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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the years there has been a growing awareness of the public school's responsibility for the laboratory phases of teacher education. Recently this concern has brought about the emergence of a central office position which will in this study be labeled as the Professional Teacher Educator in the Public School. On the other hand, a review of the literature supports the conclusion that the assumption of responsibility for teacher education by public school personnel has up to now been in a rather primitive state of development.

In the past, that portion of the role of the public school administrator which included some responsibility for teacher education has, in most cases, been acting essentially as a mere expediter of administrative minutiae. This role was conceived to center on such activities as: mechanically distributing the student teacher assignments among certified personnel according to a predetermined university or school formula, the projection of student teaching placements, protecting stacks of moldy records, and occasionally arbitrating an emotion-laden knotty problem. These deadening exercises
constituted assigned specific administrative responsibilities for teacher education activities in public schools, usually delegated to some central office staff person.

The dearth of models or guidelines for the creation of this role has initiated a myriad of responses to the demand for improved teacher education. Some states have made progress toward creating a viable partnership between teacher training institutions (traditionally solely responsible for teacher education) and the public schools (formerly considered to fulfill their responsibility by providing a learning laboratory for teachers). Other states have varied their programs but little over a thirty-year span, and have exercised no leadership to assist school systems in meeting new demands and challenges. As a consequence of this inadequate state leadership, public schools and colleges often have been carrying on essentially a holding action with this important laboratory aspect of teacher education.

Many forces have provided some impetus for change in the educational arena. Mass media with its emphasis on the value of education, the increased general educational level of citizens, legislation, international and social issues have all contributed to the awareness of the increased range of tasks for the schools. One concurrent activity that has increasingly involved public schools has been teacher education. Since 1945 the move to more extensive utilization of the public school for professional laboratory experiences,
especially student teaching, has increased at a phenomenal rate. ¹

Education has been delegated as a state function by the federal constitution. With these powers, states have exercised certain controls and delegated others. Teacher education, with certification policies retained by the state, has not, however, been the recipient of extensive financial support. This lack of state funding has created a most trying position for teacher education. State policies and standards outline the requirements for student teaching as well as certification but do not provide appropriations to support ongoing student teaching programs, upgrade the quality of the teacher education laboratory, or add personnel to meet the increased demands for such facilities. The fact that teacher education involves state departments, colleges, and schools further complicates an already hazy financial picture. Conant in his book, The Education of American Teachers, has a definite recommendation on support for the laboratory phase of teacher education. "The state should provide financial assistance to local boards to insure high-quality practice teaching as part of the preparation of teachers enrolled in either private or public institutions."² Andrews writing on this topic in an article entitled,


"Prospects and Priorities for State and Federal Aid for Student Teaching," for the 1965 Association for Student Teaching Yearbook had this to say:

Student teaching is now a cooperative enterprise carried on in two separate institutions—schools and colleges, with separate lines of authority and separate sources of support. Looking at the present situation analytically, it is little wonder that neither type of institution has been able to find adequate financial support for this joint enterprise. 3

Funding either from local, state, or federal sources, however, remains a pivotal issue in the creation of viable field experience programs to meet today's challenges.

Conventional teacher education programs with disjointed, autonomous approaches of colleges and schools have generated many separate and unrelated efforts to foster change. Recently, due to many forces, there has emerged in various areas much concern to establish a true partnership in this relationship between public schools and colleges to improve the field experience phase of teacher education. Encouragement in the form of authorization for federal support for certain teacher education activities appears in the law known as the "Education Professions Development Act." This act is intended to provide states and local school systems with funds with which to

recruit and train teachers on an emergency basis, as well as to support several other types of professional preparation of personnel for teaching. Determinations of the request for funds will depend upon the evaluation the EPDA makes of the proposal. This program if fully funded may, for example, provide professional educators with some resources for change and improvement in teacher education, and conceivably in this critical area of joint responsibility for the laboratory phases of teacher education.

Placed on a continuum, the laboratory phase of teacher education programs nationwide vary from well-conceived, functionally-organized, jointly-funded, viable partnerships to haphazard, capricious, irresponsible programs with attitudes of the principal participants ranging from effective cooperation to open conflict.

The future and, for that matter, many of the present teacher education programs look much more demanding and involved than the simpler patterns of decades gone by. This hugh national task demands leadership and conceptual skills that will foster the wise use of the combined resources of schools, colleges, and state governments. The challenges demand the ability to plan, coordinate, delegate, innovate, and evaluate. It would be hoped that professionals possessing these skills can be instrumental in carving out the multifaced future

---

role of the teacher educator in the public school, as one of the key figures in this evolving process.

Responsible institutions must now find a common ground for professional educators to unify their efforts to improve teacher education. Is it possible for professional teachers to respond to a new role that might provide the impetus for change in teacher education? Have professional educators achieved the degree of maturity that will enable teachers to respect the well-founded proposal of the practitioner as well as that of the theoretician? Direction must be based upon a melding of study, research, cooperation, and experience. These goals and objectives are dependent upon a unified thrust of professionals in their quest for improved teacher education. Such a plan of action demands the assumption of new roles and responsibilities. Key concepts center around cooperative planning, programming, funding, and evaluation in this merger of public school and college resources.

A review of educational research in The Journal of Teacher Education 1964-68 and The Association for Student Teaching Yearbooks 1964-68 revealed no direct reference to a public school professional charged directly with coordinating responsibilities for teacher education functions taking place in public schools.

The partnership concept is examined extensively, on a theoretical basis but seldom discussed in terms of public school
involvement. Reference is made to the need for new roles and extended responsibilities of public school personnel, but little is found in the literature to structure these suggested innovations.

The foregoing is a brief description of one perspective on teacher education today. Instead of attempting a generalized analysis of the complex totality, efforts in this study will be concentrated on a detailed inquiry into the role of the professional teacher educator who has responsibility for administering, directing or coordinating teacher education in the public school. The role of this emerging position varies in importance from a full-time central office appointment to a part-time assignment added to other responsibilities.

Statement of the Problem

Defining the emerging role of the teacher educator in the public school is complicated due to: (1) conflicting concepts of the nature of a relatively new position; (2) the lack of clear-cut organization, authority, and support for the field experience phase of teacher education; and (3) a scarcity of models from which to draw suggested functions.

Traditionally, teacher education has been considered the exclusive domain of higher education institutions. The campus laboratory school associated with and controlled by the college (chiefly teachers colleges and some universities) provided and generally served adequately as a laboratory for teacher-education experiences.
until after World War II. Today there is observable progress in various places toward improved cooperative arrangements for the use of public schools as laboratories for teacher education. Partnerships involving schools, colleges, state and federal departments, and professional organizations, represent a higher level of collaborative effort that seems essential as a basis for improving the laboratory phase of teacher education.

The problem of role definition becomes clouded as perspectives from the various involved institutions are examined. The traditional approach to teacher education, witnessed by the pre-packaged college program, provided limited field experiences concentrated at the end of a four-year degree program. The public school professional charged with some responsibility in relation to the laboratory phases of teacher education in his system was delegated the task of coordinating certain phases of pre-structured arrangements from some college curriculum. With a history of this level of involvement, the role of the teacher educator in the public schools varied greatly, and the position was seldom one of importance, either in prestige or effectiveness.

Many public school officials have tended to become irritated by this pattern of unequal status. More recently some public school administrators have been moving to become participating team members, and have assumed more responsible roles in decision making
in teacher education. As an example, the Dallas, Texas school system recently took action to stop accepting pay in any form for teacher education services. Another example of an activity in teacher education sponsored by public schools is a part of Education Professions Development Act (EPDA). This act permits a school system, on a pilot basis, to conduct a full certification program entirely within its own schools.

Indications of apparent change in the public school's concern for teacher education is given emphasis by the appointment in numerous school systems of a teacher educator to a central office position. For instance, here in Ohio both the Dayton and Columbus school systems recently took this action.

The many examples of such changes support the position that a study of the evolving responsibilities and roles related to activities of teacher education in public schools should be made. A clear picture of these innovations and their implications should be available to the leaders of all concerned institutions, schools, colleges, and state departments.

After the present status of the evolving position of the public school teacher educator is determined, then the question may be raised as to the functions which are being delegated to such a central staff person. It could be assumed that such aspects as administration, coordination, research and development, and evaluation need
exploration. Is the role of the teacher educator in the public schools to be concerned primarily with one or a combination of these functions?

If one were to examine only the administrative functions of operating teacher education in a public school one might expect to find the role chiefly that of coordinating activities. In this case the policies and regulations would presumably be imposed from an outside agency, colleges, or by the Board of Education based on the recommendations of central office personnel. This level of operation, by itself, negates many functions normally associated with collaborative educational leadership. A coordinating role in this instance may be assumed to be primarily one of acting as an intermediary between two or more separate operations. Not only is the position difficult, it may add only another layer of bureaucratic paper shuffling.

One function that, regardless of role conception, would be of genuine concern to teachers as well as to college supervisors is the placement of student teachers. This activity provides an example of a service that can be examined from several different perspectives.

Investigating this process from the point of view of the coordinative function only, there are "X" number of student teachers to be placed with "X" number of cooperating teachers. This becomes purely a mechanical process that could be handled more rapidly and efficiently through computerization. On the other hand, the professional teacher educator presumably would see the placement process
as a professional opportunity to place students individually with competent cooperating teachers. Consideration would be given to such factors as background, training, experience, location, schedule, and the needs of both student and teacher.

The interrelationship of responsibilities for programs in teacher education with authority based upon collaborative efforts between schools and colleges is another problem that needs to be examined. What, for example, will be the reaction of college officials to proposed alterations in a college program when some real responsibilities for improving the design of a teacher education curriculum rest upon officials in another institution, the public schools? Will there be reluctance expressed by college personnel when the issue demands extensive collaboration with professionals from the public school? What role then will the public school teacher educator believe he should have in the development, supervision, modification, or evaluation of the program, or what role will college officials think he should carry?

Basically, then this study centers on sharpening and defining the emerging role of the teacher educator in the public school. In practice the role has been fulfilled to a degree in isolated instances, but teacher education is too important to leave to chance. Both schools and colleges have been challenged with the demands of many professional personnel who believe that collaboration and cooperation
of leaders in both institutions are essential to improved teacher education programs.

This investigation will center on three pertinent questions regarding the role of the teacher educator in the public school. What is the present status of the teacher educator in the large city school systems in the United States? What are the varying concepts that the professionals hold about the functions of this role? What are the functions which are deemed important to the role of the public school teacher educator?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine, by means of a direct inquiry, the role of the public school teacher educator in the field experience phase of teacher education. Results to be compiled from the investigation will be utilized to determine the present status of the teacher educator, to ascertain functions of the position, and to develop guidelines for the role. This survey is confined to school systems in the United States of 25,000 or more pupil enrollment. A compilation of the positions created by the public schools designed to carry some of the function of a teacher educator will be used as an indication of the present development of this role.

In designing the instruments to secure data from both public school and college personnel, a major objective is to ascertain
functions of the public school teacher educator, both as the role is presently conceived and in a projected view of what the role may become. The findings secured from the public schools will be compared to the findings from a jury of recognized college experts in the field. Another perspective of the public school teacher educator's role will be examined by conducting a review of recent publications from state departments and professional organizations.

Data from this study should be useful to the profession in determining (1) the present stage in the development of this teacher education role, (2) the emerging direction of the process, and (3) potential coordinating functions associated with the role of teacher educator in the public schools.

**Procedures**

1. A one-page inquiry regarding the designated central office public-school official now delegated teacher education responsibilities, was mailed to the office of the superintendent of each school system in the United States enrolling 25,000 or more pupils. This instrument:

   (a) Briefly described the purpose of the study

   (b) Requested the name, title, and address of the professional official responsible for teacher education.

   (c) Requested the completion of a check list of
responsibilities for which the teacher educator is accountable, as seen by the chief administrator or one of his subordinates.

2. A questionnaire was designed for submission to the designated teacher educators in these public school systems of over 25,000 enrollment. This instrument was intended to determine the present status of public school teacher educators and their views of their role as projected into the future.

3. This questionnaire was subjected to a trial run by securing the reactions of twelve public school administrators with assigned responsibilities for teacher education. Using the suggestions received, the form was revised.

4. The revised questionnaire was mailed to teacher educators designated by the superintendents of school systems in the United States with a pupil population of 25,000 plus.

5. The results from this questionnaire were tabulated on the basis of most-frequently-indicated to least-frequently-indicated functions.

6. Another instrument was developed, field tested and mailed to recognized college leaders of long experience in the field of laboratory experiences for prospective teachers. These designated college educators were chosen to serve as a professional jury. This instrument was designed to secure the judgment of the jury on the
present status of the public school teacher educator, and their views as to projected desirable directions for the development of this suggested role. After their views were tabulated, a comparison was made with those held by the professional teacher educators in the public schools.

7. The tabulated results from two questionnaires were studied to identify similarities and differences in the rankings.

8. Guidelines and a role statement for the position of the public school teacher educator were developed from the functions listed most frequently by those in the position, by the jury, and from the literature.

**Definition of Terms**

1. Public school teacher educator. This professional educator is employed by the public school to a position of central office status, and has been delegated responsibilities for functions and tasks related to the school's involvement in the laboratory experience aspects of teacher education.

2. Pre-service teacher education programs. These programs involve any planned sequence of professional education courses and laboratory experiences for college students preparing to become teachers.
3. **Administrator.** A college or public school official having designated responsibilities and decision making authority—a line officer.

4. **Coordinator.** A college or public school official with assigned responsibilities in communication, administration, and evaluation. Professionals holding this title normally have limited or no line authority.

5. **Field Experience Programs.** These programs cooperatively arranged with schools and colleges are planned sequences of laboratory activities for teacher education students. These professional laboratory experiences include all those activities designed to provide sequential learning experiences for pre-service teacher education students. Included in this group of experiences would be observation, participation, and student teaching. These experiences may, in addition to school experiences, include those in community and social agencies. The latter two, however, are not under consideration in this study.

**Limitations of the Study**

1. Only limited field testing of the instruments was carried out, since they were designed only to secure factual data and opinions and the data obtained was not to be subjected to statistical treatment, but only simple tabulation. The field testing was done only to the
extent necessary to demonstrate that the instrument would produce the type of data sought.

2. Little or no allowance was made for variations in the operating practices of school systems in various parts of the country, thus giving opportunity for varying interpretations of a few questions.

3. The jury of college teacher educators was selected by identifying known leaders in the field and thus no random sampling was used.

