This dissertation has been microfilmed exactly as received

65-10, 421

WILSON, Maudecca LaVone, 1929-
THE SELECTION OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS IN SELECTED OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph. D., 1965
Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/1897

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE SELECTION OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS IN SELECTED OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

MAUDECCA LaVONE WILSON

Norman, Oklahoma

1965

THE SELECTION OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS IN SELECTED OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

DEDICATION

This research study is respectfully dedicated to my parents, Willie and Susie Wilson, in appreciation of the immeasurable contribution they have made to the education of their children.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For her wise and kindly guidance, the writer is indebted to her major professor, Dr. Mary Clare Petty, who directed the writing of this research report, and to the other members of her dissertation committee, Dr. Claude Kelley, Dr. Fred A. Sloan, Jr. and Miss Ruth E. Elder, for their helpful advice and criticism during the period of graduate study.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. J. Curtis Dixon and Mr. R. L. Cousins of the Southern Education Foundation for the financial support given by their organization.

Appreciation is acknowledged for a leave of absence for graduate study granted by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia upon the recommendation of Dr. William H. Dennis, Jr., the late President of Albany State College. Gratitude is also expressed to personnel of the Georgia State Department of Education, especially Mrs. Maenelle D. Dempsey, for technical assistance and information.

Acknowledgement is gratefully made for the assistance of supervising teachers and principals and for the invaluable cooperation of the following directors of student teaching:

Miss Annie L. Sheffield, Albany State College; Dr. C. D. Berry, Fort Valley State College; Mr. C. M. Richardson, Paine College; Mrs. Dorothy Hamilton, Savannah State College; Mrs. Beatrice E. Williams, Spelman College; Dr. Ann M. Cochran, Morris Brown College; and Dr. Pearlie C. Dove, Clark College.

And finally, the writer recognizes the contributions of the members of her family whose understanding, encouragement and moral and spiritual support made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		viii
Chapter		
I.	GENERAL PLAN OF THE STUDY	1
	Introduction	1
	Historical Background of the Student Teaching Program in Georgia	5
	Activities of State Department of Education	7
	Preparation of Supervising Teachers	8
	The Role of Southern Education Foundations in Student Teaching Programs	10
	Need for Study	12
	Statement of the Problem	14
	Purpose of the Study	15
	Limitations of the Study	15
	Definition of Terms	17
	Procedure	19
	Establishment of Criteria	20
	Gathering the Data	21
	Selection of the Sample	24
	Evaluation of Programs	26
	Organization of the Report	26
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	27
	Off-Campus Student Teaching	27
	Need for Criteria	33
	Desirable Practices	35
	Development of Evaluation Criteria	43
III.	ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA	44
	The Colleges	44

Chapter Page

Albany State College 44
Fort Valley State College. 45
Paine College. 46
Savannah State College 46
The Atlanta University Center. 47

Description of Programs 48
Administration of Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs. 54
Selection of Supervising Teachers 60

Professional and Personal Characteristics of Supervising Teachers. . . . 60
Professional Activities. 66

Selection of Cooperating Schools. 69

The Staff and Program. 69
The School 77

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . 85

Summary 85
Major Findings. 86
Conclusions and Recommendations 89

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 92

APPENDIX A. 100

APPENDIX B. 120

APPENDIX C. 125

APPENDIX D. 148

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Student Teachers and Cooperating Schools 1963-1964	50
2.	Evaluation of Administrative Practices	61
3.	Evaluation of Professional and Personal Characteristics of Supervising Teachers	67
4.	Evaluation of Professional Activities of Supervising Teachers	70
5.	Evaluation of the Staff and Program of the Cooperating School	78
6.	Evaluation of the School	83

THE SELECTION OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS IN SELECTED OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

CHAPTER I

GENERAL PLAN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The student teaching phase of teacher education has received much attention and has come into sharp focus as an important aspect of such programs. The resultant need is for a more critical appraisal of the student teaching program, its purposes, and its practices, especially the selection of supervising teachers and cooperating schools.

Student teaching experiences in the education of prospective teachers are not new. The earliest normal schools in the country maintained classes for children where students could observe and practice the techniques of teaching. At the time when many teacher-education programs consisted of one year's work, the teacher trainee spent a large part of that year with children in the model school.[1] As the one-year

---

[1] Asahel D. Woodruff, Student Teaching Today (Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960), p. 8.

program was extended to a four-year program, the time given to such professional laboratory experiences was, in many instances, confined to one period of the four-year curriculum and consisted of a course in student teaching.

Modern programs of teacher education provide several types of professional laboratory experiences for students, of which student teaching is, perhaps, the most important. The value of this kind of experience depends to a large extent upon the effectiveness of practices employed in the program.

The American Association of Teachers Colleges, through its Committee on Standards and Surveys recognized, in 1945, the need for revising standards. The committee appointed a sub-committee to make a study of student teaching in the professional education of teachers. At that time these standards had not been revised for a period of twenty-five years, and members of the sub-committee were charged with the responsibility of making recommendations for the revision of Standard VI, "The Training School and Student Teaching."[1]

The Association for Student Teaching shared in the revision of Standard VI, and in 1948 the name was changed to "Professional Laboratory Experiences". In the book School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education,

---

[1] American Association of Teachers Colleges, Revised Standards and Policies for Accrediting Colleges for Teacher Education (Oneonta, N. Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1945), p. 8.

published that same year, it was made clear that a new and broadened point of view was being shared by committee members. Pre-student teaching, direct experiences and post-student teaching direct experiences were emphasized and given a place of prominence on the Standard VI criterion.[1]

The AST bulletin, A Guide to Planning for Off-Campus Student Teaching published in 1948, emphasizes the need for laboratory facilities sufficiently extensive to provide for each student contacts with "normal situations and varied enough to provide contacts with different pupil groups." The writers also stress the fact that the revised standard is concerned with the student's range of contacts with curriculum and administrative organizations as well as with the location of the facility.[2]

The American Association of Teachers Colleges subcommittee report, School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, did much to broaden the concept of direct experience in teacher education. In the recommendations of the committee, a clear statement regarding the need for an expanded concept of direct experiences in teacher education is made. A portion of the statement follows:

---

[1] John G. Flowers, et al., School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Oneonta, N. Y : American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1948), pp. 30-31.

[2] Howard T. Batchelder, Richard E. Lawrence, and George R. Myers, A Guide to Planning Off-Campus Student Teaching, Bulletin 11, (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), p. 4.

> The time is at hand for rethinking the program of professional education and applying the best we know about social needs and the way learning takes place. Doing these makes it evident that direct contacts with teaching-learning situations cannot and shall not be limited to a course in student teaching. Rather than a course, there is a need for a series of laboratory experiences extending over the period of college work and designed to help the student to participate in and study the major activities of today's teacher.[1]

Since the publication of the sub-committee report, School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education assumed accrediting responsibilities, and as of July 1, 1954, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education succeeded the AACTE as the agency responsible for the accreditation of teacher-education institutions in the United States.[2]

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education has made several revisions of Standard VI, the most recent of these revisions was made in 1960.[3] This standard on professional laboratory experiences represents criteria for programs in professional laboratory experiences in teacher

---

[1]American Association of Teachers Colleges (now the Association of Colleges for Teacher Education), School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Washington: National Education Association, 1948), pp. 320-21.

[2]Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, loc. cit., p. 4.

[3]National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Standard and Guide for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Washington, D. C.: The Council, 1960), Standard VI.

education. However, literature reveals no evidence that these criteria necessarily delineate the combined thinking and ideals of representatives of institutions engaged in preparing teachers, writers, state representatives responsible for accreditation, or professional organizations.

Historical Background of the Student Teaching Program in Georgia[1]

The first organized program of observation and student teaching in the colleges and universities for Negroes in Georgia began at Morris Brown College, Atlanta, during the second semester of the 1935-1936 school year. This program was initiated by Ann M. Cochran who is presently a faculty member in the Education Department at Morris Brown College.

The college arranged with H. R. Hunter, then Assistant Superintendent of Atlanta Public Schools, to inaugurate a student teaching program in the public schools of Georgia. Initially, student teachers spent one hour per day, during a specified period, in the schools. There was a gradual increase to a two-hour period but with the teaching load of the college supervisor remaining at a level commensurate with his prior responsibilities.

---

[1]All information pertaining to the historical background of the student teaching program was received through personal interview with Mrs. Maenelle D. Dempsey, State Teacher Education Consultant and former State Coordinator of Student Teaching, Georgia Teachers Education Association, Atlanta, Georgia, January 5, 1964.

Under the direction of Helen A. Whiting, a cooperative program was begun in 1942. Included were colleges in the Atlanta University Center (Clark, Morehouse, Morris Brown, and Spelman) and Paine College in Augusta. Roy Davis and Nell Hamilton, Atlanta Public Schools, and Paul West, Fulton County, were the designated officials to administer the student teaching program in the Atlanta area. In recent years this program was expanded to include the area superintendents of cooperating schools in the selection of supervising teachers and placement of student teachers.

In 1953, a report prepared by Helen A. Whiting indicated that a minimum of 180 hours of student teaching was necessary. Maenelle D. Dempsey succeeded Helen A. Whiting in September, 1954, and is currently serving as coordinator of student teaching in the Atlanta University Center. During Maenelle Dempsey's tenure the hours required of student teachers have been increased from 180 to 270 hours in the elementary schools and to 292 hours in the secondary schools. On both levels students are required to do full-time student teaching for nine weeks. Improvement has been made in the following areas: (1) placement of student teachers, (2) orientation, (3) certification and preparation of supervising teachers, (4) professional bulletins and other mimeographed materials, and (5) cooperative study and continuous evaluation of the program.

A program for the preparation of supervising teachers was begun by R. O. Johnson in 1953. This program was cooperatively sponsored by Clark College, Morehouse College, Morris Brown College, Spelman College, Paine College, Albany State College, Fort Valley State College, and Savannah State College. Fort Valley State College presently conducts its own program for preparing supervising teachers. Guidance and consultative services in developing and improving teacher-education programs are available on a statewide basis.

Activities of State Department of Education[1]

The Georgia State Department of Education has worked actively for the development of those professional understandings and abilities which are essential to successful student teaching. Achievement of this objective requires a carefully planned sequence of laboratory experiences, including directed observation, active participation and full-time responsible teaching under the direction of the college in a laboratory school or in cooperating public schools.

Under the sponsorship of the State Department of Education the Georgia Council on Teacher Education, a professional group of representatives from the colleges, public schools and the State Department of Education, developed the

---

[1] All information pertaining to the activities of the Georgia State Department of Education was received through correspondence from Mrs. Mary E. Perkins, Coordinator of Teacher Education, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia, October 24, 1964.

general criteria for all teacher-education programs. The Council has formulated a few underlying policies governing the selection of cooperating schools; the selection, training, and compensation of supervising teachers; and the direction and operation of the program.

Preparation of Supervising Teachers

The colleges of Georgia offer a program of education for supervising teachers. The primary purpose of this sequence is to provide selected teachers with sufficient understanding of the skills and knowledges required for effective supervision of student teaching, and other professional laboratory experiences.

Enrollment is by invitation only. Outstanding teachers are recommended by public school administrators. The major criteria used in the selection of supervising teachers are that the teacher is conducting an above-the-average program for pupils, is willing to do further study in special preparation for working with student teachers, and is teaching in a school that has been selected as a student teaching center.

There are in Georgia two colleges for Negroes that offer programs for supervising teachers: Fort Valley State College and Atlanta University. Both programs include three types of experiences:

1. A beginning workshop. (5 quarter hours)
2. An internship (this is a field course taken during the school year following completion of the beginning workshop). (5 quarter hours)
3. A follow-up workshop seminar in the supervision of student teaching. (5 quarter hours)

The workshop is not limited to classroom teachers. It is highly desirable for principals of schools working with student teachers to be acquainted with the supervision of student teaching. This sequence may be worked in as a part of the requirements for the master's degree and may be taken either beyond the bachelor's degree or beyond the master's degree. Upon completion of the three-course sequence the participant applies for a duplicate certificate with a "Supervising Teacher Service" endorsement.

The State Department of Education provides a small stipend, as a salary supplement, to each teacher who supervises a student teacher. The payment varies according to the amount of special preparation which the individual has had through the Planned Program for the Preparation of Supervising Teachers. A teacher who has had no special preparation receives twenty dollars for each student supervised; a teacher who has completed the first workshop receives thirty dollars; a teacher who has completed internship and the seminar is given a certificate as a "Supervising Teacher" and receives fifty dollars. A few of the colleges supplement the amount paid by the State; consequently, some supervising

teachers receive as much as $100.00 per student teacher supervised.

The Role of Southern Education Foundation in Student Teaching Programs[1]

The executive staff of the Southern Education Foundation receives requests for grants from educational institutions and agencies in the thirteen states in the Southern region and also accepts the responsibility for identifying certain deficiencies in education and suggests projects which might be beneficial in the improvement of those areas which are deemed inadequate. There have been several projects sponsored by the Southern Education Foundation to improve the off-campus student teaching program in Georgia and the entire Southern region.

Different approaches were made during the summer of 1960 toward improving the quality of student teaching which were of interest to educators responsible for the preparation of teachers throughout the Southern region. The first of these programs was a summer workshop at the University of Texas, in Austin, called the Advanced Methods of College Supervisors of Student Teachers. The approach was to bring fifteen college supervisors of student teaching from Negro

---

[1] All information pertaining to the role of the Southern Education Foundation in the Student Teaching program was provided through an interview with Mr. R. L Cousins, Acting Executive Director, Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia, December 29, 1964.

colleges to the University of Texas for a period of three weeks to work on this project. Work was done to develop improved methods and techniques for directing student teachers assigned to local schools.

The second project was a non-credit one at Grambling College in Louisiana. All teachers who supervised student teachers from Grambling College met on the campus for the purpose of discussing their responsibilities. All sessions were held under the careful guidance of college staff members. The original project was very limited but down through the years it has grown and involved both college supervisors and cooperating teachers and credit has been increased to five quarter hours.

During 1961-1962 no projects were proposed, but the idea was being discussed by representatives with the staff of the Southern Education Foundation. In 1962-1963 two projects were sponsored: a summer workshop at Prairie View A & M College, Texas, and a summer workshop on a statewide basis at Virginia State College, Petersburg. The objectives of these workshops were to reach common understanding, promote uniformity of practice and work toward greater competence and effectiveness in the training of future teachers.

During 1963-1964 two more projects were sponsored: one at South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, and a regional wide project for the improvement of student teaching at Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia. The Atlanta proposal

was designed to motivate and stimulate other states to develop similar programs.

In 1964-1965 Tennessee State University had a plan that brought thirty Negro supervising teachers to the University campus each Saturday for an entire semester to take a course in student teaching. Projects in Alabama, Florida and Mississippi were modeled after previous ones.

The Southern Education Foundation has a proposal for 1965-1966 which calls for a cooperative project between the supervising teachers in schools in south Georgia, and staff members of Albany State College.

Mary Perkins, Coordinator of Teacher Education, Georgia State Department of Education, stated in an interview:

> Projects for the improvement of student teaching are not eligible for aid under the National Defense Education Act, but there is a movement on foot to get federal aid for such projects as a vital factor in the improvement of teacher education. The numerous projects aided by Southern Education Foundation in the South are helping to focus attention upon the importance of each state making provisions for programs for the improvement of student teaching.[1]

Need for Study

The student teaching phase of the teacher-education programs for Negroes in the colleges in Georgia is expanding greatly, and this increased expansion has resulted in a greater utilization of off-campus schools. Therefore criteria

---

[1] Interview with Mary E. Perkins, Coordinator of Teacher Education, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia, December 29, 1964.

for the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers are needed.

A review of doctoral dissertations and professional journals and personal experiences of critic teachers at Albany State College pointed up a need for this study. A need for studies of this nature was further indicated in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research.[1]

Supervising teachers and principals have likewise indicated concern over the lack of information referrent to professional laboratory experiences. Participants at a recent conference on student teaching stated that there is considerable need within the southern states to examine the theory and practices of the supervision of student teaching to the end that this kind of supervision can be improved within the region.[2] Since many authorities agree that continuous evaluation is of great importance, a study of this kind can make a contribution in helping the college directors and supervisors to evaluate their student teaching programs.[3] In a publication by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher

---

[1]Chester W. Harris, (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960), p. 1473.

