLIST

Item	P Value
Descriptive Statement 1 for Basic Principle I	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 7a for Basic Principle II	Not significant .70
Descriptive Statement 6 for Basic Principle II	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 3 for Basic Principle III	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 2e for Basic Principle IV	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 2 for Basic Principle V	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 3a for Basic Principle VI	Not significant .22
Descriptive Statement 4a for Basic Principle VI	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 4b for Basic Principle VI	Not significant .075
Descriptive Statement 3 for Basic Principle VII	(Reject) Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 6 for Basic Principle VII	(Accept) Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 4a for Basic Principle VIII	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 2 for Basic Principle IX	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 2 for Basic Principle X	Less than .01
Basic Principle XI	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 1a for Basic Principle XII	Not significant .10
Descriptive Statement 1b for Basic Principle XII	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 1c for Basic Principle XII	Not significant .27
Descriptive Statement 5 for Basic Principle XIII	Less than .01
Descriptive Statement 1j for Basic Principle XIV	Not significant .07
Descriptive Statement 1k for Basic Principle XIV	.035
Descriptive Statement 1n for Basic Principle XIV	Less than .01

APPENDIX K

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF STUDENT-TEACHING PROGRAMS AND VALIDATED CRITERIA THAT GIVE EVIDENCE OF THE PRESENCE OF EACH PRINCIPLE IN A STUDENT-TEACHING PROGRAM

Basic Principle I

The general framework of the organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be determined by objectives.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle I

1. The program operates from a frame of reference established by a set of specific objectives.
2. Formulation of the objectives is the result of the cooperative effort of all personnel working with the program.
3. Provision is made for continuous evaluation of objectives for revision in light of changing needs.
4. The objectives are clearly stated in writing.
5. Provision is made to assure opportunity for all personnel working with the program to understand the objectives.

Basic Principle II

The organization and administration of a student-teaching program should be flexible.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle II

1. The program is organized so as to provide more than one student-teaching assignment for those who appear to need or desire additional supervised teaching experience.
2. The student-teaching assignments vary in length according to the needs of the individual student.
3. Supervising teachers in laboratory schools provide a definite sequence of student-teaching experiences that will meet the individual needs of the student.

4. Time and facilities are provided for the college staff to study individual students to determine their individual needs.
5. Time is provided in staff load so that competent college staff members may study the laboratory schools to ascertain their adequacy to meet the needs of individual students.
6. The budget provides money for the college staff members to study the laboratory schools to determine their adequacy for meeting the individual needs of students.
7. The scheduling of college classes other than student teaching permits the student to do student teaching, determined by his needs, for a full day at a time.
8. Provision is made for laboratory school staff members to study the college courses to determine their adequacy for meeting the individual needs of students.
9. Time is provided in staff load to permit adequate supervision of student teachers by college supervisors.

Basic Principle III

The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to develop a better understanding of individual differences, child growth, and development.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle III

1. The organization of the student-teaching program provides each student teacher opportunities for guided contacts with children and youth
 - a. Of different socio-economic backgrounds.
 - b. Of different abilities.
 - c. Of different maturity levels within their age group.
 - d. Of different age and grade levels.
2. The administration of the student-teaching program assures that student teachers will have guided contacts with children and youth
 - a. Of different maturity levels.
 - b. Of different abilities.
 - c. Of different socio-economic backgrounds.
 - d. Of different age and grade levels.

3. The length of the student-teaching assignment is sufficient for the student teacher to observe and study human growth and development.

Basic Principle IV

The student-teaching program should provide opportunities for the student teacher to participate in important phases of a teacher's in-school and out-of-school activities of the school.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle IV

1. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to participate with the supervising teacher and others in planning class work for the students.
2. The student-teaching program provides opportunities for the student teacher to
 - a. Attend and participate in some faculty meetings of the laboratory school.
 - b. Work with other laboratory school staff members and students on various school committees and out-of-school projects.
 - c. Work with student groups such as home rooms, student councils, and other school clubs.
 - d. Participate in school-community groups who are concerned with civic and educational problems concerning the school.
 - e. Work with out-of-school youth activities and organizations such as Boy Scouts, inter-community competitive sports, religious organizations, and teen-age clubs.
3. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to be present and participate in some of the conferences with individual parents concerning the students and their problems.
4. The student-teaching program permits the student teacher to be present and participate in conferences with individual students concerning the student's problems.