4. School systems of less than 25,000 enrollments were not considered, although it is known that some smaller systems have designated central office staff members to the role of teacher educator.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews selected aspects of the literature in teacher education as it relates to the direct experiences of prospective teachers in public schools, college-controlled laboratory schools, and the collaborative efforts of colleges and public schools. The chapter is organized into three major sections: the first deals briefly with the historical aspects of teacher education (primarily laboratory experiences), the second section traces the expanding importance of school-college partnership in the training of teachers, and the third part deals with the public school administrator in teacher education.

A search of current research in teacher education gave little if any direct reference to the position of public school teacher educator as defined in this study. For many years central office persons in the public schools have been performing functions that coordinate the field experience phase of teacher education in varying degrees. Support for this was found in several recent state department and professional organization publications which are cited later in this chapter.

A study, "The Administration of Student Teaching in Their Secondary Schools by Large City Systems," conducted by Helen
Jewett Rogers in 1951 examined the public school's role in administering student teaching programs. \(^1\) This inquiry proved to be the only directly related piece of research found on the public school's function in the administration of student teaching. A pertinent recommendation by Rogers supports the concept of the public school teacher educator.

In order properly to administer the program, the city should provide necessary staff and facilities for this function. This will include accounting procedures by which the school district will be aware of its direct and hidden costs for the program, and will have a continuous record of numbers and placements of student teachers in its schools. In cities having large programs, a position of Director of Student Teaching should be created to provide for adequate management, coordination, and supervision of the program in city schools. \(^2\)

Additional references will be made to this study later in this chapter in the section on functions of the public school teacher educator.

The apparent void in the research pertaining to this role may be attributed to several causes. For example, the role of teacher educator has been traditionally conceived of as college position; the role has been performed as a side line by the public school educator, or the function is not designated to any professional.

A survey was conducted of three sources of professional

\[^1\text{Helen Jewett Rogers, "The Administration of Student Teaching in Their Secondary Schools by Large City Systems," Education, LXXII (January, 1952), 341-348.}\]

\[^2\text{Ibid., p. 346.}\]
teacher education studies. The three resources examined were: The Journal of Teacher Education (1954-1969), Review of Educational Research (1960-1969), and the Educational Research Information Centers (1956-1969). The search centered on titles of studies that inferred collaborative efforts of colleges and public schools or the public school teacher education function. With few exceptions, studies or articles that dealt with the position of teacher educator referred to a college function. Oblique references to this function in regard to the public school's responsibility in teacher education began to appear in the middle 1950s. A publication of the National Education Association made this clear:

The purpose of this paper is to indicate the nature of the present organization and administration in instruction of higher learning for the preparation of teachers and to post some of the problems and issues involved. There is considerable expression of opinion as to how teacher education should be organized and administered, but the research on the relationship between patterns of organization and effectiveness of the program is indeed meager. In many institutions there is almost open conflict in the division of responsibility for the preparation of teachers, and there is considerable interest in this problem throughout the country. ³

---

Teacher Education

Teacher education evolved slowly over the years in America. Prior to 1860, teaching was viewed primarily as a stepping stone to another career. Teaching was considered a job that could be performed by anyone who was knowledgeable in the "3 Rs." For example, a housewife could organize a school while tending her own children and the household. The schools became known as "dame schools" and were the beginning of a trend to label teaching as a woman's job. Ministers, merchants, tailors, and farmers also gravitated to teaching as a sideline. The demands of their primary occupation diminished the time, energy, and value that could be given to teaching.

The state of Massachusetts, a pioneer in education in America, was credited with establishing the first normal school in 1839. The primary mission of the normal school was the training of elementary school teachers. The first normal school was located in Lexington, Massachusetts, dubbed by the students as "Lexington Academy." It was interesting to note that although the name had officially been changed from "Academy" to "Normal," the program in reality was primarily that of its predecessor, the academy, and the level of instruction was equivalent to the then developing high school,

---

grades nine to twelve. Reasons reported for resisting major program modifications included: (1) the fear of domination from a foreign country, Prussia and England in particular, and (2) the general acceptance of a common educational theory as proposed by men like Pestalozzi.

The program offered by normal schools of this period centered around basic educational theory (a combination of philosophy and psychology), history of education, didactics (a course in the theory and art of teaching) and practical experience in a model or practice school. This model school, usually attached to the normal school, served as a place for students to observe and to practice teaching. Lack of funds and inadequate staffing of the normal school resulted in poor supervision and hastened the demise of this aspect of the program.5

Serious consideration was also given to phases of field experience and their conduct in the late nineteenth century. Supervision of practice teachers remained an open question until after the turn of the century. The camps were sharply divided, many favored supervision by the regular staff while an equal number touted the specialized critic teacher.

The development of comprehensive teacher education programs in normal schools was only partially effective. For instance

5Ibid., p. 513.
in 1900, only 33 per cent of the total teaching staff in the state of Massachusetts had graduated from a normal school. It was apparent that an overwhelming majority of teachers were appointed without regard for their academic preparation in professional subjects and responsibilities.\(^6\)

Although normal schools continued to increase after 1900, they began to evolve into teachers' colleges. A number of factors influenced this development: (1) professional education courses became more respectable due to their acceptance in the curriculum of the universities; (2) rapid increase of high school graduates after 1890; (3) increasing public interest in quality as well as the quantity of school programs; (4) the expanded four-year curriculum at the collegiate level in normal schools; and, (5) the rise of accrediting agencies.

No doubt all of the above factors contributed to the growth of college-level teacher training. These factors also contributed to programs that contained many unrelated courses which in turn gave rise to a popular concept that teachers, as well as other professionals, had to be liberally educated. Finally, recognition of these four-year curricula by various states led to a gradual acceptance of education as a recognized university program.\(^7\)


\(^{7}\)Ibid., p. 451.
Another influence, which prompted the further development of teacher education, was the contributions of several scholars. Notables in this group include: John Dewey, Ellwood Cubberley, A. A. Hinsdale, William Kilpatrick, and Boyd Bode. These men devoted their efforts to advancing the study of philosophy of education, while men like E. L. Thorndike, Arthur Gates, and S. L. Pressey blazed trails in psychology that contributed immeasurably to teacher education. For example, their work on individual differences, styles of learning, and testing has provided a content reference for generations of teachers.

The influence of John Dewey's work in the field experience phase of teacher education, just to single out one example, continues today. He contended that practice teaching without an opportunity to examine theoretical concepts amounts to mere apprenticeship training. He stressed the laboratory concept as a vital approach to teacher education. The laboratory approach included provisions for practice, and scientific investigation of the teaching learning environment. 8

---

During this period in the development of teacher education, increased importance began to be directed toward (1) teacher certification, (2) salaries and fringe benefits, and (3) professional organizations. The centralization of educational control at the state level began to have an impact in the late 1800s. By 1911, a majority of states had passed certification laws. Upgrading of certification was illustrated by increased requirements which included by 1920 a high school diploma. Moreover, a number of states legislated certification requirements that included and named specific professional courses such as history of education, educational psychology, and theory and practice of teaching. 9

Another major contributing factor in the evolution of professional education for teachers was the development of professional organizations. The first recognized teachers' organization, the National Teachers Association, was founded in 1857. In 1870, the name was changed to the National Education Association. Problems centered on membership, finances, accepted purposes, and communications between teachers and the public. The National Education Association's ability to attract and provide a platform for influential educational leaders from college presidents to classroom teachers was a positive development. Such names as Francis Parker,

9Butts, op. cit., p. 454.
William Harris, E. E. Brown, Henry Barnard, Charles DeGarmo, Charles Eliot, and others were examples of professional educators who made profound contributions to professional teacher education through their involvement with the National Education Association and their writings published by the Association. 10

The direct experience phase of teacher education has taken many patterns over the last fifty years. The model school, the laboratory or campus school, and the public schools have provided teachers in training with opportunities to observe and participate in numerous learning activities. Even though educators and critics alike, generally endorse this phase of teacher education, there has been little agreement as to timing, location, sequence, value, and structure of direct experience.

In 1903, John Dewey outlined five purposes served by direct experience in teacher education which would be widely accepted today: (1) observation primarily of the psychological climate and some conception as to the mission of the whole school; (2) second-stage students to be engaged in assisting the teacher, working with individuals, etc.; (3) the selection and arrangement of subject matter using continuous growth as a guide; (4) the amount of practice teaching individualized; and (5) the advanced work of an apprenticeship type (internship). 11

10 Ibid., p. 456.
Although there have been many proponents of the value of direct experience by recognized educational leaders (Mead, Stratemeyer, Lindsey and Conant, and others) and several professional organizations, it seemed logical to say that the value of field experience has been underrated by the college of education. Support for field experience phase of teacher education from colleges has been sporadic and in numerous cases considered an unwanted additional program of questionable merit.  

**History of the Laboratory School**

The laboratory phase of teacher preparation has long been recognized as important. In 1654, Duke Ernest of Gotha, realizing the necessity for teachers to have experience, promoted the idea that student--or practice--teaching must be an integral phase of their preparation. In 1698 his grandson, Frederick II, established seminaries in which a form of "microteaching" was prescribed. Students were required to demonstrate their teaching ability by instructing their fellow students. Pestalozzi, in addition to generating educational theories, utilized the practice of field experience at the Institute at Yverdon, Switzerland. State support for student teaching in

---

Berlin in 1788 was a specific part of the professional curriculum for teachers. Observation and participation in regular classroom work and actual teaching under supervision was an integral phase of the early laboratory schools. The Franciscan friars working among the Indians of New Mexico, were given credit for initiating student teaching practices as early as 1680 in the Western Hemisphere. In the early 1800s, Mother Seaton of Maryland established a teacher training school that required practice teaching and was reported to be the forerunner of normal schools.\(^\text{13}\)

Laboratory schools illustrated well the democratic concept of uniqueness. These schools, usually associated with a teacher training institution, varied widely in function, purpose, organization, and administration. Although there seemed to be a consensus among leaders of laboratory schools that recognized the improvement of instruction as their primary function, student teaching was the real central purpose. Other functions claimed by various laboratory schools were experimentation, observation, participation, and demonstration.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{13}\)E. I. F. Williams, The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1942), pp. 1-2.

The experimental laboratory schools offered an environment that fostered a scientific attitude among students and staff. They provided a place where theory could be tested, where hypotheses were projected and tried, and where the spirit of inquiry stimulated a continuous search for improvement. The experimental function, though widely acclaimed by laboratory schools, was not clearly defined in many schools. 15

It was interesting to note that Williams 16 reporting on the functions of the laboratory school in the late 1930s, listed four purposes: observation, participation, demonstration teaching, and student teaching. Experimentation as a purpose was omitted from his list, suggesting that this was not often conceived as a major function at that time. 17

Laboratory schools that emphasized the training or practice function, provided student teachers with opportunities to do practice teaching under the supervision of a master teacher.

Demonstration, or model, schools were staffed with the best qualified teachers available. The basis for their selection

15 Ibid., p. 28.

16 Williams, op. cit., p. 131.

17 Margaret Willis, "Three Dozen Years" (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Publication, 1968), p. 94. Experimentation was listed as one of the primary functions of the laboratory school at The Ohio State University.
included not only subject matter knowledge, but an expertise in supervisory responsibilities with teacher education students. Through observation and seminars, teacher education students were expected to analyze and emulate the methods demonstrated. The staffs of these schools believed that the quality of the instruction provided by these proven professionals was of the highest caliber.\footnote{Ramseyer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 32.}

Although laboratory schools expressed interest in experimentation, the majority of their efforts were directed to teacher education experiences. Ramseyer cites the following as curbs to experimentation: lack of research methodology, excessive demands for teacher education experiences, and restrictions imposed by limited budgets. Notable exceptions to this pattern were schools whose primary thrust was experimentation. These included the Chicago Laboratory School, the Francis W. Parker Laboratory School, the Speyer School, Horace Mann Lincoln Institute, and The Ohio State University School.\footnote{Ramseyer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 38.}

These schools generated many innovative programs that later were modified and adopted by public schools. It is recognized that laboratory schools influenced the "activity school," the "child centered curriculum," the "project method," the "unit plan," the
"broad fields curriculum, " "unified studies, " and the "core" curriculum. 20

A most interesting approach to the problem of curtailed experimentation was suggested by Ramseyer. He recommended that a closer working relationship between teacher education colleges and the public schools be developed. This relationship would foster the combined experimental practices in laboratory and public schools in order to investigate both controlled and natural situations. 21

In summary, Ramseyer listed the following conclusions about the contributions of laboratory schools to school improvement.

1. The laboratory concept of teacher education is growing among teacher colleges. Experiments are underway to give teachers more experience, and to bring theory and experience together in the process of inducting the prospective teacher into the profession of teaching.

2. Most laboratory schools find these teacher education duties so burdensome that they are handicapped in the opportunity to develop new ideas.

3. The laboratory school has been one of the very effective instruments in school improvement by contributing greatly to experimental work.

4. A few laboratory schools have been leaders in experimental approaches to school improvement. In these schools the immediate teacher education duties (providing opportunity for observation, participation and directed teaching) have been lighter than in the others.

---

20 Ibid., p. 41.
21 Ibid., p. 48.
5. A system of controlled and uncontrolled schools is suggested by some colleges of education to care for the several laboratory functions of teacher education including experimentation. 22

The shift in function of the laboratory school appeared to be from an initial thrust toward experimentation and teacher education to a concentration on professional laboratory experiences for prospective teachers. No doubt many variables influenced this apparent change. At the outset, laboratory schools were equipped to meet the demands of the teacher candidate and the student scholar of education. As the demands for teacher education experiences increased, the laboratory schools gradually became more and more committed to this function.

One writer 23 sees two major reasons for the demise of laboratory schools: (1) the population explosion with the increased demands for field experience overtaxed college laboratory facilities, and (2) these demands contributed to a lack of significant research effort by the college-controlled laboratory schools.

In a 1969 study of laboratory schools, Howd and Browne examined trends in objectives and functions of the schools and investigated the total number in operation. They reported that eighty-five

22Ibid., p. 49-50.

23John F. Ohles, "Is the Laboratory School Worth Saving?" The Journal of Teacher Education, XVIII, 3 (Fall, 1967), 306.
per cent of their respondents used the public schools for student teaching. This represents a definite trend away from the stated purposes of earlier laboratory schools. Other functions reported in this study included: a center for pre-student teaching experience, research, experimentation, and in-service education.\(^{24}\)

It is interesting to note that an educator, viewing the scene in 1948, provided a different perspective for the future of the laboratory school concept and needs for collaborative efforts in teacher education being accepted today.

