THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE MASTER OF TEACHING DEGREE AT OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

RAYMOND PAUL SEMONES

Norman, Oklahoma

1960

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/1454

THE MASTER OF TEACHING DEGREE AT OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES

APPROVED BY

Claude Kelley

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. Claude Kelley for his guidance of this study, and for his keen insight into the problems involved.

A debt of gratitude is also owed to Dr. Glenn Snider for his advice in the planning of the problem, and continued interest in the writer as a student.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Arthur Heilman, Dr. Chester Williams, and Dr. William Fulton for their contributions as members of the writer's advisory committee, to Dr. Willard Lane and Dr. Ross Pugmire, former chairmen of the writer's committee, and to Dr. Stanley Clifton for his service as a member of the thesis committee.

The understanding, patience, encouragement, sacrifices, and financial assistance of the writer's family are recognized as essential to the completion of this effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		v
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF GRADUATE WORK AT THE SIX STATE COLLEGES OF OKLAHOMA	8
III.	PURPOSES OF GRADUATE OFFERINGS AT THE SIX STATE COLLEGES OF OKLAHOMA	40
IV.	CURRICULAR OFFERINGS	64
V.	OTHER ASPECTS OF THE MASTER OF TEACHING PROGRAM	74
VI.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY		99
APPENDIX		102

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number of Undergraduate Education and Psychology Courses Listed by the Six State Colleges of Oklahoma for the Academic Years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958	65
2.	Graduate Courses Listed by the Six State Colleges of Oklahoma for the Academic Years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958	66
3.	Duplication of Graduate Courses Listed by State Colleges of Oklahoma for the Academic Years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958	70
4.	Number of Graduate Courses Listed by Only One State College of Oklahoma, and the Colleges Listing Them for the Academic Years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958	72

THE MASTER OF TEACHING DEGREE AT OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

One of the most extensive recent changes concerning the preparation of teachers in Oklahoma is the development of the Fifth-Year Programs, leading to the Master of Teaching degree at the state colleges of Oklahoma. However, there is nothing new in the concept of a terminal Master's degree especially designed for teachers. In fact, the earliest use of the term "Master" in connection with educational pursuits was to denote one who was qualified to teach. Only as Mastership became sought after by those with no intention of teaching, solely as an indication of superior achievement, did it have any other connotation. This necessitated a distinction between Master's degrees for teachers and for non-teachers.

The Master of Arts was first offered as an earned degree in the United States at Harvard College, in 1874. Before that time the degree was honorary, or simply applied for in the United States.

The growth of the teaching profession has made possible so much specialization in Education there is need for differentiating between the various master's degrees in terms of the purpose for which the degree was

established. Thus, the Master of Teaching degree was conceived principally as a terminal degree for elementary and secondary school teachers.

The normal procedure by which teacher-training institutions add graduate work is to offer a Master of Arts or Master of Science degree in Education, which as often as not includes preparation for administrators, as well as for classroom teachers. Harvard and Yale universities now offer a Master of Arts in Teaching, the purpose of which is the advanced training of classroom teachers. The Harvard catalog states the purpose of the degree to be to prepare the teacher for his first position.[1] This is a relatively recent development.

When added by a state institution whose principal purpose is the preparation of teachers, the Master's degree program has often been thought to be a step in the development of a graduate school, occasionally culminating in the offering of the doctorate. However, in these instances, the initial authorization often included in its purpose the preparation of administrators, or at least failed to specifically limit the program to preparation of better classroom teachers.

Need for the Study

As the Master of Teaching degree programs had been in operation six years,(1955-1960) they were deemed to be sufficiently mature to justify analysis and interpretation. Timeliness was added to the study by the fact that six state colleges were visited by committees representing both the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for

---

[1]Harvard University, General Announcement, 1958-1959, p. 30.

the purpose of evaluating the Fifth-Year Programs. This resulted in the accreditation of the institutions by both accrediting agencies.

Purpose of the Study

It was the purpose of this dissertation to: (1) trace the history and development of graduate study at the state colleges with specific reference to the Fifth-Year Programs; (2) examine the present status of the program, consider it in the light of the purposes stated for the program at its initiation, and seek explanation for any variations between these two.

The Problem

The problem of this study was to analyze and interpret the Fifth-Year Programs of the six state colleges of Oklahoma, as they were developed and operated in the first five years.

Review of the problem indicated that answers would be sought to the following questions:

1. How did graduate work at the state colleges originate and under what authorization?
2. What provided the impetus for the Fifth-Year Programs?
3. What was the legal authorization for the programs?
4. What were the original purposes of the program?
5. How do the original purposes of the programs resemble or differ from the purposes as presently stated?
6. To what degree, and in what respects, if any, do the programs deviate from the original purposes?

7. What provisions have been made in the programs for selective admission and retention?
8. When graduates are enrolled in the undergraduate courses what distinction is made between the work required for graduate credit and that required for undergraduate credit?
9. What practices are followed in the planning of the programs of the individual students?
10. To what degree is work in the Fifth-Year Programs transferable on graduate programs at other institutions of higher learning, both within and outside of Oklahoma?
11. What effort is made by the institutions involved to protect the credits of their students in transferring them to institutions other than the six state colleges?
12. What is the future of the Fifth-Year Programs as anticipated by the state colleges?

Delimitation of the Problem

With the exception of background material, the time covered in the study was limited to the academic years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958.

The study was limited to the six state colleges of Oklahoma, located at Ada, Alva, Durant, Edmond, Tahlequah, and Weatherford operating under the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges. It was limited to that part of the activities of the colleges directly related to the Fifth-Year Programs and the provision of work leading to that degree.

The programs of colleges were considered as a group and individually, but no institution has been identified by name, except in the

citing of historical incidents and published statements of purpose.

Definition of Terms

The term "North Central Association" as used in this study refers to the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The term "controlling boards" is used in this study to include both the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

The term "Fifth-Year Program" is used to mean the Master of Teaching degree program. (This term is so used by the state colleges.)

The term "administrative officers in the programs" includes presidents and deans of colleges, and chairmen of departments of education.

Methods of Research and Sources of Data

The historical method and normative survey were used to secure data. Data which are a matter of record were sought by historical research methods. Data concerning the acceptability of work in the Fifth-Year Programs were sought by letters of inquiry to the six regional accrediting associations, and by inquiry of the graduate office at the University of Oklahoma. All other data were secured from interviews with persons in positions having access to the data needed. Specifically, these included administrative officers in the programs, and the Chancellor of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and his assistant.

The following procedure was used in gathering data by interview:

1. An interview guide was developed from questions pertinent to the problems of this study. A separate interview guide

was developed for each classification of interviewee (classifications of interviewees are: Chancellor and Administrative Assistant of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, college presidents, college deans and chairmen of departments of education.)

2. Interviews were recorded electronically, or manually, according to the preference of the interviewee.

Treatment of the Data

Data acquired by historical research, such as that acquired from reports, minutes of meetings, and college catalogs, were systematically tabulated and appropriately reported.

Data gathered by letter of inquiry were tallied and reported in tabular form.

Data gathered by interview on record were transcribed in abbreviated form and grouped by colleges. Responses were then classified by topic, and those basically the same were grouped with proper headings. The abbreviated cards were then arranged according to major thought, to facilitate the writing of the report. The apparent modal position was established for each item of the interview guide for each college. Pertinent comments not anticipated by the interview guide were reported individually.

Organization of the Report

Chapter II developed the history of graduate work at the state colleges. Chapter III was an analysis of the developing purposes of the Fifth-Year Programs. Chapter IV surveyed the curricular offerings of the

Fifth-Year Programs throughout their development. Chapter V was concerned with three distinct areas of the Master of Teaching Programs. They were student-personnel practices as they pertained to students in the Master of Teaching programs; the acceptability of work done in the Fifth-Year Programs; and the anticipated future of these programs. Chapter VI presented the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF GRADUATE WORK AT THE SIX STATE COLLEGES OF OKLAHOMA

Early History: 1949-1951

It would not be unusual in any group of six four-year colleges for some of their administrators to contemplate the establishment of a graduate program. Any president might entertain the idea that perhaps his institution should add such a program even if some of the others were not ready for such a development.

Thus, it would be virtually impossible to record and report the earliest conceptions of graduate ambitions by or for the institutions concerned in this study. However, manifestations of such thinking became a matter of public record when resolutions of interested groups were presented to controlling state boards.

The first such record is found in the minutes of the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges, for the meeting of November 20, 1949, in which is recorded:

> The secretary presented a resolution from the Central District OEA concerning the making of Central State College a graduate school. The secretary was instructed to acknowledge receipt of the same and state that it was presented to the board and was

taken under advisement.[1]

One year later, the Alumni Association of East Central State College presented a similar resolution on behalf of its Alma Mater. Copies of the resolution were distributed to the members of the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges before the meeting of November 13, 1950. The minutes of this meeting devoted some 400 words reporting this resolution.[2]

That this seed fell on more fertile ground than the proposal a year earlier is evidenced by several facts apparent in the above-mentioned minutes: (1) that instead of mere mention and acknowledgment by the regents, it rated a rather full coverage in the minutes, including a rather one-sided report of favoring the proposal; (2) that the Board, at its first opportunity, indicated sympathy for the proposal and (3) that the board brought the matter to the attention of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education which would need to make any final decision on the matter.

It is quite probable that the request a year earlier had some recognized effect in preparing the ground for the favorable reception of the later request. The different procedure in presenting the later request, that of sending it to the individual members of the Board, may have had some effect on the tone of its reception. However, the difference is so marked that some basic change in the situation must have been recognized by the board between the dates of these two requests.

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, November 20, 1949, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, November 13, 1950, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

It is entirely possible that the following enrollment data is pertinent to this change in attitude toward these requests for graduate programs. During the year when the earlier request was made (1949-1950), the total full-time enrollment for regular fall and spring semesters at the six colleges had increased over the previous year by 1234 students.[1] This constituted an all-time high of 7964 students for the six colleges. Certainly taking proper care of the students already enrolled or trying to enroll was a major consideration of the Board at this time. However, in the year in which the second request (1950-1951) occurred, enrollment for the six colleges totaled 6394, or some 1580 students less than the previous year. The total enrollment was less than for any year since 1945-1946. Perhaps, at this time, the Board anticipated to some extent the additional decrease of some 684 students which was to take place the following year. By this time the Board was no doubt highly concerned with how to make suitable use of the facilities which were so limited in terms of need for them the year before. While the enthusiasm of the Board for such a program was no doubt based on more than this need, such a development could hardly have failed to appear to the Board as a possible means of utilizing facilities more efficiently.

As a result of the above request, the Board instructed its secretary to write the Board of Regents for Higher Education requesting it to list the changes these colleges would need to make in facilities and staff before they could be granted authority to offer Master's degree programs

---

[1]"Summary of Resident Enrollment," Seventh Bienniel Report of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, page 96.

in Education.[1]

Before their meeting the following month, a similar resolution on behalf of Southwestern State College was received by members of the Board. However, it invoked no reaction, as the Board was awaiting a reply to the letter that was sent to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as a result of the previous request.[2]

At this point, the interest of another state college in a graduate program was evidenced in quite a different manner. Southeastern State College requested Oklahoma A. & M. College to design a program for a graduate center in which the two institutions would cooperate. Roy S. Tompkins, Director of the Division of College Extension, drafted the plan which follows, dated December 27, 1950, as a result of this request:

A Proposed Program for Graduate Centers in Cooperation With State Colleges

1. It is proposed that plans be approved for offering graduate work in education toward a Master's degree at Southeastern State College in cooperation with the administration of that institution. Approximately one half of the work required for a Master's degree may be done at this center providing sixteen hours or at least one full semester or two full summers of work to be done at Oklahoma A. & M. College.

2. Instructors for teaching courses on the graduate level may be nominated by either institution but must be approved by both.

3. Fees. Student fees are fixed by the Board of Regents for Higher Education and are eight dollars per semester-hour. All fees collected will be deposited by the Division of College

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, November 13, 1950, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, December 29, 1950, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

Extension with the business manager of Oklahoma A. & M. College.

4. It is proposed that when staff members who are regularly employed by Southeastern State College are selected to teach a course, Oklahoma A. & M. College, through its Division of College Extension, will pay two hundred dollars per semester for the services of any such instructor teaching a two-hour course.

5. When instructors are selected from the Oklahoma A. & M. College staff and sent to Southeastern, the amount paid will be determined by the School of Education and the Division of College Extension.

6. When a special instructor is selected for a full-time teaching program, during a summer session or a regular semester, when all his services are required in the graduate program, Oklahoma A. & M. College will pay one-half the salary, and Southeastern State College will pay the other half. In this event, fees collected from the students taking work with this instructor will be divided equally between the institutions.

7. It is further agreed that all the courses offered on the graduate level will be the same courses which are offered on the campus of Oklahoma A. & M. College.

8. Only graduate students and under-graduates with senior standing should be admitted to graduate courses.

9. It is understood that Southeastern State College will furnish adequate classrooms and provide heat, water, lights, and janitor services.

10. It is also understood that library materials will be made available for graduate study, including books, bulletins, documents, and periodicals, approximately one-half of which will be furnished by Oklahoma A. & M. College with the understanding that materials furnished by this institution may be transferred to other graduate centers.

11. It is also understood that Southeastern will provide a library staff with suitable hours available for night classes as well as those in the regular daytime schedule.

12. It is proposed that the Dean of Southeastern State College, or some one else designated by the president will serve in cooperation with the representative from Oklahoma A. & M. College as administrator of the program. It is understood that he will assist in the organization of classes, in making plans for the collection of fees, in selecting and assigning proper classroom space, in issuing bulletins, in arranging class schedules and in consultation with representatives from Oklahoma A. & M. College, will be on the alert for this with suggestions for

the continual improvement of the program. For this service Oklahoma A. & M. College proposes to pay the fee which will be agreed upon by the two institutions.

13. The minimum enrollment for any graduate course is fifteen.

14. The plan may be modified at the close of any semester upon the motion of either institution, and the approval of both.[1]

This plan was submitted to the office of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for its approval. Basically, this was the plan later adopted for use at each of the six colleges during the summer of 1951.

The above plan was accompanied by a memorandum to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education from Napoleon Conger, Dean of the School of Education of Oklahoma A. & M. College, on the subject:"Master's Degree in Education in the State Colleges." In his memo, Conger: (1) lists the sources of demand for such programs in the state colleges; (2) cites the plan being used in Michigan in which the University grants degrees to candidates doing as little as one summer term at the University, the balance being done at the state colleges; and (3) suggests as an alternative to this plan the changing of the state law so that a fifth-year's work could be substituted for the Master's degree on pay scales.[2]

Early Leadership of Regents' Office

Through 1950, the little activity that took place concerning the subject of graduate work at the state colleges originated in the area served by the college in whose interest the activity was undertaken, and was focused at the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges,

---

[1]Mildred A. Carter, History and Development of Fifth Year Program at East Central State College, March 3, 1958, Appendix I, page 1.

[2]Memorandum from Napoleon Conger, quoted in Carter, loc. cit.

However, in November, 1950, the Regents of Oklahoma Colleges involved the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education with its request for information concerning requirements for offering graduate work.[1] Subsequently, in early 1951 the office of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education assumed leadership in the effort to increase the number of graduate education programs in the state. On January 2, 1951, copies of the proposed program and the memo from Conger, as mentioned above, were sent by the office of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to the presidents of the six state colleges. At this time, the graduate deans, deans of education, and directors of educational extension work at the University of Oklahoma and at the Oklahoma A. & M. College were invited by Chancellor M. A. Nash, of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, to meet with him on February 12, 1951. The purpose of this meeting was to consider possible offerings in graduate work other than on the campuses of the two graduate schools.

Following this meeting, Chancellor Nash wrote George L. Cross, President of the University of Oklahoma, and Henry Bennett, President of the Oklahoma A. & M. College, asking that appropriate representatives meet in his office on April 11, 1951, with the presidents of the state colleges to discuss the reported need for graduate level extension work and how to coordinate it. The following is a summary of the minutes of that meeting:

> Norman and Stillwater for many years have been authorized to do extension teaching on both the graduate and undergraduate levels at centers designated by these two institutions.

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, November 13, 1950, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

Ada, Alva, Durant, Edmond, Tahlequah, Weatherford, and other places are considered appropriate centers to meet certain needs through extension teaching by Norman and Stillwater.

Both major institutions have conducted some such classes in the past at one or more of the above-mentioned centers, and both have considered appropriate services for the 1951 summer.

Such efforts by the graduate schools to serve the needs of public school teachers seeking professional advancement in these centers are to be commended.

By the use of such qualified staff members as the accredited graduate schools may approve, the opportunity is afforded to earn graduate credit to some extent, and the work is accepted toward the Master's degree at Norman and at Stillwater to the extent specified.

The work is directed and offered by the two graduate institutions at a four-year college campus. The four-year colleges have not been authorized to offer graduate work.

To the fullest extent feasible, the two Oklahoma state-owned accredited graduate schools will endeavor to coordinate these undertakings and cooperate in their administration.