[2]Report Regional Conference on the Improvement of Student Teaching (Atlanta, Georgia: Atlanta University, April 30-May, 1963), p. 1.

[3]Planning for Student Teaching. A Report of Findings of the Workshop for Supervising Teachers of Student Teachers (Atlanta, Georgia: School of Education, Atlanta University, 1960).

Education, Maaske makes the statement that leaders in teacher education have long felt the need for a greater quantity of reliable research concerned with practices in the process for educating teachers.[1]

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was the determination and evaluation of practices in the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers in off-campus student teaching programs in selected teacher-education institutions in Georgia. More specifically, this study was broken down into three sub-problems:

1. The development of appropriate evaluation criteria based on professional literature.
2. The determination of current practices used in selected cooperating schools and teachers in off-campus student teaching programs in selected teacher-education institutions in Georgia.
3. The evaluation of current practices through the use of the criteria established and the formulation of recommendations.

---

[1]American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Research in Teacher Education (Oneonta, N. Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1954), p. 5.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine and evaluate practices in the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers in off-campus student teaching programs in selected teacher-education institutions in Georgia. More specifically, the underlying purposes were:

1. To develop an appropriate evaluation criteria using statements from publications of the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the Association for Student Teaching as major sources.
2. To determine current practices used in selecting cooperating schools and teachers in off-campus student teaching programs in the selected teacher-education institutions in Georgia by use of structured and depth interviews of college personnel responsible for directing student teaching and principals of various cooperating schools.
3. To evaluate current practices through the use of the criteria established by the research and to formulate recommendations.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited in the following ways:

1. To colleges and universities for Negroes in the state of Georgia accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
2. To those colleges and universities in the above state which have programs of teacher preparation for elementary school teachers.
3. To the off-campus student teaching aspect of the teacher-education program.

It was further limited by the following assumptions basic to this study:

1. That professional literature, especially that published by the Association for Student Teaching, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education, was a defensible source of statements with implications for evaluation of practices in the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers.
2. That these statements furnished a satisfactory basis for the development of criteria for the evaluation of cooperating schools and supervising teachers.
3. That current practices in the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers by the colleges can be determined through interviewing the college directors and supervisors of student

teaching and the principals of the cooperating public schools.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were recommended by the Association for Student Teaching through the work of the Committee on Terminology and are used in this study.[1]

Prospective Teachers are those men and women who are in the process of preparing to teach.

Practices is used to mean procedures followed in the conduct of the student teaching and its supervision.

Facilities are elements in the make-up of a school which make it possible for it to carry on its work; e. g., buildings, equipment, teachers, pupils, and surroundings.

Campus or Off-Campus Laboratory School is a school which is controlled and supported (all or in part) by the college and which is organized as an integral part of the teacher-education program to provide significant opportunities to study and relate the various phases of the teacher's activities both in and out of school.

College Supervisor is a college faculty member who supervises student teaching.

Director of Student Teaching is a college faculty member who is administratively responsible for making necessary arrangements for a student teaching.

---

[1]Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, op. cit., Bulletin 11, p. 60.

Professional Laboratory Experiences include all direct relationships with children, youth, laymen, and professional groups which contribute to the effectiveness of a person in performing the total functions of a teacher.

Cooperating School is an off-campus school whose facilities are used for student teaching in the program of teacher education; it is not an integral part of the teacher education institution itself, but by agreement provides opportunities for student teaching.

Student Teaching is a period of guided teaching when a college student assumes increasing responsibility for directing the learning of a group or groups of learners over a period of consecutive weeks.

Student Teacher is a college student who is engaged in an assigned student teaching experience, but the term is often used to refer to any college student preparing to teach. Recently the term associate teacher is being suggested as a more useful designation for a student who takes over the full responsibility for directing the learning of groups of pupils.

Supervising Teacher or Cooperating Teacher is a teacher of a school who also directs the work of a student teacher with these same pupils.

Cooperating Principal is one who performs the responsibilities of a principal in a cooperating school.

Procedure

The normative survey[1] and evaluation method of research were used in this study. This method was chosen as the most appropriate one for a study which seeks to find the prevailing conditions and compare them with established criteria.

The first step in this study was a comprehensive study of pertinent literature as a basis for establishing criteria.

The second step was the establishment of criteria for the evaluation of practices in the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers.

The third step was the development of the interview forms designed to determine the practices of the colleges in selecting cooperating schools and supervising teachers.

The fourth step in this study was the development of evaluative instruments, one designed to appraise practices followed by the colleges and one for use in evaluating the situations in which student teachers are currently placed.

The fifth step was to secure administrative cooperation for the study.

The sixth step was to conduct the interviews.

The seventh step was the use of the established criteria to evaluate current practices as determined through structured and depth interviews.

---

[1]Carter V. Good, A. S. Barr, and Douglas E. Scates, The Methodology of Educational Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1941), p. 324.

Establishment of Criteria

As the literature was reviewed, all statements with implications for evaluation and their sources were recorded. The following literature was reviewed:

1. Publications on the subject produced by the Association for Student Teaching, including yearbooks, bulletins, research bulletins, and communications from the executive secretary.

2. Publications by the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education.

3. Statements by the National Council for Accreditation in Teacher Education on Professional Laboratory Experience, Standard VI.

4. Criteria recommended by the Georgia State Department of Education.

5. Textbooks such as Working with Student Teachers, by Florence B. Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsey,[1] and Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education, by Aleyne C. Haines.[2]

6. Professional periodicals with emphasis on articles published after 1948.

7. Doctoral dissertations and other unpublished materials.

8. Materials from handbooks, manuals, and bulletins from different colleges, reports from conferences and workshops.

After highly similar statements were combined one hundred five statements with implications for evaluation,

---

[1] Florence B. Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsey, Working with Student Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1942).

[2] Aleyne Clayton Haines, Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960).

forty-nine for selecting supervising teachers, and fifty-six for selecting cooperating schools were recorded. Each statement was assigned a coded number which represented the source of information from which the statement was taken. The complete list of statements is in Appendix A of this study.

This list had to be reduced in length. First, all statements from official publications of the Association for Student Teaching, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education were retained for further study. These organizations are an authoritative source of information, and their publications reflect accurately the opinions expressed in all the professional literature reviewed. Finally, those statements found in the literature of at least two out of three of the above organizations were retained for the development of criteria. These statements were carefully compared. After a minimum of editing approximately thirty-six statements were found to have appeared in at least two out of three of the reviewed publications. These thirty-six criteria are in Appendix B of this study.

Gathering the Data

The basic procedure used in gathering the data for this study was direct interviews with all directors of student teaching in the seven selected colleges and with randomly selected principals of cooperating schools in Georgia.

It was felt that direct contact with the directors and principals would best determine the present practices used by these institutions in the selection of supervising teachers and cooperating schools.

Good, et al.,[1] stated that through the personal interview it is possible to secure much data that cannot be obtained through the less personal procedures of distributing a questionnaire.

An interview affords an opportunity for the respondent to see who is getting the information and to receive guarantees as to how it is to be used and also enables the interviewer to follow up leads and take advantage of small clues and to evaluate personally the person giving the facts. On the basis of the thirty-six established criteria, two interview forms were constructed in order to obtain the more detailed data.

Two parallel structured interview forms were constructed in order to insure coverage of the thirty-six criteria for which information was needed. Rummel[2] recommends the use of the structured interview. One interview form was used with directors of student teaching in the seven selected institutions in order to determine practices used in the

---

[1] Good, Barr, and Scates, op. cit., p. 378.

[2] J. Francis Rummel, An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964), p. 174.

selection of supervising teachers and cooperating schools in the selected institutions. A second interview form was used with the twenty-six cooperating school principals to evaluate student teaching situations in which student teachers were currently placed.

Both interview forms were divided into four major parts with sub-items. Part one included general information which covered enrollment in the teacher-education program, number of student teachers, and number of off-campus centers used for 1963-1964. It also included the distance to these schools, residence requirements for student teachers, amount of time student teachers spend in school, amount of credit received for student teaching, placement of student teachers, total number of student teachers assigned to any one supervising teacher, recognition or privileges given supervising teachers, remuneration made to supervising teacher or school, and student teaching policies.

Part two of the interview forms dealt with present practices in the selection of supervising teachers with regard to professional preparation, professional experience and assignment, personal characteristics, professional characteristics and activities, and instructional skill.

Part three dealt with practices used in the selection of cooperating schools with regard to characteristics of cooperating school teachers, characteristics of cooperating principals, curriculum and instruction procedures, facilities

desired in cooperating school, services available to the cooperating school, participation of student teachers, accreditation of the cooperating school, and characteristics of the community.

Part four dealt with the administrative facets of the off-campus student teaching program: securing the understanding of boards of education, procedure followed in the selection of cooperating school, procedure followed in the selection of supervising teachers, requirements for the school system as a whole, and continuity in use of the cooperating school.

Copies of the interview forms are in Appendix C of this study.

Selection of the Sample

The first sample constituted the total population of directors of student teaching in the selected teacher education institutions. The second sample constituted a randomly selected group of principals of cooperating schools. Of the seventy principals of cooperating schools used by the seven teacher training institutions, twenty-six were interviewed. The twenty-six principals interviewed represented a stratified random sample of the seventy principals. All cooperating schools were arranged in an alphabetical list and numbered consecutively. A third of the schools used by each institution

were drawn by cluster sampling from the total number. This sampling technique is recommended by O'Toole.[1]

As soon as the schools had been selected letters were sent to the dean of instruction of each institution as well as to the cooperating principals. The letter contained an explanation of the study and a request for permission to visit the institution for the purpose of collecting data. Permission was granted by the dean of instruction of each college and all the principals of the cooperating schools.

Practice interviews with experienced persons were conducted to verify that the guides would elicit information sought. Rummel[2] revealed that this method aids the researcher in improving his technique in conducting interviews.

In consulting the seven directors of student teaching and the twenty-six principals a concerted effort was made to establish rapport, to conduct the interview in a conversational manner so that spontaneous reactions rather than directed statements could be obtained, and to ask one question at a time in an effort to avoid implying a desired answer to any one question.

The information derived from the interviews was subsequently analyzed, interpreted, and organized and presented in a form that permitted a comprehensive view of practices

---

[1] A. L. O'Toole, Elementary Practical Statistics (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), pp. 50-55.

[2] J. Francis Rummel, op. cit., p. 103.

used in selecting supervising teachers and cooperating schools in the selected institutions.

Evaluation of Programs

Bases for rating the reported practices were established, and a check sheet for recording the ratings was developed. A copy of the check sheet and an explanation of the bases for rating practices are in Appendix D of this study.

The practices of each institution were rated. These ratings are the foundations for the evaluations and recommendations made in this study.

Organization of the Report

The report of this study is divided into four chapters.

Chapter I sets forth the general plan of the study.

Chapter II is devoted to the review of related literature.

Chapter III is concerned with an analysis and evaluation of data.

Chapter IV summarizes the findings, formulates the conclusions, and lists the recommendations drawn from the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Although studies have been made of some aspects of teacher-education programs in Georgia, no evidence was found that a comprehensive study had been made of practices in the selection of supervising teachers and cooperating schools in the selected teacher education institutions. Perkins stated that the only criteria for evaluating such programs in Georgia was developed by an Advisory Council on Teacher Education in the early 50's and that further consideration should be given to the establishment of criteria.[1] All literature reviewed emphasized the importance of off-campus student teaching and the need for criteria for selecting cooperating schools and supervising teachers.

Off-Campus Student Teaching

The development of off-campus laboratory experiences is difficult to trace. The first off-campus facilities are not recorded, but it can be assumed that the first teacher-education institution to enroll more student teachers than

---

[1] In a report by Mary E. Perkins to a fall conference on Student Teaching, Atlanta, Georgia, December 11, 1964.

its campus school could care for turned to the public schools in the town. It is recorded that in 1920 one-third of the normal schools in the country were using public schools for student teaching.[1] In 1928, Colebank[2] discovered a clear tendency toward the use of public schools as cooperating schools. Foster's[3] research in 1933 revealed that the number of campus schools was increasing but that use of the public school as a center for student teaching was still the dominant practice. Eight years later, Hammock[4] noted an increase in the use of public schools as an integral part of the program of student teaching in secondary education. In 1945, Brink's[5] study of student teaching in universities pointed out that public schools were still bearing the heaviest burden of student teaching although the use of campus schools had not

---

[1] E. L. Welborn, "Cooperation with Local Schools in Student Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, VI (November, 1920), p. 450.

[2] George H. Colebank, "Practice Teaching in the Colleges of the North Central Association," The North Central Association Quarterly, III (December, 1928), p. 376.

[3] Frank K. Foster, "The Training School in the Education of Teachers," Teacher Education Curricula, National Survey of the Education of Teachers, Bulletin 1933, No. 10, III, pp. 367-68.

[4] Robert C. Hammock, "Student Teaching in the Programs of Prospective Secondary School Teachers in the United States" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, The University of Texas, 1942), pp. 230-31.

[5] William G. Brink, "The Administration of Student Teaching in Universities Which Use the Public Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXX (October, 1945), pp. 394-402.

decreased. Stiles,[1] two years later, indicated that the majority of student teaching in universities was done in public schools located in university cities. In the same year, Blyer[2] made a similar point and added that there was some apparent feeling that laboratory schools were not being used as much as they should be, that they were not laboratories in the full sense of the word. In 1948, Lindsey[3] noted that the campus school was the most commonly used of all types of laboratory centers, but that a large number of institutions were using public schools and that some were using both types.

The campus school, established almost with the beginning of normal schools, has remained a force in teacher education through the years. The public school, however, is being used more and more as a laboratory, and in modern education it is perhaps even greater in importance in the education of teachers than is the campus school.[4]

---

[1]Lindley J. Stiles, "Organization of Student Teaching in Universities," Journal of Educational Research, XL (May, 1947), pp. 706-12.

[2]Dorothea Blyer, "Student Teaching in the American Association of Teachers Colleges," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXIII (February, 1947), pp. 75-87.

[3]Margaret Lindsey, "Major Findings and Recommendations in the Study of Professional Laboratory Experiences," American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, First Yearbook (1948), p. 199.

[4]Association for Student Teaching, Off-Campus Student Teaching, Thirtieth Yearbook (Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: The Association for Student Teaching, 1951), p. 21.

These persons involved in teacher education appear to be thoroughly committed to the idea that the learning it seeks can best occur when prospective teachers understand boys and girls, understand the environment of boys and girls, and participate with boys and girls in their school environment. In spite of this apparent commitment, laboratory experiences other than student teaching are relatively uncommon.[1]

Literature further reveals that there is a marked trend toward off-campus professional laboratory experiences. Rucker[2] pointed out that there was a trend toward more full-time student teaching, more professional laboratory experiences, and more off-campus experiences. Similar observations have been made by Stiles et al.,[3] Weber,[4] and Dalton;[5]

---

[1]Lindsey, op. cit., p. 199.

[2]Winfred P. Rucker, "Trends in Student Teaching 1932-1952" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1952).

[3]Lindley Stiles et al., Teacher Education in the United States (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1960), pp. 237-38.

[4]Robert A. Weber, "Selected Factors in Student Teaching in Southern Tax-Supported Institutions," 1954. Copies not available. Author is at the University of South Carolina. Studies in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1957), pp. 26-28.

[5]W. Theo Dalton, "Trends in Student Teaching for the South-eastern Region," 1952. No printed copies available. Studies in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), p. 18.

Ohlsen[1] and Bennie[2] go a step farther and assert that off-campus laboratory situations noticeably improve the quality of the student teaching experiences.

Holstine[3] emphasizes that each student should be exposed to normal situations, which are varied enough "to provide contacts with different pupil groups." As a result of her doctoral investigation in 1951, Rogers[4] states that the public schools "have an obligation to participate in the training of the teachers who will later staff the schools." Bennie[5] concludes that greater emphasis on teaching as found in full-time student teaching of the off-campus program "provides more opportunity for student participation in worthwhile

---

[1]Merle M. Ohlsen, "A Full-Time Off-Campus Student Teaching Program," NASSP Bulletin, 39 (May, 1955), pp. 94-101.

[2]William A. Bennie, "A Comparative Analysis of the On-Campus and Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs in Secondary Schools at Miami University" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1955). Studies in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1957), pp. 26-28.

[3]Garold Holstine, Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, Thirty-Third Yearbook (Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: The Association for Student Teaching, 1954), pp. 8-9.