When the public schools are sufficiently experimental in their approach, and as they are able to absorb the teacher education functions of the university-supported laboratory schools, these latter schools should be abandoned and the monies used to support the experimental and teacher education functions of systems of public schools which constitute the laboratory then in use.\(^{25}\)

By 1950 the use of public schools as a setting for professional laboratory experiences had increased to a point of at least equal importance to that of the campus school. Reasons for this evolution were cited by Swenson and Hammock as follows:

1. Large enrollments in our teacher training institutions.
2. The financial savings involved with having facilities, staff, materials, and equipment in off-campus schools.


3. Prospective teachers would be working in a more nearly realistic situation with children in a normal environment.

4. Prospective teachers should be operating in teaching situations as they are with guidance from college in the direction of something better.

5. Student teaching provides an in-service component for both school and college personnel.

6. A great variety of contexts in schools available, e.g., philosophy, environment, and operation.26

In summary, the change from the on-campus laboratory school for teacher education experiences to the public school appeared to accelerate in the post-war period of the late 40s and 50s and continues today. Reasons for this move centered on the population explosion with a rapid increase in numbers of student teachers, economic factors (the public schools offered operational facilities), and the demand for "reality." Two educators writing on this topic in the 1950s offered this explanation: The shift in teacher education practices from campus laboratory schools to public schools "is made up of choice, convenience, and necessity, the three placed in probable order of importance."27


27 Ibid., p. 27.
School-College Partnership in Teacher Education

Recently much attention has been directed to a partnership between public schools and institutions that offer college degrees in teacher education. These relations have taken various forms but all appear to have their origin in the recognition of the need for the improvement in teacher education by leaders in both institutions. The differentiated staffing programs of Georgia, the clinical professor of Oregon, teacher education centers in Maryland, and various consortia of schools, colleges, state department, professional organizations, and federal agencies in several locations are examples of collaborative efforts to improve teacher education over the country.

The need for collaboration is long and convincing, according to E. Brooks Smith. He contends that a new order in cooperative arrangements is imperative if the present lock-step in teacher education is to be broken. The following conditions work against the establishment of a true clinical experience in a teaching laboratory:

1. Farming student teachers out on the basis of one student to one teacher, with no organized orientation and only three visits a term by an overloaded college supervisor.

2. Overwhelming numbers of students, especially in metropolitan areas, assigned to fewer and fewer qualified supervising teachers who want to do the job regularly.

3. No released time of the supervising teacher for conferences, planning, evaluating, analyzing, and criticizing.

4. Little consistency in the student-teaching experience. Every room engenders a different program, ranging from copycat teaching to responsible co-teaching. There is no individualized program based on the needs of the student and the potentialities of the situation, but step-by-step indoctrination whereby the practices of one generation of teachers are passed on unbroken to the next generation.

5. No commonality among universities of schedule or requirements of work; every college is different in its demands even though the same school system is used.

6. Little influence on school curriculum by teacher education programs; most student teaching is done in very conventional classroom situations.

7. Little influence on college curricula in teacher education by school personnel; college curricula are not advancing except for a little microteaching here and there. College faculty are often out of touch with the modern school situation.

8. Schools out of tune with university educational theorizing. School people become overwhelmed by the system and do not care to experiment unless told how the new program will fit and that it will be teacherproof.

9. Schools and colleges blaming each other for today's poorly trained and non-committed teachers. School people say that the colleges teach students nothing but irrelevant theory that they cannot use; college people say that the schools stifle the creativity of their graduates the minute they take a job in the system. ²⁹

²⁹Ibid., pp. 29-30.
Haskew in the late 40s, writing on collaborative efforts of schools and colleges to improve teacher education, called for a public school budget to support student teaching. He further recommended that a state-wide plan be formulated to provide operational structure for teacher education programs. According to this plan, public schools and colleges jointly would be responsible for student teaching under state leadership. 30

State-wide plans to improve teacher education were exemplified by the Georgia plan of 1950. Under this comprehensive program, standards and criteria were developed for in-service as well as pre-service teacher education. Since 1951 California remits $5.00 per semester hour earned by student teachers to assigned school districts. The utilization of this money is determined by local option. Other states where governmental action has provided the structure for improvement in teacher education include: West Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, and Kentucky. 31

Joint sponsorship of direct experience to teacher education received widespread support from several professional conferences


conducted in the late 50s and early 60s (Bowling Green 1958),
(Kansas TEPS Conference 1959), and (New Horizons 1961). Since
that time considerable effort on the part of the profession, both as
individuals, organizations, and institutions has been expanded to pro-
mote viable partnership in teacher education.

The need for direct experience to give meaning to ideas
and to develop understanding that goes beyond verbalization
to the ability to implement ideas in action suggests a profes-
sional program in which direct experience is an integral part
of each of the four years of college. Direct experiences in
the earlier years of the college program serve primarily to
clarify the meaning of ideas--what do they mean, what do they
look like in action, how do they work? Those experiences
engaged in later in the program serve to build and test the
individual student's ability to put his ideas into action with
children and youth; to test the meaning of ideas when he is
assuming responsibility for their implementation. In like
manner the need for active involvement in the learning
situation moves from seeking to understand and find answers
to questions of what, how, and why to assuming increasing
responsibility for guiding the experiences of children and
carrying forward the varied activities of the teacher. 32

There is need to work in schools having different major
educational philosophies, varied types of instructional
materials, different patterns of administrative organiza-
tions, children of varied socio-economic backgrounds. 33

The above quotes taken from work produced nearly two
decades ago offered strong support for the contention that the public

32 Florence Stratemeyer, "The Expanding Role of Direct
Experience," Off-Campus Student Teaching, Association for Stu-
dent Teaching, Thirtieth Yearbook (Lock Haven, Pennsylvania:

33 Ibid., p. 16.
school's role in direct experience was recognized as an important phase of teacher education. In retrospect, those leaders promoting the increased utilization of public schools as learning laboratories for teacher education students based their recommendations upon assumptions that have withstood the test of time. For example, it was felt that a variety in patterns of organization, curriculum, methods, socio-economic environments, furnished contrasting styles that could not be duplicated in one school.

Teacher education has been shaped from forces inside the profession as well as outside demands from society as a whole. An examination of the influence exerted by higher education, the public school, and professional organizations on changing components of teacher education would provide one historical perspective of this evolution. The rate of change appears to be slow. For example, in 1945 Brink's study of student teaching underscored the concentrated use of public schools, although at this time, the use of campus schools for student teaching had not declined significantly. The speculation continues in the reference cited regarding the comparative utilization of campus schools and public schools for student teaching. They conclude by saying that perhaps the public schools are now

---

34Stratemeyer, op. cit., p. 21.
(1951) utilized as much if not more than campus schools in the education of teachers. 35

The trend over the past two decades since the late 40s and early 50s has been to involve the public schools in all phases of direct experience in teacher education. One of the landmark studies of this era was the so-called Flower's Report of 1948, *School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education*. This report sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education offered strong support for a systematic sequence of direct experience in teacher education. It was from this study that the phase "Professional Laboratory Experience" was coined to include along with student teaching both pre- and post-student teaching experiences in public schools. It should be noted, however, that the Flower's Report recommended the utilization of the campus laboratory school for pre-student teaching experiences, but also advocated using public schools as providing needed teaching experiences. Reasons for the change to public school laboratories included: numbers, reality base, contrasting environments, and financial support. Other forward-looking recommendations that came from this report included: (1) scheduling student teaching as a full-time experience away from campus, (2) using community agencies and neighborhood schools for

pre-student teaching experience, and (3) suggestions for post-student teaching laboratory experiences. (The internship was recommended as an additional experience following student teaching.)

It appeared that in view of the reasons stated that the public school's increased participation in teacher education was as much a matter of necessity and expediency as it was of objective involvement. Consideration of a more comprehensive look at the school-college relationships for teacher education, however, reveals several obvious benefits for the schools. The following were offered as examples of benefits accruing to the schools: employment of new teachers, continuing education for the present staff, and utilization of college resources to upgrade present programs.

Andrews in 1964 expanded the concept of state support for student teaching to include federal aid for the field experience phase of teacher education. He saw the solving of financial problems (here-tofore one of nondescript dimensions) as an improvement of school-college cooperation in this joint venture.

---


In 1965 Andrews outlined a state program of financial support for student teaching in which he developed seven priorities. The first priority centered around the public school involvement in teacher education.

1. Extension of public school administrative and supervisory service for teacher education functions.

When school systems are deeply committed to the importance and improvement of student teaching, and can and do allocate staff time for system wide and building coordinators, the climate for teacher education can be and frequently does become demonstrably superior. A comprehensive system of well designed in-service upgrading of school and college personnel can improve their effectiveness in directing student teaching.⁴⁹

Writing on this subject recently, Stone made several specific references to roles in teacher education for which public school professionals had competence and concern.

School-College Alliance. Related to the new conception of professional education is the bringing of the public schools into a more vital role in the professional aspects of teacher preparation. School principals and supervisors often were not only involved in the selection, assignment, and evaluation of interns, but many served as "clinical professors" for the concurrent seminars. Some participated as demonstration teachers in the specially organized summer schools for elementary or secondary school children which often became the center of the intern's initial summer of pre-internship.

preparation. In addition, a number of the schools themselves were experimenting with new teaching innovations and arrangements for instruction and thus interns were given opportunities to experience the new instructional media at first hand. 40

Public school personnel so involved often spoke of the program as "our program." Thus there has occurred a breakdown of the traditional dichotomy of pre-service and in-service education: the colleges' obligation versus the public schools' responsibility. Teacher growth is a continuing process and each group is now involved in both parts. The prospective teacher and her pupils are the chief ones to gain from this new alliance of resources. 41

A recent publication of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards and the National Education Association conveys widespread awareness for structural and organizational changes in teacher education programs. The institutions most closely affected were the schools and colleges with state departments, federal offices, and professional associations also vitally concerned. The state with its legally constituted responsibilities for teacher education occupies a pivotal position. The article continues with a reference to our democratic form of government in which the state responds to leadership from the populace. The professional educator, regardless of position or title, is in a position to initiate action that would lead to changes in structure, organization and


41Ibid., p. 179.
administration of teacher education programs. Student teaching may be a phase of teacher education that could offer a direction for change by assisting in the establishment of new programs and organizations. 42

In an article, "Promises and Pitfalls in the Trend Toward Collaboration," E. Brooks Smith and John I. Goodlad called attention to the need for stating explicitly the unique responsibilities and goals schools and colleges have in teacher education. They contend that by its nature the university approaches the study of teaching from a research, universal base, while schools, again due to their mission, view teacher training in terms of local needs. They recommend further that placing responsibilities is in itself a joint venture. Further they suggest that instructional responsibilities be considered first then obligations for coordinating and administering the program should be assigned. It is quickly explained that each institution may wish to develop its own design for instituting change. 43


The following summations were offered as examples of different types of cooperative ventures:

A. State and Regional Approaches  
B. Student Teaching Centers  
C. Affiliated Schools and Research and Development Centers.\(^{44}\)

Several innovative structures have been created during the interim that fostered the partnership concept. There were twenty-nine innovative ideas in student teaching listed in the Baltimore Conference on State Responsibility for Student Teaching in 1968.\(^{45}\)

Twelve of these innovations involved additional interinstitutional cooperation. The trend in these experimental teacher education programs centered on the public school's responsibility with commensurate authority in planning, administering, and evaluating these new ventures. Examples of programs that have achieved extensive cooperation between public schools and colleges may be found at the University of Maryland, Wayne State University, and Rochester, New York.\(^{46}\)

Since Cooperative Laboratory Centers for Teacher Education, each involving a college or university and schools, would be responsible for instruction and supervision in the

\(^{44}\)Ibid., p. 35.  
\(^{45}\)Roy A. Edelfelt, editor, Innovative Programs in Student Teaching, Maryland State Department of Education (Baltimore, Maryland: 1968), p. 87-133.  
\(^{46}\)Ibid., pp. 107-109.
field phases of teacher education, they would need to have a team structure of university and school personnel to design and implement an instructional and supervisory program within the general framework of university certification programs approved by the state agency upon the advice of the state-wide Commission. After higher-level agreements have been reached, responsibility for the instructional program would be delegated to this cooperating center faculty of college professors and supervisors and school administrators and supervising teachers by university and school authorities. A center's organizational structure should include a joint steering committee, an instructional planning committee, and faculty meetings. 47

Numerous leaders in teacher education have taken positions supporting these contentions; in addition to Andrews were educators like Christenbury, Lindsey, McGeoch, Pogue, Smith, and Stone. Stone in an article entitled, "One Step Further" had a cryptic analysis to add to the present dilemma in teacher education:

In a nutshell, the problem is that teacher education is a stepchild—unwanted by the college, permissively accepted by the schools, allowed in any and all forms by state departments of education, tolerated by the profession. And if this is true of teacher education generally, it is even more true of student teaching, which is the low man on the professional education totem pole with everyone except student teachers themselves. (For purposes of this paper student teaching should be understood to mean all aspects of field experience.) 48

The potential problems of collaborative efforts are related to the interests of the parties involved. If one party attempts to impose a standarized plan or disregards the ideas of the other party

---


48 Stone, op. cit., p. 135.
collaborative efforts are doomed. The design, scope, and contract of the partnership needs to be generated and confirmed by the involved professional personnel. In some states, the parties are composed of university and public school personnel, while in a limited number of states, the state department of education is exerting the dominant force in collaborative efforts. 49

It has recently been suggested that the roles of various professionals on the teacher education team undergo specific alterations. For example, professors would regularly conduct visits to the schools for purposes of supervision or conducting a seminar on teaching. Bridging the theory-practice gap would be enhanced in this operation. There would also be changes for the role of public school personnel as they assume more of an active responsibility for teacher education. The cooperating school would designate departments to work with groups of pre-service teacher education students. Teachers would be responsible for formulating, supervising, and evaluating pre-service programs. The principal or curriculum specialist could assume responsibility for the coordination of these programs. Supervisory personnel could devote their efforts to improvement of instruction by concentrating service efforts on the professional development of

49 Edelfelt, op. cit., pp. 146-147.
pre-service and in-service teachers as a part of a team with university personnel. ⁵₀

At the organization level, an expanded partnership that included leadership from schools and colleges, state departments and professional organizations has been recommended. The organizational design of the local program needs to rest with schools and colleges. In this view of collaboration, State Departments and professional organizations are seen as resource centers, providing leadership and creating a state-wide climate receptive to the partnership concept. ⁵¹ Several writers saw the partnership, in the form of teacher education centers. It is inferred that the involvement of school personnel tends to shift the responsibility thus creating a more receptive attitude toward innovation and experimental practices. An implicit assumption of this view is that the schools have the most at stake in the success of the program for pre-service teacher preparation.