Details of finance, physical accommodations, etc, will be agreed upon by the participating institutions. The four-year college will cooperate in the project.

An early announcement of this service, to whatever extent possible, is earnestly solicited by the presidents of the six state colleges.[1]

Finalization of Plans for Summer 1951

On April 23, 1951, Presidents Spencer, Chambers, Burton, and Garrison of Ada, Edmond, Weatherford, and Tahlequah conferred with the State Regents for Higher Education at a regular meeting regarding need for graduate work at these centers to accommodate public school teachers during the summer. Morris S. Wallace and Director R. R. Tompkins of the Oklahoma A. & M. College teaching service attended. The Regents were informed that the graduate councils at Norman and Stillwater would hold

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., pages 2 and 3.

a joint conference on graduate extension work on April 26, 1951.[1]

On May 9, at the request of Chancellor Nash, a conference of the presidents of the six state colleges and deans of the two graduate schools, or their representatives, was held in his office to further discuss the problem.

The policies agreed on in this meeting were presented to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for their consideration on May 10, 1951. Shortly thereafter, the presidents of the six state colleges, Oklahoma A. & M. College, and the University of Oklahoma received a letter from Chancellor Nash setting forth the following conditions under which graduate work might be offered at the six state colleges:

1. The student should be enrolled by and in the graduate institution in order to give full protection to the student.
2. The graduate institutions will be responsible for advising each student in planning his program.
3. A maximum 8 hours (semester hours) will be transferrable to either graduate institution.
4. The work will be by the graduate institution at the location designated.
5. The four-year college itself will not be offering graduate work.
6. The Regents have not authorized the four-year colleges to offer graduate work.[2]

In response to the above, President Cross of the University of Oklahoma, in a letter to Chancellor Nash, dated May 12, 1951, wrote that

---

[1]Minutes of Monthly Meeting, April 23, 1951, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

[2]Letter from Chancellor Nash, quoted in Carter, op. cit. App. 1, 8.

while it is financially impossible for this work to be given as extension work in so far as the University of Oklahoma was concerned if it were offered as credit by the state colleges the University would be willing to accept up to eight semester hours of this work in its Master's program and eight semester hours of its own extension work, leaving sixteen semester hours that would remain to be done on campus.[1] He suggested the credit then be treated as residence credit of the state colleges.

He also mentioned another alternative was that of making all six state colleges off-campus graduate centers whose work would be accepted, if previously approved by the two graduate colleges. Work taken at such centers would be freely transferable to either of the two state graduate colleges in order to avoid competition among them for enrollments. The student would be enrolled at the center, not at any college.

On May 18, 1951, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education held a conference with the presidents of the six state colleges and representatives of the two graduate institutions concerning graduate courses to be offered by the University of Oklahoma and the Oklahoma A. & M. College. The concensus was that such programs at the six state colleges during the summer of 1951 should be sponsored by the two existing graduate institutions and that semester-hours credit earned at any of the six centers would be acceptable to both Norman and Stillwater under standards mutually approved.

At their meeting of this date the Regents declared their policy as follows:

a. The two institutions now authorized to offer graduate work may

---

[1]Letter from President Cross, quoted in Carter, ibid. App. 1, 10.

offer courses for graduate credit at any of the six state colleges upon the request of the college after the graduate study committee of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education has approved the course, the instructor, and the library facilities.

b. The graduate study committee of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education would consist of one representative from each of the two graduate schools, one representative of Education at the University of Oklahoma, one representative of the six state colleges, and one representative of the State Regents for Higher Education.[1]

On this date, May 18, 1951, the State Regents for Higher Education authorized the six state colleges and the two graduate schools to proceed under plans mutually agreed upon by the participating institutions. This authorization was for the summer of 1951 only. This action, the result of which was that the graduate study committee of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education stood behind the credit, broke up the apparent impasse resulting from the reluctance of the State Regents for Higher Education to authorize the state colleges to grant graduate credit in their own names. In effect, the Graduate Study Committee of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education granted the credit and defined it as graduate credit.

As a result of the above action the following courses were offered by the University of Oklahoma and the Oklahoma A. & M. College at the six state colleges during the summer of 1951: Administration of Audio-Visual Education Materials, Psychology of Learning, Educational Measurements, Fundamentals of Curriculum Development, Basic Principles Underlying Teaching of Reading, Evaluation and Improvement of Secondary Schools, Fundamentals of Public School Administration.

---

[1] Minutes of Monthly Meeting, May 18, 1951, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Early Development In Graduate Work by the Six State Colleges

Graduate Work at the Six State Colleges

On August 6, 1951, a letter to the eight cooperating institutions from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education authorized the continuation of the type of program carried on during the summer of 1951.[1] This decision was reached as a result of a mail ballot of the board of regents. This letter reiterated the convictions of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education that the function of graduate work should remain with the two established graduate schools and for the time the graduate function would not be expanded to the six state colleges.

Enclosed with the above letter was a sheet entitled "Some Considerations Concerning Expansion of Graduate Services." On this sheet were repeated the convictions stated in the letter. In addition, it mentioned the inevitability of increased costs of expanding the six colleges to graduate schools. It also held that institutional and administrative interests should be relegated to a secondary position.

There can be little doubt that at this time the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education had no intention of authorizing graduate work in the name of the six state colleges at any time in the near future. However, the following authorization of function was authorized by unanimous vote of this board at their next meeting on August 27, 1951:

> In order to meet immediate demands among the teachers of the state for courses in the field of education on the graduate level the six state colleges (Ada, Alva, Durant, Edmond, Tahlequah and Weatherford) have permission to offer a maximum of 16 hours graduate credit in

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, August 27, 1951, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

courses in the field of Education only, upon prior approval by the Regents Graduate Study Committee as to courses, professors, and library facilities.[1]

The above seemed to reflect a radical change of policy on the part of the State Regents for Higher Education. However, in the week preceding this action, two memos were mailed from the Regents' office to the president of each of the six state colleges. The first of these was entitled: "Regarding Courses for Graduate Credit Toward a Master's Degree in Education at Ada, Alva, Durant, Edmond, Tahlequah, and Weatherford." In this memo the following possibilities were mentioned for action which might be taken by the Oklahoma State Regents at the next meeting:

1. Authorize graduate schools at the six state colleges.
2. Authorize the six state colleges to offer a limited amount of course work.
3. Authorize the two existing accredited graduate schools to accept certain undergraduate courses from the six state colleges as transfer credit.
4. Create a state system of graduate study centers at the six state colleges, supervised by the Regents Graduate Study Committee.
5. Authorize the two existing accredited graduate schools to establish graduate study centers at the six state colleges.[2]

The other enclosure was entitled: "Concerning Courses for Graduate Credit for the Master's Degree of Education at the Six State Colleges." The gist of this memo was that the six state colleges were able to administer a commendable graduate program, that it was within the authority of the regents to authorize such a program, and if this were done it would

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, August 27, 1951, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

[2]Carter, op. cit., Appendix I, 17.

be in a manner consistent with the North Central Association regulations, citing the policy of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education that only the North Central Association could determine which of the six state colleges were qualified to add graduate work at that time.[1]

It is significant that the authorization which was voted unanimously on August 27, and the ballot by mail on August 2 were both unanimous votes. This indicated that a substantial change of thinking took place in the leadership of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education during the middle part of August as the unanimous votes can be interpreted as votes of confidence in the leadership of that office.

The presidents, deans, and chairmen of the departments of education were asked the cause of this change. The most significant responses were from the presidents. The following statement is a typical reaction: "The presidents organized an effort to inform the regents of the demand for such a program." One college president went so far as to state that the presidents put pressure on the regents to authorize the program.

Efforts of Individual Colleges

The first efforts of an individual college to obtain approval for graduate programs were undertaken through the Board of Regents for Oklahoma Colleges.

On February 11, 1952, President Garrison of Northeastern State College, requested and received permission from the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges to file a preliminary application with the North Central Association for approval as a graduate school. On March 5, 1952, this

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., Appendix I, 18.

board authorized each of the six colleges under its jurisdiction to file necessary preliminary applications with the North Central Association for their approval of one year of graduate study in Education and, if such approval were received, to file a request for authorizations with the State Regents for Higher Education to grant the Master's degree in Elementary Education. This was the first mention of any degree other than the Master's degree in Education to be found in the historical data.[1]

On April 10, 1952, Garrison reported to the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges that he and his dean had recently submitted to the North Central Association an application for preliminary approval. He reported that the North Central Association looked with disfavor upon making Northeastern a graduate school, pending the following: more adequate budgets, the enlargement of the library facilities, and a greater percentage of the faculty with doctorates.[2]

Coordinated Effort

The subsequent successful effort to gain authorization for graduate programs was mounted by seeking aid of both the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

On February 23, 1953, Presidents Spencer of Ada, Chambers of Edmond, and Garrison of Tahlequah appeared before the State Regents for Higher Education on behalf of a proposal to authorize the six state

---

[1]Minutes of Monthly Meeting, February 11, 1952, Board of Regents of Oklahoma State Colleges.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, April 10, 1952, Board of Regents of Oklahoma State Colleges.

colleges to offer a fifth-year program of teacher training. The Board took the matter under advisement for consideration at the next meeting in the expectation that each teacher-training institution interested might submit its proposed program. On March 23 at the next meeting of this same board, the six state colleges repeated their request of the previous month for authorization of the fifth-year program of teacher-training. The presidents of the colleges concerned conferred with the regents regarding this function. A special committee was appointed of the Board of Regents to study the matter further and made recommendations looking to the formulation of the plan for possible adoption at the next meeting.[1]

Meanwhile the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges was busily concerned with the problem of graduate work in the state colleges. On February 25, this board went on record unanimously as:

> Favoring the offering of graduate work leading to the Master's degree in Education by the colleges under its jurisdiction in so far as their facilities warrant and that the presidents be instructed to prepare a statement to the board showing what additional facilities, faculties, and curricula would be required and the approximate cost of such additional facilities, faculties, and curricula.[2]

On March 18, 1953, at the meeting of the Regents for Oklahoma Colleges, President Burton of Southwestern presented the Board an estimate of cost of preparing Southwestern to offer graduate work leading to a Master's degree. This was pursuant to the request of the regents for such information at its previous meeting.[3]

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, February 23, 1953, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, February 25, 1953, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

[3]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, March 18, 1953, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

The following month, on April 15, the Regents of Oklahoma Colleges held their regular monthly meeting.[1] The meeting began in the morning and in the normal course of its agenda the Board unanimously passed a motion asking for detailed and specific information concerning the improvements necessary to meet the specifications of the North Central Association.

Then, after a discussion at lunch with the college presidents concerning a request to the Board of Regents for Higher Education for permission to offer graduate work leading to the Master's degree, and upon realization of the importance of quick action due to the shortage of time between then and the summer term, the Board reconvened and voted unanimously to request the Board of Regents for Higher Education to grant permission to all six state colleges to offer graduate work leading to the Master's degree. Then, going even further, a motion carried unanimously that the colleges Tahlequah, Durant, and Edmond be permitted to offer such work beginning with the summer of 1953.

On April 27, 1953, the Board of Regents for Higher Education, reacting to the request from the Regents for Oklahoma Colleges previously cited, authorized the fifth-year teacher-training program at the six state colleges leading to a Master's degree in the field of education, under certain conditions, contingent upon preliminary clearance with the North Central Association and in compliance with certain basic

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, April 15, 1953, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

requirements which follow:[1]

1. The student must have been awarded a Bachelor's degree, and must have had at least one year of successful professional teaching experience before being admitted to the fifth-year program of study.

2. The student must satisfactorily complete an approved program of study including at least 32 semester hours of work in addition to the Bachelor's degree requirements.

3. The student must complete not less than 16 semester hours of this approved program of study after June 1, 1953.

4. The student may not earn more than 16 semester hours during any semester (4 semester hours if fully employed) or 8 semester hours during a regular summer term.

5. The training of supervisors, specialists, and administrators will not be the objective of the Master's degree program.

6. The fifth-year program shall not be developed as the first step toward the doctor of philosophy or the doctor of education degrees, rather the emphasis will be on the improvement of instruction in elementary and secondary schools by planning suitable and meaningful fifth-year programs of study in an effort to meet the individual needs of study regardless of the level of instruction.

7. No Master's degree will be awarded before July, 1955.[2]

On May 14, 1953, the Board of Regents for Oklahoma Colleges unanimously passed the following motion:

> That permission be given to all six colleges to proceed with graduate credit leading toward a Master's degree in Education in

---

[1]In the minutes of the State Board of Regents for Higher Education these requirements are referred to as "exhibits attached hereto." None were so attached, but Tom Sexton, administrative assistant of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, stated that they were the same as those attached to the later authorization on January 25, 1954. These are copied above with the following exception: The term "Master of Teaching" was not used here for the reason that it is not found in any minutes before November 23, 1953, and the term "Master's Degree in the Field of Education" is used in the authorization, which is grounds for reasonable doubt that the term "Master of Teaching" was used at this time.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, April 27, 1953, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

accordance with a resolution passed by the Board of Regents for Higher Education authorizing these colleges to:

1. After October 1, 1953 each institution is authorized to seek preliminary clearance from the North Central Association.

2. This preliminary clearance with the North Central Association must be secured by each institution.

3. Copies of this preliminary clearance report from the North Central Association must be filed with the governing board and with the State Regents.

4. No announcement of a Master's degree program is to be made until after the North Central Association gives its preliminary clearance.

5. The program at each institution is to conform to the counsel and advice of the North Central Association and to the agreed basic requirements as follows----.[1]

Item 5 above continues with a listing of basic requirements concerning a fifth-year teacher training program leading to a Master's degree in Education based on individual needs. This listing follows closely but in more detail the basic requirements listed in the authorization of the Board of Regents for Higher Education of April 27, 1953 quoted above.

East Central State College and the Master of Education Degree

In 1953, a determined effort was initiated at East Central State College to establish the Master of Education degree program.

Pursuant to the authorization, of May 14, 1953, and after intensive effort at self-evaluation, East Central State College at Ada on September 15, 1953, filed with the Board of Review of the North Central Association its application requesting permission to offer a Master's

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, May 14, 1953, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

degree in Education. Along with this, its self-survey report was filed. On November 2, 1953, Norman Burns, executive secretary of the North Central Association, informed President Spencer that the request had been denied by the Board of Review. A paragraph from this letter gave a major reason for the denial of the request:

> One of the major points considered by the Board of Review was the competence of the faculty. Undoubtedly, progress has been made in strengthening the faculty since the college was accredited as an institution awarding the Bachelor's degree. From the evidence at hand, however, the Board was not persuaded that sufficient progress has been made to justify the introduction of a program for graduate study. In faculty training, for example, the college does not rank high among institutions offering the Bachelor's degree. Perhaps it would be well to continue to work toward a strengthening of the faculty in this regard and to allow a longer period of time for further development of the faculty as a strong instructional staff working as a unit toward fully agreed-upon educational goals.[1]

Master of Teaching Degree

Development of Statement of Purposes and Requirements

A preliminary statement of purposes and requirements for the Master of Teaching degree was drafted in early 1953 by President Spencer of East Central State College, at the request of Chancellor Nash. This statement contained the first recorded usage of the term "Master of Teaching" in connection with the programs in Oklahoma.

Purpose

> To provide a fifth-year of teacher training at the six state colleges based upon the needs of the individual student in relation to improving the students' instructional knowledge and practices.

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., 10, 11.

This fifth-year program is not conceived as a first step toward the Doctor of Philosophy or the Doctor of Education degrees. In fact the program need not be considered in terms of advanced degrees. Rather the emphasis will be on improvement of elementary and secondary classroom instruction by planning suitable and meaningful fifth-year studies for practicing teachers in an effort to meet the individual needs of these teacher students.

The training of supervisors, specialists, and administrators will not be involved in the Master of Teaching degree program. It appears that at least for the present our existing graduate institutions can satisfactorily meet the demands of these public school positions.

It is believed that such a fifth-year program can be conducted under present administrative arrangements, therefore no graduate school authorizations are deemed necessary at this time. Under the fifth-year program the needs of the individual student are paramount regardless of the level of instruction, or the nomenclature of the degree itself.