Basic Principle V

The student-teaching experiences should be cooperatively planned and developed by the student teacher, his advisers, and supervisor.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle V

1. The organization and administration of the program designates college personnel to participate in the supervision of the student teacher in actual laboratory work.

2. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program encourages the supervising teacher, college supervisor, and the student teacher to plan cooperatively the entire program of activities for the student teacher.
3. The student-teaching program provides for continuous cooperative evaluation of the student teacher.
4. Provision is made for revision of the student-teaching activities in light of the continuous cooperative evaluation.

Basic Principle VI

The organization and administration of the teacher-education program should provide a continuous and correlated sequence of experiences leading to and following the student-teaching experience.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle VI

1. Every college staff member engaged in the teacher-education program has an obligation to develop his courses so as to encourage continuous growth of the student with respect to the student's total program.
2. There is a high degree of correlation among and continuity in all of the courses leading to student teaching.
3. The courses which are concerned with supervised observation are co-requisite with the student-teaching assignment.
4. The courses concerned with the methods and techniques of teaching precede the student-teaching assignment.
5. The student teacher receives proper preparation and counseling concerning his assignment prior to reporting to the supervising teacher.
6. The student teacher is gradually inducted into the actual student-teaching experience by the supervising teacher, depending upon the student teacher's ability and readiness.
7. The teacher-placement activity works directly with the college supervisor and supervising teachers to place the beginning teachers in appropriate positions.
8. Time and money are provided for the college supervisor, or some other qualified person, to study the student-teacher graduates after placement to evaluate their
 - a. Fitness for their positions.
 - b. Adjustment to their positions.

9. Time and money are provided for campus conferences or seminars for recent teacher graduates and college staff members.
10. Provision is made for on-the-job visits to recent teacher graduates by the college supervisor or the supervising teacher.
11. Provision is made for assistance by correspondence to recent teacher graduates from the Director of Teacher Education and other college personnel.

Basic Principle VII

Adequate physical facilities and personnel should be provided for conducting an effective student-teaching program.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle VII

1. A sufficient number and variety of schools are used as student-teaching laboratories to provide adequate opportunity for each student teacher to observe and participate in the major activities of a teacher's regular work.
2. The physical facilities, equipment, tools, materials, and teaching aids necessary for effective teaching are present in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories.
3. The program provides an adequate number of qualified personnel to guide effectively and supervise the student teachers in their student-teaching experience and to carry on the total student-teaching program.
4. The classes taught by student teachers are large enough to provide a practical teaching situation.
5. The classes taught by student teachers are small enough to provide opportunity for student teachers to work with individual students.
6. Schools other than a college campus school are used so as to insure student-teacher contact and work with typical rather than atypical groups of children.

Basic Principle VIII

The staff members of the teacher-education institution and of the laboratory schools who are concerned with the student-teaching program should have adequate preparation for all of the major phases of student teaching.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle VIII

1. The staff members who supervise student teachers in the laboratory schools are qualified from the standpoint of academic preparation.

2. The college staff members who directly and indirectly work with the student-teaching program are qualified from the standpoint of academic preparation.
3. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers in the laboratory schools have had successful teaching experience in the area in which they are supervising.
4. The college staff members who work with student teachers have had successful teaching experience in
 - a. College teaching.
 - b. Public school teaching.
5. The supervising teachers who work with student teachers have exhibited evidence of continuous professional preparation and growth.
6. The college staff members who work with student teachers have exhibited evidence of continuous professional preparation and growth.
7. Supervising teachers in the laboratory schools have had special training in supervision.

Basic Principle IX

The officials of the teacher-education institution should have a clearly stated agreement with each school that is used as a laboratory school.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle IX

1. The officials of the teacher-education institution have a clearly stated agreement with each school that is used as a laboratory school
 - a. With respect to the assignment of student teachers.
 - b. With respect to the maximum number of student teachers.
 - c. With respect to the placement of student teachers.
 - d. With respect to the selection of the supervising teachers.
2. The responsibilities of the student teacher have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement.
3. The responsibilities of the supervising teacher have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement.