The essentials for school-college collaboration, specifically as they relate to this study have been summarized as follows:

1. A commitment of staff, time and money, both from the school and university.

⁵₀ E. Brooks Smith, op. cit., p. 32.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 33.
2. An acceptance of the point of view that classroom teachers, college professors, and school administrators contribute equally, but differently, to the education enterprise. Each has an important special contribution to make to teacher education.

3. An interinstitutional structure that is given some autonomy by both institutions for the development and execution of the clinical field component in teacher education but is responsible to both parent institutions at the top level.

4. A steering committee to set policy, develop plans, and review activities of the cooperative teaching clinic or teaching center. This committee should be small and have an equal number of members from the schools and the universities, representing the administration and the teaching faculty of both institutions. Someone from each institution should be high enough in the administration to commit his institution to action. 52

School-college partnerships have been evolving over the past twenty years. If this evolvement is to become a development there is much to be accomplished in the area of objective efforts on the part of educational and state leaders. In a recent address, William R. Hazard 53 gave focus to the situation by pointing to needed links in school-college relationship in the areas of finance, management, shared planning, and jointly appointed faculties. The awarding of state and federal resources were cited as incentives to promote

52 Ibid., p. 35.

school-college cooperation in teacher education. The concluding statement centered on the profession's attitude toward accepting joint efforts—"when and if the teaching profession wants joint planning, it will happen."

School-college collaboration can only be realized if agreements provide for mutual as well as distinct contribution, responsibility, accountability, and support. Educators from all levels have a stake in teacher education that demands a realignment of organization, structure, and functions. These suggested changes, of course, place new demands on professional personnel to answer needs created in the form of new positions with changed roles. For example, public schools would be called upon to provide additional administrative services such as arranging, supervising, and evaluating future teacher education programs.

The Public School Administrator of Teacher Education (Teacher Educator)

In the previous sections in Chapter II the need for additional public school involvement in pre-service teacher education has been emphasized. This trend started in the early 1900s and has evolved slowly and sporadically to the present time. With the trend toward increased utilization of the public schools in teacher education since about 1950, came the need for some type of organization and structure
which would facilitate a program that had formerly been sponsored
almost totally by another institution, the college.

In this section the role and function of the public school
administrator of teacher education will be examined through ex-
amples of recommended tasks and functions as they have appeared in
the literature.

The implications of the need for public school leadership and
responsible administrative service was made quite clear in a set of
guidelines developed by an American Association of Colleges for
Teacher Education committee in 1948. The following represent
selected principles from that workshop committee reports.

1. The development of laboratory facilities in teacher edu-
cation is essentially a state function. However, for the
immediate task of operating these facilities college and
public schools must assume joint responsibility. In the
earlier stages of a teacher's education the colleges must
assume the major roles with the public schools gradually
increasing their participation; while at the latter stages,
continuing into the early years of teaching service, the
colleges maintain continuing although gradually decreas-
ing responsibility.

2. All plans and contracts should be designed to set high
standards of education performance and these agreements
should recognize the joint responsibility of both public
schools and colleges to maintain these standards.

3. Contracts with cooperating schools and agencies must
include carefully determined and mutually agreed upon
conditions and specifications under which the broader
aspect of laboratory experiences in teacher education
may be carried out successfully on a high educational
plane.
4. Plans must be laid and continuous effort exerted to develop an understanding of the program and an interest in the development of students on the part of community leaders and school staff members as well as the supervisory personnel in the schools or agencies.

5. Institutional officials must assume the responsibility of "getting along" successfully with local school officials. Continuous cooperative effort is necessary to keep contracts in force and in harmonious and effective operation. 54

In the same year, 1948, the "Flower's Report," gave recognition to the importance of precise agreements with responsible agents of the off-campus facilities to be utilized. The following illustrates the emphasis placed on contractual arrangements related to joint administrative control:

The executive administration of this agreement shall lie with the Superintendent of the Public Schools and the Dean of the College of Education or such persons as may be designated by them or either of them as their representatives. In the case of delegation of executive power or responsibility to other than the individuals named above, the information of the fact shall be made a matter of written record and transmitted to all whose work is affected thereby. 55

One of the major recommendations of a study conducted by Rogers in 1951 was that large public schools should appoint a Director of Student Teaching whose responsibilities would include: management, coordination, and supervision of the program in the city

---


Rogers continued by saying that the administration of student teaching programs has, particularly in large cities, become a major undertaking. Colleges and public schools are mutually dependent in this joint venture if they are to provide adequately for pre-service teacher education. 56

The Rogers study of 1951 provided additional evidence to support public school involvement in pre-service teacher education as more than just an institutional setting for laboratory experiences. For
An appeal was made for establishing an equalitarian relationship between schools and colleges concerned with upgrading the profession of teaching. Specific recommendations included: (1) an active rather than passive leadership role for schools; (2) establishment of minimum standards for teacher education practices and the enforcement of those standards thus forcing all colleges to also establish more uniform practices; and, (3) that all requests for placement of teacher education students be made through an office of Directed Teaching established by public schools. 57

The recommendations that the Office of Directed Teaching be established in schools was a direct reference to the "public school teacher educator" as defined in this study. This recommendation

56 Rogers, op. cit., p. 346.

57 Ibid., p. 346.
continued by suggesting that a position, "Director of Student Teaching," should be created to provide administration and supervision of the program in large public schools. 58

Additional support for the contention that school administrators have a responsibility in offering leadership in developing teacher education programs may be found in this excerpt from the 1951 Association for Student Teaching Yearbook:

An off-campus program of student teaching would be impossible without the cooperation of superintendents and principals. They not only must concern themselves with the needs of the teaching profession but must be willing to work with the teacher training colleges and their local teaching staffs in planning ways of operating an off-campus program. 59

Professional educators at the college level have long recognized the important contribution made by off-campus laboratory experiences to pre-service teacher education. The quality of the laboratory experiences depended upon the public school personnel, facilities, and contractual arrangements. Special consideration was given to the selection of the cooperating teachers. Leadership offered by the school administrator was also stressed as an important aspect

58 Ibid., p. 347.

of the total environment for pre-service teacher education students.

The following quotes taken from the 1954 Association for Student Teaching Yearbook give credence to this point. Cooperative arrangements must be satisfying to all participating personnel.

Not only should there be a feeling of confidence on the part of the college personnel and students, but there must be a feeling of satisfaction and security on the part of the administration and teachers of the cooperating school. The cooperating teacher must feel that there is great personal satisfaction in working with student teachers. The fact that the classroom teacher must have a genuine desire to work with student teachers cannot be given too great an emphasis. Then too, the school principal should be interested enough in the cooperative arrangement to offer not only school facilities but his support in enriching the student teaching experiences. Students regard their student teaching experiences as the most valuable part of their pre-service education; hence, the cooperating school has a major responsibility, and the college has the obligation of initiating, coordinating, and supporting the factors to put a good program into effect.

We always confer with the administration of all off-campus schools before accepting them for our student teaching situations. Unless they are receptive of this program, we do not use them. The public school administrator and the director of student teaching jointly approve all cooperating teachers before any student teachers are assigned. No cooperating teacher is used who does not willingly accept this responsibility. The administrators (superintendents and principals) approve all student teachers before they are assigned to a local school.

---


61 Ibid., p. 29.
The opportunities for apprenticeship work toward the end of the pre-service training period for teachers should be expanded greatly. The school districts of America and those of us who teach in them must accept our share of the responsibility for developing young candidates for the teaching profession. They deserve to have an opportunity to come into the classrooms--into offices and school systems--to observe, to practice under leadership and direction, and to go back to their teacher training centers to evaluate and to condition their thinking and development on the basis of what they have seen and the experiences they have had. 62

Other evidence that the public school administrator was considered a valuable member of the teacher education team was found in the usual practice of principal's orienting his staff. Since the school administrator has responsibility in educational leadership and the area of school-community relations it logically follows that orientation for teacher education students would be one of the principal's responsibilities. This was recognized in the early 1950s as indicated by the following:

Building principals seem to be well aware of this need for careful induction also, and assume responsibility for it in many instances. College personnel, similarly assume a large share of the responsibility for orienting the students to a teaching situation. 63


Not only do principals visit the students but they assume the responsibility for interpreting school policies to the student. As a member of the public schools' administrative staff, they are best equipped to do this. It is conceivable that most principals set aside specific time for this task. 64

The building principals in many public schools deserve attention for their active interest and participation in teacher-education. They visit student-teachers, offer suggestions, interpret school policies, and promote desirable attitudes on the part of students by including them in the school functions. 65

... we must work out arrangements in which the subject-matter people, the people in education, the school people, work together so that young people are inducted in a situation in which they are able to make use of their new knowledge and training. 66

Representatives of the entire faculty, as well as administrators, superintendents, and supervising teachers, should help plan the content of and the sequence within a teacher preparation program. 67

Decisions regarding the professional education of teachers should be made by the education staff jointly with elementary school and secondary school staffs and the academic faculty of the institution. 68

64 Ibid., p. 108.
65 Ibid., p. 115.
68 Ibid., p. 355.
In a challenge issued to the public schools in 1959,

L. O. Andrews has this to say:

The task of supervising student teachers requires the harmonious relationship of many different people carrying many different roles. Public school personnel can give assistance in developing sound descriptions of the roles of several of these persons. In particular, in those school systems in which several different colleges place student teachers it is imperative that public schools take leadership. The task requires the setting up of cooperative groups, representing both schools and colleges, to develop principles, define roles, and set forth basic rules for normal operating procedures. 69

Writing on the topic of student teaching administration

Woodruff offered still another challenge for collaborative action:

When a college and a public school join forces in educating teachers, a "Working Council" should be established to facilitate administrative actions. It should include the college director of student teaching, the superintendent of each district or someone designated by him to represent him, and such others as these people agree upon, selected from the college staff and the public school administrative staff. This council should proceed to develop a manual of policies and procedures with the help of all interested parties and should meet periodically to review the operation of the program. 70


In 1963 the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (NCTEPS) published a position paper on teacher education. In the publication emphasis was placed upon recommendations for supervised teaching and field experience. Much support was offered for the partnership concept with colleges, schools, and the state involved as contributors to improved teacher education. The following recommendations with administrative implications, for the above partners appeared in this publication:

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, give a reduced work load, and compensated beyond their regular salary. 71

Systematic ways should be provided for teachers and administrators in the schools to advise the college in the planning and conducting of the teacher education program. 72

In referring to the public school's administrative function in field experiences Andrews in 1964 suggested:

Payment to the school districts for the extra administrative and supervisory service necessary to operate high-quality programs of student teaching and related experiences. Amounts of support could be determined on a straight per capita basis, or paid after the numbers of


72 Ibid., p. 15.
students served reached a certain level, or by units or blocks of 20, 30, or 50 student teachers. Under such a plan, school systems serving large numbers of prospective teachers could employ additional administrative personnel who would serve as coordinators of teacher education services in districts, groups of schools, or even in individual schools.  

In a publication, "A Guide for the Student Teaching Program in North Carolina," the State Department of Education in 1964 outlined some specific teacher education functions for which a public school administrator was responsible. These tasks were listed as follows:

1. Assisting the college supervisors of student teaching and school principals in identifying and selecting supervising teachers.

2. Participating in the orientation of student teachers to the school community and school program.

3. Serving as a resource person, assisting the supervising teacher and college supervisor with special problems in instruction.

4. Participating in conferences with student teachers, and principals.

5. Involving student teachers in the ongoing in-service teacher education programs.

6. Assisting in the cooperative evaluation of the student teaching program.

---


A recent NCTEPS (1966) publication, "Who's in Charge Here?" expands this partnership concept to include the cooperative development of new policies and guidelines for student teaching. These guidelines are suggested to promote a partnership among colleges, schools, state and federal agencies, and professional organizations to provide a better education for our teachers.

Part II of this publication is devoted to a tentative division of responsibilities in teacher education paraphrased as follows:

A. Public schools provide:
1. The learning laboratories
2. Supervising teachers with special skills and competency for analyzing and evaluating teaching behavior and the nature of teaching

B. Colleges are responsible for:
1. Planning and conducting the student teaching program
2. Deciding appropriate timing and sequence of student teaching
3. Inclusion of the study of teaching in student teaching

C. Jointly public schools and colleges are responsible for:
1. Planning for student teaching
2. Examining present practices and experimenting with other teaching procedures. 75

An elaboration and extension of these points is found in a sequel, A New Order in Student Teaching, published by NCTEPS in 1967. Support for this evolving effort by the public schools and colleges is found throughout the publication.

The organization and substance of student teaching will be the responsibility of the colleges and universities and of the schools, which are the central participants of the training of teachers. Collaborative efforts are needed between colleges and public schools to establish a governing structure that will serve all phases of the program. The state department of education and professional associations will influence substance in many ways, but the responsibility for it will clearly rest with the schools and colleges. Reasonable institutional (school and college) autonomy should be respected. A check and balance system should be developed to monitor the program. 76

If the teaching profession really means to improve clinical instruction through programs of field experience including observation and participation, simulated teaching, student teaching, and internships, if it really means to advance knowledge of teaching, then old, loose liaison patterns of forced hit-or-miss cooperation must be abandoned, and a joint school-college partnership must be adopted. 77

A study entitled "Toward Improved Teacher Education in Greater Cleveland" was submitted to the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education in 1966. This study was designed to offer an examination of recruitment and selection practices for admission to teacher education programs, and the continuum of pre-service, in-service education programs. Cited as evidence of interest in teacher education programs was the active participation in the investigation of twenty-eight of thirty-two school systems in greater Cleveland.

Recommendations from the study that illustrated possible


77 Ibid., p. 12.
functions and activities for a public school administrator of teacher education follow:

2. That a council be organized on a continuing basis in order to provide the mechanism for discussion of mutual problems among departments of education and between these departments and representatives of school systems in Cuyahoga County.

15. That one of the first items considered by the council recommended previously be consideration of improving the coordination of efforts in developing more effective student teaching experiences.

23. That periodic joint meetings be held between members of high school departments and members of corresponding college and university departments for the purpose of exchanging information and ideas concerning the specific field of inquiry which should form a bond of mutual interest.