Requirements for Admission to Program

To be admitted to the fifth-year program a student must:

1. Have completed requirements for a Bachelor's degree
2. Have completed a minimum of one year professional teaching
3. Have a valid standard teaching certificate
4. Have recommendation of faculty admissions committee

Requirements for Admission to Candidacy for the Master of Teaching Degree

To be admitted to candidacy for the Master of Teaching Degree a student must:

1. Have a formal outline of his fifth-year program approved by his advisor
2. Have satisfactorily completed not less than 8 semester hours toward his approved program
3. Have successfully passed required examinations given by faculty admissions committee

Graduation Requirements

To be eligible for Master of Teaching degree the student must:

1. Have maintained at least an average grade of B in his fifth-year program
2. Have successfully passed required examinations oral or written or both as determined by the college
3. Have completed a minimum of 32 semester hours beyond the Bachelor's degree in keeping with his approved program

Some Additional Considerations

1. Students who before June 1, 1953 already have some credit beyond the Bachelor's degree must complete not less than 16 semester hours credit toward an approved fifth-year program in residence at the degree granting institution done after June 1, 1953.
2. May not earn in excess of 16 semester hours during any regular semester (4 hours if fully employed) or 8 semester hours during a regular summer term.
3. Correspondence or extension credit earned after June 1, 1953 shall be allowed toward the Master of Teaching degree.
4. Off-campus in-service training program (individual problems) not to exceed a total of 8 semester hours may be allowed toward a Master of Teaching degree. Such courses shall be limited to those which can be offered more effectively at the in-service location and the student shall be limited to two semester hours per semester.[1]

The passage of time between April 28 and November 20, together with a conference between Sexton and Burns in Chicago, produced the following changes:

a. variations in order and wording, including distinction between admission to program and admission to candidacy
b. deletions:
   1. requirement of recommendation of faculty admissions committee for admission to program
   2. recommendation of inclusion of seminar courses in approved program
   3. restriction of correspondence or extension credit earned after June 1, 1953

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., Appendix III, 2.

4. suggestion that recommendations of student's employer be considered in planning program of student

c. substitution: the later draft substitutes "demonstrated ability to pursue fifth-year program" for "successfully passed required examinations given by faculty admissions committee" as a requirement for admission to candidacy.

d. Additions:
   1. added to the purposes of the fifth-year program:
      (a) a broad statement of the purposes of teacher education
      (b) added to the statement of purpose that it is not designed as a program to develop research personnel in a discipline to advance frontiers of knowledge
      (c) that it is largely an in-service program
      (d) that for most it is a terminal program
   2. statement of authorization
   3. limitation of 8 semester hours placed or amount of off-campus in-service courses allowed on approved program, and limits such courses to those that can effectively be offered at the in-service location.[1]

The passage of time between November 11, 1953, and December 17, 1953, and the December 17 conference of Burns with the presidents of the six state colleges, produced the following changes in the statement of purposes and requirements:

a. variations in order and wording
b. deletions: omitted from the statement of purposes that for most it would be a terminal program
c. Additions:
   1. To the listing of purposes it added the following: To meet the individual needs of students through suitable meaningful study programs. The plan recognized that the individual needs of the student are paramount regardless of the level of instruction. However, the age, previous training, experience of the student would be considered in the accomplishments expected. Conferences with the students' employers and other interested individuals may help to determine needs of the student in this program. (The last statement constitutes a re-instatement.)
   2. The requirement that the student be limited to two hours per semester of the individual projects pursued at the in-service location.
d. re-instatements (deleted in previous development)

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., Appendix III, 4.

1. That no correspondence or extension credit earned after June 1, 1953 will be allowed on Master of Teaching degree program.
2. Recommendation of use of seminars on fifth-year program.[1]

Approval by Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

On November 23, 1953, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education considered the fifth-year training program at the six state colleges and explored the possibility of the Master of Teaching degree instead of several Master's degrees as heretofore contemplated by the Board.[2] At this meeting, conferences with officers of the North Central Association were authorized in keeping with the stated purposes of the programs. Final action at this time was postponed until such time as exhibits were filed with the Regents' office (the December 17 meeting in Oklahoma City with Burns was a result of this authorization.)

In response to a request from the office of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education a letter was received from Ralph Rackley, Dean of the College of Education at the University of Oklahoma.[3] This letter was dated December 28, 1953. In this letter Rackley questioned whether the successful completion of any 32 hours taken after the Bachelor's degree necessarily constituted a Master's degree program, even if taking such work does materially improve the quality of instruction given by the teacher. He suggested that the state law be changed to permit the present Master's salary increment to be paid to teachers who

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., Appendix III, 8.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, November 23, 1953, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

[3]Letter from Ralph Rackley, quoted in Carter, op. cit., Appendix III, 30.

have completed a fifth-year of study planned to improve competency as teachers but not necessarily resulting in a Master's degree. He suggested that if, as seemed to be the consensus, the four-year program does not sufficiently train a teacher, perhaps the present four-year program should be studied with a view to improving this preparation. Rackley wrote with conviction that if the recognized fifth-year of study not leading to the Master's degree were authorized the pressure for graduate degree programs at the state colleges would be relieved.

Because of its implications concerning purposes of this program, further comment on this letter will be reserved for Chapter III, concerning development of purposes of the program.

At its next meeting January 25, 1954, the State Board of Regents for Higher Education unanimously approved the following authorization:

Degree of Master of Teaching

> The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, recognizing that public school teachers, even after the best of four-year programs and particularly after practical experience in the field, need strengthening in some areas of their previous preparation, hereby authorize the six state colleges located at Ada, Alva, Durant, Edmond, Tahlequah, and Weatherford to institute and develop fifth-year programs of study for elementary and secondary teachers leading to the degree of Master of Teaching.
>
> This authorization is conditioned upon the following:
> 1. The student must have been awarded a Bachelor's degree, and must have had at least one year of successful professional teaching experience before being admitted to the fifth-year program of study.
> 2. The student must satisfactorily complete an approved program of study including at least 32 semester hours of work in addition to the Bachelor's degree requirements.
> 3. The student must complete not less than 16 semester hours of this approved program of study after June 1, 1953.
> 4. The student may not earn more than 16 semester hours during any semester (four semester hours if fully employed) or 8 semester hours during a regular summer term.

5. The training of supervisors, specialists and administrators will not be the objective of the Master of Teaching degree program.
6. The fifth-year program shall not be developed as the first step toward the Doctor of Philosophy or the Doctor of Education degrees. Rather the emphasis will be on the improvement of instruction in elementary and secondary schools by planning suitable and meaningful fifth-year programs of study in an effort to meet the individual needs of students regardless of the level of instruction.
7. No Master of Teaching Degree will be awarded before July, 1955.[1]

Appended to the minutes of this meeting is a statement entitled: New Fifth-Year Teacher Training Program Inaugaurated at State Colleges. This statement included many points which existed in the preliminary statement as refined by the two meetings with Burns but which were not in the authorization quoted above.[2]

The following week on February 2, 1954, representatives of the six colleges met at Edmond and reached the following agreements:

1. 16 hours may be accepted in transfer toward fifth-year work provided the work fits into the pattern of work designed for the candidate.
2. 8 hours of graduate credit from any other accredited institution will be accepted in transfer toward fifth-year work provided the work fits into the pattern of work designated the candidate.
3. A maximum of 16 hours of graduate credit from all sources earned prior to June 1, 1954 may be accepted toward the Master of Teaching degree.
4. Any senior needing less than 16 semester hours for graduation may during the last semester of enrollment take some graduate work along with the necessary undergraduate work for graduation, provided the total load does not exceed 16 semester hours. In connection with this it was agreed that no more than 8 hours of credit may be earned and counted toward the degree before the completion of one year of teaching experience.
5. All work to be counted toward the Master of Teaching degree must be earned within a period of 6 years exclusive of any time

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, January 25, 1954, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

[2]Ibid.

out for military service.

6. At least 12 hours must be done on the campus with the student enrolled at the rate of a minimum of 12 hours per semester or six hours a summer session.
7. No 100 or 200 level courses will be allowed for graduate credit.
8. Questions of "core courses," minimum number of hours in professional education courses, the taking of courses in fields which the student has no undergraduate preparation, whether or not to use major and minors, were left to the individual colleges to decide.
9. Each college will try to give Master's degree work in all high school subject fields in which it is authorized to qualify students for teaching certificates.
10. Requirements of minimum of 18 semester hours in the field of professional education including student teaching, exclusive of 32 hours required for the degree.[1]

Development of the Program After Its Authorization

Following this meeting Chancellor Nash included the following suggestions with a personal note to each of the six state college presidents:

MISCELLANEOUS SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FIFTH YEAR PROGRAM

1. Sound undergraduate program will continue to be the main objective. Over-emphasis on the Master of Teaching programs could penalize the four-year work.
2. For the Master of Teaching degree, create as few new 500 courses as possible. Expansion, which implies added cost, should be avoided. We have had and will have hard enough work securing adequate funds for undergraduate programs.
3. For the Master of Teaching degree, let the great emphasis be on "what" or "how." Require more subject matter, "What to teach" (courses in English, History, Math, Science, etc.) rather than methods "How to teach," (courses in education, etc.).
4. Be prepared to show that this fifth-year program has the superior requirements. Refrain from advertising "no thesis will be required" or other short cuts, which create an impression that the Master of Teaching degree will be the cheap and easy route.
5. For the Master of Teaching degree, build the individual applicant's program soundly. The result will be a record which your college can defend in academic circles with pride. A degree based on acceptable standards beyond criticism by Chicago

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., Appendix III, 31.

Norman, Stillwater and others.

6. Some applicants are already in line at Norman and Stillwater for a Master of Education degree. Let your college be on record as encouraging them to complete such programs there, not transfer to you. Avoid a reputation for proselyting. We are not against the Master of Education degree, we are for it for those who want it. Positive, not negative.
7. Protect the students by certain advice to him, that your college does not expect him to transfer this Master of Teaching work, cannot insure acceptance elsewhere, etc.
8. Disregard some past impressions and make special effort to maintain the good will of existing graduate schools, deans, and professors at Norman and Stillwater. Repeated visits, solicitation of counsel and criticism from Dean Holley and Dean Rackley, etc. This is only part of good public and professional relations.[1]

On March 17, 1954, a list of new 500 level courses was approved by representatives of the six state colleges, and, on May 24, sixteen such courses were submitted to the State Regents for Higher Education which, following their approval, were incorporated into the curricular offerings of the six colleges. These will be discussed further in Chapter IV which is concerned with these curricular offerings.[2]

On March 30, 1954, Burns of the North Central Association called the Regents' office regarding the proposed fifth-year teacher training program. The proposed program had been discussed by the North Central Association Board of Review. Burns reported that this Board appeared very interested in such an experiment and, according to Burns, liked the idea presented. Burns' call seemed to emphasize the possibility that all six institutions might not have been ready to begin the program at that time. It appeared to be the concensus of the members of the Board of Review that under normal conditions all six might not be in position to

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., Appendix III, 32.

[2]Carter, op. cit., 22.

go ahead with such plans simultaneously. It was pointed out to Burns that the needs are similar throughout the state of Oklahoma, but Burns felt that such a factor as readiness of the institution must be considered as well as the factor of need.[1] In a letter of this same date from Chancellor Nash to President Spencer of East Central the following thoughts were among several suggested for consideration:

1. The Master of Teaching degree program must be different from that leading to the traditional Master of Education degree.
2. Perhaps the Regents should consider carefully an approval of a long list of courses to apply on this degree.
3. The Master of Teaching degree is not designed as a part of the Master of Education, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Education degree programs.
4. The North Central Association is looking for an experimental program which may or may not be uniform among the colleges.
5. Some educators feel that all teachers can not be served properly by the existing graduate programs.
6. Could it be that no fifth-year work should be offered except during summers the first year or two? This might obviate questions concerning adequate finances and proper standards.
7. The six state colleges were not all accredited by the North Central Association at the same time. It could be that not all six will be able to meet North Central Association requirements for the fifth-year program at the same time.
8. If an institution is not reasonably sure of being able to meet requirements, it should consider carefully waiting before beginning the experiment.
9. Each institution must eventually have its own work approved by the North Central Association, regardless of what other institutions do.
10. An institution can hardly afford to be embarrassed by not having its program approved by the North Central Association after its first inspection.
11. Dr. Burns feels kindly toward the concept as presented to him thus far. Can we still abide by that concept?[2]

The final question would seem to imply that perhaps the thinking current in Oklahoma on the subject at this time did not follow the thinking

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., Appendix III, 66.

[2]Letter from Chancellor Nash, quoted in Carter, op. cit., App. III, 67.

of which Burns had expressed interest and hope for approval. Further evidence of such a possibility is found in a letter from Burns to Chambers, dated June 7, 1954. This letter was written upon the receipt by Burns of the announcement of the fifth-year program at Central State College. Burns expressed surprise at the substantial number of courses being set up specifically as fifth-year or advanced courses. His thinking was that the availability of large number of courses, mainly in Education and Psychology, could conceivably interfere with the attainment of the objectives of the program, which, as he understood it, was to broaden as well as deepen the teacher's preparation. He stated:

> It seems logical to assume that the students enrolled might wish to concentrate on those courses which would be most likely to carry graduate credit with the thought of possible transfer to a graduate school to the extent this occurred, the building of a balanced program for each individual student would be rendered more difficult.[1]

Burns also expressed concern over the requirement that no lower level courses, 100 or 200 courses would be allowed on the graduate program. Burns felt that this violated the objective of the fifth-year program to improve the competence of teachers without regard to the usual requirements of a graduate program.

The Fifth-Year Program and Certification

At its April 25, 1955, meeting the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education considered the Master of Teaching degree with reference to the issuance of certificates by the State Board of Education. Some

---

[1]Letter from Dr. Burns, quoted in Carter, op. cit., Appendix III, 70.

clarification was requested to enable evaluation for advanced standing when needed for a doctorate, and for the use of applicants for administrators certificates. The Regents went on record as considering this to be an accredited recognized standard Master's degree.[1] This position was again reaffirmed by unanimous action of this Board on February 25, 1957.

At its February 11, 1957, meeting the Board of Regents for Oklahoma Colleges unanimously approved the following:

> The council of Presidents be authorized to request the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to modify their regulations relating to the Oklahoma State Colleges offering courses leading to the granting of Administrators' Certificates.[2]

Pursuant to this authorization, the Oklahoma Commission on Teacher Education and Certification was approached with the proposal to change the certification requirements for administrators to conform with the philosophy expressed by Carter.

> Instead of certification serving to improve teachers and the teaching profession in general, it militated against the improvement of teachers by forcing almost all of our young people who aspired to become administrators into this pattern many years ahead of the time the jobs would become available, thereby limiting the number of students taking graduate work in the fields in which they were teaching at the time and in which, in all probability, they would continue to teach for a number of years.[3]

According to Carter, a special committee of this Commission recommended the adoption of such a program to the Commission. The Commission in turn accepted the plan and recommended to the State Board of Education

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, April 25, 1956, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, February 11, 1957, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

[3]Carter, op. cit., pp. 29, 30.

that it be put into effect. In the spring of 1957 the State Board of Education approved the new program and it went into effect officially October 7, 1957.[1]

Graduate Extension Work

A significant milestone was passed in March when Northeastern State College requested authority to offer a graduate extension course. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education reiterated its policy concerning off-campus extension courses for graduate credit. Only the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University were authorized to offer such courses. Any exceptions to this policy required individual consideration by the regents.

Accordingly the request of Northeastern State College for permission to conduct such a course during the 1957-1958 second semester (already being taught!) was considered and authorized by the regents. This authorization had been recommended by the Regents committee on off-campus work and was granted by unanimous vote.[2]

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., 30.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, March 24, 1958, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

CHAPTER III

PURPOSES OF GRADUATE OFFERINGS AT THE SIX STATE COLLEGES OF OKLAHOMA

Introduction

Purposes Prior to Offering of Master of Teaching Degree Program

Prior to the inauguration of the Master of Teaching Degree program, graduate work at the six colleges had as its purpose the provision of work which would be acceptable towards the Master's degrees offered by other institutions, principally the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College. The purpose of the state colleges under this arrangement could conceivably be interpreted as either of the following: (1) the same as those of the degree program as established by the institution offering the degree, or (2) the encouraging of advanced preparation of teachers in its area by making it more convenient for them to satisfy requirements for advanced degrees at other institutions. The following excerpt from the minutes of the Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges would support the latter as being more nearly what this board had in mind in its efforts to establish such a program:

> Request of East Central State College Alumni Association to authorize East Central State College to offer graduate work and the Master's degree in Education: It was brought out in the discussion that the existing graduate schools were too badly crowded to adequately care for the demands or for graduate work in Education;

> that a number of Oklahoma elementary teachers and elementary principals were going out of state for graduate work, and they would prefer to attend one of the Oklahoma colleges if such colleges were accredited for graduate work in Education.[1]

The purpose of graduate work is further shown in the authorization by Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for graduate study at the six state colleges: "In order to meet immediate demands among the teachers of the state for courses in the field of education on the graduate level, the six state colleges...have permission..."[2]

Thus it would seem that both of these controlling boards recognized the satisfaction of the demands of Oklahoma teachers as the first consideration, or the principal purpose of these graduate offerings.

In interviews with Presidents, Deans, and Chairmen of Departments of Education of the six state colleges, and with the Chancellor and Administrative Assistant of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the following question was asked: Were there any differences between the purposes of the programs offering graduate work in cooperation with the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College on the six campuses and the purposes of the programs when the six colleges were authorized to offer up to sixteen hours of graduate work?[3]

Of the fifteen responses from the state college personnel, (at one school, none of the three felt qualified to answer this question by reason of their late involvement in the program) twelve were negative, only three affirmative, and of these three, one president and two Chair-

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, November 13, 1950, Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, August 27, 1951, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

[3]Appendix.

men of Departments of Education represented three different colleges. Their explanations were similar. The president cited broader offering, the Department Chairmen cited thinking toward non-traditional Master's degree program. The relative infrequency of this response suggests that these interviewees were thinking of the Master of Teaching degree program with which they were occupied at the time of the interviews. The terms they used here were used by many in describing the Master of Teaching program.