[4]Helen Rogers, "The Administration of Student Teaching in the Secondary Schools of Large Cities" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1951). Student Teaching Today (Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960), p. 10.

[5]Bennie, loc. cit., pp. 26-28.

activities, gives more adequate participation . . . and results in earlier attainment of the objectives."

Although the preceding statements attest to the superiority of the off-campus program, it should be pointed out that the shift to off-campus student teaching is not all the work of administrative genius and that practical necessity as well as curricular considerations have had a heavy hand in this relatively recent trend. Stiles and others assert this effectively in the following words:

> Confronted with the necessity of providing for increasing enrollments in teacher education programs, many colleges find it impossible to arrange professional laboratory experiences (particularly student teaching) for all their students in any one school.[1]

Stiles also maintains that financial considerations have been involved in professional laboratory experiences and states:

> Like all schools, the campus school is confronted with constantly rising costs for the construction and maintenance of adequate building facilities. . . . Many campus schools have been unable to expand their facilities to provide student teaching opportunities for increasing numbers of students enrolled in their colleges.[2]

The increasing trend toward the use of public schools for student teaching has resulted in problems of coordination of efforts. The conditions under which the solutions to problems of student teaching are to be worked out differ from

---

[1] Stiles et al., loc. cit., p. 238.

[2] Ibid., p. 252.

state to state and from institution to institution within the state. A concerted effort must be made to clarify the problems of student teaching programs in public schools and to examine current practices for consistency and validity.

Despite numerous research studies conducted in an effort to develop sound procedures, much of the practice of selecting cooperating teachers is still haphazard, some approaches professionally disgraceful. The reasons for this situation are numerous, but perhaps the two most common are lack of understanding of sound criteria and failure to give evaluation the time and attention needed.[1]

Need for Criteria

The Association for Student Teaching, through its standing committee on standards and performances, has recognized the need for a "tool" or set of criteria for evaluating professional laboratory experience in teacher-education programs. Helen Douglas, Chairman of the above-named committee, and A. C. Moon, Executive Secretary of the Association for Student Teaching, both indicated in the spring of 1961 that no adequate set of criteria had been developed for use by teacher-education institutions which were attempting to raise standards to meet accreditation requirements or to improve the laboratory experience phase of their teacher education

---

[1] L. O. Andrews, Student Teaching (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 83.

programs. If such a set of criteria existed, the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education might find it useful in the evaluation of laboratory experiences in institutions applying for accreditation.

In a publication by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Maaske makes the statement that leaders in teacher education have felt the need for reliable research data related to practices in the process for educating teachers.[1] Other writers have indicated concern over the dearth of information on professional laboratory experiences. Asahel D. Woodruff, writing for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, comments on the student teaching phase of the problem in the booklet Student Teaching Today:

> The lack of action by state departments of education to implement any requirements of their own making has left the focus of responsibility in doubt and has caused the colleges to assume it by default. The absence of any clearly defined relationship between the on-campus aspects and the student teaching aspects of teacher education, and the lack of understanding of the rationale for the nature and purpose of student teaching have been accomplished by varying amounts of disparity and conflicts between the two parts of the program . . . All of these and perhaps other factors seem to be reaching some kind of culmination which is catching all parties unprepared for the task of stating sound principles and developing a sound program . . . The literature deals very sparingly with the problem. Texts on student teaching rarely get to the role of the cooperating teacher and of the college personnel . . . Recent books on education as a

---

[1]Roben J. Maaske (Chairman), Needed Research in Teacher Education (Oneonta, New York: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1954), p. 5.

> profession are silent on this problem. Codes of ethics of professional associations say nothing about it. This is almost a forgotten problem in education.[1]

In 1952, Steeves,[2] who had studied the literature on student teaching from 1929 to 1950, concluded that the supervising teacher is seldom prepared for his work through study of supervision. He also concluded that the twenty years of literature studied yielded no conclusions concerning the qualifications desired in off-campus supervising teachers.

Zerbes states the current challenge of preparing teachers:

> The professional education of teachers for today's schools cannot be validated by reference to the criteria of other days. Education leadership cannot let itself be diverted from the challenge of its day with dereliction of its social trust. A realistic reorientation of teacher education should prepare students for dynamic roles in today's schools.[3]

Desirable Practices

In an Association for Student Teaching bulletin, A Guide to Planning for Off-Campus Student Teaching, the nature

---

[1]Asahel D. Woodruff, Student Teaching Today (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960), pp. 1-2.

[2]The Association for Student Teaching, Teacher Education and the Public Schools, Fortieth Yearbook (Dubuque, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1961), pp. 10-11.

[3]Laura Zerbes, Teachers for Today's Schools (Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1951), pp. 8-9.

of the problem facing nearly all institutions was stated in the following words:

> Nearly every institution which prepares teachers for American schools is . . . or soon will be . . . faced with the problem of planning for a new or expanded program of off-campus student teaching. Growing numbers of students are putting heavy demands on currently used facilities for student teaching. Many colleges and universities already have found it necessary to seek and develop new situations in which student teaching can take place. The continued need for giving attention to problems of expansion is obvious.
>
> Where campus laboratory schools are available, the pressures have led either to the expansion of these facilities or to the use of other school facilities in the immediate vicinity of the institution. In many instances, schools in the college community which have been used to provide the major facilities or to supplement facilities available on the college campus already are being used to capacity and they are dangerously overloaded.[1]

Louise Willson, President of the Association for Student Teaching for 1948, indicates in her forward in the yearbook that the problem of how to provide adequate programs in laboratory experiences is not clear. She further states:

> The prospective American teacher needs to see for himself professional goals which are worthy of the kind of society ours can be at its best. He needs experiences which will help him understand the quality of educational services such a society will offer. He also needs experiences which will reveal the limitations of today's educational services; and he needs that kind of functional knowledge and skill which will help him move from the present reality toward the ideal which he keeps ever before him.
>
> How to provide this kind of professional experience is our problem. No institution has found the one way to do it. Many are searching, however, institutions in all sections of the country are

---

[1]Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, op. cit., Bulletin 11, p. 3.

> examining their programs with the aim of devising better ways. . . .[1]

Stratemeyer and Lindsey suggest that institutions preparing teachers should place emphasis upon the evaluation of schools serving as laboratories in the teacher-education program. Representatives of colleges, in school selection, must take into account several important factors; e.g. the school and community, the educational program of the school, and the school and staff. In addition, there should be practical considerations of school budget, teacher time, and available monies. These all play an important part in the selection of schools.[2]

They further emphasize that colleges attempting to select schools for student teaching should take a close look at the staff, their characteristics, and the way they work, as a basis for deciding whether or not a school should be invited to participate in the program of teacher education.[3]

In his critical analysis of teacher education, Conant proposes that the state assume major responsibility for quality programs:

---

[1]Association for Student Teaching, Professional Laboratory Experiences, An Expanding Concept in Teacher Education, Twenty-seventh Yearbook (Cedar Falls, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1948), p. 1.

[2]Florence B. Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsey, Working with Student Teachers (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958), p. 56.

[3]Ibid., p. 87.

> The state should approve programs of practice teaching. It should, working cooperatively with the college and public school authorities, regulate the condition under which practice teaching is done and the nature of the methods instruction that accompanies it. The state should require that the colleges and public school systems involved submit evidence concerning the competence of those appointed as cooperating teachers and clinical professors.[1]

His recommendations cover the schools' responsibility for providing quality personnel for teacher-education activities:

> Public school systems that enter contracts with a college or university for practice teaching should designate, as classroom teachers working with practice teaching, only those persons in whose competence as teachers, leaders, and evaluators they have the highest confidence, and should give such persons encouragement by reducing their work loads and raising their salaries.[2]

Haines states that the quality of experiences offered for boys and girls in a given school situation is of paramount importance if student teaching is to be a desirable educative experience rather than a routine assignment. She further emphasizes that the most important factors to be considered in selecting cooperating schools are related to understanding of the student teaching program, willingness to work with prospective teachers, harmonious professional

---

[1] James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), pp. 64-65.

[2] Ibid., p. 63.

relationships, and involvement in continual improvement of the curriculum.[1]

The prevalence of this point of view was evidenced at the Bowling Green Conference:

> Student teachers should have as many experiences with real school situations as practicable. Under these circumstances, the public schools that assist in the teacher education task should be carefully selected. Whether it is recognized or not, they are, in fact, members of the college faculty.[2]

The parent study of all comprehensive studies of professional laboratory experiences in teacher education describes the laboratory school thusly:

> In general, this school should be a representative school in the sense of having a non-selected group of children or youth and having a definite community setting; having a staff of able teachers qualified to guide laboratory experiences; having a program that is dynamic and forward-looking; being one in which the staff, the administration, and the community are willing to cooperate in making the school a situation serving the . . . function of providing desirable experiences for prospective teachers.[3]

Students demand much from many persons. Each person's role is important, and each is dependent on the

---

[1]Aleyne Clayton Haines, Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960), p. 21.

[2]The Education of Teachers--As Viewed by the Profession (Official Group Reports of the Bowling Green Conference, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1948), p. 57.

[3]John G. Flowers, et al., School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Oneonta, New York: American Association of Teacher Colleges, 1948), pp. 330-31.

other. The student teaching experiences become most effective and productive when the respective roles are played in the spirit of cooperation and partnership. The supervising teacher is the cog around which student teaching revolves. "His role is no longer that of a 'critic teacher' but a helping teacher."[1]

In accepting the supervisory task, the supervising teacher should be employed in fields in which he has had several years of successful teaching and should be able and willing to accept the dual role of both classroom teacher and teacher educator. He must continue his professional improvement in order to keep abreast of the changing educational pattern. Professional degrees, alone, will not suffice. Workshops, conferences, continued professional readings, and a variety of other endeavors will help keep the supervising teacher moving toward ever increasing professional competencies.

Lockett[2] concludes that student teaching must provide for both qualitative and quantitative experiences. Depth of experience is equally as vital as breadth and may be more

---

[1]Ernest J. Nilner (ed.), The Supervising Teachers Thirty-eighth Yearbook (Iowa: William C. Brown Co., Inc., 1959), p. 38.

[2]Booker Thomas Lockett, Resume of basic findings from the study, "The Program of Supervised Student Teaching in the Atlanta University Center, 1948-1958," (Atlanta, Georgia: Atlanta University, 1958), p. 20.

important fundamentally to future growth and development of beginning teachers.

Perkins[1] stated at a Fall conference in 1964 that the supervising teacher should be conducting an above-the-average program for pupils and should be positively interested in working with the student teaching program. In addition to this criteria, the supervising teacher:

1. Must hold at least the professional four-year certificate in the area for which the student teacher is preparing.
2. Must have at least one year's experience in that field, (it would be desirable for the teacher to have three or more years of teaching experiences in that particular field).
3. Must be selected by the proper college official in cooperation with the local school authorities.

Gayles[2] emphasized that the Department of Education at Florida A and M University did not use teachers as supervising teachers in the internship teaching program unless they had taught for a period of three years with teaching experience on the same grade level or in the same subject taught. She further stated that the supervising teachers should be recommended by the principals of cooperating schools; however, the final decision and approval of the supervising

---

[1]In a report by Mary E. Perkins to a fall conference on student teaching, Atlanta, Georgia, December 11, 1964.

[2]Letter from Anne R. Gayles, Profession of Education, Florida A and M University, Tallahassee, Florida, February 3, 1965.

teachers should be made by the director of internship teaching.

The following statements appear in a recent Position Paper published by the NEA National Commission on Teacher-Education and Professional Standards.

> Each student needs a substantial period of student teaching, with skilled supervision by both school and college personnel in a program cooperatively planned and conducted by the schools and colleges. Supervising teachers should be the most capable teachers in a school; they should be specifically prepared for their supervisory work, given a reduced load and compensated beyond their regular salary. College supervisors should be well qualified by preparation and experience, having salaries and faculty status commensurate with the importance of their responsibility.
>
> State education agencies should assume increased responsibility (including the making available of financial assistance) for insuring that student teaching is conducted in good schools with the supervision of well-qualified teachers and administrators.[1]

A few state education departments have published guide-lines to assist the public schools and colleges in making student teaching arrangements. In Oklahoma, a Guide for Organizing and Administering Student Teaching has been developed by the Oklahoma Commission on Teacher-Education and Professional Standards. Its introductory statement points out that a properly functioning student teaching program is of value to:

---

[1] National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Position Paper (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964), pp. 4-5.

1. The public school--in that it provides opportunities to evaluate prospective new teachers; provides an educational and placement liaison with the college; and provides communication lines for the interpretation of public schools purposes, problems and operation.
2. The cooperating teacher--in that it increases the individual attention that can be given to his pupils; challenges him to superior performance; and brings to his classroom the ideals of another adult.
3. The profession--in that it develops professional unity, emphasizes professional ethics, and involves to a greater extent the entire group in improving the competency and professional standards of its members.[1]

The entire problem of the education of teachers is conditioned by the facilities and practices available for student teaching. These facilities and practices should be such that they will provide student teachers with actual experiences of such quality and quantity as may be necessary in schools similar to those in which they may be expected to teach.

Development of Evaluation Criteria

A careful examination of the literature reviewed in this chapter furnished the foundation for the development of criteria which were fundamental to this study. As the professional literature was reviewed, there was a thorough search for statements with implications for evaluation of practices in the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers.

---

[1] Educational Research Service, Circular Number 4 (Washington, D. C.: May, 1964), p. 1.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis of data and evaluation of practices in the selection of supervising teachers and cooperating schools as found in selected teacher-education institutions in Georgia. This chapter presents background information on the institutions contributing to this study, followed by the presentation of four aspects of the off-campus student teaching programs: description of programs, the administration of the off-campus student-teaching program, the selection of supervising teachers, and the selection of cooperating schools.

The Colleges

The seven teacher-education institutions furnishing the data for this study are located throughout the state of Georgia. Information pertaining to the locale, enrollment, etc., comprises the material in the following pages in order that the reader may gain familiarity with the institutions.

Albany State College

Albany State College is located just outside the city of Albany. The college is state supported, offering work on

the undergraduate level. The enrollment is over 1,200. Albany State College is a unit of the University System of Georgia, under the supervision of the State Board of Regents and is approved by the Georgia State Department of Education and the Veterans Administration. The college is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.[1]

Fort Valley State College

Fort Valley State College is a state supported college located in Fort Valley, Georgia. Fort Valley State College offers work on the graduate and undergraduate levels. The enrollment is over 1,500. It is a unit of the University System of Georgia, under the supervision of the State Board of Regents. The college is a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, and is accredited by the State Department of Education of the State of Georgia.[2]

---

[1] Albany State College Bulletin, XXI, No. 10, Albany, Georgia, May, 1964), p. 7.

[2] Fort Valley State College Bulletin, XXII, XXIII, No. 4, Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia, May, 1962, pp. 35-37.

Paine College

Paine College is located in Augusta, Georgia, with an enrollment of approximately 750. Paine is a privately operated institution given full college credit by the State Departments of Education of Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina. Paine is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The chief support of the college, is provided by two cooperating churches: The Methodist Church and The Christian Methodist Episcopal Church. A substantial amount of Paine's support comes through the Annual Campaign of the United Negro College Fund, of which the college is a member.[1]

Savannah State College

Savannah State College is located just outside of Savannah, in the suburb of Thunderbolt. Savannah State College is a state supported institution, offering work on the undergraduate level, with an enrollment over 1,000. It is a unit of the University System of Georgia, under the supervision of the State Board of Regents. The college is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.[2]

---

[1] Paine College Bulletin, Paine College, Augusta, Georgia, 1964-1965, pp. 26-27.

[2] Savannah State College Bulletin, Savannah, Georgia, May, 1964, p. 8.

The Atlanta University Center

The programs of Clark College, Morris Brown College and Spelman College are described as one program--The Atlanta University Center--because of the affiliated working relationship and similarity of the student teaching programs. Although they are referred to as The Atlanta University Center, the directors of student teaching from each college were interviewed separately.