5. That colleges and universities develop arrangements with local school systems which will permit joint appointments of faculty members by the school system and by institutions of higher learning. 78

The dimension of the operations in the student teaching phase may be understood more fully by noting that 38,690 student teachers were placed in 113 school systems of over 25,000 pupil population as reported in a study by the Educational Research Service of the National Education Association (1962-1963). The administrative task may be placed in perspective by considering that each of these school systems averaged 340 student teachers in 1962-1963. It should be

noted that student teaching in this case represents only one phase of
the field experience program of prospective teachers that involves
the public schools. 79

The above survey was conducted by means of a questionnaire
sent to 402 school systems with enrollments of 12,000 or more.
Since the current study involved school systems with enrollments of
25,000 or more, student teaching placements in schools of lesser en-
rollment were not included in the totals above.

Recent publications have been referring to and making rec-
ommendations for public school administrative functions relative to
teacher education. Primarily, these publications were sponsored by
state departments, local school districts, or professional organiza-
tion. The intent of presenting this information at this juncture is to
offer still another perspective of the public school teacher educator's
role in teacher education.

One recent recommendation published by the National Educa-
tion Association and the National Commission on Teacher Education
and Professional Standards had this to say:

Teacher education and experimentation are becoming
recognized responsibilities of the schools. These include
provision for a relationship between the teacher education

79Cooperation in Student Teaching, Educational Research
Service Circular No. 4 (Washington, D. C.: National Education
function and the regular supervisory and curriculum effort. Such a new setting and organization will require some changes in role for school personnel, including the possibility of adding new jobs.

Coordinator for Teacher Education in the Schools. Develop and oversee cooperative programs with universities from the school point of view; coordinate placement of students and interns; direct system-wide programs for the improvement of teaching; set programs for beginning teachers; act as one of the representatives of the school system in local, regional, and state meetings on teacher education; participate in joint policy decision making; direct an office and build an adequate staff.80

In a circular produced by Educational Research Service of the National Education Association referred to earlier, a study depicting the operational structure of the Everett Washington Public Schools was cited that dealt with the "Role and Responsibility of the School District Coordinator." These roles were listed as follows:

1. The coordinator shall represent the school district in its relations with Western Washington State College in the Supervised Teaching Program.

2. The coordinator shall help all staff members to become aware of policies and procedures of the program.

3. The coordinator shall approve all student teachers for placement within the district.

4. The coordinator shall assign students to principals and cooperating teachers as per student and college requests.

5. The coordinator will provide student teachers with an orientation to the school district and coordinate plans for their orientation to their respective schools.

80A New Order in Student Teaching, op. cit., p. 18.
6. The coordinator will provide the College with completed registration booklets and enrollment cards.

7. The coordinator shall keep the college informed of all school district holidays and vacations. \(^{81}\)

In the same report another variation of structure was illustrated by a listing of role statements for teacher education in the DeKalb County, Georgia Public Schools.

**Responsibilities of the County Administration**

1. Receives requests for placement of student teachers from various colleges and universities (Instruction).

2. Assigns student teachers to specific schools and to specific supervising teachers (Instruction).

3. Provides an orientation to the system-wide policies and procedures in the DeKalb Schools (Instruction).

4. Provides supervisory services and other professional aid to student teachers (Instruction).

5. Interviews each student teacher as a prospective teacher for the DeKalb Schools (Personnel). \(^{82}\)

The school systems of metropolitan Nashville have entered into a joint venture with the colleges preparing teachers in that area. In order to insure the autonomies and responsibilities of the collaborating institutions the following policies were jointly developed and adopted.

\(^{81}\) *Cooperation in Student Teaching, op. cit., 4.*

\(^{82}\) *Educational Research Service Circular, op. cit., p. 48.*
I. The Administration and the School Board

A. General Responsibilities

Provide cooperatively written policies concerning the operation of the student teaching program in the Metropolitan Public Schools. These policies should include qualifications of teachers, assignment procedures, prerogatives and responsibilities of supervising teachers, and a general philosophy of student teaching. Contracts with participating colleges should be entered into on this basis.

D. Establish a position to be known as the Metropolitan Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences. This person would be assigned the responsibility by the Board of Education for coordinating the student teaching program in the Metropolitan Schools.

E. Ask the Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences to explore the possibility of designating certain schools for experimentation and pre-service and in-service preparation of teachers.

F. Supply the Metropolitan Nashville Education Association office with a list of supervising teachers and their school addresses at the beginning of each quarter or semester.  

Metropolitan Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences

1. With the aid of the Metropolitan Council on Student Teaching develop policy recommendations pertaining to student teaching in Metropolitan Schools.

2. Supply leadership for maintaining the integrity of established student teaching policies and regulations.

3. Work with principals and college directors to determine

---

final appropriate placements for student teachers.

4. Maintain records of student teaching experiences in Metropolitan Schools.

5. Supply needed information concerning student teaching in Metropolitan Schools.

6. Instigate cooperative planning to improve the effectiveness of participants in the student teaching program.

7. Provide for reassignment or removal of a student teacher should it become necessary. This should be the result of a cooperative decision made by all persons concerned. 84

In a publication sponsored by the Pennsylvania State Department of Instruction policies were stipulated to restructure and redefine the roles of the three agencies (colleges, schools, and Department of Public Instruction) involved in teacher education. They proposed to underscore the school role in this joint venture by appointing a public school professional as a contact person. These proposals were stated as follows:

The public school appoint a contract person (the principal or a local coordinator) charged with the responsibility of making student teaching arrangements in the school. Such responsibilities would include:

1. Provide the Department of Public Instruction with names of available, qualified supervising teachers within the district.

2. Cooperate with the Department of Public Instruction and colleges in establishing guidelines for the student teaching experience.

84 Ibid., p. 14.
3. Cooperate with the college coordinator in the selection of supervising teachers and in the performance of supervisory responsibilities.

4. Acquaint the total staff, school board, and community with the goals of the student teacher program.

5. Develop an atmosphere of acceptance and make the student a member of the total staff.

6. Cooperate with the college coordinator or director of student teaching in arranging pre-student teaching observations.

7. Arrange the supervising teacher's schedule to allow for equitable work load and for scheduled meetings with the college coordinator.

8. Orient the student teacher at the local level by arranging meetings, providing faculty handbooks, statements of school philosophy and policy.

9. Observe the interaction of student teachers, supervising teachers and student teachers.

10. Arrange programs for in-service education for supervising teachers and student teachers.

11. Arrange supervising teacher's schedule to permit him to participate in conferences on the college campus, and state and national meetings concerning student teaching, such as the Association for Student Teaching.  

Another more recent Pennsylvania State Department of Education publication of 1969 became more explicit in structuring the public school's administrative function in the field experience phase

---

of teacher education. The following is a series of guidelines developed to detail this operation:

The cooperating school in order to demonstrate administrative support to the total student teaching field experience should:

1. Appoint a staff member of the school district to coordinate student teaching.

2. Maintain a list of qualified cooperating teachers who are willing and able to take a student teacher.

3. Establish an instructional climate conducive to learning.

4. Provide administrative staff members as consultants and resource people.

5. Give support and direction to programs that enhance the student teaching operation.

6. Permit observation of student teachers by prospective employers.

7. Arrange released time for staff as needed.

8. Arrange for the involvement of student teachers in a variety of teaching experiences.

9. Establish district policies on assignments.

10. Plan and conduct student teaching policy meetings for all participating teacher-preparing institutions.

In the same publication the roles and responsibilities of the

School District Coordinator of Student Teaching were spelled out:

A. Maintain communication between school district and teacher-preparing institutions on program policies and placement of student teachers.

B. Help plan an orientation of student teachers to school policies, curriculum, and personnel for student teachers.

C. Exercise leadership in identification and selection of cooperating teachers.

D. Insure representation for the school district in professional deliberations on student teaching.

E. Identify and facilitate the use of educational and community resources.\(^{87}\)

Some of the state plans do not specifically name a public school person as a coordinator of professional laboratory experiences but instead delegate this responsibility to existing members of the school's administrative team. For example, the principal or another administrator may be used. Illustrations of this approach were found in a Utah State Department publication.

The Role of the School District and Cooperating School

To accept their function in teacher education as an integral part of their public obligation.

To identify and provide highly competent cooperating teachers and other personnel as needed.

To orient student teachers to the philosophy, policies and program of the district and of the school.

\(^{87}\)Ibid., p. 12.
To arrange compensation for school personnel for their professional responsibilities in student teaching.

To promote curriculum development and instructional improvement to insure a vital student teaching program.

To provide the materials and facilities available to the school to permit the student teacher to function effectively. 88

A slight variation of this plan was found in a North Carolina State Department of Education publication. In this proposal the principal, supervisor of instruction, and the superintendent were given specific administrative tasks in their responsibility for student teaching.

Public school supervisors were also delegated responsibilities in pre-service teacher education. Their assigned tasks were closely aligned to their role in the improvement of instruction, e.g., continuing education, evaluation and selection of personnel.

Supervisors of instruction are closely identified with the ongoing instructional program in the school. They are familiar with the quality of work done by teachers and are constantly working with teachers and principals on instructional programs. They occupy a position and role in the school program which qualifies them to make a unique contribution to student teaching programs. Among their specific duties are the following:

1. Assisting the college supervisors of student teaching and school principals in identifying and selecting supervising teachers.

88 A Guide for Student Teaching, Utah State Board of Education (Salt Lake City, Utah: 1968), p. 3.
2. Participating in the orientation of student teachers to the school community and school program.

3. Serving as a resource person, assisting the supervising teacher and college supervisor with special problems in instruction.

4. Participating in conferences with student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals.

5. Involving student teachers in the ongoing in-service teacher education programs.

6. Assisting in the cooperative evaluation of the student teaching program. 89

In an article entitled, "An Assessment of the Administrative Organization of a Cooperative Venture," Johnson listed role definitions which have evolved since the beginning of cooperative teacher centers at Wayne State University in January, 1963. Johnson develops the position that a comparison of the roles specified for the graduate faculty adviser and school adviser offered insight into the balance of responsibility between the involved institutions. The school adviser's role has been defined as follows:

1. He observes the general operation of the Center from the school's point of view.

2. He helps in smoothing out difficult situations on the school side.

3. He takes final responsibility for the school when problems arise which primarily involve the school.

89 Ibid., p. 12.
4. He shares teaching and leadership functions in the seminars, orientation programs, and in-service education meetings.

5. He represents the Center at college affairs. \(^{90}\)

In summary then, the functions taken from the literature reviewed were distinctly specified responsibilities of some public school administrator (teacher educator). The following represent a listing of suggested administrative tasks recommended in the literature for the public school teacher educator or some professional usually in a supervisory capacity.

1. Developing field experience programs
2. Administering field experience programs
3. Coordinating teacher education placements
4. Supervising teacher education programs
5. Evaluating teacher education programs
6. Organizing teacher education councils
7. Serving as a liaison between school and college
8. Orienting students and faculty
9. Selecting supervising teachers
10. Establishing field experience policies

11. Publicizing teacher education programs
12. Organizing continuing education programs
13. Collaborating with other educational agencies
14. Keeping records
15. Facilitating instructional resources

This list of suggested administrative functions reported from other than usually indexed literature is not an exhaustive list. The reported statements do, however, describe something of the need as it was being recognized by various groups, even though the position of "Teacher Educator in the Public Schools" or a related title does not often appear. The fact that the functions are recognized as responsibilities that serve the field experience aspects of teacher education indicate that these tasks will be delegated to some public school official, with a reasonable expectancy that this position will appear in the table of organization as a central office assignment in the public schools.

Examples have been cited of recommendations and policies from current professional organizations and various state department publications that focus on the school's mission in the coordination of the field experience phase of teacher education. These scattered and incomplete bits of evidence support the need for more public school involvement in teacher education and illustrate the fact that districts were investing time, talent, and support for innovative teacher
education programs. These positive actions by public schools demonstrated viable responses to functions heretofore largely considered in the college domain. Combined with other evidence assembled, these statements and lists of functions support a case for the emerging role of the public school teacher educator.

Historically, teacher education has been primarily controlled by colleges. Recent work and statements of many leaders in education have endorsed changes in pre-service teacher education including field experience. The attempt in this chapter has been to sketch some of the evolution of teacher education, particularly the field experience aspects from its early inception to the present day. The three sections of this chapter were concerned with the historical aspects of teacher education including the development of laboratory schools and their use as student teaching centers, the evolving concepts of school-college partnership including the growing insistence upon greater collaboration between schools and colleges in the laboratory phases of teacher education, and the evolution of the concept and functions of the role of a teacher educator in the public schools.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The study was designed to ascertain the status of public school coordination of field experience functions for pre-service teacher education students; and to develop guidelines and a role statement for the emerging position of public school teacher educator. The study represents the cooperative efforts of numerous public school and college personnel who were asked to respond to field tests, consultations, and surveys.

How could the status of public school coordination of field experience be determined? The natural approach appeared to be a survey of large city school systems in the United States which may include on their staffs professional positions similar to that which could be called a teacher educator. Additional information that would be provided by this survey includes the priorities placed on the various aspects of the public school's involvement in the field experience phase of teacher education. The review of recent literature has also been utilized to sharpen the focus on the position of the public school teacher educator. This includes a perspective of the role in the form of recommendations provided by numerous recent state level publications.
The questions to serve as a basis for the inquiry are listed as follows: What is the present status of the teacher educator in the large city school systems in the United States? What are the varying concepts that professionals hold about the functions of this role? What are the functions which are deemed important to the role of the public school teacher educator?

**Data Procurement**

The selection of a research method to procure the necessary data to insure adequate information was given serious consideration. Variables that were considered included: the nature and scope of the problem; the nature of desired data; and time limitations. Careful consideration was given to the fact that a study of the public school's role in the coordination of the field experience phase of teacher education is a limited topic. At the initial conception of the study consideration was given to limiting the scope to that of a state-wide inquiry into the status of the teacher educator in the public school. After study and numerous consultations an interim decision was made to expand the study into a district survey, then a regional one, and finally to a nationwide survey. One impetus for enlarging the scope was the decision to limit the inquiry primarily to the specific functions of this public school central office position. Two factors influenced this decision, one being the complicated problem of selecting
an appropriate or representative region to study, and the other the problem of relating regional data to give a picture of the national situation.

With these considerations as a basis, the decision was made to utilize the questionnaire method to survey public school systems in the United States with enrollments of 25,000 or more pupils. In addition to being more representative of the situation country-wide, it was assumed that all systems of that size were apt to be involved in teacher education activities. It was also assumed that these systems were likely to have staff members in central office positions in which the assigned duties would include at least some aspects of the role of a teacher educator. It was further assumed that a nationwide survey of all large school systems would provide a more accurate picture of the present status of the public school teacher educator than some type of sampling certain classifications of public schools.