The response of the Chancellor and Administrative Assistant of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in joint interview was summarized as follows: The purposes changed gradually, not at a specific time, from that of assisting students in the programs at the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College to the purposes as stated for the Master of Teaching program. The purpose was and still is to give graduate work. Serving the student is the specific objective of the program.

Development of Statement of Purposes

The following tentative statement of purposes, dated April 28, 1953, was drawn up by Charles Spencer, President of East Central State College, at the request of Chancellor Nash of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education:

Purpose

> To provide a fifth-year of teacher training at the six state colleges based on the need of the individual student in relation to improving the students' instructional knowledge and practices.

> This fifth-year program is not conceived as a first step toward the Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education degrees. In fact, the program need not be considered in terms of advanced degrees. Rather, the emphasis will be on the improvement of elementary and secondary classroom instruction by suitable and meaningful fifth-year studies for practicing teachers in an effort to meet the individual needs of these teacher-students.
>
> The training of supervisors, specialists, and administrators will not be involved in the program. It appears that at least for the present our existing graduate institutions can satisfactorily meet the demands of these public school positions.
>
> It is believed that such a fifth-year program can be conducted under present administrative arrangements, therefore no graduate school authorizations are deemed necessary at this time.
>
> Under the fifth-year program the needs of the individual students are paramount regardless of the level of instruction, or the nomenclature of the degree itself.[1]

The following implications may be drawn regarding the concept of the program on which this statement was based: (1) In so far as advanced education is concerned, this program was considered to be terminal. (2) It was designed primarily to improve those already teaching, and was based on their needs as individuals, implying few or no specific courses required. In fact, the last sentence implied that it was more important that the need be met than any level of instruction maintained. (3) The training of supervisors, specialists, and administrators was specifically excluded from the program at least so long as the demand for these can be trained by already existing graduate schools. (4) The concept seemed to be one thought of as of undergraduate, or at best semi-graduate, since no graduate authorization was thought to be necessary. (5) The last line implied that the term "Master" in the degree was not meant as an indicator of the level of work done. Presumably

---

[1]Mildred A. Carter, History and Development of Fifth Year Program at East Central State College, March 3, 1958, Appendix III, p. 2.

it was used to curry acceptability for the program, or to satisfy the requirement for the Master's salary increment, or both.

The statement of purposes in the form it was submitted to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education January 24, 1954, for approval was based on the above; but, in the intervening time, the following changes had evolved: (1) variations in order and verbiage; (2) addition of a broad statement of the purposes of teacher-education; (3) addition of the statement that the program was largely an in-service program; (4) addition of the statement that the program was not designed to develop research personnel in a discipline that would advance frontiers of knowledge.

In the course of the development of this program, the opinion of certain educators within the state was sought. One such educator was Ralph Rackley, then Dean of the College of Education at the University of Oklahoma. His letter of December 28, 1953 indicated the following: (1) While concurring in the opinion that teachers with Bachelor's degrees and teacher experience could benefit from additional study, and that this study need not be graduate work, Rackley expressed doubt that any work so designed would automatically constitute graduate work, and that the completion of thirty-two hours of such work should be recognized with a Master's degree, just because it materially improved them as teachers. (2) If the current four year programs were insufficient to prepare capable teachers, they should be carefully studied and their inadequacies determined to furnish data to govern the development of programs requiring more than four years. This study should determine whether such additional study should be graduate or undergraduate preparation.

(3) A fifth-year of preparation which would satisfy the requirements for the Master's salary increment (requiring a change of state law) would relieve the pressure for additional graduate programs in Education. (4) The six state colleges would play a vital role in improving public schools if a recognized fifth-year of study were authorized which ignored graduate study and gave attention wholly to improvement of teachers.[1]

Rackley's letter accounted for no change in the policy statement approved the following month by Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Not deviating greatly from the policy statement proposed by the state colleges, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education formulated a policy statement of its own. The statement of authorization read as follows:

> The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, recognizing that public school teachers, even after the best of four year programs, and particularly after practical experience in the field, need strengthening in some areas of their previous preparation, hereby authorize the six state colleges located at Ada, Alva, Durant, Edmond, Tahlequah and Weatherford, to institute and develop fifth-year programs of study for elementary and secondary teachers leading to the degree of Master of Teaching.[2]

This authorization was conditioned upon seven requirements, two of which were concerned with purposes: One requirement states: "The training of supervisors, specialists, and administrators will not be the objective of the Master of Teaching degree program."[3] This requirement restated, though less definitely, the third of the five implications drawn on page 43.

---

[1]Letter from Ralph Rackley, quoted in Carter, op. cit., App. III, p. 30.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, January 25, 1954, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

[3]Ibid.

Another requirement stated:

> The fifth-year program shall not be developed as the first step toward the Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education degrees. Rather, the emphasis will be on improvement in instruction in elementary and secondary schools by planning suitable and meaningful fifth-year programs of study in an effort to meet the individual needs of students regardless of the level of instruction.[1]

The requirement rephrased, though perhaps as above to a lesser degree of intensity, the thoughts from which the remainder of the implications on page 43 were drawn. None of the changes mentioned as having been developed in the proposed policy statement were included in the policy statement passed by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

In the report of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for the biennium in which the program was inaugurated, a one-page statement was found describing the new program.[2] The purposes as stated in it closely followed those of the authorization, with the following exceptions: (1) It omitted from mention the phrase "regardless of level of instruction" or comparable phrase, when citing the flexibility of the program planned for an individual. (2) The statement concerning for whom the program was intended read as follows: "The program will be designed for the elementary and secondary classroom teachers, and not for administrators, supervisors or specialists."[3]

The wording "will be designed for" as used above, seemed slightly less emphatic than "will not be the objective of", as stated in the Policy

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Seventh Biennial Report of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. p. 90.

[3] Ibid.

Statement of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in disclaiming the purpose of training of administrators, supervisors, and specialists. However the language of the statement submitted to the Regents for approval, drawn up by Spencer was much more emphatic, being worded "will not be involved in the program." Thus, it appeared to have been anticipated at this early date that sometime it might be desirable to extend the purpose of the program to include the preparation of administrators.

However, the use of the term "classroom teacher" makes questionable the common justification for this function without further authorization by interpreting the unmodified term "teacher" in the legal sense, that is, including all in the education profession.

The basic thinking, the propogation of which was responsible for the eventual approval of the Master of Teaching program, was summarized in 1953 in the following quotation from Spencer:

> The Public Schools are more and more requiring administrators and classroom teachers to have Master's degrees. The six state colleges of Oklahoma must be able to prepare administrators and teachers for all the Public Schools of the state. The anomaly whereby the six colleges primarily designed to train teachers are not authorized to grant the Master's degree in Education, despite the fact that some institutions not primarily designed as teacher training institutions are permitted to grant such a degree...this anomaly cannot long endure. Circumstances demand that the six state colleges at Ada, Alva, Durant, Edmond, Tahlequah and Weatherford, offer work leading to the Master's degree in Education. This next step forward in teacher education cannot be long delayed.[1]

Shortly after the approval by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education of a Policy Statement authorizing the Master of Teaching Programs, Chancellor Nash of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

---

[1]Charles F. Spencer, "The Role of the Teacher's College," Oklahoma Teacher, XXXIV, (April, 1953), 27.

sent a list of eight suggestions regarding the fifth-year program to the Presidents of the six state colleges. This list included two suggestions which pertained to purposes:

1. Sound undergraduate programs will continue to be the main objectives. Over-emphasis on the Master of Teaching program could penalize the four-year work.
2. For the Master of Teaching Degree, let the great emphasis be on "what", not "how". Require more subject matter, "what to teach". (courses in English, History, Math, Science, etc.) rather than methods, "how to teach" courses in Education, etc.[1]

Statements of Purpose by Institutions

The statement of purposes of the fifth-year program at Central State College appeared in the 1957-1959 catalog as follows:

> Central State College offers a Master of Teaching degree. The purposes of the program are to provide opportunities for teachers to secure broader cultural and professional development than is possible on the undergraduate level. Each fifth-year study program is based upon the needs of the individual student and designed to improve his instructional knowledge and practices by:
> 1. Developing an increased ability to integrate materials and methods in a useful and meaningful way.
> 2. Developing an increased understanding of the problems related to schools and providing training in the solution of such problems.
> 3. Developing competencies in finding, analyzing, and presenting data for instructional purposes.
> 4. Strengthening the student in phases of subject matter where weaknesses may exist.
>
> The degree is designed as a fifth-year of teacher-training. It is aimed at meeting the needs of the classroom teacher and the requirements of the State Board of Education relative to salary increment and other advantages that go with any Master's degree. Courses offered in the program are of graduate level and meet recognized graduate standards. Work taken in pursuance of the degree that meets Master and/or Doctorate requirements in other colleges or universities may be transferred in accordance with generally accepted practices. The emphasis is upon training the student in the interpretation and use of existing research pertinent to his work, and upon the improvement of his classroom instruction.

---

[1]Letter from Chancellor Nash, quoted in Carter, op. cit. Appendix III, p. 32.

> The principal emphasis upon the fifth-year program is during the summer session, with only limited offerings during the regular academic year.[1]

Following is the statement of purpose of the Master of Teaching Degree program at East Central State College as it appeared in the 1958-1960 catalog:

> This program, authorized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to begin in June, 1954, has for its purpose the professional improvement of teachers in the common schools. It is designed to meet a clearly recognized need on the part of teachers already in professional work for at least a year of formal education.. experience beyond the four-year baccalaureate degree program. It is not concerned primarily with research but is largely an in-service program for working personnel. It has the following particular objectives, all within the general purposes of teacher education:
>
> 1) To extend and enrich the general education and cultural background of the student.
> 2) To promote the student's personal growth, including the development of a wholesome philosophy.
> 3) To improve the student's general professional background, including knowledge of human growth and development.
> 4) To improve the student's professional competence, and his specific knowledge and understanding in his field of specialization.
> 5) To increase the student's appreciation of and competence in scientific investigation and independent study.
>
> Inasmuch as the fifth-year program is pursued largely by active teachers, principal offerings are provided in summer sessions. During the academic year the enrollments generally are in the evening and, on occassion, Saturday classes only.[2]

The earliest published statement of purpose of the Master of Teaching program at Northeastern appeared on a leaflet announcing the program for the summer of 1954. This statement began: "It is understood that the main and probably the only objective for the Master of Teaching program is to improve the teacher and his teaching techniques."[3] The

---

[1]Central State College, Bulletin, (July, 1958), Catalog Issue 1957-1959, p. 50.

[2]East Central State College, General Catalog, 1958-1960, p. 82.

[3]Northeastern State College, The Master of Teaching Degree, a leaflet announcing the Fifth-Year Program, n.d. (1954), p. 2.

corresponding statement from the 1959-1960 catalog follows:

> The program is basically designed to improve teaching in all its aspects. Its aim is to develop master teachers through individual programs of study designed to provide proficiencies in (a) general education, (b) subject matter preparation, (c) psychological foundations, (d) sociological foundations, and (e) professional education. Due consideration is given to training the student to interpret and use the existing research pertaining to his work, and to acquainting the student with the language of the particular field of interest and with the language of professional education.[1]

The purpose of the Master of Teaching degree program at Northwestern State College was published in the 1958-1960 Annual Bulletin:

> The degree is designed basically to produce master teachers through individual programs of study developed to provide proficiencies in: general education; subject matter preparation; teaching skill and techniques; sensitivity to professional concepts, ideals and standards; psychological foundations; and reflective thought processes. In arriving at a program of study for each candidate, an advisory committee created for him uses the felt needs of the candidate, needs disclosed through diagnostic techniques, and records of his teaching experience.
> Since each candidate shall have had at least one year of teaching experience and shall hold a currently valid teaching certificate, the Advanced Professional Program is an opportunity to extend, reinforce, and integrate his techniques, skill, and knowledge in general and specific fields.[2]

The purpose of the Master of Teaching degree program at Southeastern State College was published in 1958-1960 bulletin:

> The purpose of the program for the Master of Teaching degree is an extension of the primary purpose of Southeastern State College, that is, the education of teachers for the public schools. The aim of the advanced study program, as for undergraduate teacher training, is continued development in general education and attainment of knowledge and skills needed to be a competent teacher. Since this aim is never fully realized, the plan for the Master of Teaching degree is designed to improve the efficiency of elementary and secondary teachers in the public school; to increase their knowledge and understanding of child growth and development. The objective is not so much the accumulation of semester hours as the taking of

---

[1]Northeastern State College, Annual Bulletin, 1959-1960, p. 22.

[2]Northwestern State College, Bulletin, 1958-1960, p. 119.

> specially planned work and the undergoing of these experiences which will be of maximum value to the individual teachers. Since these teachers will have had at least one year of teaching experience and professional growth, their study for the Master of Teaching degree will be an opportunity to extend, reinforce, and integrate their knowledge, techniques and skills.
> The first of these Master of Teaching degrees, which qualify teachers for the same pay as those with traditional Master's degrees, was awarded at the end of the summer term of 1955.[1]

Southwestern State College, in its 1956-1958 catalog, stated the purpose of the Master of Teaching program as follows:

> To provide an advanced professional course of study for students who already have acquired a Bachelor's degree in Education and wish to improve their proficiency and skill as classroom teachers.
> 1. To extend and broaden the background of the teacher in the areas of specialization peculiar to his teaching field or fields.
> 2. To develop the teacher's proficiency in the understanding and use of the more effective methods and techniques related to the specific teaching field or fields.
> 3. To increase the proficiency of teachers in guiding and directing the growth and development of children and adolescents in areas of learning and personal-social adjustment.
> 4. To extend and broaden the teacher's understanding of the school's place in society with its responsibility for preservation and improvement of our democratic society.
> 5. To improve proficiency in critical thinking as it relates particularly to educational problems. This involves qualities of intellectual curiosity, open-mindedness, critical and evaluative reading of professional materials, and ability to create and contribute ideas to the profession.[2]

The purposes of the Master of Teaching degree program, as stated in the catalogs of the six colleges had much in common. They stated, in varying terminology, that they were designed to promote better teaching or develop better teachers, occasionally called "Master Teachers". Then more specific statements were made concerning where emphasis is placed in

---

[1]Southeastern State College, Bulletin, 1958-1960, (May, 1958) p. 54.

[2]Southwestern State College, Catalog, 1956-1958, Quarterly Bulletin, (March, 1956) p. 17.

achieving the purposes. As would be expected, there were some variations in what was included from school to school and in what was emphasized.

The statement of one school varied from others in that it included the qualifying of teachers for Master's salary increment and testifying to the graduate quality of the work and its transferrability on Master's and Doctor's programs elsewhere.[1]

Another disclaimed research as a primary concern and included a statement of the general purposes of teacher education.[2]

Still another cited its use of advisory committees to determine the needs of the individual student.[3]

Yet another cited as its purpose merely the extension of the purpose of the college, the education of teachers for public schools. At this school, the objective was not as much the accumulation of credit hours as the study of specially planned work and the undergoing of those experiences which would be of maximum value to the individual teacher.[4]

Another claimed as its goal the improvement of the educational profession, beginning: "The program is basically designed to improve teaching in all its aspects."[5]

---

[1]Central State College, Bulletin, Catalog Issue, 1957-1959, (July 1958) p. 50.

[2]East Central State College, General Catalog, 1958-1960, (July 1958) p. 82.

[3]Northwestern State College, Bulletin, 1958-1960, p. 119.

[4]Southeastern State College, Bulletin, 1958-1960, p. 54.

[5]Northeastern State College, Annual Bulletin, 1959-1960, p. 22.

Change in Stated Purposes Pertinent to Master of Teaching Program

Two of the schools, Central State and Southeastern have made no change in their published statements of purpose for the Master of Teaching degree programs, other than minor variations in wording.

East Central State College made two changes, that may or may not be significant, depending on the thinking which was responsible for the change. In the statement, "The program...has for its sole purpose the professional improvement of teachers in the common schools",[1] the word "sole" was dropped in 1953.[2] In the statement: "It (the program) is largely an in-service program for working teachers",[3] in 1955, the word "personnel" was substituted for "teachers".[4] It was significant that both of the changes removed limitations in the wording of the purpose. The limitations removed could have been interpreted to imply that the program was not for administrators, specialists or supervisors.

At Northeastern, the early statement: "It is understood that the main and probably the only objective for the Master of Teaching program was to improve the teacher and his teaching techniques" was replaced with: "The program is basically designed to improve teaching in all its aspects".[5] The significance of this change was that it reduced or eliminated the previously imposed limitation of professional

---

[1]East Central State College, General Catalog, 1954-1955, (July 1954) p. 65.

[2]East Central State College, General Catalog, 1955-1956, (July 1955) p. 66.