The Atlanta University Center including Clark, Morris Brown, and Spelman Colleges, is located in Atlanta, Georgia. Each institution is independently organized under its own board of trustees and has its own administration, but through the affiliation, overlapping of work is eliminated and the resources and facilities of any one of the institutions are available to students of the other institutions. Since September, 1929, there have been exchanges of teachers and students among the affiliated institutions. These colleges are privately operated. The chief support of Clark College is The Methodist Church; of Spelman College, The Baptist Home Missionary Society of the American Baptist Convention; and of Morris Brown College, The African Methodist Episcopal Church. They also draw support from other philanthropies and foundations, such as The Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, etc. A substantial amount of support comes through the Annual Campaign of the United Negro College Fund, of which

the colleges are members. The colleges are also members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.[1]

Description of Programs

The seven selected institutions in Georgia make wide use of off-campus schools in their student teaching programs. The use of cooperating schools has been necessary for several reasons, the most important being the increased number of student teachers and the demand for a more realistic situation in which to do student teaching.

In each program, the person charged with the responsibility for student teaching fills the position of Director of Student Teaching. The years of service of the directors in their present positions range from five to thirty-nine years. All of the directors have done work beyond the master's degree; three have doctor's degrees and four have master's degrees.

During the interviews each director of student teaching expressed clearly defined objectives for their student teaching programs. There was remarkable agreement upon the objectives reported by the directors. After a minimum of editing these objectives are summarized as follows:

1. To develop those professional understandings and abilities which are essential to successful teaching.

---

[1] Atlanta University Bulletin, Series III, No. 126, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, April, 1964, p. 24.

2. To provide an opportunity for students to implement theory--both to study the pragmatic value of the theory and to check with the students their understanding of the theory in application.
3. To furnish activities which assist students in seeing their needs for additional study through raising problems and questions.
4. To study with the students their abilities to work effectively in the guidance of actual teaching-learning situations.

Achievement of these objectives requires a carefully planned sequence of laboratory experiences. Such programs are designed to develop teaching competency and to promote an understanding of the learning process.

The seven directors interviewed reported their student teaching responsibilities to be: selecting cooperating schools and supervising teachers, assigning student teachers, and holding one or more teaching assignments.

The total number of elementary student teachers in the seven selected institutions from September, 1963 to May, 1964, was 178. The total number of schools used by the seven institutions at this time was seventy. Twenty-six of these were randomly selected for this study. Table 1 gives a breakdown of student teacher enrollment from September, 1963, to May, 1964, and the number of cooperating schools used during this period.

TABLE 1

STUDENT TEACHERS AND COOPERATING SCHOOLS -- 1963-1964

College	Number of Student Teachers						Number of Cooperating Schools	
	Semester		Quarter				Total Number	Number Selected for Study*
	First	Second	Fall	Winter	Spring	Total		
Albany				21	30	51	10	4
Clark	9	8				17	4	2
Fort Valley			5	23	5	33	18	6
Morris Brown	10	5				15	8	3
Paine		15				15	7	3
Savannah				14	14	28	12	4
Spelman	18	1				19	11	4
TOTALS	37	29	5	58	49	178	70	26

*One third of cooperating schools used by each institution selected at random.

The distance to off-campus schools from teacher-education institutions varied from one half mile to 100 miles. The Atlanta University Center, Paine College and Savannah utilized cooperating schools within their own city school systems. Albany State College utilized five systems, and Fort Valley State College, twenty-five systems.

Albany State College and Fort Valley State College require students to live in the community where they teach. This requirement did not apply to The Atlanta University Center, Savannah State, and Paine College since students taught in the school systems where the teacher education institutions were located.

All student teachers in the seven selected institutions spend a full day in student teaching. In The Atlanta University Center, the student teachers in elementary education spend 270 actual clock hours in full time teaching, which is about six hours for five days each week. Albany State College, Fort Valley State, Paine College and Savannah State College require student teachers in the primary grades to spend six hours and thirty minutes a day for five days each week in teaching. Student teachers in all other grades, through the twelfth, spend a total of seven hours a day for five days each week in teaching. In addition, the supervising teacher usually devotes a half hour after school conferring and planning with the student teacher. The principals'

reports substantiated those of the directors of student teaching in the seven selected institutions.

Albany State College, Fort Valley State, and Savannah State College operated on the quarter plan and require twelve weeks or one full quarter to complete student teaching while The Atlanta University Center and Paine College operate on the semester plan and require nine weeks to complete student teaching. Credit for student teaching in all of the institutions is the same for all curricula concerned. Students on all levels at The Atlanta University Center and Paine College receive six semester hours credit for student teaching, while at Albany State, Fort Valley State, and Savannah State students receive fifteen quarter hours credit for student teaching. As a general rule, the student teachers take no other course during that period.

Student teacher placements are made by the directors and supervisors of student teaching in cooperation with principals. In The Atlanta University Center official representatives of the Atlanta Board of Education, Coordinator of Student Teaching and area superintendents share this responsibility.

In all institutions, only one student teacher may be assigned to any one cooperating teacher. No institution reported a rank for the supervising teacher. The majority of the institutions reported a listing of the names of the supervising teachers in the college bulletin.

Five of the institutions gave no honorarium to supervising teachers. One institution, Savannah State College, gave a compensation of thirty dollars, and Paine College matched the honorarium given by the Georgia State Department of Education. In all of the institutions, the Georgia State Department of Education gave each cooperating teacher a remuneration ranging from twenty to fifty dollars a semester for each student supervised. The amount of the remuneration depended upon the amount of special training the supervising teacher had completed in the planned program for the supervision of student teaching.

Establishment of student teaching policies varied considerably. Albany State, Fort Valley State, Paine, and Savannah State Colleges reported that policies were established by the Teacher Education Council made up of class advisors, heads of departments, directors, and coordinators of student teaching. The directors of student teaching of The Atlanta Center reported that The Atlanta University Center Teacher Education Committee, through the agreed upon cooperative program, formulates policies in accordance with the standards of the approved programs and certification of the Georgia State Department of Education. The policies are then administered by the coordinator of student teaching, who serves as a liaison for the State Department of Education, The Atlanta University Center and the Atlanta Public Schools.

Administration of Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs

The following criteria were established for the evaluation of the administrative practices of off-campus student teaching programs. (See Appendix B)

Criterion 1.--Local boards of education should expend time and energy to facilitate the student teaching program.

Criterion 2.--Supervising teachers should be selected jointly by principal and college official.

Criterion 3.--The cooperating schools should be selected by the person in charge of the off-campus student teaching program in the teacher-education institutions in which the student teacher is enrolled.

Criterion 4.--The cooperating schools should be used continuously, that is, year after year.

Criterion 5.--The cooperating school system should include grades 1-12, all of which are available for laboratory experiences.

All interviewees expressed the opinion that the superintendent, together with the local boards of education, are considered key people who concern themselves with the needs of the teaching profession and work with the colleges and the members of their staffs to plan a way of operating off-campus programs more effectively. There is a cooperative relationship between all colleges, local boards of education, and the public schools that serve as laboratory centers for observation, participation, and student teaching.

In The Atlanta University Center the Coordinator of Student Teaching secures permission from the Atlanta Board of Education to place student teachers in the Atlanta Public

Schools. In all four of the other programs the director of student teaching secures permission by correspondence from the Superintendent of Education to place student teachers in the school system or county. The superintendent arranges the contractual agreements with the colleges to accept the student teachers.

All directors of student teaching and the principals of cooperating schools were in complete agreement when they reported that the local board of education saw the immediate and ultimate value of the student teaching program and displayed a strong willingness to expend the time and energy necessary to carry out this program.

The practices used by each institution in the procedure for the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers varied considerably. Albany State, Fort Valley, Paine, and Savannah State Colleges reported similar practices. Schools in which student teaching centers are established are chosen because of welcoming attitudes and willingness on the part of administrative personnel and faculty.

In the above four cases, prior to selecting a cooperating school to become a participant in the college student teaching program, a sub-committee composed of persons serving on the Teacher-Education Committee visits the school to see if the school has certified and competent classroom teachers and adequate facilities and equipment. This committee also seeks to find out the attitudes of the principals and their faculties

toward the acceptance of student teachers. Only those schools will be invited to join the college program that (1) meet the requirements for certification of teachers, (2) have adequate equipment, and (3) demonstrate a desire for student teachers. Further, the school personnel must agree that they will work cooperatively with the college program in promoting the students' growth.

After the inspection of prospective cooperating schools is made, the directors of student teaching have the responsibility for selecting the cooperating schools. The directors of student teaching solicit recommendations and suggestions from staff members who are in elementary education.

Although principals are asked to recommend classroom teachers, the college may select any faculty member to become the supervising teacher of students. There are few instances where some good classroom teachers do not care to work with student teachers. All directors inferred that the colleges opposed coercion.

The directors of student teaching at Albany State, Fort Valley State, Paine, and Savannah State Colleges and the principals reported that cooperating schools were selected by the director of student teaching or the person in charge of off-campus student teaching. The supervising teachers were selected by the college officials in cooperation with the cooperating principal.

Practices used in selecting cooperating schools and supervising teachers in The Atlanta University Center, differed greatly from the practices followed by the four institutions previously discussed. The selection of Atlanta public schools is made by official representatives of the Atlanta Board of Education in cooperation with the coordinators of student teaching and the area superintendents. The coordinator of Student Teaching serves as a liaison representative for the State Department of Education, the public schools and the colleges in The Atlanta University Center. This involves making administrative contacts with the Atlanta Public Schools referrent to selecting cooperating schools, scheduling student teachers, checking qualifications of supervising teachers, preparing requests for payment of the honorarium for supervising teachers, attending seminars, attending meetings of The Atlanta University Center Teacher-Education Council, and attending Teacher-Education Committee meetings.

The Atlanta Board of Education makes available a list of certified teachers and schools to the colleges in The Atlanta University Center. This list is verified with the Division of Certification, State Department of Education. Requests are often made by directors of student teaching for a particular school or teacher whose name does not appear on the list. This request may or may not be granted. It was implied by all principals and directors of student teaching in The Atlanta University Center that many schools designated

by the Atlanta Board officials had not been used by the colleges. Schools in close proximity to the colleges are used frequently and are often overtaxed. The principals of the cooperating schools in The Atlanta University Center were in agreement with the three directors of student teaching when they reported that cooperating schools were selected by the official representatives of the Atlanta Board of Education in cooperation with the cocrdinator of student teaching and the area superintendents. Directors of student teaching select supervising teachers from an "Approved List" made available by the Atlanta Board of Education.

The directors at Albany State, Fort Valley State, Paine, and Savannah State Colleges, and cooperating principals reported that they have no definite policy relative to the continuous use of cooperating schools. However, they indicated that an effort is made to utilize the same cooperating schools year after year.

Again, the practices followed by The Atlanta Center were different. Due to the large number of Atlanta Public Schools, the building programs, the double shifts, and the tendency to overuse schools near the colleges, it was necessary to develop a rotation system to prevent the frequent use of any specific school. Implementation of the rotation system was established by each college; this insures using a school and also a supervising teacher only once during the school year.

There was no policy relative to the availability of the whole system in any of the seven selected institutions. However, it was implied by the interviewees that their entire systems were available for professional laboratory experiences. All directors and principals provided evidence that the local boards of education understood the student teaching programs and were willing to cooperate with the colleges.

On the basis of information furnished by the directors of student teaching at Albany State, Fort Valley State, Paine, and Savannah State Colleges and cooperating principals, policies suggested by the criteria relative to selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers were fully implemented and consistently followed. Thus, it appears that this aspect of the program is strong. The Atlanta University Center followed somewhat different policies, and these practices did not completely conform to those implied by the established criteria. Consequently, it appears that this aspect of the program in The Atlanta University Center is acceptable.

Data revealed that Albany State, Fort Valley State, Paine, and Savannah State had no definite policies relative to the continuity of the use of cooperating schools. There was, however, an indication that this policy was desirable and effort was exerted to use the same schools year after year. The principals were in complete agreement. Therefore, it appeared this aspect of the program was acceptable. The Atlanta Center used a rotation practice which was fully

implemented, but not consistent with the established criteria. The principals were in agreement. Consequently, it appears that this aspect of the program is acceptable.

Data reported by the directors and principals revealed that the seven selected institutions have no definite policy relative to use of the school system as a whole. Even though there was no definite policy for the school system as a whole, it was indicated by all directors and principals that the entire system was available for professional laboratory experiences. As a result, it appears that this aspect of the program is acceptable.

Table 2 gives a summary of the evaluative judgments related to the administrative practices of the off-campus student teaching programs. These evaluative judgments were based on reports from all directors of student teaching in the seven selected institutions and the twenty-six cooperating principals.

Selection of Supervising Teachers

Professional and Personal Characteristics of Supervising Teachers

The following criteria were established for the evaluation of professional and personal characteristics of supervising teachers.

Criterion 6.--The supervising teacher should be qualified by preparation for the highest permanent professional certificate available for his field or level in the state.

TABLE 2

EVALUATION* OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

Criteria	Albany State		Atlanta Center		Fort Valley State		Paine College		Savannah State	
	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals
1. Understanding and cooperation of local boards of education	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
2. Cooperating school is selected by person in charge of off-campus student teaching.	S	S	A	A	S	S	S	S	S	S
3. Supervising teacher is selected by directors and principals working together.	S	S	A	A	S	S	S	S	S	S
4. Schools are used continuously, year after year. . .	A	S	A	A	A	S	A	A	A	A
5. Availability of the whole school system	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	A

*S -- Strong based on information furnished by directors and principals.
A -- Acceptable based on information furnished by directors and principals.
U -- Unsatisfactory based on information furnished by directors and principals.

Criterion 7.--The supervising teacher should have a minimum of three years of successful classroom teaching.

Criterion 8.--The supervising teacher should be bona fide, full-time with regular assignments.

Criterion 9.--The supervising teacher should be willing and able to guide the program of student teacher.

Criterion 10.--The supervising teacher should show evidence of professional growth, taking advantage of opportunities to improve through in-service training, course work, and conferences.

Criterion 11.--The supervising teacher should possess physical and mental health, vitality, and self-confidence sufficient to enable him to assume this added responsibility.

Criterion 12.--The supervising teacher should possess qualities which are essential to good supervision, such as practical insight into inter-personal backgrounds, deep understanding of the social structure and a wide cultural background.

In all cases there was a strong indication that the institutions had accepted as the minimum qualifications for supervising teachers those qualifications set forth by the State Department of Education in its listing of Criteria for the Selection of Supervising Teachers:

> 1. Holds at least the professional four-year certificate in the area for which the student is preparing.
> 2. Must have at least one year's experience in that field (it would be desirable for the teacher to have three or more years of teaching experience in that particular field.)
> 3. Must be selected by the proper college official in cooperation with the local school authorities.
> 4. Agrees to work with the designated representatives of the training institution in planning the experiences of the apprentice.[1]

---

[1]Division of Education, Criteria on Education of Supervising Teacher (Atlanta, Georgia: State Department of Education, 1959).

The directors of student teaching of the seven selected institutions reported that all supervising teachers are required to have at least the professional four-year certificate in the area in which the student teacher is placed. Although the State Department of Education only requires a supervising teacher to have one year of teaching experience, all directors reported that in accepting the supervisory task, the supervising teacher should be teaching in the field in which he has had three years of successful experience and should be willing to accept the dual role of the classroom teacher and teacher educator. Only full-time teachers with regular teaching assignments are considered for selection as a supervising teacher. Furthermore, all directors reported that a supervising teacher must be willing to work with the student teachers and with designated representatives of the college in planning experiences for the student. Although principals are requested to recommend good classroom teachers, the college is given free choice in selecting the supervising teachers of student teachers. In some instances, good classroom teachers do not care to work with student teachers.

In all cases the directors reported that cooperating teachers are encouraged to continue their professional improvement in order to keep abreast of changing educational patterns. Supervising teachers are expected to attend workshops and conferences, to do professional reading and to engage in a

variety of endeavors designed to keep them moving toward complete professional competence.

The selected teacher-education institutions in Georgia offer a program of education for supervising teachers under the sponsorship of the State Department of Education. The primary purpose of this program is to promote extensive understanding of skills and knowledges requisite for effective supervision of student teaching. The selected teachers are encouraged to enroll in the program of supervision of student teaching either at Atlanta University or at Fort Valley State College. The State Department of Education allows a nominal amount toward the supervising teacher's expense for this program. The completion of this supervisory program enables the teacher to meet the requirements of the State Department of Education for a supervising teacher's certificate, and also contributes toward professional growth. The certificate is not required, but priority is given those supervising teachers who have completed the program.