**Questionnaire Development**

In order to ascertain the existence, function and perimeters of the position of the public school teacher educator three instruments were developed to survey three populations, public school superintendents, public school teacher educators and college teacher educators. The first of these (see appendixes A and B) consists of an introductory letter, a request to the superintendent of schools for the name and
address of the professional(s) responsible for teacher education in each school system and a check list of suggested functions for which this person might have some responsibility. Spaces were provided for additional functions to be listed by the respondents.

The second instrument (see appendix C) was developed to be sent to the designated individual teacher educators, whose names had been secured from the superintendents through the use of the first instrument. As in the case of the mailing of the first instrument, an introductory letter explaining the nature, purpose, and specifics of the inquiry was included. A definition of the position of the public school teacher educator was included to help respondents focus sharply on the subject of the investigation. The instrument consists of fifteen items to ascertain functions of the teacher educator as perceived by those designated to perform this role in the public schools. The suggested items were arranged to elicit value judgments regarding the role in two ways: first, as presently conceived, and second, as thought to be ideal for each function. The purpose of this inquiry was to determine the present status, function, and future of the position as seen by those occupying this post.

The preliminary draft of this instrument was sent to twelve professionals in the public schools of Franklin County, Ohio for their criticisms. These educators have assignments which provide obligations that correspond to the proposed role functions of the public school
teacher educator. Eleven of the twelve educators responded with valuable criticisms and suggestions for the improvement of the instrument.

The instrument was revised accordingly and subsequently mailed to 121 teacher educators identified in the initial inquiry to superintendents. Replies were received from 101 teacher educators for a percentage of 83 per cent plus, which was considered representative of the total population surveyed.

Procedure in the Use of a Jury

Since at the outset of this investigation there was little concrete evidence to cite regarding the existence, nature, or function of the public school teacher educator's role, it became apparent that additional perspectives would lend credence to the study. A decision was made to establish a jury of recognized leaders in the field experience phase of teacher education.

The primary purpose of this jury was the establishment of still another frame of reference with which to further sharpen the perception of the role of the public school teacher educator. A decision was made to construct a third questionnaire to assess the views held by the jury.

The third instrument (see appendix D) was developed to
solicit the conceptions held of the position of a teacher educator in the public schools by college personnel, their conceptions regarding the functions of this role and a rating of suggested tasks and responsibilities of this position. The educators selected were recognized leaders in the field experience phase of teacher education and collaborative professional efforts with public schools. These leaders were selected by the researcher and his adviser with due care to see that they represented different types and sizes of institutions and were well distributed across the country. (The persons requested to serve on the jury are listed in appendix E).

The first instrument was mailed to 168 public school systems in the United States that had enrollments of 25,000 or more. The name and address of the superintendent was secured from a United States Office of Education Publication entitled "Education Directory, Public School Systems." A self-addressed, stamped envelope was included for the convenience of the respondent.

From the initial mailing to superintendents 114 returns or 67 per cent were received. A reminder letter was sent to the remaining systems (see appendix C). From this second request an additional 40 returns were received. This number added to the original 114 increased the returns to 154 out of a possible 168, and the percentage to a high of 92.
An analysis of the 154 returns (see appendix F) on the first instrument revealed the following: 48 of the respondents identified a professional with responsibilities in the direct experience phase of teacher education, but they did not complete the survey of functions; 73 said "yes" to having a teacher educator and completed the survey of functions. The reminder letter did not contain a checklist of suggested teacher education functions. Totaling the returns from both mailings, 121 did identify a teacher educator; 5 returns indicated no teacher educator, but the survey had been completed by a member of the central office staff; 28 replied no teacher educator and did not complete the survey.

Space was provided and respondents were requested to add teacher education functions which may have been omitted. From this request 38 additional functions were listed.
### TABLE 1
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF REPLIES FROM THREE GROUPS SURVEYED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Surveyed</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendants</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Teacher Educators</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Teacher Educators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several percentages from the data provided by the first inquiry seemed significant. Initially, the receipt of returns from over 90 per cent of the population surveyed suggest that they believe teacher education to be a very important topic. It also suggests that public school administrators have identified with an area of their accepted responsibility in providing field experiences for teacher education students. Unanswered questionnaires were returned from four school systems with an explanation that due to heavy demands on their personnel, time was not available for this type of research.

The second instrument constructed to elicit responses regarding the role of the public school teacher educator was sent directly to designated central office personnel by name. Superintendents had designated 121 persons with responsibilities for coordinating the
field experience phase of teacher education. From this initial mailing 101 replies were received. With an 84 per cent return a decision was made that no reminder letter would be sent in view of the fact that many of these persons might not be on duty during the summer when this follow-up procedure was considered.

After receiving and tabulating the results of the second instrument, a third was constructed, field tested with ten local teacher educators, modified accordingly, and mailed to 45 selected college teacher educators, who were to serve as the jury. These educators were selected on the basis of extensive study and experience in the field experience phase of teacher education. From the first mailing a total of 22 were received, or just under 50 per cent. Thinking this was not an adequate return, a reminder letter was mailed to these college teacher educators. An additional 12 returns were received following this mailing, bringing the total to 34 and the percentage to 76. It should be noted that this instrument was mailed in the summer, which may account for a somewhat lower percentage of returns compared to the other two instruments.

Summary

Methods and procedures were established to procure data regarding functions of the public school teacher educator. Determination of research methods were based on such considerations as time, objectivity, and utility.
Three populations--superintendents, teacher educators designated by superintendents, and college teacher educators--were surveyed by means of a questionnaire. In addition to the tabulation of the returned instruments, use was made of an extensive search of current literature, particularly publications of state and professional organizations. Guidelines for the public school's responsibility in coordinating field experience programs will be formulated from the data secured from the surveys and related literature. In the next chapter the findings and results of this investigation will be discussed.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

A compilation of the findings and a discussion of the results are reported in this chapter. In order to gain perspective regarding the role of the public school teacher educator the following kinds of questions were pertinent: (1) What is the present status of the teacher educator in the large city school systems in the United States? (2) What are the varying concepts that the professionals hold about the functions of this role? and (3) What are the functions which are deemed important to the role of the public school teacher educator?

Data were secured from three sources: (1) superintendents of large city systems in the United States or persons designated to answer for them; (2) public school personnel performing teacher education functions; and (3) college teacher educators.

The data secured will be presented in tabular form. The chronological order matches the sequence in which it was secured. The first section will discuss the findings of the superintendent's survey.
The Superintendents' Survey

In this instrument the superintendent or one of his central office associates completed a check list of functions which had been suggested as major responsibilities for which the teacher educator was accountable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Number of Responses N=78</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serving as liaison between public schools and college(s)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering the placement process of teacher education students</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing criteria for selecting teachers and schools for teacher education services</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and improving pre-service teacher education programs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating in-service programs to upgrade cooperating or supervising teaching skills</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table clearly shows that the superintendents did not discriminate significantly among the functions on the basis of relative
importance. Nevertheless, the responses indicate that superintendents tend to view these suggested functions as an important part of teacher education.

These school administrators and their designated staff members viewed the liaison function with colleges as the most significant function. It was revealing to note that both categories, "Developing and improving pre-service teacher education programs," and "Coordinating in-service programs to upgrade cooperating or supervising skills," were given substantially lower ratings. The other function that was rated very highly dealt with the placement process for teacher education students. This evaluation may be based in part on an awareness of the steadily increasing numbers of students in teacher education programs being placed in public schools for professional experiences.

Since some response was received from 92 per cent of the total number of 168 superintendents surveyed, it can be inferred that teacher education is important to them. Drawing firm conclusions from responses to an untested list of suggested teacher education functions for public school personnel would be unwarranted. However, it can be noted that over two-thirds of the total school systems replying to this section did indicate the five suggested functions as potential roles for a public school professional teacher educator.
The superintendents or their delegated respondents also indicated interest in teacher education by contributing sixteen additional functions which they considered pertinent.

**TABLE 3**

**TEACHER EDUCATION FUNCTIONS SUGGESTED BY SUPERINTENDENTS OR THEIR DESIGNATED ASSISTANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering Student Teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Federal Programs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Cooperating Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering Internship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Laboratory Stations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating Plans for Teacher Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with State Department</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating In-service, Pre-service Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Employment for New Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating Teacher Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Seminars</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Tutorial Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Certification for New Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving on Teacher Education Committees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving with Professional Organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the superintendents appeared to be aware of the current problems facing teacher education. There was some evidence that suggested schools were expecting to assume an increased responsibility for teacher education as witnessed by the list of functions checked and the additional ones submitted. There was at least also some evidence of a continuing traditional view that teacher education is primarily a college responsibility as suggested by their comments.

The Public School Teacher Educator Survey

A second questionnaire was sent to public school personnel designated by the superintendents as having responsibilities directly related to teacher education functions. These data were needed to answer questions regarding a conception of the role as viewed by professionals assigned to specific tasks. Much of the data is presented in tabular form followed by an analysis of the information provided.

The first item on this survey dealt with a request for the official title of the position held by the person addressed. The form was designed on the assumption that these job titles would provide clues to these being teacher education positions. The 101 respondents reported a total of 56 different titles. Eight of the titles carried specific reference to the teacher educator title itself and are listed first in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number of Times Position Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Student Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant for Teacher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Teacher Training Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Student Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Specialist--Teacher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Teacher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Teacher Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel--Staff Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director of Personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director, Department of Staff Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director Personnel and Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Staff Development--Federal Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator In-Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of In-Service Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Development In-Service Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director for Staff Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth Service Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist in Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Specialist for Continuing Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Personnel Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Staff Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum--Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College--City Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant in Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Elementary Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Secondary Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Adult Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Educational Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Secondary Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Elementary Education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Secondary Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent of Instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant--Personnel Services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Director of Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative--Educational Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent--Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent--Educational Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent Elementary Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to Associate Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Evaluation and Special Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Junior High Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director of Elementary Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one assumes that in-service education and staff development are functions which are directly related to teacher education, broadly conceived, then 23 of the 56 titles do involve some direct
relationship to the teacher education function. However, most of the evidence seems to confirm the relatively untried nature of the position. Other inferences that may be drawn from titles listed by public school personnel include: (1) most of the titles connoted general administrative functions rather than specific functions, and (2) that the delegation of teacher education responsibilities may have been added to existing positions. Almost 50 per cent of the reported job titles suggest traditional public school, central office positions.

Item 2

How many years have you served as a teacher educator in your present position or other public school systems?

TABLE 5

YEARS OF SERVICE AS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER EDUCATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in Years</th>
<th>Number (N=98)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 or less</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 60 per cent of the respondents have served five years or less as a teacher educator. This information coupled with results from item 1 tend to confirm the assumption that the role of the public
school teacher educator is a relatively new and evolving position. Another way of assessing this possibility is to combine the answers to items 1 and 2. When this was done those who held positions including teacher education, or in-service education and staff development combined, included 22 persons who had held these posts two years or less, 12 for 3-5 years, six for 5-10, and six respondents checked the 10 years or more category.

TABLE 6

JOINT APPOINTMENTS OF TEACHER EDUCATORS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Number N=98</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public School, only</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School and College, jointly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 94 per cent answered this in the negative it would indicate that joint funding of the public school teacher educator position is most uncommon at present. Although the replies to items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12 indicate extensive cooperation between public schools and colleges, there appears to be little joint funding of this position.

Of the 6 per cent who indicated they were employed jointly, 4 per cent received 50 per cent of their salary from each institution, and the remaining 2 per cent received 75 per cent of their salary from a college.
Item 4

What priority is placed upon pre-service teacher education (laboratory experiences) by your school system?

TABLE 7

REPORTED PRIORITIES FOR PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Public School</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This item was rated at the high point of the continuum by most respondents. By combining the "high" and "highest" categories, a total of 75 per cent of the respondents indicate that they consider pre-service teacher education as very important. Since only 26 per cent checked the highest priority, it could be safely inferred that phases of teacher education other than laboratory experiences were also considered vitally important. "Average" and "low" priorities combined for a 25 per cent rating.
Item 5

Do you consider your role as a teacher educator to be primarily administrative, instructional, evaluative, curricular, or other?

TABLE 8

PRIMARY ROLE PERCEPTION OF TEACHER EDUCATORS SAMPLED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this item are decisive in that nearly 70 percent of these professionals responding saw their role as administrative in nature. A review of Table 4 would definitely support this conclusion.

Teacher education functions that apparently have been assumed by the public schools such as placement and coordination are administrative in nature. Since the demand for other pre-service teacher education functions such as evaluation may have lacked the explicit nature of placement and supervision, both colleges and public
schools have been reluctant to initiate change.

Such a decisive response may also suggest that the administrative functions of pre-service education have been shared by the college while other phases have not been.

Those professionals who listed titles having a reference to teacher education were inclined to view their roles as something other than chiefly administrative. Such terms as instructional, evaluative, curricular, and developmental were used to describe their primary functions as a teacher educator.

Item 6

What other agencies or institutions are involved with your teacher education program?

TABLE 9

OTHER AGENCIES OR INSTITUTIONS REPORTED AS BEING INVOLVED WITH TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS SAMPLED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>N=101</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College(s)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These percentages total more than 100 because several of the respondents checked more than one institution as being involved with teacher education in their systems.

As might be expected, the vast majority of responses on this
item went to colleges (93.1 per cent). State Departments were reported as involved in 33.7 per cent of the school systems sampled. The Teacher Corps and Multi-State Teacher Education Program were examples offered to illustrate federal involvement (18.8 per cent) with teacher education programs. Only 3 per cent checked the "other" category with the comments of "joint projects with other public schools" and "local professional groups."

Perhaps it is significant that the wording of the question which emphasized the possessive in reference to "your teacher education program" was apparently acceptable. This acceptance is an indication that the public schools do consider the laboratory aspects of teacher education as "their program." Results from this question also seem to indicate an increasing involvement of other agencies in these aspects of teacher education when 52.5 per cent of the schools sampled check the state department or federal agencies or both. No doubt the impact of such projects as the Multi-State Teacher Education Program, the Teacher Corps, some of the Regional Education Laboratories and others is also reflected in the results from this question.

Item 7

By whom are teacher education policies developed?
Check any that apply.
**TABLE 10**

TYPES OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION POLICIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS SAMPLED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public School Personnel</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Personnel</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Representation (Public School and College)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department, Public School and College</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation from Professional Associations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These percentages total more than 100 due to respondents checking more than one type of personnel.