[3]East Central State College, General Catalog, 1954-1955, (July 1954) p. 65.

[4]East Central State College, General Catalog, 1955-1956, (July 1954) p. 66.

[5]Northeastern State College, Annual Bulletin, 1955-1956, p. 29

positions to be served by the program. The 1958-1960 catalog gave further evidence of the direction of the program by changing its name to "Advanced Professional Program".[1]

A search of the catalogs of the six colleges revealed no other significant change in the statement of the purposes of the colleges in any of the catalogs with regard to the teacher-training function.

In summary, it may be said that there has been no significant change in published statements of purposes of the Master of Teaching programs, with the possible exception of the substitution of terminology that may be interpreted as less limiting in naming the professional positions served by the Master of Teaching program.

Interviews

The President, Dean of Instruction (or Dean of the College), and the Chairmen of Department of Education were interviewed at each of the six state colleges. Also interviewed were the Chancellor and Administrative Assistant of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. At the six state colleges, questions[2] were asked so that responses[3] might give insight into the development of these programs. These questions and a summary of the responses follow:

Question.--Is there any difference between the purposes of programs offering graduate work at the six state colleges before the beginning of the Master of Teaching degree programs and the purposes

---

[1]Northeastern State College, Annual Bulletin, 1956-1957, p. 22.

[2]See Appendix

[3]See Appendix

pursued after this development? If so, what is this difference?

Responses.--There was general agreement (with exceptions noted below) that a major change in purpose occurred at the beginning of the Master of Teaching degree programs. The purpose of graduate work at the state colleges before the beginning of the Master of Teaching degree programs was, in a sense, the same as that of the degree on which the work was to be applied. These people saw the training of administrators as the purpose of the Master of Education degree. The purpose since the beginning of the Master of Teaching programs is also that of the degree on which the work is applied. In this case, this is the training of classroom teachers.

Exceptions.--The Chairman of the Department of Education at one state college stated that this change in purposes had taken place at his school in 1951, so no change took place at the institution of the Master of Teaching degree.

Question.--During the early planning for the Master of Teaching degree program, the North Central Association was thought to favor a program meeting the needs of individual teachers, regardless of the level of instruction. Many educators in Oklahoma were thought to favor the traditional concept of a respectable graduate program. In trying to achieve both of these, persons concerned with the operation of the programs might at times feel themselves to be at cross-purposes. Did you experience any such feelings? Did you sense evidences of them in others?

Responses.--This question evoked more than "yes" or "no" answers. While only four individuals responded that they had had such feelings, nearly all were aware of its existence in others.

The Presidents of two institutions said this conflict is avoided at their schools, as no effort was made to maintain the traditional concept of a respectable graduate program. One went on to say that the North Central Association had nothing in mind, that they stimulated the North Central Association's interest in their type of program.

A Dean said that while these feelings did exist, they were based on a misunderstanding of what the North Central Association had in mind, that at the meeting in April, 1959, his opinion of what the North Central Association desired was changed, that the North Central Association certainly wanted a program of graduate caliber.

A Chairman of one Department of Education replied that at his school it has always been a rigorous graduate program, that they were not concerned with what the North Central Association desired.

Question.--Since this program leads to a degree called Master of Teaching, are prospective students who desire to prepare for administrative positions advised to enroll in the program? If not, are they advised not to?

Response.--Five schools advised administrative students to enroll in Master of Teaching programs. The reasons most often cited were: (1) We offered work to qualify for the provisional administrator's certificate; and (2) A good administrator must be a good teacher. At the sixth school, the Dean stated that they were discouraged from enrolling in the Master of Teaching program, while the Department Chairman stated that they were neither encouraged or discouraged.

Question.--We recognize that in a dynamic program purposes, as well as methods, attitudes etc, will perhaps change. What changes in

the purposes of this program have you recognized at your school? What changes do you recommend?

Response.---Seventeen of the eighteen responded that no change had occurred. One Dean claimed credit for his college for the initiating of the movement which resulted in the change in certification requirements for the provisional administrator's certificate. This change made the qualification for this certificate possible within the framework of the Master of Teaching degree program. The Dean of this college cited this change as a change of purpose.

Often expressed was the thought that the original purpose of the Master of Teaching program was to improve teachers in Oklahoma--there had been no change.

In summary, it can be said that those concerned with the operation of the Master of Teaching degree programs saw as its principal purpose the improvement of classroom teaching in Oklahoma. Few of them seemed familiar enough with any detailed statement of purposes to be more specific. As they saw it, the Master of Teaching degree bore the same relationship to classroom teaching as the Master of Education degree bore to school administration. The feeling of being at cross-purposes in trying to satisfy both the North Central Association and the conservative view held by most Oklahoma school administrators was wide-spread. Those who reconciled the two in their own thinking were aware of the feeling in others.

Suggestions of Change of Purposes

From Interviews

General agreement existed among those interviewed that a substantial change of purpose for graduate work at these institutions took place at the time the schools were authorized to offer the Master of Teaching degree. The interviewees stated, in effect, that the following change took place: the purposes of the Master of Teaching degree were substituted for the purposes of the degree on which the work was to be applied. For each school this was a different change, as the purposes of the Master of Teaching degree program as stated varied from school to school. It was suggested at one school that this change took place at the time the school was first authorized to offer graduate work in its own name (August 28, 1951).

According to one Dean of Instruction the change in the certification requirements for the provisional administrator's certificate was instigated by one of the state colleges. This change, making it possible for a student to qualify himself for the provisional administrator's certificate within the framework of the Master of Teaching program, became effective October 7, 1957.[1] This Dean considered this change as reflecting a change of purpose of the institution. The philosophy behind this change is expressed by Carter.[2]

---

[1]Carter, op. cit., p. 30.

[2]Supra, p. 38.

From Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

The following was excerpted from the minutes of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education:

> The Master of Teaching degree at the six state colleges was considered in conference with Presidents Spencer, Chambers and Garrison with reference to the issuance of certificates by State Board of Education.
>
> Some clarification of the degree was requested to enable evaluation for advanced study when needed for a doctorate, and for the use of applicants for administrators certificate. The Regents consider this to be an accredited recognized standard Master's degree.[1]

The day following the above action, April 26, 1955, a letter was sent to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Oliver Hodge, by Chancellor Nash, citing and amplifying this clarification. This letter follows:

> Dear Dr. Hodge,
>
> It has come to our attention that clarification is needed concerning the Regents' January 25, 1954 statement which authorized the six state colleges to offer programs of study leading to the Master of Teaching degree. In particular, clarification of the following sentence has been requested: "The training of supervisors, specialists, and administrators will not be the objective of the Master of Teaching degree program."
>
> In this preliminary statement authorizing the fifth-year program, the Regents wished to place emphasis on meeting the needs of the individual student, rather than upon pre-determined course or group of courses.
>
> In approving the fifth-year program, the Regents wished to arrest the growing tendency of many teachers as graduate students to major in Educational Administration. First, we need more and better teachers. Secondly, most of such students upon graduation would not be able to find jobs in administration due to the very low turn-over of such jobs.
>
> From reports the Regents have received, it is believed that the fifth-year program is making a real contribution toward providing better qualified personnel in our public schools.
>
> There appears to be in the interpretation of some that work taken in this fifth-year program cannot or should not be acceptable

---

[1]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, April 25, 1955, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

in meeting the requirements of certain special certificates, such as certificates for principals, and superintendents. Such was certainly never the intent of the Regents. To the contrary it is generally recognized that actual classroom teaching experience should certainly be a pre-requisite for administrative work. As to what further specific training might be needed when an individual becomes an administrator, this is entirely up to the State Board of Education which is by law responsible for the certification of public school personnel.

There is no prohibition against these institutions offering courses acceptable for administrators certificates. As a matter of fact, these institutions for several years have offered such courses, and have actually furnished the state with most of the administrators employed in this state through the years.

Since these six institutions are essentially "teachers' colleges" it is not unthinkable that they cannot contribute at least in part to any public school program.

The Regents believe that the State Board of Education should have no hesitancy in approving the work of the six state colleges in any field in which they have a qualified faculty. The fact that all of the six institutions are recognized by the North Central Association and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the Oklahoma State Department of Education constitutes a background in which there can be few questions as to the quality of the programs. They are institutions of higher learning, members of the Oklahoma State system of Higher Education, under Article XIII-A of the constitution of Oklahoma, administered under Article XIII-B of the constitution. And this Master's degree is fully accredited by the Oklahome State Regents for Higher Education.

Sincerely,
M. A. Nash[1]

On February 25, 1957, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education re-affirmed the above statement by unanimous vote.[2] The intent stated in the letter above appears to be in direct conflict with two previous statements of purpose from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. These were: The statement in the Seventh Biennial Report of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, cited on page 46; and the original authorization for the programs, cited on pages 45 and 46. As this statement was authorized by the Oklahoma State Regents

---

[1]Letter from M. A. Nash, quoted in Carter, op. cit., App. III, p. 16.

[2]Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, February 25, 1957, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

for Higher Education in 1955, and re-affirmed by it in 1957, there was little doubt that these actions constituted a definite change in the objectives for the Master of Teaching programs as seen by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

The practical effect of the change of purpose suggested above was apparent in the following: Between the beginning of the Master of Teaching degree programs and the end of the period included in this study, the Master of Teaching degrees granted by these six colleges totaled 1121.[1] Between October 7, 1957, the effective date of the change of requirements for the provisional administrator's certificate, and the end of the 1957-1958 academic year, thirty-two provisional administrator's certificates had been issued on the basis of Master of Teaching degrees.[2] Thus, 2.9 per cent of Master of Teaching degrees granted had resulted in provisional administrator's certificates.

Summary

Prior to the inauguration of the Master of Teaching programs, in 1954, those administering these programs saw as the purpose of graduate work at these colleges the providing of work applicable on Master's Degrees in Education at other institutions, principally the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College. To those college administrators,

---

[1] Eighth Biennial Report of the Oklahoms State Regents for Higher Education, p. 108, and Ninth Biennial Report of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, p.106.

[2] Mail canvass and personal inspection of certification records of the six state colleges of Oklahoma.

the purpose of the Master of Education Degree was to train public school administrators. At the beginning of the Master of Teaching programs, the purpose of graduate work at these schools became that of improving classroom teaching.

The statement of purpose of the Master of Teaching degree program as it appeared in the original authorization by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, appears on pages 47 and 48.

The statements of purpose of the Master of Teaching degree programs as they appeared in the catalogs of the six colleges had much in common with each other and with the above statement of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. They stated, in varying terminology, that the programs were designed to improve teaching, or sometimes more specifically, classroom teaching. More specific statements were made concerning where emphasis was placed in achieving the purposes. The only significant changes occurring in these statements consisted of changes of terminology which were interpreted as less limiting in naming the professional positions served by the Master of Teaching program.

One interviewee suggested that a change of purpose occurred when the requirements for the provisional administrator's certificate were changed to allow it to be earned within the framework of the Master of Teaching program.

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education changed its position from that of opposing the training of administrators in the Master of Teaching program to that of endorsing it. However, it refused to recognize that this was a change of position, implying that such was its original intention, the record not withstanding.

The percentage of holders of Master's of Teaching degrees who have been certified as administrators did not indicate that this change in position of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education resulted in any substantial change in the purposes of the Master of Teaching degree programs within the time covered by this study.

CHAPTER IV

CURRICULAR OFFERINGS

Introduction

The study of the curricular offerings of the six Oklahoma State colleges has two purposes: 1. to determine if the adding of graduate courses was accompanied by change in the undergraduate offerings, and; 2. to compare the number and variety of graduate courses offered by the various institutions.

The data for the tables in this chapter were derived from the course listings in the catalogs of the respective colleges. Each college was identified by the same symbol in all tables and discussions. It was recognized that some degree of inaccuracy was introduced by the fact that all courses listed in the catalog are not regularly offered, and others may not be dropped from the catalog until long after they have failed to appear on the schedule of classes. However, it was felt that even greater error would be introduced by following the alternative of listing the courses actually offered. This error would be caused by courses appearing to be dropped from the program simply because the demand was not great enough for all of them to be offered each year. The Master of Teaching program was largely a summer program. It was not likely that each of the courses in the program would be offered each summer, especially at the schools with smaller enrollment. This would

cause an artificial appearance of instability.

Effect of Addition of Master of Teaching Programs on Undergraduate Programs

In Table 1 it was shown that college C reduced its undergraduate listings in Educational Psychology by four for the 1955-1956 year. Inspection of the catalog of college C revealed that in the year this drop occurred, college C dropped five courses which none of the other five colleges were offering. This suggested that, while the individualistic character of the curriculum of college C may have suffered, no course listings were dropped for which a need was recognized by the colleges as a group.

TABLE 1.--Number of Undergraduate Education and Psychology Courses Listed by the Six State College of Oklahoma for the Academic Years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958

Year	Colleges					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
*1952-1953	27	26	39	28	26	18
*1953-1954	27	24	38	39	26	18
1954-1955	27	24	38	39	25	18
1955-1956	27	24	34	39	25	18
1956-1957	27	24	34	39	26	18
1957-1958	28	24	34	37	26	18

*The Master of Teaching degree programs were not operating these years.

Table 1 revealed that the only other college to show any reduction in number of listings at or after the beginning of the Master of Teaching degree program was college D, which reduced its listings from thirty-nine to thirty-seven for the academic year 1957-1958. The evidence seemed to warrent the conclusion that, in so far as could be determined from catalog

listings, the addition of the superstructure of courses designed for the Master of Teaching degree program had negligible effect on the undergraduate curricular offerings.

Graduate Courses

In Table 2 were listed the courses identified as graduate courses in the catalogs of the colleges for the years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958.

TABLE 2.--Graduate Courses Listed by the Six State Colleges of Oklahoma for the Academic Years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958

Department and Course	1952-1953	1953-1954	1954-1955	1955-1956	1956-1957	1957-1958
ART						
Adv. Art Crafts for Elem. School			B EF	AB EF	AB EF	AB EF
Individual Study in Art						A
Problems in Art Educ. in Elem. Schools						A
Seminar in Art				C		
BUSINESS EDUCATION						
Improvement of Instruction in Bookkeeping and Gen. Business			EF	A EF	AB EF	AB EF
Improvement of Instruction in Secretarial Subjects			EF	A EF	AB EF	AB EF
Individual Study of Bus. Educ.						A
Problems of Skilled Building in Business Education				C		
Seminar in Business Education						A
Survey of Advanced Accounting for Teachers				B	B	B
EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY						
Administration and Use of Audio-Visual Materials	B DEF	BCDEF	BCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Advanced Educ. Measurements	B DE	BCDE	BCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Advanced Educational Psych.	B DE	BCDE	BCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Advanced Mental Hygiene			B EF	AB EF	AB EF	AB EF
Advanced Psych. of Adolescence	B DEF	BCDEF	BCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Advanced Psych. of Children	B DEF	BCDEF	BCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Advanced Student Teaching			B F	B F	B EF	B EF
Clinical Practice in Remedial Reading		C	C	C	BC	BC
Curriculum and Methods of Teaching Slow Learners and Retarded Children				A	A	A
Educational Sociology	B DEF	BCDEF	BCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Educational Statistics	B DEF	BCDEF	BCD F	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Evaluation and Records				C		

Table 2--Continued

Department and Course	1952-1953	1953-1954	1954-1955	1955-1956	1956-1957	1957-1958
EDUCATION AND PSYCH. (contd.)						
Fundamentals of Curric. Devel.	B DE	BCDE	BCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Fundamentals of Elem. Curriculum Development				A	A	
Fundamentals of Public School Administration	B DEF	BCDEF	BCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Fundamentals of Secondary Curriculum Development				A	A	
Guidance of Exceptional Children						A
History of Education	B DEF	BCDEF	BCD F	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Improvement of Instruction in Arithmetic in Elem. School			EF	A EF	A EF	A EF
Improvement of Instruction in Elementary Social Studies			EF	A EF	A EF	A EF
Individual Study in Education			B EF	AB EF	AB EF	AB EF
Introduction to Graduate Study			B DEF	AB DEF	AB DEF	AB DEF
Legal Aspects of Public School Administration					C	C
Methods and Techniques of Counselling						A
Modern Philosophy of Education	B DE	BCDE	BCDE	ABCDE	AB DEF	AB DEF
Motivation of Learning				C	C	
Principles of Student Guidance	B DEF	BCDEF	BCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Prob. of Teaching in Elem. School	B DEF	BCDEF	BCD F	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Prob. of Teaching in Sec. School	B DEF	BCDEF	BCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Public School Finance	B DE	BCDE	BCD	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Public School Housing					C	C
Public School Relations	B DEF	BCDEF	BCD F	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Seminar in Education			B EF	ABC EF	ABC EF	ABC EF
Special Problems in Teaching Reading	B DEF	BCDEF	BCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Supervision of Teaching	B DE	BCDE	BCD	ABCDEF	ABCDEF	ABCDEF
Survey of Exceptional Children				A	A F	A F
Survey of Physical Defects			B F	B F	B EF	B EF
Thesis in Education Research					B	B
HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION						
Advanced Physical Hygiene						A
Curric. Construction in Health and Physical Education				C	C	C
Health and P.E. Problems for Elementary Teachers						A
Health and E.E. Problems for Secondary Teachers						A
Health Problems				C	C	C
Individual Study in Health and Physical Education						A
Seminar in Health and P.E.				C	C	A C

Table 2--Continued

Department and Course	1952-1953	1953-1954	1954-1955	1955-1956	1956-1957	1957-1958
HOME ECONOMICS						
Home Econ. for Sec. Teachers						A
Individual Study in Home Ec.						A
Problems in Home Ec. Educ.				C	C	C
Seminar in Home Economics						A
INDUSTRIAL ARTS						
Individual Study in Indust. Arts						A
Indust. Arts for Sec. Teachers				C		A
Seminar in Industrial Arts				C	C	A
LANGUAGE ARTS						
English						
English for Secondary Teachers				C		A
Individual Study in English						A
Seminar in English			EF	C EF	C EF	A EF
Teaching of Contemporary Lit.				C	C	C
Speech						
Individual Study in Speech						A
Seminar in Speech						A
Speech for Elem. Teachers						A
Speech for Secondary Teachers						A
Mathematics						
Math for Elementary Teachers						A
Math for Secondary Teachers						A
Individual Study in Math						A
Seminar in Mathematics				C	C	A
MUSIC						
Adv. Conducting and Score Reading			EF	A EF	A EF	A EF
Individual Study in Music						A
Instrumental Methods and Materials for Secondary Teachers					E	A E
Music for Elementary Teachers			B F	B F	B EF	AB EF
Seminar in Music				C	C	C
Vocal Methods and Materials for Secondary Teachers					E	A E
SCIENCE						
Individual Studies in Science						A
Problems of Teaching Natural Science at Elementary Level				C	C	A C
Seminar in Science						A
Science for Elementary Teachers			EF	AB EF	AB EF	AB EF
Science for Secondary Teachers			EF	AB EF	AB EF	AB EF
SOCIAL STUDIES						
Indiv. Studies in Social Studies						A
Seminar in History			EF	EF	EF	EF
Seminar in Social Studies				A C	A C	A C
Social Studies for Sec. Teachers						A

It was apparent from Table 2 that no graduate courses in areas other than Education were listed by these colleges prior to the beginning of the Master of Teaching degree programs, and only nine were introduced in the first year of the programs.