No definite policies related to personal characteristics required of supervising teachers were reported by any of the seven directors of student teaching. They indicated that certain personal documents, such as health records and recommendations are required at the time teachers are employed, and it is assumed that the principals considered these before recommending individuals to serve as supervising teachers.

All directors are apparently aware of desirable personal characteristics of supervising teachers. Characteristics considered desirable were: ability to understand the college student, emotional stability, and ability to follow acceptable standards of language, dress and social amenities.

In all cases the directors reported that the principals recommend supervising teachers. In a few cases personal data forms, interviews and observations by college supervisors are used.

The principals reported that all eighty-seven supervising teachers employed by them hold the professional four-year certificate. Forty-eight hold master's degrees, twenty-five have completed the Supervisory Teacher's course, and nineteen are in the process of completing the course. All supervising teachers are reported as full-time with regular assignments varying from first to seventh grade, and professional experience ranging from three to forty-seven years. All seven programs may be evaluated as strong in criteria related to supervising teachers' professional preparation, professional experience, assignment, willingness to work with students and professional growth. The importance of mental and physical health of supervising teachers and the need for supervisory insight were recognized by all directors of student teaching, but definite policies have not been established. The principals concurred. Hence, it appears that this aspect of the program is acceptable.

Table 3 gives a summary of the evaluative judgments related to professional and personal characteristics of supervising teachers. These evaluative judgments were based on information furnished by directors of student teaching in the seven selected institutions and the twenty-six cooperating principals.

Professional Activities

The following criteria were established for the evaluation of professional activities of supervising teachers.

Criterion 13.--The supervising teacher should be competent in his understanding of the college student and his ability to guide that student in working with children.

Criterion 14.--The supervising teacher should exhibit a high level of professional ethics.

Criterion 15.--The supervising teacher should understand and demonstrate application of basic principles of effective teaching and learning.

Criterion 16.--The supervising teacher should provide for individual differences and needs of students.

Criterion 17.--The supervising teacher should have courage to give a frank evaluation of the student teacher and to those who share the responsibility for his experience.

Criterion 18.--The supervising teacher should be willing to provide the student with varied experiences consistent with the stated objectives for his experience.

Criterion 19.--The supervising teacher shares the classroom with a student teacher and gives him complete responsibility for a period of time.

Each director strongly recognizes many professional activities required of supervising teachers but reported that they are not consistently followed. Since many excellent

TABLE 3

EVALUATION* OF PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SUPERVISING TEACHERS

Criteria	Albany State		Atlanta Center		Fort Valley State		Paine College		Savannah State	
	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals
6. Highest certificate	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
7. Three years teaching experience.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
8. Full-time, regular assignments	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
9. Willingness to guide the student	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
10. Continuous professional growth.	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A
11. Physical and mental health.	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
12. Supervisory insight	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A

*S -- Strong based on information furnished by directors and principals.
A -- Acceptable based on information furnished by directors and principals.
U -- Unsatisfactory based on information furnished by directors and principals.

classroom teachers do not care to work with student teachers, it is not always possible to carry out the professional activities required of supervising teachers. Although professional activities required of supervising teachers differ from one institution to another, all colleges emphasized desirable characteristics to be: accepting the supervisory task, adjusting to a professional partnership, guiding a prospective teacher's efforts, helping a colleague evaluate his growth, and deriving professional advantages from the presence of student teachers.

All directors reported that there are general abilities that supervising teachers should possess and, furthermore, all supervising teachers should be recommended by the principal or school sponsor as an outstanding teacher. They further emphasized that supervising teachers should make wise use of community resources, be active in school and community affairs, provide experiences for the student teacher that are interesting, challenging, as well as thought and action provoking. The supervising teacher should be well informed and able to implement what he teaches. He should have a desire to grow professionally and possess a positive professional attitude and a real liking for teaching. The teacher should see each student as an individual. In teaching, he should use modern methods and be creative. The directors agreed that these characteristics are difficult to evaluate; however, all directors reported that these characteristics are

considered by the cooperating principal. In a few cases these characteristics are recorded on personal data forms.

All seven programs may be evaluated as strong on the criterion related to effective teaching characteristics of the supervising teacher. All principals were in substantial agreement since they give no supervising teacher an unsatisfactory rating.

All seven programs may be evaluated as acceptable according to criteria related to understanding of student teachers, professional ethics, provisions for individual differences, frank evaluation, variety of experiences, and responsibility of assignment. The principals were in accord.

Table 4 gives a summary of the evaluative judgments related to professional activities of the supervising teachers. These evaluative judgments are based on information furnished by all directors of student teaching in the selected institutions and the twenty-six cooperating principals.

Selection of Cooperating Schools

The Staff and Program

The following criteria were established for the evaluation of the staff and program of a cooperating school.

Criterion 20.--The administrative staff and teachers of the cooperating school should fully understand the student teaching program and be willing to have student teachers as part of the school and willing to provide experience of quality in order to make a strong contribution to the success of the student teaching field.

TABLE 4

EVALUATION* OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF SUPERVISING TEACHERS

Criteria	Albany State		Atlanta Center		Fort Valley State		Paine College		Savannah State	
	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals
13. Understanding of the college student	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
14. High professional ethics. .	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
15. Effective teaching. . . .	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	S	A	A
16. Provision for individual differences	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
17. Frank evaluation.	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
18. Provision for varied experiences	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
19. Assignment of responsibility to student teacher	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A

*S -- Strong based on information furnished by directors and principals.
A -- Acceptable based on information furnished by directors and principals.
U -- Unsatisfactory based on information furnished by directors and principals.

Criterion 21.--The staff of the cooperating school should be alert and constantly engaged in improving its educational program and contributing to the development of children and youth.

Criterion 22.--The staff of the cooperating school should be qualified as a supervising teacher even though they do not supervise.

Criterion 23 --The curriculum should be varied in their curricular offerings, good professional libraries, wide selection of materials, sufficient local resources to provide the student with quality experiences in the school and community.

Criterion 24.--The program of the cooperating school should make real provisions for individual differences.

Criterion 25.--The philosophy and practice of the cooperating school should closely approximate those advocated by the teacher-education institution.

Criterion 26.--Student teachers should have the privileges similar to members of the staff such as, an opportunity to participate in faculty meetings, committees, extracurricular activities, curriculum revision and similar activities.

Criterion 27.--The program of the cooperating school should provide opportunities for the student teachers to meet and work harmoniously with parents.

The Georgia State Department of Education has formulated underlying policies governing the selection of cooperating schools to be used for student teaching. The Council on Teacher Education developed these policies and they were adopted by the Georgia State Board of Education.[1] Each institution plans within the framework of these policies.

The Atlanta University Center uses the Atlanta public schools designated by the official representatives of the

---

[1]Division of Education, Criteria on Education of Supervising Teachers (Atlanta, Georgia: State Department of Education, 1955).

Atlanta Board of Education in cooperation with the coordinator of student teaching and area superintendents. The college directors and supervisors of The Atlanta University Center have little to do with the selection of public schools. The college personnel are the "key contact representatives" who make necessary arrangements with the principals of the schools selected. Specific problems in the selection and use of the public schools are referred to the office of coordinator of student teaching.

Since the selection of the cooperating schools is an administrative concern, the directors of student teaching of The Atlanta University Center colleges did not report any fully implemented policies relative to the requirements of the staff of cooperating schools. However, the selection of schools is not left fully to the colleges in The Atlanta University Center, they indicated an awareness of certain desired practices.

The directors of student teaching at Albany State, Fort Valley State, Paine, and Savannah State Colleges reported that a committee composed of persons serving on the Teacher-Education Committee makes a visit to the prospective school before inviting them to join the college program. This committee seeks to ascertain what the feelings of the principal and his faculty are concerning the "taking in" of student teachers. Only those schools are invited to join the college program that meet the requirements of certification

of teachers and evidence a desire for student teachers. All faculty members must agree to work with the college in promoting each student's growth.

Meanwhile, it is made clear to the prospective cooperating schools that the welfare of the public school student comes first. No school is expected to sacrifice the pupil's opportunities for effective instruction for the student teachers' sole benefit. Contributing something to the cooperating school is taken to be equally as important as receiving services and advantages from it. Supervising teachers plan cooperatively with college personnel in order to insure good student teaching performance.

The professional attitudes exhibited toward student teaching by the administrators and teachers in the cooperating schools contribute to establishing desirable working arrangements. When students arrive at the cooperating school to begin their teaching, the principal holds a conference with the assigned group to explain such matters as the school's philosophy, policies, regulations, rules, and his expectations of the student teachers during their period of practice. Students make a tour of buildings and grounds and meet their supervising teachers and other school personnel. Afterwards, the principal holds any conference with the student teachers and supervising teachers that he deems necessary.

It was reported by all directors and principals that not only do professional attitudes of the public school faculty members have an impact upon student teachers directly, but they are also reflected in attitudes of the pupils, the parents, and the community. A professional atmosphere can contribute extensively to the development of professional teachers.

There was a strong conviction expressed by all seven directors that the supervising teachers cannot provide student teaching experiences of desired quality without further services from the entire staff. There must be faculty-wide acceptance. There was a commendable similarity between characteristics desired in the cooperating schools among the seven selected institutions--the principal and all faculty should be willing to cooperate with the college program; the schools should have certified principals and teachers even though the teachers do not supervise; and the principal and faculty both share in enriching the student teaching program. As a general rule, these characteristics are observed by college supervisors.

The information furnished by all directors of student teaching and principals reveals that there are no definite policies relative to the curriculum and instruction of cooperating schools. All directors recognize the importance of these factors and try, as nearly as possible, to place students in the best situations. Although there was no indication of fully implemented policies in regard to the curriculum

and instruction, all directors considered certain characteristics desirable for the school curriculum: the cooperating school's program should exemplify high standards of teaching; the program should be forward looking and practices should closely approximate those of the college; and each child should be recognized individually when planning a program.

All principals and directors were in complete agreement when they reported that student teachers are welcomed and quickly gain acceptance as members of the school staffs. Student teachers from the seven colleges are regarded, in general, as professional assistant teachers. They have approximately the same rights and responsibilities of other teachers in the systems. The supervising teachers clearly delegate increasing authority and responsibility to the student teachers as they demonstrate willingness and ability to accept it. This authority and responsibility frequently applies to all aspects of teaching including methods of discipline, responsibility for grading, and determinations of teaching practices. Of course, such student teaching activities are carefully supervised and evaluated.

The student teachers engage in many activities during the period they are teaching in the public schools. They spend an average of approximately six or seven hours daily in teaching or related activities. The classroom activities in which student teachers participate include teaching all subjects in the elementary school curriculum and at all levels,

using teaching units, supervising study periods, supervising library periods, teaching physical education, using audio-visual aids, preparing case studies, designing and preparing bulletin boards, constructing and administering tests, preparing material of instruction, participating in teacher-pupil planning, guiding pupils in projects, organizing and supervising field trips and excursions, and working on committees.

In general, the student teacher engages in many unrelated or non-teaching activities, e. g., calling roll, checking attendance registers, making attendance reports, making lunch reports, conducting devotional periods, directing current news reports, raising school funds, supervising fire drills, attending P. T. A. meetings, attending departmental or curriculum committee meetings, supervising music and creative dancing, helping pupils prepare exhibits for science and art fairs, and keeping health records.

As a part of the student teachers' professional growth, they are expected to participate in local church activities, participate in community improvement programs, attend meetings of civic organizations, participate in community drives, serve as community resource persons, and help with homeroom mothers' clubs. Student teachers spend from ninety to ninety-five per cent of the time in the school in the classrooms of the supervising teachers, the rest of the time is spent organizing and preparing materials of instruction.

Table 5 gives a summary of the evaluative judgments related to the staff and program of the cooperating school. These evaluative judgments are based on information furnished by the seven directors of student teaching in the selected institutions and the twenty-six cooperating principals.

The School

The following criteria were established by the evaluation of the cooperating school.

Criterion 28.--The cooperating school should have over-all quality as determined by the curriculum standards of local or regional accrediting agencies, professional preparation of staff, experience of staff, and staff turnover.

Criterion 29.--The school plant and equipment and other facilities used for professional laboratory experiences should be such quality as to meet the curriculum needs of pupils with whom the student teacher will come in contact.

Criterion 30.--The cooperating school should be close enough to the college campus to make travel between the school and the college easily possible for students, their cooperating teachers, and the college supervisors working with them.

Criterion 31.--The cooperating school should provide services such as, salary schedule, and sick leave.

Criterion 32.--Salaries for teachers in the cooperating school should be adequate to attract the best teachers available.

Criterion 33.--The cooperating school should have an operating budget which allows for acquisition and maintenance of desirable equipment, research and supplies for a well-rounded program.

Criterion 34.--The community from which the school draws population should be interested in its school.

Criterion 35.--The community should afford adequate living facilities for the student teachers.

TABLE 5

EVALUATION* OF STAFF AND PROGRAM PRACTICES OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS

Criteria	Albany State		Atlanta Center		Fort Valley State		Paine College		Savannah State	
	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals
20. Staff understands the student teaching program . . .	S	S	A	A	S	A	S	S	S	A
21. Staff is engaged in improving its program	S	A	A	A	S	S	S	S	S	S
22. Staff is well-qualified . .	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
23. Curriculum offerings are varied.	S	A	A	S	S	A	A	S	A	A
24. Provisions for individual differences	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	S	A	S
25. Philosophy related to teacher education institution	A	S	A	U	A	U	A	S	A	A
26. Student teachers participate in school program. . .	S	S	S	S	S	A	S	S	S	S
27. Provision for students to work with parents. . . .	S	A	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	A

*S -- Strong based on information furnished by directors and principals.
A -- Acceptable based on information furnished by directors and principals.
U -- Unsatisfactory based on information furnished by directors and principals.

Criterion 36.--The community should be representative of different socio-economic levels.

The seven directors of student teaching and the twenty-six cooperating principals were in complete agreement when they reported that all schools designated or selected as cooperating schools are accredited by the Georgia Accrediting Commission. The public schools used by The Atlanta University Center and Paine College have sought for accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, but have not as yet been admitted.

The seven teacher-education institutions utilize facilities of off-campus public schools. Albany State College utilizes the facilities of five systems, ten public schools, and one campus laboratory school in providing pre-student teaching laboratory experiences. Fort Valley State College utilizes the facilities of twenty-five school systems, eighteen public schools, and one campus laboratory school. The Atlanta University Center utilizes the facilities of the Atlanta Public Schools. Paine College utilizes facilities of the Augusta Public Schools and Savannah State College utilizes the facilities of the Savannah Public Schools.

By arrangement with the Board of Education of the City of Atlanta, the School of Education maintains a close relationship with the newly erected Oglethorpe School. This building incorporates the most modern arrangements and devices for elementary school teaching. Students from The

Atlanta University Center are permitted to use these facilities for laboratory purposes. Paine College and Savannah State College also have laboratory school accommodations.

A policy of the Georgia State Department of Education prohibits the use of campus laboratory schools as a student teaching center. However, they may be used for observation purposes. One of the major functions of the campus laboratory schools is to contribute to the stimulation and improvement of the student teaching program. In fulfilling this function the faculty of the laboratory schools engage in designing, testing, and disseminating innovations in all phases of education activity. The program in the public schools ranges from kindergarten through grade twelve. Teachers are reported certified and in adequate numbers to serve the school population.

All schools selected as cooperating centers are of modern structure and provide modern equipment and facilities for observation experiences for numerous students and actual laboratory work for a significant number of student teachers. The Atlanta University Center, Paine College, Fort Valley State College, and Savannah State College reported no requirement in regard to the distance to the cooperating school from the institutions, although Fort Valley placed student teachers as far away as one hundred miles. Albany State College reported a consistent practice that no student be placed in a school over seventy miles from the institution.

The supervisors of student teachers from The Atlanta University Center, Paine College, and Savannah State College have to travel relatively short distances to make contacts with the individuals for whom they have responsibilities. In some instances, the college supervisors at Fort Valley State College and Albany State College travel relatively long distances to make contacts with the individuals for whom they have responsibilities.

All college supervisors pay the cost of transportation to and from in-town centers. Transportation to and from the out-of-town cooperating schools is paid by the colleges. Usually three or more supervisors representing different specialized fields make visits together. The college supervisor who uses his automobile to transport his colleagues receives so much a mile to help cover his expenses.