The teacher educators responding checked three of the suggested responses with an almost equal frequency: (a) "public schools" 32.7 per cent, (b) "college" 28.7 per cent, and (d) "state department, public school, and college personnel" 34.7 per cent. The highest percentage went to joint representation (c) with 61.4 per cent. "Representation from professional associations" (e) scored a relatively low 7.9 per cent. One district in (f) reported teacher education policies were made by the teachers' union; another respondent reported
policies were established by the board of education.

Perhaps the most significant result of these responses was the finding that these teacher educators did not believe that policy development was exclusively a public school responsibility. From these data, it can be inferred that public school personnel see the development of teacher education policies as some kind of cooperative responsibility between several agencies. This finding is uncertain, however. Results from items 4, 5, and 6 seem to substantiate this observation. Results from items 3 and 8, however, tend to be in conflict with this point of view.

When the state department was added as a third agency in the group involved in the development of teacher education policies, this combination received far fewer responses than the combination of just public school and college. Responses to this question clearly indicate that these public school personnel respect the central position of the college.

The involvement of professional organizations in policy development for teacher education was rated very low by public school personnel. This result could indicate that up to now much of the influence of professional organizations in teacher education has been rather indirect.
Item 8

Check any of the following pre-service teacher education programs for which you have some responsibility. Use a "J" to indicate joint school and college responsibility.

TABLE 11

PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR WHICH SCHOOL PERSONNEL ASSUME SOME RESPONSIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Education Programs</th>
<th>Joint School-College Number Percentage</th>
<th>Public School Number Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September Field Experience</td>
<td>30 28.7</td>
<td>22 21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>56 55.4</td>
<td>36 35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>34 33.7</td>
<td>24 23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>10 9.9</td>
<td>7 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation and Participation</td>
<td>40 39.6</td>
<td>26 25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 4.0</td>
<td>7 6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following comments were listed as additional pre-service teacher education activities by the respondents: internship of freshmen and sophomore level teacher corps, teacher assistant, teacher aides, teacher education centers, planned supervised program in lieu of student teaching, coordination of some aspect of the Multi-State Teacher Education Program.
Item 9
In what ways have college personnel contributed to pre-service teacher education programs for your school system? Please check any that apply.

Item 10
In what ways have you contributed to the college pre-service teacher education program? Please check any that apply.

In reporting on these two items the answers were combined because they were designed to secure an indication of the status of collaborative efforts of professionals at the college level and those from the public school.

**TABLE 12**
**NUMBER OF COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS OF COLLEGE AND PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL AS REPORTED BY THE RESPONDING PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER EDUCATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>College Personnel in Public School</th>
<th>Public School Personnel in College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Times Reported N=101</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of student teachers</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant services</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee work</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange teaching (Teaching in public school, or teaching in college)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A high percentage of responses fit readily into the traditional pattern of college-public school relations. For example, over 96 percent of the school personnel surveyed indicated that "supervision of student teachers" was the contribution college personnel made to pre-service teacher education. Consultant services, long a role played by college personnel, was checked by approximately two-thirds of the school personnel. On the other hand, the public school teacher educator's chief contribution centered on consultant services and supervisory work. Items that indicate collaborative efforts such as teaching for the college, research and evaluation were infrequently noted by public school personnel.

As noted in the table, 13 percent of the respondents checked the "other" column. Comments made by school people indicated numerous contributions to planning the pre-service teacher education program, implementation, administration of intern programs, conducting workshops. Preparation of handbooks was added as specific contributions to teacher education.

Item 11

Please rank order the following constraints or limitations to a strong teacher education program in your situation. Rank number 1 as the most serious constraint.

To determine an accurate ranking of the constraints to teacher education programs, a table was developed to indicate the
value ratings placed on the suggested limitations or constraints. This procedure requires placing an assigned value to the rank order given by all respondents to each constraint (rank 1 = 1, rank 2 = 2, etc.). On the basis of the total value, the final rank order of the table was determined. The table illustrates the importance given to each constraint by the respondents.

TABLE 13
RANKINGS BY CONSTRAINTS TO TEACHER EDUCATION
AS VIEWED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Final Rank</th>
<th>Number of Times Each Rank Checked</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Role Conception</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 18 16 10 5 2 2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21 11 11 6 6 8 6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Programming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12 7 11 9 12 6 5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 12 12 13 9 9 5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12 8 7 7 12 5 15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Cooperation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 10 9 15 6 14 5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Domination</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9 10 9 7 4 13 12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 14

RANKING OF CONSTRAINTS TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>(Listed from most serious to least important)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inadequate role conception by &quot;student teaching team&quot; (cooperating teacher, principal, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inadequate programming (local school system has not assumed or been granted a true partnership role)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of proper supervision from college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lack of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lack of cooperation among educational institutions (i.e., public schools, state department, and college)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>College domination (i.e., each college dictates its unique program)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints listed as most serious by public school personnel centered on "role conception," "financial support," "inadequate programming," and "lack of college supervision." The fact that "role conception" was ranked by the public school teacher educators as the most serious constraint to a strong teacher education program indicates their awareness of the importance of clear expectations. The high ranking for the next three constraints, "financial support," "inadequate programming," and lack of "college supervision," suggests that these public school personnel believe that colleges and state departments of education should share at least a part of the responsibility for leadership and support for the laboratory phases of teacher education.
Item 12

What are promising innovations in pre-service teacher education with which your school is associated? Please check any that apply.

### TABLE 15

**INNOVATIONS IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN REPORTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovative Programs</th>
<th>Number N=90</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jointly financed programs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro teaching</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching center</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical professorship</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses strongly suggest a trend toward more collaborative efforts when two of the three most frequently checked, jointly financed programs and student teaching centers are combined. In many cases micro-teaching probably also represents some type of collaborative effort.

Innovations in teacher education reported by these public school personnel in response to the "other category" also suggest an interest in collaborative efforts. The following is a list of all the
additional innovations reported by public school teacher educators:

1. Extended laboratory course for two years
2. Development of school centers
3. Mini-courses
4. Learning corporation
5. Cluster approach
6. Intensive course for those holding degrees in other fields to attain certification--project career
7. District-sponsored internship
8. Methods taught in public school by college professor
9. Instructional coordinator (responsibility for coordinating field experiences at local level)
10. Middle Elementary Teaching Team Program
11. Multi-State Teacher Education Program
12. Instructional media center
13. Training Teachers of Teachers Program
14. Planned supervision program in lieu of student teaching
15. National Teacher Corps
16. Video taping
17. Summer programs for pre-service teachers
18. Field experience for freshman and sophomores
19. Team leaders of student teachers
20. Teaching aides--sophomore and junior
Item 13

What phases of your school program, other than classroom teaching, are utilized for student teaching or other pre-service experiences? Please check any that apply.

TABLE 16

PHASES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAMS REPORTED AS BEING UTILIZED FOR EXPERIENCES FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel services (guidance, visiting teacher, etc.)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative services</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological services (testing and diagnostic)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are additional phases of the public school program utilized for experiences given in response to the checking of the "other" category for item 13.

1. Instructional materials
2. Administration of preparation programs
3. Departments of instruction becoming involved--library (2)
4. Instructional consultants
5. Research

6. Special education (2)

7. Pre-student teachers work in school as teaching aides (3)

8. Internship in business department

9. Observation of outdoor education

10. Consultant services

11. Educational television instructors

12. In-service student teaching

There was no clear-cut emphasis on any one phase of the school program being utilized for pre-service teacher education. Items on psychological services, student personnel services, and administrative services received 78 per cent of the total responses with each phase sharing an almost equal percentage of the responses. Interpreting the results was made difficult due to a lack of discrimination. The interest generated by this item as indicated by the number of responses and the list of additional experiences indicates considerable emphasis on comprehensive experiences for prospective teachers.

Item 14

Do you involve community agencies as a planned phase of pre-service teacher education?

The results here were very definite. An overwhelming 81 per cent indicated that they did not involve community agencies as
a planned phase of pre-service teacher education. The following, however, are comments on question 14, which illustrate ways in which community agencies are being involved in some pre-service teacher education programs:

1. Workshops for inner-city teachers
2. Community action programs
3. National teacher corps
4. Interns
5. Opportunity centers and recreation centers
6. Child guidance clinics
7. Family helpers
8. Juvenile bureau
9. Community chest
10. Community service council
11. Inner-city complex
12. County agencies such as mental health clinics
13. Business and industry cooperation in vocational education
14. Community cultural resources (library--park--museum)
15. Local education association
16. Welfare agencies
17. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
18. Parent Teachers Association
19. Chamber of Commerce
Item 15

(Public School Instrument)

What priority in terms of effort or time do you give to each of the following teacher education functions? Please respond in two ways, first on the left side of the page respond as the role is today. And second on the right side respond as you would ideally have it. Key: 5=highest priority, 4=high priority, 3=average priority, 2=low priority, 1=lowest priority.

(College Instrument)

Please respond in two ways to the following suggested teacher education functions. On the left side of the page check the columns which describe the role of the public school educator today. On the right side check the columns that describe the functions of the teacher educator as you would ideally conceive his role.

Lists of suggested teacher education functions were submitted to both groups of respondents (public school teacher educators and college specialists). They were requested to value rate these functions on a five to one scale both as they conceived these tasks being fulfilled today by a public school teacher educator and their rating of the functions as they conceived them ideally.

The lists of suggested functions submitted to the two populations were constructed to elicit responses on teacher education from college as well as public school personnel. Additional requests were made of college respondents by enlarging the list of suggested functions. This extended list tended to corroborate the inclusive nature of the suggested functions. Most of the analysis, therefore, was
concentrated on the fourteen correlative functions.

In order to facilitate their handling, the correlating functions from the two instruments were abbreviated. There were a total of fourteen correlative functions in the two instruments. These functions were abbreviated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Public School</th>
<th>Jury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with college</td>
<td>(j) Liaison with teacher training institutions</td>
<td>(i) Serving in a liaison capacity with college(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Place-ments</td>
<td>(o) Coordinating placements of teacher education students</td>
<td>(n) Placing teacher education students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting cooperating teachers</td>
<td>(b) Selecting cooperating or supervising teachers</td>
<td>(b) Selecting supervising teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with personnel department</td>
<td>(a) Liaison with your personnel department for recruitment and employment</td>
<td>(a) Recruiting teacher education students for staff employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing resource for education classes</td>
<td>(e) Providing resource personnel for education classes in college</td>
<td>(e) Acting as a resource person for college classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging field experience</td>
<td>(h) Arranging for all types of field experience in the school</td>
<td>(h) Arranging field experience for prospective teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing in-service programs</td>
<td>(i) Developing cooperative programs for pre-service education between school system and college</td>
<td>(f) Conducting in-service programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Developing pre-service programs
(d) Developing pre-service teacher education programs
(d) Developing pre-service programs

### Evaluating pre-service programs
(m) Evaluating pre-service teacher education
(l) Evaluating pre-service programs

### Working with professional organizations
(k) Working with professional organization directly concerned with teacher education
(j) Serving through professional organizations

### Working with state department
(g) Working with state department on curriculum or certification
(g) Collaborating with state department officials

### Promoting teacher education councils
(l) Promoting teacher education councils
(k) Developing teacher education councils

### Coordinating tutorial programs
(c) Coordinating tutorial programs
(c) Coordinating tutorial programs

### Research in pre-service programs
(n) Research in pre-service teacher education
(m) Conducting research in teacher education

Rankings of the suggested teacher education functions were secured by tabulating the value ratings of the respondents. Functions were ranked from 1 (highest) to 14 (lowest) depending on the ranking each item received. A mean ranking was determined by computing an average rank for each item.
### TABLE 17

**RANKING BY MEAN OF SUGGESTED FUNCTIONS AS GIVEN BY THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER EDUCATOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Today</th>
<th>Mean Ideally</th>
<th>Rank Today</th>
<th>Rank Ideally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(j) Liaison with teacher training institutions</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) Coordinating placements of teacher education students</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Selecting cooperating or supervising teachers</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Liaison with your personnel department for recruitment and employment</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Providing resource personnel for education classes in college</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Arranging for all types of field experience in the school</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Developing cooperative programs for pre-service education between school system and college</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17--continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Today</th>
<th>Mean Ideally</th>
<th>Rank Today</th>
<th>Rank Ideally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(f) Providing in-service programs for cooperating or supervising teachers</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Developing pre-service teacher education programs</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) Evaluating pre-service teacher education</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Working with professional organizations directly concerned with teacher education</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Working with state department on curriculum or certification</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Promoting teacher education councils</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Coordinating tutorial programs</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) Research in pre-service teacher education</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean Today</td>
<td>Mean Ideally</td>
<td>Rank Today</td>
<td>Rank Ideally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Serving in a liaison capacity with college(s)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Selecting supervising teachers</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Recruiting teacher education students for staff employment</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Serving through professional organizations</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) Placing teacher education students</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Collaborating with state department officials</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Arranging field experience for prospective teachers</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean Today</td>
<td>Mean Ideally</td>
<td>Rank Today</td>
<td>Rank Ideally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Coordinating tutorial programs</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r) Conducting in-service programs for administrators and supervisors</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Conducting in-service programs</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Recruiting teacher candidates for the profession</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(u) Counselling student teachers</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) Supervising pre-service programs</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s) Continuing professional growth after pre-service</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Developing pre-service programs</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t) Supervising student teaching</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18--continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Today</th>
<th>Mean Ideally</th>
<th>Rank Today</th>
<th>Rank Ideally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(m) Conducting research in teacher education</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Evaluating pre-service programs</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Developing teacher education councils</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Acting as a resource person for college classes</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q) Teaching &quot;methods&quot; classes (pre-service)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) Administering pre-service programs</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to analyze the results from the two instruments, a rank order correlation was employed to compare the fourteen correlative functions in four ways: first, a comparison was made of the public school personnel's ratings of functions for "today" and "ideally," second, a similar comparison was made of the ratings by college personnel; the third comparison was that of "today" for both...
school and college respondents, and the fourth comparison examines
the value ratings of the projections of the "ideal" role as made by
school and college personnel.

TABLE 19
RANK ORDER CORRELATION OF SUGGESTED
FUNCTIONS: PUBLIC SCHOOL INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating placements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting cooperating teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with personnel department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing resource for education classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging field experience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing in-service programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing pre-service programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating pre-service programs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with professional organizations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with state departments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting teacher education council</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating tutorial programs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in pre-service programs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rho = .79  p < .01
A rank order correlation of .79 is significant at less than the .01 level.¹ This indicates a consistent relationship between the teacher education functions as presently conceived and what should they be in the future. This may be illustrated by examining the fourteen items in terms of the top four, bottom six and the remainder in-between. A comparatively high degree of ranking consensus is found at both ends of the table, indicating that public school personnel value most of the functions presently and also rank these functions ideally in much the same order. Exceptions to this are found in such items as "providing resource for education classes," "providing in-service programs" and "developing pre-service programs," and "research in pre-service programs."