College A listed the largest number of such courses (41) in 1957-1958, with college C having the greatest number the two previous years, (17 in 1955-1956, 18 in 1956-1957). College D listed no such courses for any of the years included in the study.

Table 2 also revealed that the number of graduate education courses offered at one or more of these colleges increased from nineteen in 1953-1954, the year before the Master of Teaching program began, to twenty-eight in 1954-1955, and thirty-four in each of the following years.

The college listing the greatest number of graduate education courses for the last three years covered in the study was college A with thirty-three in 1955-1956 and 1956-1957 and twenty-nine the following year. College D consistently listed the smallest numberof these courses, with eighteen in the final year of the study.

A requirement placed on the Master of Teaching programs by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, provided that individual needs of the student be met, regardless of the level of instruction.[1] As a result, at the six colleges most junior and senior courses were available to the Master of Teaching programs.

An effort was made to determine what distinction, if any, existed between the amount and quality of work done by graduate students and that done by undergraduate students taking the same courses. During interviews

---

[1]Supra, p. 47.

with the Chairmen of Departments of Education the following question was asked:

Question: In undergraduate classes taken by graduates for graduate credit, what distinction is made between graduates and undergraduates in work required or grades received?

Response: At colleges B and F, the additional work requirement for graduates was indicated in the syllabus for the course before graduate enrollment in the course was allowed. At colleges A and D, the instructor listed the additional work required of graduate students on forms which were filed with the office at the end of the course. At colleges C and E, it was left up to the instructors, but there was supposed to be additional work required of graduates.

It was evident in Table 2 that the trend was toward providing graduate or fifth-year courses in each of the subject areas, in order to reduce or eliminate the practice of taking these undergraduate courses in the Master of Teaching programs.

Uniformity in Graduate Course Listings

The degree of uniformity of the course listings of the six Master of Teaching programs is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3.--Degree of Uniformity of Graduate Courses Listed by State Colleges of Oklahoma for the Academic Years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958

Number of	Duplication of Course Offerings by Year:					
Colleges	1952-1953*	1953-1954**	1954-1955**	1955-1956	1956-1957	1957-1958
6	0	0	0	14	14	14
5	0	12	9	6	5	5
4	12	6	8	5	8	9
3	6	0	6	6	6	5
2	0	0	6	6	5	8
1	0	1	1	26	24	42

*Only four colleges listed graduate work in catalog this year.
**Only five colleges listed graduate work in catalog this year.

The fourteen courses offered by all six colleges in the years 1955-1956 through 1957-1958 all appeared in the list of courses which the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education authorized for the six colleges in 1951. These courses, which were considered basic to the Master of Teaching degree program, were:

History of Education
Educational Sociology
Advanced Psychology of Childhood
Advanced Psychology of Adolescence
Problems of Teaching in Elementary Schools
Special Problems of Teaching Reading
Problems of Teaching Secondary Schools
Administration and Use of Audio-Visual Materials
Educational Statistics
Principles of Student Guidance
Supervision of Teaching
Fundamentals of Public School Administration
Public School Relations
Advanced Educational Psychology

Offered by five of the six schools in 1955-1956 through 1957-1958 were:

Introduction to Graduate Study
Fundamentals of Curricular Development
Advanced Educational Measurements
Public School Finance
Seminar in Education

Offered by four of the six schools were:

Advanced Art Crafts for Elementary Schools
Improvement of Instruction in Bookkeeping and General Business
Modern Philosophy of Education
Individual Study in Education
Music for Elementary Teachers
Science for Elementary Teachers
Science for Secondary Teachers
Advanced Mental Hygiene

The twenty-eight courses contained in the three lists above were each offered in a majority of the Master of Teaching degree programs in Oklahoma. These may be considered as the principal offerings of the Master of Teaching programs.

Diversity in Graduate Course Listings

Table 3 revealed there were more graduate courses (42) listed by only one of the six colleges than the total number of courses (41) offered by two or more of these colleges. Table 3 also revealed that no significant number of graduate courses was listed by a single college before the second year of the Master of Teaching program, 1955-1956.

It is seen in Table 4 that college C was the early leader in independence or non-conformity of graduate curricular development. College A replaced College C in this role in the final year of the study, 1957-1958. Colleges D and F, followed closely by E, demonstrate none of these characteristics in this development of their graduate curricula.

TABLE 4.--Number of Graduate Courses Listed by Only One State College of Oklahoma, and the Colleges Listing Them for the Academic Years 1952-1953 through 1957-1958

Year	Colleges						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
1952-1953	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1953-1954	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
1954-1955	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
1955-1956	8	1	17	0	0	0	26
1956-1957	8	2	13	0	1	0	24
1957-1958	32	2	7	0	0	0	41
Total	48	5	39	0	1	0	93

Summary

The evidence indicates that the addition of courses designed for the Master of Teaching program had little effect on course listings at that time. In fact, it appears to have had a stabilizing effect on the undergraduate education curricula as the colleges exercised their experimental initiative on the graduate program.

Graduate courses in areas other than education were non-existent at these colleges prior to the advent of the Master of Teaching programs. The number of these courses listed by one or more of these six colleges grew from nine in 1954-1955, the first year of the program, to thirty-four in the final year of the study, 1957-1958.

The number of graduate education courses at these colleges was somewhat more stable, increasing from twenty-eight to thirty-four in the same period of time. The graduate courses offered before the Master of Teaching programs continued as the core of the graduate education work for these programs.

At all six colleges, in undergraduate courses taken for graduate credit, graduate students are expected to do additional work. The colleges varied widely in the extent to which they required documentation of this additional work.

Twenty-eight graduate courses were listed by a majority of the six colleges. These courses were considered the principal offerings of the Master of Teaching programs in Oklahoma.

College C, and later college A, deviated significantly from the group in the direction of diversity or independence of curricular offerings.

College C was the first to establish a large number of graduate courses, then reduced this number as undergraduate courses were used instead, with a graduate number and name. College A increased its number of graduate course listings by twenty-four for the year 1957-1958.

CHAPTER V

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE MASTER OF TEACHING PROGRAMS

Three aspects of the Master of Teaching degree programs were minor in importance and lacking in available pertinent material. None of these three was considered sufficient to warrant an entire chapter. These three aspects were: Student Personnel Practices; Acceptability of work in the Master of Teaching degree programs by other Institutions of Higher Learning; and Anticipated Future.

Student Personnel Practices

Certain personnel practices regarding graduate students were thought to have bearing on the question of quality of graduate work in the Master of Teaching programs. Therefore, questions concerning these practices were included in the interviews with the Deans and Chairmen of the Departments of Education. These questions, each of which is followed by a summarization of the responses to it, were as follows:[1]

Question.--What procedure is followed in gaining admission to the program?

Response.--At colleges A. and B, the student first applied to the registrar for admission to graduate study. At all six colleges the exec-

---

[1]Appendix

utive officer of the fifth-year committee or council enrolled the student in his first enrollment. In the procedure, there was no provision for screening among the applicants at any school. The only requirement was that the student hold a Bachelor's degree and complete a year's successful teaching experience. However, the student could earn up to eight hours before completing the year of experience or could enroll in up to eight hours of graduate work in his final semester of undergraduate work, if his total enrollment were not over sixteen hours for the semester.

Question.--What effort is made to discourage marginal students?

Response.--This was done informally, largely by grades and informal counseling. There was no established system for this.

Question.--What procedure would be used to remove from the program a student felt to be unqualified, or undesirable teacher material? How frequently does this happen?

Response.--Students were screened on the basis of grades when applying for candidacy after completing eight to sixteen semester hours. However, this seldom resulted in the elimination of a student from the program.

Question.--What effort is made to encourage promising students to continue?

Response.-- The Chairman of one Department of Education reported a system of writing letters to promising candidates, reminding them of the remaining requirements, and encouraging them to complete the program, There was no organized effort at the other five colleges, though at one, the use of occasional graduate assistantships was cited.

Question.--When is the student advised, and how often is he ad-

vised in the selection of course work? Is the student advised by an advisor, or by a committee?

Response.--He was advised at the time of his first enrollment for that enrollment. Then, usually after eight hours of work, his entire program was determined. At one college, the student was assisted in this by a single advisor; at five colleges, by a committee of three. After the program was determined, a single advisor usually completed the advising.

Question.--Are suggestions of the employer of the student considered in planning his program? Are these suggestions solicited?

Response.--These suggestions were considered when available. Of the twelve responses, eight indicated employer suggestions were solicited; four indicated that they were not.

Question.--What is the requirement at your college concerning the distribution of course work among the areas of general education, professional education, and teaching field of the student?

Response.--At College A, the distribution was based on six competencies instead of on the three areas named in the question. College B required six to ten hours in the teaching field, ten hours in professional education, and five hours of general education courses. At College C approximately half the work was done in the teaching field, half in professional education, and little or none in general education. College D required ten to sixteen hours in the teaching fields, eight to sixteen hours in professional education, and zero to eight hours in general education. At College E the distribution was approximately eight hours in the teaching fields, sixteen hours in professional education, and eight hours in general education courses. College F required a specific core

of eight to eleven hours of professional education courses. The remaining hours were distributed without specific limitations.

Acceptability of Work in the Master of Teaching Degree by Other Institutions of Higher Education

Other Institutions Within the Oklahoma System of Higher Education

The work offered in the Master of Teaching program was accredited as graduate work by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, therefore acceptable to some extent at both graduate schools under jurisdiction of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.[1]

By mutual agreement, the six state colleges each accepted for transfer to its Master of Teaching program up to sixteen hours of work taken in the Master of Teaching programs of the other state colleges of Oklahoma.[2]

At the University of Oklahoma, the following rule governed the transfer credit allowed on the Master's degree programs:

> Up to eight hours transfer credit may be accepted for graduate residence work at another institution provided such work...has been taken in a well-established graduate school offering major graduate work in the subject matter....[3]

As the Master of Teaching degree was judged to be in the subject matter area of education, only graduate level education courses were transferable to the graduate college at the University of Oklahoma. A maximum of eight hours could be applied, and these only on the Master of Education degree program, the only Master's program on which this work is

---

[1] Supra, p. 62.

[2] Supra, p. 34.

[3] University of Oklahoma, Bulletin, Issue for the Graduate College, August 15, 1959, pp. 12-13.

acceptable. In the event a holder of the Master of Teaching degree program were to enter a doctorate program at the University of Oklahoma, the graduate office of that University reported the following procedure: The credit allowed for work in the Master of Teaching degree was determined by the advisory committee. To arrive at this decision, the committee evaluated the work taken by the student at the state college.

In accepting credits transferred from these colleges, the graduate office reported that it made no distinction between the Master of Teaching programs which were accredited by the North Central Association and those which were not. All six Master of Teaching programs were accredited by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, and the University of Oklahoma had considered them as such since their beginning.

Acceptability of Work in Area of the North Central Association

Outside the Oklahoma System of Higher Education, accrediting associations were of major importance in determining the acceptability of transferable credits. As Oklahoma was in the region served by the North Central Association, the actions and policies of this association were most pertinent to the study of the acceptability of work taken in the Master of Teaching degrees in Oklahoma. In response to a letter of inquiry, Robert F. Sullivan of the North Central Association supplied information pertinent to the acceptability of the four colleges with the Master of Teaching programs not yet accredited, as well as to that of the two with accredited Master of Teaching programs.

To the question "What does accreditation as recently received by two state colleges of Oklahoma mean?" The following response was given:

> Accreditation means that in the judgment of the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association satisfactory institutional arrangements for carrying on the educational program have been made. It means that the whole institution is considered; its elements of strength are weighed against its elements of weakness, and on the basis of informed opinion the decision to accredit or not accredit is made. Hence the accreditation of the Master of Teaching degree at the institution mentioned means that the arrangements made by the institution for conducting its program are satisfactory.[1]

According to Sullivan, accreditation of a program at any degree level allowed extension into areas not contained in the original examination, unless otherwise stated.[2] Thus, the two recently accredited state colleges, so far as the North Central Association is concerned, were accredited to offer any Master's degree program it might choose. Any such expansion of degree programs would, however, require the approval of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, as authorization of function would be involved.

When asked what procedure is followed by a regionally accredited college in determining the acceptability of credits from a college not so accredited, Sullivan replied as follows:

> Although the acceptance or non-acceptance of transferred credit is a matter that varies among institutions, the general procedure is to follow the information and evaluation contained in the booklet issued by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers under the title, "Report of Credit Given by Educational Institutions."[3]

From Sullivan's statement, it appeared that the policy of University of Oklahoma toward such work, as listed in "Report of Credit Given by Educational Institutions," in common practice became the policy

---

[1]Letter from Robert F. Sullivan, Assistant to the Secretary, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

of most institutions of higher education in the area served by the North Central Association.

Thus, at most graduate schools, the accreditation by the North Central Association was the basis of evaluation of the programs so accredited while the policy of the University of Oklahoma was the basis for such evaluation of the programs not so accredited.

Acceptability of Work Outside the Area of the North Central Association

In an effort to obtain data on the acceptability of work in the Oklahoma Master of Teaching programs at colleges outside the area served by the North Central Association, letters of inquiry were sent to each of the five other regional accrediting agencies. Replies were received from the Western College Association, the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Their responses are summarized below:

Each member institution was free to accept or not accept any credits from any other institution, so far as the regional accrediting associations are concerned.

All collegiate institutions accredited by any one of the six regional accrediting agencies were recognized as having nationally accepted accreditation. However, there was no guarantee of the transfer of credits between accredited institutions.[1]

---

[1]Letters from an officer of each of the following: Western College Association, Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

In determining what credit to accept from non-accredited colleges, the general practice was to follow the policy of the state university of the state in which the unaccredited college was located. These statements of policy were found in the pamphlet, "Report of Credit Given by Educational Institutions", issued by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. The usual practice appeared to be to delay recording the transfer of any credits from unaccredited colleges until the transfer student had demonstrated competence through examination or through one or two semesters of course work.[1]

Efforts of the State Colleges to Protect Graduate Credits

At two of the six colleges, the belief was expressed that there was no need to protect their credits. The president of one stated that the only degree on which the course offerings were intended to apply was the Master of Teaching degree at that institution. At this college, use of the term "graduate" was avoided. The president at the other expressed the belief that graduate credit should be granted for any course taken by a graduate, because the student is a graduate. Therefore, there was no reason to substantiate the graduate quality of the work done.

The visitation committee of the North Central Association, in listing the element of weaknesses of the graduate program of one of the two recently accredited, cited the lack of graduate-only courses. Another college which is to be visited during the summer of 1959, added an extensive number of such courses to its listings in its catalog for 1957-1959.

---

[1] Ibid.