All students living on campus and who practice in the city schools of the college location are transported daily to and from cooperating schools at the expense of the college. Transportation is a personal responsibility of city residents who practice in the city schools. All students who work in out-of-town centers pay their own travel expenses from the college to the assigned student teaching centers and return.

Annual conferences that bring in principals and supervising teachers to the college in order to increase their understanding of the supervisory task are sponsored by the college. The cost of their transportation is reimbursed by

the college. Consultants from the state and regional levels are employed.

The directors reported that the colleges have no control over the selected public cooperating schools as to ownership of the buildings, employment of the administrative and supervisory staff, salaries of administrators and teachers, school budgets, or other services available to the cooperating school. However, the director of student teaching at Paine College reported that if the cooperating school's budget does not allow for adequate equipment and supplies for a well-rounded program, money is taken from the college budget to meet this request. During the year 1963-1964, $250 was taken from the Paine College budget for student teaching instructional purposes.

The directors of student teaching in The Atlanta University Center did not report any policy regarding the cooperating school's community. The directors of student teaching at Albany State College and Fort Valley State College reported one requirement referrent to the community affording adequate living conditions: all homes in which student teachers live must be approved by the principal. Selection of homes and arrangements for room and board are made by the principal. Only homes that can offer an adequate standard of living are selected.

Table 6 gives a summary of the evaluative judgments related to the staff and program of the cooperating school.

TABLE 6

EVALUATION* OF THE SCHOOL

Criteria	Albany State		Atlanta Center		Fort Valley State		Paine College		Savannah State	
	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals	Directors	Principals
28. Accreditation by accrediting agencies. . . .	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
29. School plant and facilities meet needs of the pupils. .	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	S	S	A
30. School close enough to make travel easily possible. . .	A	S	S	A	A	U	S	S	S	S
31. Provisions for services such as salary schedule, etc.. .	U	S	U	S	U	A	S	S	S	S
32. Salaries are adequate . . .	U	A	U	S	U	A	U	A	U	A
33. School has operating budget.	U	A	U	A	U	A	U	S	U	U
34. Community is interested in the school	U	S	U	A	U	U	U	A	U	A
35. Community affords adequate living conditions	S	A	U	A	S	U	U	S	U	A
36. Community is representative of different socio-economic levels	U	A	U	U	U	U	U	A	U	A

*S -- Strong based on information furnished by directors and principals.
A -- Acceptable based on information furnished by directors and principals.
U -- Unsatisfactory based on information furnished by directors and principals.

These evaluative judgments are based on information furnished by the seven directors of student teaching in the selected institutions and the twenty-six cooperating principals.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine and evaluate practices in the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers in selected teacher education institutions in Georgia. More specifically, this study was divided into three sub-problems: (1) to develop appropriate evaluation criteria based upon professional literature, (2) to determine practices of the colleges, and (3) to evaluate practices through criteria developed. The normative survey and evaluation method was used in treating the data, opinions, and facts. The participants in this study consisted of the seven directors of student teaching in the selected institutions and twenty-six principals of cooperating schools serving these institutions. Data were obtained by personal interviews with all directors of student teaching and the twenty-six cooperating principals, randomly selected from the total number of seventy. A review of professional literature was the basis for the establishment of the thirty-six criteria used in the evaluation of policies and practices reported in the interviews.

Major Findings

The major findings derived from this study are as listed below:

1. The director was the most popular title for the person charged with the responsibility for the education of student teachers. Of the seven directors of student teaching, four had full responsibility for administering the student teaching program, and three had partial responsibility. Three directors had doctor's degrees and four had master's degrees. Years of service as directors of student teaching at their present institutions ranged from five to thirty-seven years.

2. The total number of elementary student teachers in the selected institutions from September, 1963, to May, 1964, was 178. The total number of cooperating schools used by the seven institutions was seventy. The distance of these cooperating schools from the institutions they served varied from one half mile to one hundred miles. Three institutions required student teachers to live in the community where they did student teaching. Four institutions placed student teachers in schools where the institution was located.

3. The seven institutions required student teachers to spend a full day in off-campus cooperating schools for a five-day week. The four private institutions operating on a semester plan required nine weeks to complete student teaching and gave six semester hours credit. The three state

supported institutions operating on a quarter plan required twelve weeks to complete student teaching and gave fifteen quarter hours credit for student teaching. In all cases, students were not permitted to carry other course work during the period in which they were involved in student teaching. A student teacher was assigned to only one supervising teacher.

4. Of the seven institutions, four reported that directors of student teaching made student teacher assignments. The three colleges in The Atlanta University Center reported that a person designated by the Atlanta Board of Education working with the coordinator of student teaching made assignments.

5. Five of the seven institutions listed the names of supervising teachers in the college bulletin. Two of the seven institutions gave no special recognition. Two of the institutions gave an honorarium to supervising teachers while five did not. The Georgia State Department of Education gave a stipend ranging from twenty to fifty dollars per supervising teacher based upon the amount of special training the supervising teacher had in the "Planned Program for Supervising Teachers of Student Teaching."

6. Of the seven institutions, four reported student teaching policies were made by a teacher education council, consisting of class advisors, heads of departments, directors, supervisors, and coordinators of student teaching. Three

reported that policies were made by a teacher education committee, in accordance with the standards of the Approved Programs and Certification of the Georgia State Department of Education. These policies were administered by the coordinator of student teaching, who served as a liaison between the State Department of Education, the colleges, and the public schools.

7. The relationship between the local boards of education and the participating colleges was a cooperative one. Supervising teachers were selected by the directors of student teaching and the principal working together. Of the seven institutions, four reported that cooperating schools were selected by the director of student teaching with suggestions and recommendations from the teacher education committee. Three colleges reported cooperating schools designated by official representatives of the Atlanta Board of Education in cooperation with the coordinator of student teaching and the area superintendents.

8. Four of the colleges made an effort to use the same cooperating schools year after year. Three of the colleges implemented a rotation system, preventing frequent use of any specific schools.

9. All institutions used the following criteria for the selection of supervising teachers:

a. Certification of the teacher in his field (s).

b. Three or more years of teaching experience in the area in which the student is placed.

c. Full-time teachers with regular assignments.

d. Willingness of the supervising teacher to work with the student teaching program.

e. Conduction of an above-the-average program for pupils and a positive interest in working with the student teaching program.

10. All institutions used the following criteria for selecting cooperating schools:

a. Willingness of the staff to have student teachers in the school.

b. Certification of the staff.

c. Professional outlook of the school program.

d. Provision for the student teachers to participate in the total school program.

e. Provision for student teachers to work with parents.

f. Accreditation of cooperating school.

g. Adequate facilities and equipment.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In view of the findings of this study, the following conclusions and recommendations are considered:

1. Through the use of defensible professional literature, adequate criteria for the evaluation of off-campus student teaching programs were established.

2. The directors of student teaching agreed upon general principles which should be followed in selecting cooperating schools and supervising teachers. These principles

were in harmony with suggestions found in professional literature.

3. Although there was agreement upon the general principles which should be followed, practices for the selection of cooperating schools and supervising teachers varied from program to program.

4. The cooperation of the public schools with the student teaching program is excellent.

5. The leadership furnished by the Georgia State Department of Education is effective and constructive.

6. All programs studied need to be subjected to thorough evaluation by college and cooperating school personnel.

7. College personnel should work for fuller implementation of principles which they generally recognized and accepted.

8. The colleges cooperating within The Atlanta University Center need a greater amount of freedom in formulating and administering their own student teaching programs.

9. Participation in the supervisory training programs offered at Atlanta University and Fort Valley State College should be required of all who supervise student teachers, and administrative personnel of the cooperating schools should be encouraged to participate.

10. The colleges need to be concerned about the following aspects of public schools before selecting cooperating schools:

a. Curriculum and instruction procedures of the cooperating school.

b. Services available to the ccoperating school.

c. The community in which the school is located.

11. The colleges of Georgia should consider the desirability of more uniformity in standards, requirements, and arrangements for student teaching.

12. All institutions should give an honorarium to supervising teachers.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Teacher Education for a Free People. Oneonta, New York: The Association, 1956.

American Association of Teachers Colleges (Now the Association of Colleges for Teacher Education). School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1948.

American Council on Education. The Improvement of Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1946.

American Council on Education. Teachers for Our Times. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

Andrews, L. O. Student Teaching. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Barnard, Henry. Normal Schools. Hartford: Case, Tiffany and Company, 1851.

Batchelder, Howard T., et al. A Guide to Planning Off-Campus Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.

Conant, James Bryant. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Curtis, Dwight K., and Andrews, Leonard O. Guiding Your Student Teachers. Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.

Devor, John W. The Experience of Student Teaching. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

Gage, N. L. Handbook of Research on Teaching. A Project of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

Good, Carter V., Barr, A. S., and Scates, Douglas E. Methodology of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Haines, Aleyne Clayton. Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960.

Harris, Chester W., (ed.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.

Lindsey, Margaret, and Gruhn, William T. Student Teaching in the Elementary School. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957.

Maaske, Roben J., (chairman). Needed Research in Teacher Education. Oneonta, New York: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1954.

Michaelis, John, and Dumas, E. The Student Teacher in the Elementary School. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Teacher Education: The Decade Ahead. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1955.

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. New Horizons for the Teaching Profession. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1961.

O'Toole, A. L. Elementary Practical Statistics. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

Rummel, J. Francis. An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.

Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1960.

Stiles, Lindley. Teacher Education in the United States. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1960.

Stratemeyer, Florence S., and Lindsey, Margaret. Working with Student Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Van Dalen, Debold B. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Woodruff, Asahel D. Student Teaching Today. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960.

Zerbes, Laura. Teachers for Today's Schools. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1951.

Yearbooks

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Standards and Policies for Accrediting Colleges for Teacher Education. First Yearbook. Oneonta, New York: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1947.

Association for Student Teaching. Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching. Forty-second Yearbook. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1963.

Association for Student Teaching. Evaluating Student Teaching. Thirty-ninth Yearbook. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1960.

Association for Student Teaching (Garold Holstine). Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Thirty-third Yearbook, The Association for Student Teaching. Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, 1954.

Association for Student Teaching. Four Went to Teach. Thirty-fifth Yearbook. Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: The Association for Student Teaching, 1956.

Association for Student Teaching. Guidance in Teacher Education. Thirty-sixth Yearbook. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The Association for Student Teaching in cooperation with the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education, 1957.

Association for Student Teaching. Improving Instruction in Professional Education. Thirty-seventh Yearbook. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1958.

Association for Student Teaching. Off-Campus Student Teaching. Thirtieth Yearbook. Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: The Association for Student Teaching, 1951.

Association for Student Teaching. Professional Laboratory Experiences, An Expanding Concept in Teacher Education. Twenty-seventh Yearbook. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1948.

Association for Student Teaching. The Supervising Teacher. Thirty-eight Yearbook. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.

Association for Student Teaching. Teacher Education in the Public Schools. Fortieth Yearbook. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1961.

Bulletins and Periodicals

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Research and Studies in Teacher Education. XVII, Bulletin No. 6. Washington, D. C.: 1964.

American Association of School Administrators and Research Division. Educational Research Service. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964.

Ashmore, Henry. "Establishing Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs," Journal of Teacher Education, IV (December, 1951).

Association for Student Teaching. Achieving Quality in Off-Campus Professional Laboratory Experiences. Bulletin No. 8. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1957.

Association for Student Teaching. Studies in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Research Bulletin No. 20. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1959.

Association for Student Teaching. The Value Approach to Student Teaching. Bulletin No. 15. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1961.

Blanchard, Everard B. "Criteria for Selecting Student Teaching Centers: An Approach," Educational Administration and Supervision, XII (April, 1955).

Brink, William G. "The Administration of Student Teaching in Universities Which Use the Public Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXX (October, 1945).

Brown, Don W. "Honors for Student Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, XIV (December, 1963).

Blyer, Dorothea. "Student Teaching in the American Association of Teachers Colleges," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXIII (February, 1947).

Colebank, George H. "Practice Teaching in the Colleges of the North Central Association," The North Central Association Quarterly, III (December, 1928).

Curtis, Dwight K. "Off-Campus Student Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVIII (December, 1952).

Dalton, W. Theo. "Trends in Student Teaching for the Southeastern Region," Studies in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: 1959.

Foster, Frank K. "The Training School in the Education of Teachers," Teacher Education Curriculum, National Survey of the Education of Teachers, III Number 10 (1933).

Malter, Morton S. "Off-Campus Student Teaching," Educational Leadership (1952).

Ohlsen, Merle M. "A Full-Time Off-Campus Student Teaching Program," NASSP Bulletin (May, 1955).

Roth, Lois H. "Selecting Supervising Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education (December, 1961).

Rucker, W. Ray. "Trends in Student Teaching--1932-1952," Journal of Teacher Education, IV (December, 1953).

Steeves, Frank. "A Summary of the Literature on the Off-Campus Cooperating Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVIII (March, 1952).

Stiles, Lindley J. "Organization of Student Teaching in Universities," Journal of Education, XL (May, 1947).

Weber, Robert A. "Selected Factors in Student Teaching in Southern Tax-Supported Institutions," 1954. Studies in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. The Association for Student Teaching, Cedar Falls, Iowa: 1957.

Welborn, E. L. "Cooperation with Local Schools in Student Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, VI (November, 1920).

Williams, Chester S., Deever, R. Merwin, and Flynn, Edward B., Jr. "Professional Laboratory Experiences," Journal of Teacher Education, XI (December, 1960).

Unpublished Materials

Bennie, William A. "A Comparative Analysis of the Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs in Secondary Schools at Miami University." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1955.

Criteria on Education of Supervising Teachers. Atlanta, Georgia: State Department of Education, 1959. (Mimeographed).

Hammock, Robert C. "Student Teaching in the Programs of Prospective Secondary Teachers in the United States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, 1942.

Lockett, Booker T. "The Program of Supervised Student Teaching in The Atlanta University Center, 1948-1958." Unpublished master's thesis, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1958.

Planning for Student Teaching. A Report of Findings of the Workshop for Supervising Teachers of Student Teachers. Atlanta: School of Education, Atlanta University, 1960. (Mimeographed).

Report Regional Conference on the Improvement of Student Teaching. Atlanta: Under a Grant from the Southern Education Foundation, Inc., Atlanta University, April 30-May, 1963. (Mimeographed).

Roberts, Clinton J. "A Descriptive Analysis of the Off-Campus Student Teaching Program of the Eleven Teacher Colleges of the State University of New York in Relation to the AACTE Principles." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1960.

Rogers, Helen. "The Administration of Student Teaching in the Secondary Schools of Large Cities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1951.

Rucher, Winferd R. "Trends in Student Teaching 1934-52." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1952.

Swain, Roland. "Criteria for Evaluating Programs in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1962.

College Bulletins

Albany State College Bulletin, Volume XXI, Number 10, Albany State College, Albany, Georgia, 1964.

Atlanta University Bulletin, Series III, Number 126, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1963-1964.

Fort Valley State College Bulletin, Volume XXII and XXIII, Number 4, Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia, 1963.

Paine College Bulletin, Paine College, Augusta, Georgia, 1964-65.

Savannah State College Bulletin, Savannah State College, Savannah, Georgia, 1964.

Other Sources

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University. Correspondence from Dr. Anne R. Gayles, Professor of Education, February 3, 1965.

Southern Education Foundation. Personal interview with Mr. Robert L. Cousins, Acting Executive Director of Southern Education Foundation, Inc., December 29, 1964.

State Department of Education. Correspondence from Miss Mary E. Perkins, Georgia State Coordinator of Teacher Education, October 24, 1964.

State Department of Education. Personal interview with Mrs. Maenelle D. Dempsey, Georgia State Teacher Education Consultant, January 5, 1965.

APPENDIX A

SOURCES OF CRITERIA STATEMENTS

All statements from any of the following sources are followed by "(1)":

Association for Student Teaching. Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching. Forty-second Yearbook, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, the Association, (1963).

Association for Student Teaching. Teacher Education and the Public Schools. Fortieth Yearbook, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, the Association, (1961).

Association for Student Teaching. Evaluating Student Teaching. Thirty-ninth Yearbook, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, the Association, (1960).

Association for Student Teaching. The Supervising Teacher. Thirty-eighth Yearbook, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, the Association, (1959).

Association for Student Teaching. Off-Campus Student Teaching. Thirtieth Yearbook, State Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, the Association, (1951).