4. The responsibilities of the college supervisor and other college personnel working with the program have been identified and clearly stated in the agreement.
5. When such an agreement has been executed, provision has been made to assure that all personnel working with the program have had opportunity to understand the provisions of the agreement.
6. The kind and the amount of payment to the laboratory school for the supervising teacher's time used in supervising student teachers is clearly stated in the agreement.

Basic Principle X

The work done in connection with the student-teaching program in the teacher-education institution and in the schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories should be considered as a part of, rather than in addition to, the regular teaching load of all personnel.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle X

1. The work done by college personnel with respect to the preparation, guidance, and supervision of student teachers is considered in determining their regular teaching loads.
2. The work done by teachers in schools which are used as student-teaching laboratories with respect to guiding and supervising student teachers is considered in determining their regular teaching loads.

Basic Principle XI

The student-teaching program should provide for evaluation of the student-teaching experience in terms of individual growth.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle XI

1. The individual growth of the student teacher is evaluated in terms of
 - a. His acquisition of essential knowledge for effective teaching.
 - b. His development of abilities and skills essential for effective teaching.
 - c. His growth in professional habits.
 - d. His development of a professional attitude.
2. The evaluation of the student teacher's work is carried on continuously throughout the program.

3. The evaluation of the student teacher's work is a cooperative enterprise which involves the student teacher, supervising teacher, and college supervisor.

Basic Principle XII

Teachers who serve as supervising teachers in schools used as student-teaching laboratories should be compensated for their services.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle XII

1. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides for the compensation of the supervising teachers in the laboratory schools for their services in terms of a stipulated amount of money.
2. The organization and administration of the student-teaching program provides that compensation be provided for supervising teachers in laboratory schools in terms of recognition in college catalogs, or other similar compensation.

Basic Principle XIII

The organization and administration of the student-teaching program should provide for evaluation for the purpose of strengthening and improving the program.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle XIII

1. The organization of the student-teaching program provides for continuous study of the program in all of its various phases.
2. The administration of the student-teaching program encourages and assists in conducting continuous study of the program in all of its various phases.
3. Methods and techniques used in the evaluation of the program are generally acceptable to the profession.
4. The information resulting from the evaluation of the student-teaching program is actively used for the improvement of the program.
5. Time and money are provided for study and evaluation of the program.
6. The continuous evaluation of the program is a cooperative enterprise involving all personnel working with the program, including the student teachers.

Basic Principle XIV

Provision should be made for the selective admission of students to the student-teaching program.

Criteria That Give Evidence of the Presence of Basic Principle XIV

1. Factors considered in the selection of students for admission to the program of student teaching include
 - a. High school scholarship record.
 - b. Aptitude tests.
 - c. Interest inventory tests.
 - d. Interviews with advisors.
 - e. Requirement of a minimum grade point achievement in college.
 - f. Speech tests.
 - g. Physical examination.
 - h. Mental ability test.
 - i. Emotional adjustment test.
 - j. Social distance scale.
 - k. Short autobiographical statement.
 - l. Language usage test.
 - m. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.
 - n. Completion of pre-requisite courses.

VITA

Herbert S. Madaus

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Thesis: VALIDATION OF BASIC PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF STUDENT-TEACHING PROGRAMS

Major Field: Secondary Education

Biographical:

Personal data: Born at Lockney, Texas, December 8, 1916.

Education: Graduated from high school at Willow Springs, Missouri in 1934; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Southwest Missouri State College, with majors in music and commerce, in 1939; received the Master of Science degree from Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, with a major in business education, in 1949; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in May, 1957.

Professional experiences: Taught in high school at Seneca, Missouri, from 1938 through 1941; served with United States Navy from 1942 through 1945; taught in high school at Riverton, Kansas, from 1946 through 1948; taught at the University of Arkansas from 1949 through 1955; taught at Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, from 1955 to the present.

Professional organizations: Phi Delta Kappa, Delta Pi Epsilon, Kappa Delta Pi, United Business Education Association, National Office Management Association, Iowa Business Education Association.

TYPISTS

Herbert S. Madaus
Marjorie McKee