College C, recently accredited by the North Central Association, followed a unique practice in recording the credits of work taken in the Master of Teaching program. Each course, graduate or undergraduate, taken in the program was recorded only with the number 5, followed by a brief description of the course. Thus, with no system of numbers from which to estimate the level of the course, the reader of the transcript had little alternative to accepting the word of the college that it was work of graduate quality. Presumably, an inquiry directed to the college would yield the same response. College C reported this as a protection for its students. However, it seems reasonable that, as knowledge of this practice gains circulation, it would perhaps result in doubt being cast on the graduate quality of any graduate work at College C.

The colleges made efforts of differing intensities to justify the granting of graduate credit for undergraduate courses taken in the Master of Teaching program on the basis of additional work required of graduates. The variation is in the extent of the effort made to document the additional work required of graduate students taking these courses.

Anticipated Future

In an effort to determine what the colleges anticipated for the future, the interviews with the president, dean and chairman of the Departments of Education at each of the six colleges included several questions bearing on this subject. Following are these questions, and responses to them.[1]

---

[1]Appendix

Question.--Do you expect the fifth-year program to continue at each of the six state colleges?

Response.--The unanimously affirmative response was conditioned by some on the success of all six colleges in obtaining from the North Central Association accreditation with the new program.

Question.--Do you anticipate that the size of enrollment in these programs will increase significantly within the next decade?

Response.--This was generally expected, thirteen to five. The responses obtained at colleges B and E were negative, two to one. A frequently expressed expectation was 10 per cent per year. The president of college F expected no significant increase unless the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University dropped the teacher-training function.

Question.--Do you expect that any of these six institutions will or are likely to offer any programs of graduate education not now offered within the next decade?

Response.--Affirmative responses totaled twelve, with four answering negatively. Two thought perhaps they might. The response at college B was negative, two to one. The Dean suggested the addition of a program for guidance specialists, and perhaps others within the framework of the Master of Teaching program. At colleges A, C, and E, Master's degree programs in the teaching areas were suggested. At all but college C, a program to train guidance specialists was suggested. At colleges C and D the addition of a standard administrator's certificate program was anticipated. Other additions suggested were: Sixth year of Teacher Training, Specialists in Audio-Visual Education, Special Education

programs.

Question.--As you know, the North Central Association recently accredited two of these six colleges, including their Master of Teaching degree programs. What effect do you expect this action to have on the Master of Teaching degree program at your college?

Response.--The nature of the responses to this question is such as to defy simple categorization. Therefore, a summary is reported of the responses at each college. The first two are from the colleges recently accredited with the Master of Teaching program. As their responses are made from a different position, they should be considered in the light of this fact.

College B: It would lend stature, dignity, and prestige to the degree. It would increase enrollment some.

College C: It would help us recognize our weaknesses and stimulate the strengthening of these areas. Perhaps it would increase enrollment. It would have a "salting down" effect on the program.

The following four schools at the time of these interviews were awaiting visitation and action by the North Central Association on their application for approval. Their responses should be viewed in the light of this fact.

College A: It would have little effect, other than to raise our hopes for like accreditation.

College D: Its only effect was to encourage us in our effort for accreditation.

College E: The president and chairman of the Department of Education thought it would have no effect, unless their program was refused

accreditation. The dean thought the college could profit from the experiences of the two already accredited, and thus increase its own chances of similar approval.

College F: It would strengthen the chances of our accreditation by its recognition of the type of program. The president reported that their accreditation resulted in pressure for college F to obtain similar accreditation.

Summary

From the responses to the questions regarding Student Personnel Practices, the following conclusions were drawn:

No provision was made for selective admission into the program, other than the selectivity afforded by the entrance requirements.

Selective retention of a sort was gained by the established systems for screening applicants for admission to candidacy, and for reporting and eliminating students with repeated low grades. However, it was reported at most of the colleges that relatively few were eliminated in this manner.

The program of the student was set up between enrollment in the eighth and sixteenth hours, varying from college to college. This was done at five of the colleges by an advisory committee, usually of three staff members, working with the individual student. The suggestions of the students' employer were considered when available, and were solicited at most of the colleges.

Three of the colleges listed specific limits within which the course work may be distributed among the areas of general education,

professional education, and the teaching fields of the student. Each of the other three colleges employed a unique plan of its own.

The six state colleges had agreed to accept a maximum of sixteen hours of credit earned in Master of Teaching programs transferred from each other.

The available data indicated no difference between the acceptability of the work in the North Central area and in areas of other regional accrediting agencies. That is, the accredited programs usually were treated as any other accredited program, and the policy of the University of Oklahoma was generally followed in accepting credits earned in the non-accredited programs. However, the individual institution was under no obligation to accept the credits of another, and always might refuse.

In effect, work in the Master of Teaching programs gained nation-wide acceptability as applied on Education Programs at the Master's level when the University of Oklahoma published in "Report of Credit Given by Educational Institutions" its policy of accepting the work under the same regulations it would accept work from any other college on such a program. This demonstrated the practical power of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to obtain nation-wide acceptability, though not formal accreditation, of any program it might desire to initiate.

The question then arose: In so far as the acceptability of credits for transfer is concerned, what benefit accrued to Colleges B and C on their recent accreditation ?

The data available would indicate the following: A person transferring work in one of these programs to another graduate college would no longer be required to establish his competence through examination or a satisfactory record at the college to which he transfers.

While the chance of refusal to accept credit was always present in accepting a transferring student, it appeared less likely to occur if the credit were being transferred from an accredited college.

A graduate college with a more liberal policy than that of the University of Oklahoma in accepting graduate credits in transfer would likely follow its own policy, instead of that of the University of Oklahoma as reported in the "Report of Credit Given by Educational Institutions". Thus, at such a college perhaps more hours, or credit earned in areas other than Education would be accepted.

The consensus of those concerned with the operation of the Master of Teaching programs was that they would grow steadily and slowly through the next ten years, presuming that accreditation by the North Central Association was obtained.

These people thought that the number of graduate programs would be increased within the Master of Teaching program. The most likely additions were thought to be guidance and administration programs. Some expected the addition of Master's degrees in departments other than Education.

There was general agreement that the accreditation of two of these six schools would prove beneficial and helpful to all six.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem of this study was to analyze and interpret the Fifth-Year programs of the six state colleges of Oklahoma as they developed and operated in their first five years.

The historical method and normative survey were used to secure data from the following sources:

1. Minutes of meetings of the controlling boards of the six state colleges.
2. Interviews with the Chancellor and Assistant of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, and with the Administrative Officers in the programs at each of the six state colleges.
3. Catalogs of the six state colleges.
4. Books and other published or duplicated sources.

Summary

The first graduate work offered at the state colleges with which the state colleges had any actual instructional responsibility took place in the summer of 1951. The holding of extension classes by

the University of Oklahoma and the Oklahoma A. & M. College in buildings of the state colleges before that time was not considered here as pertinent to the study, as the state colleges were not involved in offering the instruction.

At the May 18, 1951, meeting of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education a plan was authorized whereby the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College might, at the request of the state colleges, establish graduate centers at the state colleges. This center would operate according to plans agreed upon by the participating institutions. The authorization was for the summer of 1951.

In the summer of 1951, a graduate study center was established at each of the six colleges, the credit being granted by the University of Oklahoma and the Oklahoma A. & M. College. The courses offered at these centers were taught in some cases by personnel of the graduate school, and in other cases by personnel of the state college. In the latter, the instructor was, for the purpose of the graduate courses only, considered a member of the staff of the graduate institition, chosen with the approval of and paid by the graduate institution.

A system of graduate centers with the credit granted by the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College was essential in the transition. It removed a principal talking point of the established graduate institutions against graduate work at the state colleges (questionable acceptability of credits). At the same time it lent respectability to the work in the eyes of the public school teachers.

The eight hour limitation in effect during the summer of 1951 made it a one-summer program for most teachers enrolling, and thus

public school teachers began to supplement the demand of the presidents for expansion of the programs.

Two of the six state colleges tried individually to obtain preliminary approval for Master of Education degrees; one in 1952, the other in 1953. Both were unsuccessful. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education at that time required preliminary approval by the North Central Association before it would authorize a graduate program.

The impetus which resulted in the establishment of the Fifth-Year program was the expression by the North Central Association of its interest in an experimental Fifth-Year program of teacher education, not based on the usual requirements for a Master's degree.

Both the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and the Board of Regents for Oklahoma State Colleges were quick to grant the necessary authorization for these programs. The office of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and the college administrators, working together, were quick to develop the programs.

Two of the six colleges adhered rather closely to the philosophy of the program originally thought to be favored by the North Central Association. Two others practically ignored this philosophy, and followed the traditional concept of a respectable graduate program. In between these extremes, attempting to serve either both or neither of these points of view, were the other two colleges.

Early expressions by the Oklahoma State Regents of Higher Education definitely disclaimed the preparation of administrators as a purpose of the Master of Teaching programs.

The only changes made in the statements of purposes published in the catalogs of the respective colleges suggest some change in the

professional positions to be served by the degree programs. These changes liberalized the language in such a manner that provisions were made for educators other than classroom teachers in these programs. Of the total number of Master of Teaching degrees granted by State colleges, 2.9 per cent were used as the basis for the issuance of the provisional administrator's certificate.

The programs deviated from the original purposes in that they followed the purposes as they operate today. That is, the programs included some courses in administration, although some of these courses existed before the approval of the program.

The colleges, formerly normal schools, were originally instituted to prepare teachers for the public schools. At the time the colleges were established, most school administrators in Oklahoma were teachers with the extra responsibility of administration. Therefore the preparation of administrators fell well within the purpose of the normal school. With the progress of education in Oklahoma as students remained in school longer, the public demanded better-prepared administrators and teachers. This required more years of study, and the normal schools became Teachers' colleges.

After World War II, teacher-certification requirements were increased substantially. The Master's Degree lost the distinction that it previously held due to the scarcity of holders of the degree, and, while seldom a condition of employment for classroom teachers in Oklahoma, teachers not holding the degree were often encouraged by their employers to earn it. In short, the Master's degree was no longer unique as an element in the preparation of teachers in Oklahoma.

Thus, it appeared to the administrators of the state colleges that if the original purposes of the State Colleges were to remain unchanged, the colleges must have graduate programs. A corollary to this was that if the original purposes of the state colleges were to remain unchanged, provision for the preparation of administrators to the level of the standard certificate should be made in the state colleges. The preparation of school administrators was not questioned as a function of the state colleges until graduate work became a requirement for their certification.

Most of the administrators of the state colleges in 1959 expected the following future for the programs:

1. Constant gradual increase in enrollment--around ten per cent per year.
2. Addition of programs to qualify students for the guidance specialist and provisional administrator certificates.
3. Eventual accreditation of each of the six programs by the North Central Association.

Provision for selective admission to the program was limited to the requirements of the Bachelor's degree, the possession of a teaching certificate, and one year of successful teaching experience. Some degree of selectivity in retention of students was afforded by one or two check-points within the program. Wide variations existed among the colleges concerning the quality of work required of graduate students to obtain graduate credit in undergraduate courses acceptable in the programs.

Though there was no absolute assurance of acceptance of the credit of any college or university by another, as a rule the policy of

the University of Oklahoma was followed by other institutions. This policy provided for the acceptance of a maximum of eight hours of graduate education course work in the Master of Education degree program from the six state colleges. No distinction was made between those programs accredited and those not accredited by the North Central Association.

Conclusions

The conditions of the financing of state colleges in 1951 was such that it was apparent that Master's degree programs at the six colleges were out of the question for the time being. The evidence at this time indicated that the presidents would have to work together toward eventually obtaining graduate programs.

The unanimous and opposite decisions of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in August, 1951, concerning the offering of graduate work in the name of the state college suggested that this board was accustomed to taking unanimous action following the recommendations of the Chancellor subsequently on matters pertaining to the Master of Teaching programs.

While the office of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education made many suggestions to the state colleges concerning means of acquiring and administering the Master of Teaching programs, that office acquiesced in the decision to add the programs. The decision was in essence made by the presidents of some of the state colleges, and its approval by the controlling boards was little more than a formality.

To the college presidents the moment seemed opportune in 1953 to obtain the approval of the North Central Association of a Fifth-Year Program when the North Central Association expressed an interest in a

Fifth-Year Program which was not based on the usual requirements, but rather on the needs of the individual student, regardless of the level of instruction. These administrators were willing to call their Master's degree program a fifth-year program, as long as it terminated in a Master's degree. But they were far from unanimous in desiring the type of program the North Central Association desired. In fact, at one college, it appeared that the college was not concerned with the type of program desired by the North Central Association, but with maintaining a rigorous graduate program.

The opinions and advice of the North Central Association Secretary, Norman Burns, were taken as those of the North Central Association, and the feeling persisted among the college presidents that if his opinions and advice were followed, ultimate accreditation of the programs by the North Central Association could be expected.

No basic studies were conducted to determine if a need existed for the requested programs. No effort was made to prevent duplications of programs when the request was made to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for graduate programs for the preparation of administrators.

The history of the development of the Master of Teaching degree programs showed a definite lack of leadership in the office of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

No effort was ever made by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to establish whether or not the colleges followed the requirements laid down in the authorization of the Master of Teaching degree programs. The evidence indicated that the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, while aware of the failures of the colleges to comply with these requirements made no effort to enforce them.

It was felt necessary to question both the logic and the truth of the philosophy used to justify the Master of Teaching programs as quoted from Carter on page 38. The validity of the statement in the first paragraph, that with few exceptions, those working toward administrator's certificates took 32 hours of professional education courses, was questioned. Also the logic was questioned in the second and third paragraphs whereby the potential administrator was discouraged from that ambition through the years in which he would perhaps be at his highest competence for that position. It was also questioned that it was the proper function of the state to attempt to encourage or perpetuate the employment of older administrators as opposed to younger ones.

There was reason to question several of the statements in the letter from Chancellor Nash to Hodge, quoted on pages 59 and 60. It appeared that the purpose of the letter was to reverse a position stated in the original authorization for the programs, cited on pages 45 and 46, and the biennial report of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, cited on page 46. Conversations with those intimately involved in the development of the programs support the position that the programs originally intended to exclude the preparation of administrators. The fact that the letter claimed the opposite to be true suggested a lack of consistent purpose on the part of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

The logic supporting the methods of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as explained in the third paragraph of this letter could have been used just as effectively to support a plan whereby more teachers would be produced by making teacher-education the only college program available. The statement was based on the philosophy that the state will produce what the state needs, regardless of the desires of the individual. It also seemed doubtful that the Oklahoma State Regents for

Higher Education was properly concerned with the then existing oversupply of qualified administrators in Oklahoma.

The sixth paragraph of this letter justified the offering of courses leading to the administrator's certificate on the ground that there was no prohibition of such offerings. This was equivalent to saying that no authorization of function was required for any course offerings of any institution within the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, if the institution refrained from stating a purpose for the course, or stated its purpose as being included in some function already approved.

In the seventh paragraph, the accreditation of the undergraduate programs was cited to remove questions as to the quality of the graduate programs. This logic was difficult to understand.

The joint interview with the Chancellor and the Administrative Assistant of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education yielded the statement, cited on page 42, that serving the student was the specific objective of the program. It sees appropriate to question this statement, as the evidence indicated that the specific objective of the programs was to serve the ambitions of the state colleges. It took much desire on the part of the planners of the Master of Teaching programs to read into the enrollment figures, or any other data available, a demand for six new graduate programs, and a demand for the new concept of the Master of Teaching programs for advanced degree studies of practicing teachers. The purpose of these programs, as well as of any professional program, would properly be that of serving society.

Quite clearly the philosophy employed by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for the Master of Teaching programs, that of

providing the practicing teacher with whatever course work was needed, regardless of the level of instruction or the usual requirements for the Master's degree, was a disguised effort to acquire approval of the North Central Association of the new programs, which approval had already been denied two programs planned along more traditional lines.

The acceptance of the foregoing should have precluded the development of programs leading to the preparation of school administrators. The increase in the size of the school units in Oklahoma has changed the duties of the typical administrator. This has resulted in a common need for competencies and abilities needed only by administrators of the largest schools a few decades ago.

A somewhat devious method seems to have been used to accomplish the acquisition of Master's degree programs because of the antiquated system of state finance. The method used was probably the only method that would have succeeded. This system, when coupled with the constant need to maximize faculty salaries at the institutions, precluded the possibility of starting six full-fledged graduate programs at one time. The administrators of the state colleges believed they had to choose between seeking a Master's degree program by whatever means available to them or surrendering gradually the function of the preparation of public school personnel--administrators for the present, eventually even classroom teachers, if the Master's degree became a requirement for certification.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the results of this study be used in establishing the need for:

1. An evaluation by an appropriate outside professional group

of the system of higher education in Oklahoma with special reference to the element of coordination for one system.

2. A critical study of the relations between the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and the boards of control of the various state institutions of higher education.

These procedures might result in:

1. The elimination of unnecessary duplication of function, programs, services, and expenditures.
2. The basing of decisions by the controlling boards only upon observed need, objectively and impartially studied and recognized.