Association for Student Teaching. Achieving Quality in Off-Campus Student Teaching. Bulletin Number 8, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, the Association, (1959).

Association for Student Teaching. A Guide to Planning for Off-Campus Student Teaching. Bulletin Number 11, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, the Association, (1959).

All statements from any of the following sources are followed by "(2)":

Cottrell, P. Donald. Teacher Education for a Free People. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Oneonta, New York, (1948).

Flowers, John G., et al. School and Community Laboratory Experiences. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Oneonta, New York, (1948).

Woodruff, Asahel. Student Teaching Today. AACTE Study Series, NEA, Washington, D. C., (1960).

All statements from any of the following sources are followed by "(3)":

National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education. Standard and Guide for Accreditation for Teacher Education. The Council, Washington, D. C., (1957).

National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education. Standard VI, "Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences." AACTE, New York, (1948).

All statements from any of the following sources are followed by "(4)":

Blanchard, Everard B. "Criteria for Selecting Student Teaching Centers: An Approach." Volume XLI, (April, 1952).

Curtis, Dwight K. "Off-Campus Student Teaching." Educational Administration and Supervision. Volume XXXVIII, (December, 1952).

Steeves, Frank. "A Summary of the Literature on the Off-Campus Cooperating Teacher." Educational Administration and Supervision. Volume XXXVIII, (March, 1952).

All statements from any of the following sources are followed by "(5)":

Ashmore, Henry L. "Establishing Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs." Journal of Teacher Education. Volume XI, Number 4, December, 1951).

Brown, Don W. "Honors for Student Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education. Volume XIV, (December, 1961).

Roth, Lois H. "Selecting Supervising Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education. Volume XII, (December, 1961).

All statements from the following source are followed by "(6)":

American Association of School Administrators and Research Division, Educational Research Service, a circular, National Education Association, Washington, D. C., (May, 1964).

All statements from the following source are followed by "(7)":

Harris, Alleyne C. Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education, Rand McNally, Chicago, (1960).

All statements from the following source are followed by "(8)":

Stratemeyer, Florence B., and Margaret Lindsey. Working with Student Teachers. Columbia University, New York, (1958).

All statements from any of the following sources are followed by "(9)":

State Department of Education. Criteria on Education of Supervising Teachers, Division of Education, Atlanta, Georgia, (February 12, 1961).

State Department of Education. Standards for Professional Laboratory Experiences. State Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky, (1959).

University of Wyoming. "Criteria for Selecting Supervising Teachers and Off-Campus Schools." University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, (1959).

STATEMENTS WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR EVALUATION

The Selection of Cooperating Schools

1. The school plant, equipment and other physical facilities used for professional laboratory experiences should be of such quality as to meet the curricular needs of pupils with whom the student teacher will ultimately come in contact. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5)
2. The cooperating school should have high over-all quality, as determined by the curricular standard of local or regional accrediting agencies, professional preparation of staff, experience of staff turnover. (1), (2), (3), (4), (7), (8)
3. The curriculum should be broad enough to provide a variety of experiences for the student teacher. (1), (2), (4), (5)
4. Quality and amount of equipment and materials in the schools should be adequate for a good instructional program. (1), (2), (3), (7), (8)
5. Classrooms in the selected school should be adequately equipped with such facilities as heating, lighting, chalk boards, bulletin boards, and seating for both pupils and teachers. (4), (5), (7)

6. The school should use staff meetings for participation in programs for the improvement of instruction. (7), (8)
7. The off-campus school should be selected by the person in charge of the off-campus student and teaching program in the educational institution in which the student teachers are enrolled. (1), (2), (4), (5)
8. The school must be one in which the administrative staff, the faculty, and board of trustees understand the importance and function of the student teaching experience. (1), (4), (5), (7)
9. The school must be one which believes that the student teaching experience is a vital and necessary program of teacher education. (2)
10. The administrative staff and teachers must be willing to have student teachers as a part of the school, and willing to provide an experience of quality, in order to make a strong contribution to the success of the student teaching field. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (7), (8).
11. The school must be willing for student teachers to have a vital, constructive, alert staff that is constantly engaged in improving its educational program and contributing to the development of children and youth. (1), (2), (4), (5)
12. The cooperating school should be one which represents (as nearly as possible) a typical public school situation.

It shall have all grades, courses, and special groups that a student will be required to teach according to the certificate for which he is working. The school shall correspond to the kinds of school communities in which the prospective teacher expects to teach. (7)

13. The cooperating school shall be one which conducts a sound educational program and which can provide the facilities for a wide range of experiences and activities in which any teacher might be expected to participate in school and community. (1), (2), (3)

14. The school be equipped with an abundance of appropriate materials and teaching aids, and provide a suitable environment in which the student teacher may do his best work. (1), (2), (7), (8)

15. The administrative staff and the faculty must be enthusiastic in their efforts to strengthen the profession. (1), (2), (7), (8)

16. Philosophy and practices in cooperating school should closely approximate those advocated by the teacher-education institution. (1), (2), (3)

17. The program in the school should provide experiences in school and community situations of the type in which the student teacher is likely ultimately to find a job. (1), (4), (5), (7)

18. The school should have a representative pupil population. That is, the boys and girls in the school should

represent the range in ability, interests, and needs which is found in many schools. (5), (6), (7), (8)

19. The community from which the school draws population should be representative, including different socio-economic levels and a stable population. (1), (2), (4), (5), (7), (8)

20. The community from which the school draws population should be interested in its school. (1), (2), (3), (4), (8)

21. The staff in the cooperating school recognizes the importance of their contribution to the preparation of future teachers. (1), (2), (5)

22. The staff in the cooperating school should represent wholesome, well-adjusted people and citizens. (4), (5), (7)

23. The cooperating school should be close enough to the college campus to make travel between the school and college easily possible for students, their cooperating teachers, and the college supervisor working with them. (1), (2), (5), (7)

24. This school should be a representative school in the sense of having non-selected group of children or youth and having a definite community setting. (4), (5), (7)

25. This school should have a staff of able teachers qualified to guide laboratory experiences. (1), (2), (4), (5), (7), (8)

26. This school should have a program that is dynamic and forward looking. (1), (4), (5), (7), (8)
27. This school should be one in which the staff, the administration, and the community are willing to cooperate in making the school a situation sharing the dual function of providing desirable experiences for prospective teachers. (1), (2), (4), (8)
28. The program of the school should make real provision for individual differences. (1), (2), (4), (8)
29. The program of the school should be responsive to changes which are suggested by new knowledge. (4), (5)
30. The school should be involved in continual improvement of the curriculum. (1), (4), (7)
31. A harmonious professional relationship should exist. (1), (4), (5), (7)
32. The school should provide services such as salary schedule, sick leave, and professional library for its staff. (1), (2), (4), (5), (7)
33. Guidance and counseling services should be provided as part of the school program. (4),(5)
34. A planned program of intelligence and achievement testing should be in operation in the off-campus school. (4)
35. The local board of education should be willing to spend time and energy to facilitate the student teaching program. (1), (2), (4), (5), (8)

36. The local board administrative staff should be willing to spend time and energy to facilitate the student teaching program. (1), (2), (4), (5), (8)
37. There should be an operating budget which allows for acquisition and maintenance of desirable equipment and supplies for a well-rounded program. (1), (2), (4)
38. There should be several qualified supervising teachers available in the off-campus school in addition to the one or ones already cooperating. (1), (2), (3)
39. Salaries of teachers in a cooperating school should be adequate to attract the best teachers available. (1), (4), (5)
40. The cooperating school should be adequately staffed. (1), (2)
41. Schools should possess both educational outlook and procedures which are generally in harmony with those of the college. (1), (2), (5)
42. The situation in the school is conducive to high quality learning experiences for all concerned. (1), (2)
43. Systems chosen should include grades one through twelve, all of which are available for laboratory experiences. (1), (2), (4)
44. Local boards of education and administrators should be in hearty sympathy with the aims and objectives of the program. (1), (2), (3)

45. Schools selected should have relatively varied curricular offerings, good professional libraries, a wide selection of instructional materials, suitable facilities for seminar meetings and sufficient local resources to provide students with high quality experiences in the community. (1), (2), (3)
46. Teachers and administrators are willing and available to work with student teachers. (1), (4), (5)
47. Staff must be competent in terms of professional preparation, years of experience, and excellence in teaching. (1), (2), (3), (5)
48. Staff should be interested in and have the ability to work with student teachers. (1), (4), (5), (7), (8)
49. The center must be able to provide adequately for at least four student teachers. (4)
50. The principal must be professionally minded and willing to cooperate fully in the program. (4)
51. The philosophy of the school center must be progressive and forward looking. (1), (4), (5)
52. The faculty must show evidence of professional growth, professional planning and professional cooperation. (1), (2), (3)
53. The school center must rate at least satisfactory or better on facilities, such as, school plant, equipment, etc. (4)

54. The community must afford good living conditions for student teachers, as well as at least minimum resources and those certain community activities usually used by the school. (1), (2), (3)

55. The cooperating centers can be used continuously, that is, year after year. (1), (2), (4), (8)

56. The program of the cooperating school should provide opportunities for student teachers to meet and work harmoniously with parents. (1), (2), (4), (5)

STATEMENTS WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR EVALUATION

The Selection of Supervising Teachers

1. The supervising teacher in off-campus schools should be qualified by preparation for the highest ranking permanent, professional certificate available for his field or level in that state. (1), (2), (3), (6), (7), (9)
2. Each laboratory teacher qualifies as a child specialist, a master teacher of children, and a master teacher in guiding another into the art of teaching through studying and participating in teacher learner situations. (6)
3. The supervising teacher should have a minimum of preparation for teaching including the Bachelor's Degree and preferably the Master's Degree. (1), (2), (7), (8)
4. The supervising teacher should hold at least the professional four-year certificate in the area in which the apprentice is training. (9)
5. The supervising teacher should have a four-year degree and a standard certificate. (9)
6. The supervising teacher in off-campus schools should have two or more years of teaching experience. (4), (5)

7. The supervising teacher in off-campus schools should have had three or four years of successful teaching experience, preferably in that particular state. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6)
8. The supervising teacher should have at least one year's teaching experience in that field. (9)
9. The supervising teacher should have a minimum of three years of successful classroom teaching. (1) (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8)
10. The supervising teacher in off-campus schools should possess qualities which are essential to good supervision, such as practical insight into inter-personal relations, deep understanding of social structure, and a wide and varied cultural background. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5)
11. The supervising teacher should have a positive professional attitude and a real liking and respect for teaching. (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), (7)
12. The supervising teacher should be a responsible and willing participant in affairs of the school. (1), (2), (3), (4), (7)
13. The supervising teacher is basically a learner, striving always to improve his ability to carry out his tasks. (4), (6)
14. The supervising teacher perceives the opportunity to work with future teachers as a professional responsibility.

one which he is glad to have a chance to assume. (1), (5), (7), (9)

15. The supervising teacher is attractive because of his scope of interests, the wholesome way in which he meets his problems, his participating in community activities, and his zest for living and working. (7), (8)
16. The supervising teacher should be able to deal with basic principles of learning and teaching and verbalize these in working with a novice. (6), (7)
17. The supervising teacher should work effectively with another adult in classroom, and should be able to share rewards and joys as well as problems with other persons, and should be able to teach through another person. (3), (4), (6), (7)
18. The supervising teacher should be competent in his understanding of the college student and his ability to guide that student in working with children. (1), (5), (7), (9)
19. The supervising teacher shows evidence of genuine professional growth, such as a positive professional attitude and a real liking for it, is a responsible and willing participant in the affairs of the school, works harmoniously with others, and takes advantage of opportunities to improve through in-service training, course work, workshops, conferences or he should have personal

qualities that exemplify sound professional attitudes. (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), (8)

20. The supervising teacher should demonstrate and analyze basic principles of teaching and learning. (4)
21. The supervising teacher is willing to work with student teacher to give the time and effort necessary, and to focus on the student teacher as a learner, a student of teaching. (1), (4), (6), (9)
22. The supervising teacher has a vision and enthusiasm of the profession, is able to provide a wide variety of experiences, and will share the student teaching experience with the student teacher. (5), (7), (8)
23. The supervising teacher has been selected by the proper college official in cooperation with local school authorities. Or he should be chosen by joint action of public school and college officials. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (8)
24. The supervising teacher should possess good health; be optimistic and emotionally well balanced; have a pleasing personality. (6), (9)
25. The supervising teacher should be regularly employed in an accredited public school or should have full teaching assignment. (1), (2), (3), (6), (7), (8)
26. The supervising teacher should be desirous of rendering acceptable service to the pupils, intern, college, State

Department of Education, and profession during the internship period. (4), (5), (8), (9)

27. The supervising teacher should possess additional skill and understandings. (8), (9)

28. The supervising teacher should consider individual differences of pupils in selecting, planning, and conducting learning experiences. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (9)

29. The supervising teacher should integrate instructional activities with other subject matter areas of the pupils whenever possible. (1), (4)

30. The supervising teacher should provide pupils in the off-campus school an opportunity to participate in planning their learning activities. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7)

31. The supervising teacher should believe that evaluation should be an integral part of the teaching-learning activity. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (7), (8)

32. The supervising teacher should allow pupils to participate in the evaluation of their own learning achievement. (4)

33. The supervising teacher should use the results of evaluation as a basis for planning further instruction. (4)

34. The supervising teacher should provide for individual differences and needs of student teachers. (1), (2), (3), (4), (8)

35. The supervising teacher should be a competent teacher and an understanding supervisor, who gladly accepts the assignment. (1), (2), (3), (4), (9)

36. Supervising teachers should be superior, willing and eager to work with student teachers. (1), (2), (3), (4), (8), (9)

37. The supervising teacher should have at least three years of teaching experience. (1) (2), (3), (7), (8)

38. The supervising teacher should be mutually acceptable to the local school and the college. (9)

39. The supervising teacher should have a minimum of three years of successful classroom teaching in the district; however, exceptionally able teachers with less experience may be considered. (1), (2), (3), (4), (6)

40. The supervising teacher should have preparation for teaching to include a Bachelor's Degree, preferably a Master's Degree, and a regular teaching certificate. (1) (2), (3), (6), (9)

41. The supervising teacher should show genuine professional interest and growth evidenced by: (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), (8), (9)

    a. A positive professional attitude and a real liking for teaching;

    b. Responsible and cooperative participation in the affairs of the school;

c. Self-improvement through in-service education, course work, workshops, and conferences.

42. The supervising teacher should understand and can demonstrate application of basic principles of effective teaching and learning. (1), (2), (3), (4), (6)

43. The supervising teacher is willing and able to guide the progress of the student teacher. (1), (2), (3), (6)

44. The supervising teacher should provide the time and effort necessary for conferences with the student teacher and the college supervisor. (1), (2), (3), (6)

45. The supervising teacher should have the courage to give a frank evaluation to the student teacher and to those who share the responsibility for his experience. (1), (2), (3), (6)

46. The supervising teacher should exhibit a high level of professional ethics. (1), (2), (6)

47. The supervising teacher should be willing to provide the student teacher with varied experiences consistent with the stated objectives of the participating college. (1), (2), (3), (4), (6)

48. The supervising teacher should be willing to share the classroom experience with the student teacher and to give him complete responsibility for a period of time. (1), (2), (4), (6)

49. The supervising teacher should possess physical and mental health, vitality, and self-confidence sufficient

to enable him to assume this added responsibility. (1), (2), (3), (6)

APPENDIX B

CRITERIA

Administration of Off-Campus Student Teaching Program

Criterion 1.--Local boards of education should expend time and energy to facilitate the student teaching program.

Criterion 2.--Supervising teachers should be selected jointly by principal and college official.

Criterion 3.--The cooperating school should be selected by the person in charge of the off-campus student teaching program in the teacher-education institutions in which the student teachers are enrolled.

Criterion 4.--The cooperating school should be used continuously, that is, year after year.

Criterion 5.--The cooperating school system should include grades 1-12, all of which are available for laboratory experiences.

Selection of Supervising Teachers

Professional and Personal Characteristics

Criterion 6.--The supervising teacher should be qualified by preparation for the highest permanent professional certificate available for his field or level in the state.

Criterion 7.--The supervising teacher should have a minimum of three years with regular assignments.

Criterion 8.--The supervising teacher should be bona fide, full-time with regular assignments.

Criterion 9.--The supervising teacher should be willing and able to guide the program of student teacher.