It is further recommended that the following studies be made:

1. A comparative study of fifth-year programs in Oklahoma to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the programs, and the degree to which their purposes are currently being realized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles

Conference on the Fifth Year of Teacher Education, Teacher's College Journal, XXVII, (October, 1955). p. 7.

Gaskill, A. R. "We Now Offer the Master's Degree," Teacher's College Journal, XXVIII, (October, 1956), p. 7.

Haskew, L. D. "The Goal is Teachers," Eighth Yearbook American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, (1955), pp. 267-277.

Jacobs, John F. "Sixth Annual Workshop on Teacher Education," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXVIII, (January, 1954), pp. 318, 349.

Potthoff, Edward F. "The Teachers College Faces Its Contemporary Problem" The North Central Association Quarterly, XXIV, (January, 1950), pp. 289-294.

Rogers, James F. "Oklahoma's Fifth Year Program," Teacher's College Journal, XXVIII, (October, 1956) p. 8.

The North Central Association "Commission on Colleges and Universities Adopts Report on Graduate Programs," North Central Association Quarterly, XXXIII, (January, 1959) pp. 210-227.

The North Central Association "Programs of Post-Baccalaureate Study for Teachers Leading to the Master's Degree," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXXI (April, 1956) pp. 29-35.

Books, Theses, and Dissertations

Carter, Mildred A. History and Development of Fifth-Year Program at East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma, 1958.

Cottrell, Donald P. ed. Teacher Education for a Free People, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Oneonta, N.Y., 1956.

Hill, George E. et al, Improving Teacher Education Through Inter-College Cooperation, Dubuque, Iowa, 1956.

Potthoff, Edward F. Fifth Year Programs in Teacher Education, Urbana, Illinois, 1955.

Tyler, Robert A. A Survey of the Opinions of Fifth-Year Graduates Regarding What Should Constitute the Program for the Course Introduction to Advanced Professional Study in State Colleges of Oklahoma, 1958, Thesis for Doctor of Education degree, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Webster, Samuel Omer, Science in General Education at the Oklahoma State Colleges, 1958, Thesis for Doctor of Education degree, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

College Catalogs and Bulletins

Central State College, Bulletin, Catalog issues, published June, 1950; February, 1952; July, 1954; July, 1955; July, 1958.

East Central State College, Bulletin, Catalog issues, published in July, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1958.

Northeastern State College, Annual Catalog, issues for 1950-1951; 1951-1952; 1953-1954; 1954-1955; 1955-1956; 1956-1957; 1959-1960.

Northwestern State College, Bulletin, Catalog issues for 1951-1952; 1952-1953; 1953-1954; 1954-1955; 1955-1956; 1956-1957; 1957-1958; 1958-1960.

Southeastern State College, Bulletin, Catalog issues published in May of 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958.

Southwestern State College, Quarterly Bulletin, Catalog issues published in June, 1950, 1952, 1953; September, 1954; and March, 1956.

University of Oklahoma, Bulletin, Issue for the Graduate College, August 15, 1959.

Interviews

Central State College. Personal interviews with the President, Dean of the College and Chairman of the Department of Education, May, 1959.

East Central State College. Personal interviews with the President, Dean of Instruction, and Chairman of the Department of Education, May, 1959.

Northeastern State College. Personal interviews with the President, Dean of Instruction, and Chairman of the Department of Education, May, 1959.

Northwestern State College. Personal interviews with the President, Dean of the College and Chairman of the Department of Education, May, 1959.

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Personal interviews with the Chancellor and Assistant, May, 1959.

Southeastern State College. Personal interviews with the President, Dean of Instruction, and Chairman of the Department of Education, May, 1959.

Southwestern State College. Personal interviews with the President, Dean of Instruction, and Chairman of the Department of Education, May, 1959.

Reports

Conference on Fifth Year of Teacher Education, "Panel Summary," unpublished mimeographed conference report, Northeastern State College, November 1955, Tahlequah, Oklahoma.

Conference on Fifth Year of Teacher Education, "Summary Notes," unpublished mimeographed conference report, Southeastern State College, December, 1956, Durant, Oklahoma.

Green, Zelma B. ed. Third Annual Report of the Fifth-Year Program, Little Rock, Arkansas: Arkansas Experiment in Teacher Education, 1955.

Lambert, Hazel M. ed. Second Annual Report of the Fifth-Year Program, Little Rock, Arkansas: Arkansas Experiment in Teacher Education, 1956.

Hughes, Rees H., and White, Robert L. Jr. "Report to the Executive Board of the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, 1958.

Richardson, O. T., and Thompson, Ronald B. "Report to the Executive Board of the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools," East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma, 1958.

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Seventh Annual Report, 1954, Eighth Annual Report, 1956, Ninth Annual Report, 1958.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question 1

On August 6, 1951, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education expressed itself as, at that time, committed to the cooperative arrangement which operated during the summer of 1951, by which graduate work was offered by the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College on the six campuses. On August 27, 1951, only three weeks later, this board reversed itself and authorized the colleges to offer graduate work in their own names. What, in your opinion or to your knowledge, brought about this change? (Asked of the Chancellor and Assistant of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.)

Responses to Question 1

Chancellor and Assistant of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.--The Regents didn't reverse themselves, but only amended their previous action. The process was evolutionary, and was deliberately planned step by step. There was no radical change in the thinking of the Regents in August, 1951.

College A.--The recognition of the demand for the programs caused the presidents to organize an effort to convince the Regents of the need for it.

College B.--The cooperative program, (with courses technically offered by the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College) was unsatisfactory.

College C.--The presidents of the six colleges brought pressure to bear on the Regents to authorize us to offer graduate work in our own name.

College D.--None of these individuals was at this college when this occurred.

College E.--The need for the program was expressed by the teachers in the field.

College F.--The demand for courses offered by the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College on the six campuses in the summer of 1951 convinced the regents of the need for the program.

Question 2

Was there any difference between the purposes of the programs offering graduate work in cooperation with the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A. & M. College on the six campuses, and the purposes of the programs when the six colleges were authorized to offer up to sixteen hours graduate work? (Asked of the Chancellor and Assistant of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, College Presidents and Deans.)

Responses to Question 2

Chancellor and Assistant of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher

Education.--There was a gradual change of purpose at the time it was still to offer graduate work. Fullfilling the needs of the student came to be the specific objective.

College A.--No (president dissenting, cited broader offerings).

College B.--No (Chairman of Department of Education reports they then began thinking of a non-traditional Master's program).

College C.--No (one dissenter reported a new concept for Master's program at that time).

College D.--None of these individuals was at the college when this change took place.

College E.--No.

College F.--No.

Question 3

Is there any difference between the purposes of the programs offering graduate work at the six state colleges before the beginning of the Master of Teaching programs and the purposes pursued after this development? If so, what is the difference? (Asked of the Chancellor and Assistant of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, College Presidents and Deans.)

Responses to Question 3

Chancellor and Assistant of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.--The Master of Teaching program deals with the problems of the teacher more specifically, instead of with problems of education in general. The Master of Education degree is not flexible enough.

Colleges A, B, C, E, and F.--The unanimous response of five colleges was that the purpose changed reflecting the different purpose of the degree the work was to apply on.

College D.--None of these individuals was at the college when this change occurred.

Question 4

During the early planning for the Master of Teaching degree program, the North Central Association was thought to favor a program meeting the needs of individual teachers, regardless of the level of instruction. Many educators in Oklahoma were thought to favor the traditional concept of a respectable graduate program. In trying to achieve both of these, persons concerned with the operation of the programs might at times feel themselves to be at cross-purposes. (a) Did you experience any such feelings? (b) Did you sense evidence of them in others? (Asked of Presidents and Deans of Colleges, and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

College A.--(a) Yes; (b) no. Department Chairman reports that it has always been a rigorous graduate program, that they were unconcerned with desires of the North Central Association at this college.

College B.--(a) To some extent; (b) yes. The Dean reports that these feelings were based on what was only recently determined to be a misconception of what the North Central Association had in mind.

College C.--(a) No; (b) yes. President reports that no effort was made at college C to maintain a respectable graduate program, and that the North Central Association had nothing in mind until interest in this type program was stimulated by the Oklahoma Colleges.

College D.--None of these individuals was at the college at the time of the beginning of the programs.

College E.--(a) Yes (president dissenting); (b) yes. (the Department Chairman reported that the demand for many elementary courses never materialized as feared).

College F.--(a) No (president reported that his is not a graduate program, thus avoiding this conflict. Department Chairman reported that the work is of graduate calibar.) (b) Not when the purpose is understood.

Question 5

What procedure is followed in gaining admission to the program? (Asked of Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 5

Colleges A and B.--Apply to registrar for admission to graduate study. Then enroll with the executive officer of the Fifth-Year program.

Colleges D, E, F, and G.--Apply or enroll with the executive officer of the Fifth-Year program.

Question 6

What effort is made to discourage marginal students? (Asked of Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 6

All Colleges.--This is all done informally by grades and counseling until low grades bring the student to the attention of the elimination system.

Question 7

What procedure would be followed to remove from the program a student felt to be unqualified, or undesirable teacher material? How frequently does this happen? (Asked of Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses for Questions 7

College A.--Students are screened at the end of eight hours of work when they apply for candidacy. The Fifth-Year Council considers the application. If it rules unfavorably, the applicant is counseled to drop out. This happens infrequently.

College B.--When a student is reported twice for low grades, the Fifth-Year Committee observes the progress and recommends that the student be dropped or allowed to continue, depending on his progress during the observation period. This happens regularly.

College C.--Professors report students not doing "C" or better work. The student is warned, then dropped if the quality of his work does not improve. A student seldom is dropped.

College D.--Each student is considered at the sixteen-hour check point. The poor students are then screened out. This rarely occurs.

College E.--The Director of the Fifth-Year Program keeps records of the grades of the students, and advises by his own judgement if the student should drop. Appeals to his decision is to the Fifth-Year Council. 10 to 15% are eliminated in this manner.

College F.--The advisor of the student calls the situation to the attention of the Administrative committee of the Advanced Professional

Council, which recommends action to the council for the final decision. This has happened, but rarely does.

Question 8

What effort is made to encourage promising students to continue? (Asked of Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 8

College A.--Letters are sent to candidates noting their remaining requirements, and encouraging them to complete the program.

Colleges B, C, D, C, and F.--No organized effort, only by informal counseling.

Question 9

(a) When is the student advised, and how often is he advised on the selection of coursework? (b) Is the student advised by an advisor or a committee? (Asked of Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 9

9a

All Colleges.--The student is advised on his entry into the program, at each enrollment, at admission to candidacy, and other times, at the students' request. At College D, the advisory committee also plans and gives the comprehensive examination.

9b

Colleges A, C, D, E, and F.--The program of the student is determined by the student and his advisory committee, (usually of 3 members).

After this, the student's advisor does the counseling, except at College D as noted under 9a.

College B.--Advising and determining of the student's program is done by a single advisor.

Question 10

(a) Are suggestions of the employer of the student considered in planning his program? (b) Are these suggestions solicited? (Asked of Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 10

Colleges A, B, D, and E.--(a) Yes. (b) One yes, one no.

Colleges C and F.--(a) Yes. (b) Yes.

Question 11

What is the requirement at your college concerning the distribution of course work among the areas of general education, professional education, and teaching area of the student? (Asked of Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 11

College A.--The distribution at this college is based on six competencies instead of three basic areas, with no arbitrary limits.

College B. and D.--Definite minimum in three areas, teaching area, professional education, and general education. The distribution left to the student and advisor.

College C.--Approximately half taken in the teaching area, and half in professional education, little or no general education.

College E.--Definite limits in the three areas. Approximately half in professional education, one-fourth each in general education and in the teaching area.

College F.--A common core is required consisting of eight hours (if taken in summer) to eleven hours (if taken in winter term), with a minimum in the teaching area. The balance is distributed without specific limits.

Question 12

Since this program leads to a degree called Master of Teaching, are prospective students who desire to prepare for administrative positions advised to enrol in the program? If not, are they advised not to?

Responses to Question 12

College A.--Yes. The provisional certificate is available within the program to improve teaching. A good administrator is a good teacher.

College B.--One yes. One no, but neither are they advised not to.

College C.--Yes.

College D.--Yes, if seeking the provisional administrator's certificate.

College E.--No. (The Dean reports they are discouraged from it. The Department Chairman reports they are not discouraged from work toward the provisional certificate.

College F.--Yes, as work is available for the provisional certificate.

Question 13

In undergraduate classes taken by graduates for graduate credit, what distinction is made between graduates and undergraduates in work required or grades received? (Asked of Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 13

Colleges A and D.--Extra and higher quality work is required of the graduate students. The instructor must complete and deliver to office a form telling of this distinction.

Colleges B and F.--The distinction in amount and quality of work must be noted in the syllabus before graduate enrollment is permitted in the class.

Colleges C and E.--More and better work is required of the graduate students. This is left up to the instructors, and is not recorded or documented.

Question 14

Do you expect the Fifth-Year program to continue at all of the state colleges through the next decade? (Asked of College Presidents, Deans, and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 14

Colleges A, B and C.--Yes, if accredited.

Colleges D, E, and F.--Yes.

Question 15

Do you anticipate that the size of enrollments in these programs will increase significantly within the next decade? (Asked of College Presidents, Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 15

Colleges A and C.--Yes.

College B.--No. (president dissented).

College D.--Yes. (one conditioned his answer on accreditation.)

College E.--No. (dean dissented).

College F.--Yes. (president conditioned his answer on the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University dropping the teacher-training function.)

Question 16

(a) Do you anticipate that any of these institutions will or are likely to offer any program of graduate education not now offered within the next decade? (b) If so, what programs?

Responses to Question 16

College A.--(a) Yes (president dissented), (b) guidance, subject-area Master's programs.

College B.--(a) No (dean dissented), (b) dean suggested guidance and a few others within the Master of Teaching program.

College C.--(a) Yes, (b) president suggested subject-area Master's programs. Dean suggested a standard Administrator's certificate program.

The Department Chairman suggested a sixth year program of teacher-training.

College D.--(a) Yes, (b) Guidance and counseling. (The president suggested a standard administrator's certificate program.)

College E.--(a) Yes, (b) Dean suggested subject-area Master's, President suggested programs in guidance, audio-visual education and special education.

College F.--(a) One responded yes, one no, and one perhaps, (b) dean suggested specialist programs. The president suggested anything useful to the public schools.

Question 17

Do you anticipate that the number of curricular offerings in the fifth-year program will be significantly increased in the next decade? (Asked of College Presidents, Deans, and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 17

College A.--One responded yes, one no, one that it depends on the demand. The dean suggested graduate work in the subject areas.

College B.--No. Two responded that the number should be decreased.

College C.--Yes, (president responded that there will be no significant increase for five years, then a rapid expansion.)

College D.--Yes, (one dissented). Graduate work in the subject areas is cited.

College E.--No (dean dissented). Dean suggested graduate work in subject areas.

College F.--The presidents response was negative, the dean responded only if needed for new programs. The Department Chairman responded yes, in subject-areas.

Question 18

As you know, the North Central Association recently accredited two of these six colleges, including their Master of Teaching degree programs. What effect do you expect this action to have on the Master of Teaching degree program at your college? (Asked of College Presidents, Deans, and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 18

College A and D.--It only raises our hopes for accreditation.

College B.--It lends stature, dignity, and prestige to the degree, and should increase enrollments some.

College C.--It will help us recognize our weaknesses and stimulate the strengthening of these areas. Perhaps it will increase enrollments. It will have a "salting down" effect.

College E.--None, unless ours is refused accreditation. (dissenter stated that their profit from the experience of the first two accredited might help them achieve accreditation.)

College F.--It strengthens our chances by the recognition it gives our type of program. The president reported that it put pressure on the school to achieve accreditation, and encourages them as the two schools accredited were at extremes in organization of the programs.

Question 19

(a) We recognize that in a dynamic program, purposes as well as methods, attitudes, etc. will change. What changes in the purposes of this program have you recognized in your school? (b) What further changes in purposes would you recommend? (Asked of College Presidents, Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 19

Colleges A, C, D, E, and F.--(a) None; (b) none.

Colleges B.--(a) None (the dean dissented to cite as a change of purpose the change of the requirement for the provisional administrator's certificate to make it available within the Master of Teaching Program). (b) Would recommend no change, only refinements.

Question 20

What do you see as the most urgently needed changes in the program? (Asked of College Presidents, Deans and Chairmen of Departments of Education.)

Responses to Question 20

College A.--Add graduate level courses in the subject-areas, especially in summer sessions.

College B.--President: drop requirement of one year of successful teaching experience. Dean: reduce the freedom of choice of courses in the subject area, and interpret more strictly the term "related field" (areas related to teaching area of the student).

College C.--Add entrance examination, and check points through the program.

College D.--Add system of selective admissions. Conduct survey to determine the needs of teachers.

College E.--Add a testing program. Move emphasis from methods to subject areas. Be more alert to what other colleges are doing. Institute systems of advisement and retention.

College F.--Emphasize general education at the graduate level, professionalize the program. Plan the student's program earlier.