Criterion 10.--The supervising teacher should show evidence of professional growth, taking advantage of opportunities to improve through in-service training, course work, and conferences.

Criterion 11.--The supervising teacher should possess physical and mental health, vitality, and self-confidence sufficient to enable him to assume this added responsibility.

Criterion 12.--The supervising teacher should possess qualities which are essential to the good supervision, such as practical insight into inter-personal backgrounds, deep understanding of the social structure and a wide cultural background.

Professional Activities

Criterion 13.--The supervising teacher should be competent in his understanding of the college student and his ability to guide that student in working with children.

Criterion 14.--The supervising teacher should exhibit a high level of professional ethics.

Criterion 15.--The supervising teacher should understand and demonstrate application of basic principles of effective teaching and learning.

Criterion 16.--The supervising teacher should provide for individual differences and needs of students.

Criterion 17.--The supervising teacher should have courage to give a frank evaluation of the student teacher and to those who share the responsibility for his experience.

Criterion 18.--The supervising teacher should be willing to provide the student with varied experiences consistent with the stated objectives for his experience.

Criterion 19.--The supervising teacher shares the classroom with a student teacher and gives him complete responsibility for a period of time.

Selection of Cooperating Schools

The Staff and Program

Criterion 20.--The administrative staff and teacher of the cooperating school should fully understand the student teaching program and be willing to have student teachers as part of the school and be willing to provide experience of quality in order to make a strong contribution to the success of the student teaching field.

Criterion 21.--The staff of the cooperating school should be alert and constantly engaged in improving its educational program and contributing to the development of children and youth.

Criterion 22.--The staff of the cooperating schools should be qualified as a supervising teacher even though they do not supervise.

Criterion 23.--The curriculum should be varied in their curricular offerings, good professional libraries, wide selection of materials, sufficient local resources to provide the student with quality experiences in the school and community.

Criterion 24.--The program of the cooperating school should make real provisions for individual differences.

Criterion 25.--The philosophy and practice of the cooperating school should closely approximate those advocated by the teacher-education institution.

Criterion 26.--Student teachers should have the privileges similar to members of the staff such as, an opportunity to participate in faculty meetings, committees, extra-curricular activities, curriculum revision and similar activities.

Criterion 27.--The program of the cooperating school should provide opportunities for the student teachers to meet and work harmoniously with parents.

The School

Criterion 28.--The cooperating school should have over-all quality as determined by the curriculum standards of local or regional accrediting agencies, professional preparation of staff, and experience of staff and staff turn-over.

Criterion 29.--The school plant and equipment and other facilities used for professional laboratory experiences should be of such quality as to meet the curriculum needs of pupils with whom the student teacher will come in contact.

Criterion 30.--The cooperating school should be close enough to the college campus to make travel between the school and the college easily possible for students, their cooperating teachers, and the college supervisors working with them.

Criterion 31.--The cooperating school should provide services such as, salary schedule, and sick leave.

Criterion 32.--Salaries for teachers in the cooperating school should be adequate to attract the best teachers available.

Criterion 33.--The cooperating school should have an operating budget which allows for acquisition and maintenance of desirable equipment, research and supplies for a well-rounded program.

Criterion 34.--The community from which the school draws population should be interested in its school.

Criterion 35.--The community should afford adequate living facilities for the student teachers.

Criterion 36.--The community should be representative of different socio-economic levels.

APPENDIX C

THE SELECTION OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS

INTERVIEW FORM FOR USE WITH COLLEGE PERSONNEL

PART I

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of your institutions_____

2. Name and title of person making report_____

_____

3. Duties of person making report:

4. Total enrollment in teacher education program September, 1963-May, 1964_____ Elementary_____Secondary_____

5. Total number of student teachers in elementary education September, 1963-May, 1964_____ Number each semester: First_____ Second_____ or Number each quarter: Fall_____ Winter_____ Spring_____

6. Number of student teachers you supervised September, 1963-May, 1964_____ Number each semester: First_____ Second_____ or Number each quarter: Fall_____ Winter_____ Spring_____

7. Names and addresses of schools used in September, 1963-May, 1964: Total number_____ (Check any campus or non-public schools)

a.

b.

c.

d.

e.

(Complete list on back of sheet)

8. Indicate distance (in miles) to schools used for student teaching from teacher training institution, 1963-1964.

   Shortest_____ Longest_____

9. If the student does his teaching in a community other than the one in which the teacher training institution is located, is he required to live in the community?

   Yes_____ No_____ Does not apply_____

10. Time student teachers spend in schools:

    a. Hours per day_____

    b. Number of weeks per: Quarter_____ Semester_____ Year_____

    c. Comments

11. Credit hours:

    a. Hours credit for student teaching per: Quarter_____ Semester_____ Year_____

    b. Total maximum hours which a student is permitted to carry while student teaching: Quarter_____ Semester_____

    c. Comments

12. Who assumes the responsibility for student teacher placement?

13. Total number of student teachers that may be assigned to any one supervising teacher: Quarter_____ Semester_____ Year_____

14. Do the supervising teachers receive any special recognition or privileges? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, explain. Comment.

15. Is any remuneration made to cooperating teachers and/or cooperating schools? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, explain of comment.

16. How are policies related to student teaching made? Explain or comment.

PART II

SELECTION OF SUPERVISING TEACHERS

A. Professional Preparation

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice (informally established, but well understood) in regard to:

1. Degree requirement for supervising teachers?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

2. Certification of supervising teachers?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

B. Professional Experience and Assignment

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. Professional experience requirement for supervising teachers?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

2. Professional assignment[1] requirement for supervising teachers?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

C. Personal Characteristics

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. Personal characteristics required of supervising teachers?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

---

[1]Regular employment, full time, etc.

If this question is not answered negatively, list characteristics which you expect supervising teachers to have: (Rate significance)

2. The determination[1] of the personal characteristics of supervising teachers:
   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____
   Explanations and Comments

D. Professional Activities and Characteristics

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. Professional activities and characteristics[2] required of supervising teachers?
   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____
   Explanations and Comments

   If this question is not answered negatively, list professional activities and characteristics which you expect supervising teachers to have: (Rate significance)

---

[1]Individuals responsible for making evaluation, rating devices, etc.

[2]Such as membership in organizations, leadership roles, community service, etc.

2. The determination of professional characteristics and activities of supervising teachers?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

E. Instructional Skills

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. Instructional skill requirement for supervising teachers?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

   If this question is not answered negatively, list skills you require of supervising teachers: (Rate significance)

2. The evaluation[1] of instructional skills of supervising teachers?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

---

[1]Individual responsible for making evaluation, rating devices, etc.

PART III

SELECTION OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS

F. Characteristics of Cooperating School's Teachers

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. Characteristics required of cooperating school's teachers?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

   If this question is not answered negatively, list characteristics which you expect cooperating schools to have: (Rate significance)

2. The determination of the characteristics of the co-operating school teachers?[1]

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

G. Characteristics of the Cooperating School Principal

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

---

[1]Individual responsible for making evaluation, rating devices, etc.

1. Characteristics required of the cooperating school principal?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

   If this question is not answered negatively, list the characteristics which you expect the cooperating principal to have: (Rate significance).

2. The determination of characteristics for cooperating school principal?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

H. Curriculum and Instruction Procedures

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. Curriculum requirement of the cooperating school?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

   If this question is not answered negatively, list requirements:

2. Instructional practices required of cooperating school?

Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

Explanations and Comments

If this question is not answered negatively, list practices:

3. Consistency of practices and philosophy required of cooperating school?

Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

Explanations and Comments

I. Facilities Desired in Cooperating School's Plant

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. Instructional equipment and materials requirement for cooperating school?

Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

Explanation and Comments

If this question is not answered negatively, list criteria:

2. Physical characteristics requirement of the cooperating school?

Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

Explanations and Comments

3. Distance the cooperating school is from the college campus?

Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

Explanation and Comments

J. Services Available to Cooperating School

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. The type of services required in cooperating school?[1]

Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

Explanations and Comments

If this question is not answered negatively, list services:

2. The determination of services[2] you expect the cooperating school to provide?

Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

Explanations and Comments

---

[1]Services, such as, sick leave, salary schedule, professional library for staff, etc.

[2]Individuals responsible for making evaluations, rating devices, etc.

K. Participation[1] of Student Teachers

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. The kinds of participation provided for student teachers in cooperating school?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

   If this question is not answered negatively, list participation:

2. Student teachers contacts with parents requirement in cooperating school?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

L. Accreditation of Cooperating School

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. The accreditation of the cooperating school?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

---

[1]Privileges similar to members of the staff such as opportunity to participate in faculty meetings, committees, extra-curricular activities, curriculum revision, etc.

M. Cooperating School's Community

Do you have a definite policy or a consistent practice in regard to:

1. Special characteristics you expect the community to have?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

   If this question is not answered negatively, list the characteristics:

2. The determination of these characteristics?[1]

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

PART IV

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

N. The Administration of the Program

Do you have a definite policy or consistent practice in regard to:

1. Securing the understanding of boards of education?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

---

[1]Individual responsible for making evaluation, rating devices, etc.

Explanations and Comments

2. Procedure followed in selection of cooperating school?[1]

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

3. Procedure followed in selection of supervising teachers?[2]

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

4. Any requirement for the school system as a whole?

   Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

   Explanations and Comments

   If this question is not answered negatively, list requirements:

---

[1]Responsibility for selection, time of year, etc.

[2]Responsibility for selection, time of year, etc.

5. Any requirements for continuity[1] in use of cooperating school?

Definite Policy_____ Consistent Practice_____ No_____

Explanations and Comments

---

[1]School used as cooperating school continuously, that is, year after year.

THE SELECTION OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS

INTERVIEW FORM FOR USE WITH PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

PART I

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of cooperating school_____
2. Name of principal_____
3. Name of participating college_____
4. Total number of teachers currently employed in your school_____
5. Total number of supervising teachers currently employed in your school_____
6. Number of supervising teachers in your school September, 1963-May, 1964_____ Number each semester: First_____ Second_____ Or Quarter: Fall_____ Winter_____ Spring_____
7. Total number student teachers in your school September, 1963-May, 1964_____ Number each semester: First_____ Second_____ Or Quarter: Fall_____ Winter_____ Spring_____
8. Total number of student teachers that may be assigned to any one supervising teacher: Quarter_____ Semester_____ Year_____

9. Time student teachers spend in your school:

   a. Hours per day_____

   b. Number of weeks per: Quarter_____ Semester_____ Year_____

10. Indicate distance in miles your school is from college in which student teachers are enrolled_____

11. Do student teachers live in the community where they do student teaching? Yes_____ No_____

12. Describe procedure followed in making student teacher assignments.

PART II

SUPERVISING TEACHER

A. Professional Preparation

1. Indicate professional preparation of supervising teacher

Teacher*	Highest Degree	Certificate

B. Experience and Assignment

1. Indicate experience and assignment of supervising teacher

Teacher*	Total Years Experience	Full-time Employment		Current Assignment
		Yes	No	

* May be identified by number.

C. to E. Rating of Supervising Teachers*

Teacher**	Personal Characteristics		Professional Characteristics and Activities				Instructional Skill				
	Physical and Mental Health	Supervisory Insight	Guidance of Student Teacher	Understanding of College Student	Continuous Professional Growth	High Professional Ethics	Effective Teaching	Provision for Individual Differences	Frank Evaluation	Provision for Varied Experiences	Assignment of Responsibility to Student Teachers

* Supervising Teachers are rated as: Strong, Good, and Weak.

** May be identified by number.

PART III

COOPERATING SCHOOLS

	W	G	S*
F. Characteristics of Faculty of Cooperating Schools (Rate the characteristics of the faculty as a whole)			
1. Understanding of the student teaching program			
2. Constantly engaged in improving its educational program			
3. Professional preparation of faculty			
G. Curriculum and Instruction Procedures (Rate curriculum and instructional procedures of cooperating school)			
1. Provides variety of experiences for student teachers			
2. Provision for individual differences			
3. Provision for students to work with parents			
4. Philosophy and practices relate to those of college			

* Strong--Strong or principle is consistently followed
Good--Good or principles is generally but not consistently followed
Weak--Weak or principle is violated

	W	G	S
H. Facilities in Cooperating School			
(Rate facilities of cooperating school)			
1. School plant, equipment and other facilities meet needs of pupils.			
2. Close enough to college campus to make travel easily possible for all concerned with student teaching.			
I. Services Available to Cooperating School			
(Rate services of cooperating school)			
1. Provision for sick leave Professional library Salary schedule			
2. Teachers' salaries			
3. Allotment for operating budget			
J. Participation of Student Teachers (Rate participation of student teachers in school program)			
1. Student teachers' opportunity for participation in total school program			
K. Accreditation of Cooperating School			
(Rate accreditation of cooperating school)			
1. Rating by accrediting agencies			
Agency_____or no			
Accreditation sought_____			

L. Community

W	G	S

(Rate the cooperating school community)

1. Interest in its school
2. Living conditions for student teachers
3. Representative of different socio-economic levels

PART IV

ADMINISTRATION OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

M. The Administration of the School Program (Rate the administrative practices of cooperating school)

	W	G	S
1. Understanding of student teaching program and cooperation of boards of education			
2. Selection of supervising teacher by college official and principal working together			
3. Selection of school by persons in charge of off-campus teaching			
4. Continuity of use of cooperating school			
5. Availability of whole system for laboratory experiences			

APPENDIX D

DIRECTIONS FOR RATING A COLLEGE PROGRAM

The student teaching program of a college is given two sets of ratings. One set is based on information furnished by the director of student teaching. The other is based on information furnished by all cooperating principals interviewed. (See interview forms)

The same instrument is used for recording both sets of ratings; but two copies of the instrument are used, one for each set of ratings.

The bases for evaluative ratings are given below.

Strong (S): A program is rated "strong" if the director of student teaching of the college reports that policies in harmony with the criteria have been established and are fully implemented.

--or--

A program is rated "strong" if it can be objectively established that all cooperating schools meet the criteria or if information furnished by the principals indicates that all cooperating schools completely comply with the criteria.

Acceptable (A): A program is rated "acceptable" if the director of student teaching reports that the principle implied by the criteria has been recognized and is of concern to the college personnel but that the principle has been only partially implemented.

--or--

A program is rated "acceptable" if any situation fails to meet the criteria completely and if such failure is reported as an exception to general practice by the principal or if information furnished by principals indicates that the specific aspect of the program should be evaluated as "good".

Unsatisfactory (U): A program is rated "unsatisfactory" if the director of student teaching indicates there has been no implementation of the principle implied by the criteria.

--or--

A program is rated "unsatisfactory" if any school fails to meet the criteria without adequate explanation or if the information furnished by principals indicates that the specific aspect of the program should be evaluated as "weak".

CHECK SHEET

College_____ Name_____

Date_____ Position_____

	U	A	S
Administration of Off-Campus Student Teaching			
1. Understanding of student teaching program by board of education			
2. Selection of cooperating school by person in charge of off-campus teaching			
3. Selection of supervising teacher by college official and principal working together			
4. Continuity of use of cooperating school			
5. Availability of the whole system for laboratory experiences			
Selection of Supervising Teacher Professional and Personal Characteristics			
6. Highest certificate			
7. Three years teaching experience			
8. Full time, regular assignments			
9. Willingness to guide the student			
10. Continuous professional growth			
11. Physical and mental health			
12. Supervisory insight			
Professional Activities			
13. Understanding of the college student			
14. High professional ethics			

	U	A	S
15. Effective teaching			
16. Provision for individual differences			
17. Frank evaluation			
18. Provision for varied experiences			
19. Assignment of responsibility to student teacher			
Selection of Cooperating Schools			
Staff and Program			
20. Staff understands the student teaching program			
21. Staff is engaged in improving its program			
22. Staff is well-qualified			
23. Curriculum offerings are varied			
24. Provisions for individual differences			
25. Philosophy related to teacher-education institutions			
26. Student teachers participate in school program			
27. Provisions for students to work with parents			
The School			
28. Determination of accreditation by accrediting agencies			
29. School plant and facilities meet the needs of the pupils			
30. School is close enough to the college to make travel easily possible			
31. Provisions for services such as salary schedule, etc.			

	U	A	S
32. Salaries are adequate			
33. School has operating budget			
34. Community is interested in the school			
35. Community affords adequate living conditions			
36. Representative of different socio-economic levels			