TABLE 20
RANK ORDER CORRELATION OF SUGGESTED FUNCTIONS: COLLEGE INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Today</td>
<td>Ideally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with colleges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting cooperating teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with personnel department</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with professional organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating placements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with state departments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging field experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating tutorial programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing in-service programs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing pre-service programs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting teacher education councils</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating pre-service programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing resource for education classes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in pre-service programs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rho = -.29 n. s.
The rank order correlation of the suggested teacher education functions by the college respondents show a much greater diversity of ordering from what is to what they think future tasks should be. A negative correlation of .29 (not significant)\(^2\) was achieved with close agreements found only in items one, two, five, ten, and eleven. No discernible pattern appeared from the rankings in the table indicating little agreement by college personnel over what is and what should be. Or stated another and more positive way, the college teacher educators perceive a significantly different rank order for these items under ideal conditions.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 593.
**TABLE 21**

RANK ORDER CORRELATION: COLLEGE AND PUBLIC SCHOOL INSTRUMENT COMPARED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Today</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ideally</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with colleges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting cooperating teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with professional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating placements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with state</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging field experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating tutorial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing in-service programs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing pre-service programs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting teacher</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating pre-service programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing resource for</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research pre-service programs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rho = .54 \( p < .05 \)  
Rho = .50 \( p < .05 \)
The rank order correlation of .54, which is statistically significant at the .05 level revealed a degree of consistency between school and college personnel as they viewed the suggested teacher education functions today. Representatives of the two institutions were in agreement in items like "liaison with colleges," "selecting cooperating teachers," and "liaison with personnel department," "arranging field experiences," "providing in-service programs." Divergent rankings were found in such functions as "working with professional organizations," "working with state departments," "coordinating tutorial programs," and "providing resource for education classes."

An analysis of a comparison of the two instruments where respondents were asked to rank suggested functions in the ideal column resulted in a rank order correlation of .50 which is significant at the .05 level. This result indicated agreement between professionals as they viewed a desirable relationship of these suggested functions. There was, however, no discernible pattern to the results as basic agreement was evidenced in items one, two, four, five, eight, nine, and eleven. Items that indicated little agreement included three, seven, and ten.

Ibid., p. 593.
The utilization of rank order correlation provided a statistical analysis of comparative rankings of a suggested list of functions of the role of the public school teacher educators. A statistically significant degree of agreement in rankings was ascertained in two of the tables, 19 and 21. Divergent results of no statistical significance were achieved from a comparison of rankings in table 20.

The following analyses were based on the rank order correlations from the four comparisons:

1. There was more agreement on the value rating of suggested functions "today," than in the "ideal" column.

2. Statistically the highest agreement between the functions for "today" and "tomorrow" was found in the public school instrument.

3. All functions in both instruments were rated higher "ideally" than they were perceived to be "today."

4. Functions rated highly by both groups included: liaison with college, coordinating placement for teacher education students, and selecting cooperating teachers.

5. Functions rated low by both groups included: research in pre-service programs, promoting teacher education councils, and evaluating pre-service programs.

6. There was little agreement on functions such as: coordinating tutorial programs, working with state
departments, working with professional organizations, and providing resource for teacher education classes.

**The Jury--College Teacher Educators**

A survey was made of selected college teacher educators to secure their perceptions of the public school's functions in the field experience phase of teacher education. This third instrument had a format similar to the public school teacher educator questionnaire. It was intended to elicit their conceptions of this evolving position. These data were to be compared and contrasted with that received by the use of the other two instruments with the two other populations. The comparison of the value rating on the corresponding items from the second and third instruments on suggested teacher education functions for the public school teacher educator has been reported in a previous section. The responses of the college teacher educators will be reported, followed by some of their written comments, with a final section presenting a generalization and a comparison of the responses from the three instruments.

The jury composed of college teacher educators responded to a brief series of questions regarding the role of the public school
teacher educator as follows:

Item 1

Do you believe that public school systems should have a designated professional teacher educator (coordinator or director) for the system?

Thirty-three, or 97 per cent, replied in the affirmative, one replied in the negative.

Item 2

If your answer to number 1 is yes, should this position have central office status?

Thirty, or 97 per cent, replied yes; one, or 3 per cent, no; two did not respond.

Item 3

To what institution(s) should this position be responsible?
Check any that apply.

TABLE 22
INSTITUTIONS TO WHICH THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER EDUCATOR SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE AS REPORTED BY COLLEGE TEACHER EDUCATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number N=31</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public School(s)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint appointment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State departments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 4

How would you conceive the task function of this position?

Item 5

Do you believe that the authority for the field experience phase of teacher education should be located in:

TABLE 23

SUGGESTED LOCATION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE FIELD EXPERIENCE PHASE OF TEACHER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>N=34</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public school(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint setting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A neutral center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 6

The position of teacher educator in the public schools should be supported by the funds from:

TABLE 24

SUGGESTED SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR POSITION OF TEACHER EDUCATOR IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>N=31</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public school(s)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A joint setting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 25

SUGGESTED TASK FUNCTION OF POSITION OF THE TEACHER EDUCATOR IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO RESPONDING COLLEGE TEACHER EDUCATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>N=33</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory (coordinating)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 7

Financial support for pre-service teacher education experiences in the public school should be provided for by the following: Check those that apply.

TABLE 26

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>N=33</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public school(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and public school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose in expanding the number of proposed functions on the questionnaire directed to the jury was to capture reactions
from college teacher educators of long experience with these concerns. The responses to the additional functions continued the pattern established by the respondents in the fourteen correlated functions previously discussed. There was evidence to suggest that college teacher educators were reluctant to have public school personnel supervising student teachers or teaching methods classes. However, the jury was most supportive of public school involvement in "Continued professional growth after pre-service" and "Recruiting teacher candidates for the profession."

Judging from the lack of responses, the request to have the respondents name a professional other than the public school teacher educator for functions rated low, was ill advised. The meager response, however, did support the already well-established pattern concerning the division of teacher education responsibilities. For the most part, functions A-P were generously shared. Functions Q-V, however, were labeled as the college domain almost exclusively.

The high percentage of returns and the comments made by several of the college teacher educators indicated more than a passing interest in the topic. This section will deal briefly with some representative comments.

A part of the objective of the study was to ascertain the present status of the evolving position of the public school teacher educator. The following comments are offered as sample perceptions
of the role of the public school educator which recognized leaders in
teacher education described in their replies.

I would answer practically all of the questions with
the generalization that the majority of items are of highest
importance and should be initiated and carried out as a
joint responsibility and in a close working relationship
between the public school and the university. There are
some aspects of teacher training in which the university is
best fitted and there are a number in which the school
working with the university should bear responsibility.
Each agency has a considerable expertise to contribute to
the other and the desirable culmination of this dependent
relationship is seldom realized.

A comment taken from the response of another teacher edu-
cator to a query on the desirability of the position of public school
teacher educator reads as follows:

I would want to make sure that the function and re-
sponsibility be clearly defined and assigned.

Another took the time to write a letter regarding concerns
on the topic. Part of his reactions follow:

I can see the teacher educator as being one that knows
the most about his school system with respect to teacher
education laboratory experience needs and with respect to
what experience his school system can best provide. I do
not, however, see any college just sending their student
teachers to him and asking him to provide, with the help of
his teachers, all or most of the supervision the student
teachers would get.

As to variables that would influence the assignment of a pub-
lic school teacher educator, the comment most frequently made was:

It depends on the size of the system--the larger systems
will have resources to support such a position--it is especially
important if the system cooperates with several colleges--this
proposed position should not replace the college co-
ordinator and supervisor.

Although the vast majority of the observations regarding
aspects of the proposed position of public school teacher educator
were positive, not all were as evidenced by the following:

You probably have sensed that I am opposed to the joint
appointment. I have never seen this work successfully even
where the joint appointment might be for the college of edu-
cation and the college of liberal arts. It is difficult for a
person to serve two masters. It is also very difficult for a
person, as you well know, to keep up with what is going on
in one position today representing only one institution.

In response to questions on task function, authority and
responsibility for the public school teacher educator, one college
respondent made this observation:

This certainly places the person in a middle man
position—in a neither/nor and whipping boy spot, doesn't
it? Maybe no one would accept the job!

I personally believe that it will be many years before
the schools we use today for student teaching will be staffed
properly to assume much of the total responsibility for edu-
cating teachers.

Summary

Respondents on the three instruments reflected a concern
for the improvement of pre-service teacher education. There were
definite indications that educators saw the role of the public school
teacher educator as a viable and needed position. There was some
evidence of mutual collaborative efforts as revealed by responses
suggesting the contributions made by college personnel to pre-service teacher education, and the liaison efforts of public school professionals between the two institutions.

The two institutions, public schools and colleges, saw their responsibilities as joint concerns. Generally, state departments and federal agencies were excluded. For example, public school personnel gave the state department a 23 per cent rating and federal agencies a 13 per cent rating in the item "involvement with your teacher education program." Some 57 per cent of college personnel indicated the financial support for pre-service teacher education should come from colleges and public schools jointly.

If it were possible to judge accurately the teaching profession's position on involvement of public schools in the field experience phase of teacher education a decade ago, the extent of the movement toward more collaborative efforts between colleges and the public school in teacher education could be more accurately determined.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of the position responsible for the public school coordination of field experience functions for pre-service teacher education students, and to project additional functions in the form of guidelines and a role statement for an emerging central office position of teacher educator in public schools.

A survey of three populations, superintendents, public school personnel performing aspects of the teacher educator role, and college teacher educators, was the research method used in gathering data. The selected college personnel acted as a jury. A review was made of recent state department and professional organization publications to gain information on existing policies and recommendations for the public school professional functioning as a teacher educator. The data for this study were collected during the Spring and Summer Quarters, 1969.

The three questionnaires were sent to professional educators from three different orientations. The first instrument was mailed to city school superintendents of school systems of over 25,000 pupils
in the United States with a request for names of professional(s) in their system with assigned responsibility for coordination of pre-service teacher education programs. Superintendents or their designated subordinates were also requested to check suggested functions assigned to those professionals designated with the teacher education responsibility.

The second instrument was designed to ascertain the nature of pre-service teacher education functions as perceived by designated professionals. The instrument was constructed to reveal two kinds of data. The first part of the questionnaire centered on a descriptive inquiry into the status and scope of the role, while the second half was devoted to a two-phase value ranking pertaining to assumed functions. Respondents were asked to rate these functions in two ways; first, as they viewed them in actual practice, and second, as they would conceive them ideally.

The third instrument was designed to elicit the perspective held of the position of the public school teacher educator by a select group of recognized college leaders in teacher education. The design of this instrument was patterned after the design of the second instrument. Results from this inquiry were compared with opinions secured with the other two instruments. In this way, the respondents served as a jury. From this comparison plus the review of related literature, a set of guidelines and a role statement for the public school teacher
educator were to be developed.

In order to determine recent trends, procedures, and recommendations for the public school's role in coordinating teacher education, a survey of recent state department and professional organization publications was made. The results were consistent with information from the three instruments. Some publications cited policies and procedures of an apparent traditional nature, while several others indicated an increasingly greater responsibility on the part of public schools for pre-service teacher education.

The cover letter that accompanied the instruments suggested that "now was an appropriate time to examine the emerging role of the public school teacher educator." The results from a question regarding the "length of service as a teacher educator in this or other school systems" supported the contention of its being a comparatively new role in public school systems. A majority of 59 per cent indicated service in this position of five years or less. From the instrument directed to the superintendents those titles that included specific reference to teacher education were held by professionals who had served in those positions for ten years or less.

The data from the instruments provided substantial support for the public school's role in coordinating pre-service teacher education programs. The college leaders, by a 97 per cent affirmative rating, revealed that this function should be a designated position and
should command central office status in the public schools. The query directed to the superintendents indicated that 78 per cent named a professional who was serving functions ascribed to a teacher educator. There were, however, only a total of twenty of the various titles (56) which contained specific reference to teacher education.

Data obtained from public school teacher education and college personnel reflected a considerable gap between what is and what the respondents would like to see. For example, 70 per cent of the college personnel felt that responsibility for field experience should be a joint program while only 6 per cent of the designated public school teacher educators reported their positions as joint appointments.

In response to another question regarding financial support of pre-service teacher education, 40 per cent of the college personnel checked "college and public school" inferring mutual responsibility. Public school personnel in a check of shared programs indicated that 25 per cent of them were actually involved in jointly-financed programs.

Respondents in the second half of the instruments were asked to attach priority ratings to suggest functions of the position of the public school teacher educator. The professionals completing these value scales were requested to rate the function of the public school teacher educator in two ways. First, on the left side of the page they were asked to estimate the priority given the proposed function today.
Secondly, on the right side of the page they were asked to check the value that they considered the function should receive ideally.

A rank order correlation was utilized to determine statistically the consistency with which respondents value rated the suggested functions of the public school teacher educator. Four comparisons were made; first, the correlation of responses "today" and "ideally" by public school personnel were significant at the .01 level; second, a correlation of these same responses by college personnel was not significant; third, a comparison of college and public school "today" was significant at the .05 level, and a fourth correlation between college and public school personnel "ideally" was also significant at the .05 level.

**Discussion of the Value Scales**

1. All functions in both instruments were rated higher "ideally" than its functions were perceived in effect "today."

2. There was more agreement on the value rating of suggested functions "today," than in the "ideally" column.

3. The higher correlation of "today" and "ideally" functions was found in the public school instrument.

4. Functions such as liaison with colleges, selecting supervising teachers, and liaison with the personnel department received comparably high ratings from both the public school personnel and the college jury.
5. Functions like coordinating tutorial programs, collaborating with the state department, promoting teacher education councils, and working with professional organizations although receiving higher ratings "ideally," were rated comparatively lower by both groups.

6. Functions like evaluating pre-service teacher education programs, and research in pre-service teacher education received somewhat lower ratings from the public school respondents than they did from the college jury.

Overall, the impressions given by these value ratings of suggested functions were consistent with other findings in the surveys. In general, the public school personnel, although expressing considerable interest in teacher education, still tended to hold to the traditional view of colleges having the major responsibility for most phases of teacher education. College personnel, while expressing a similar view, believe that colleges should share more of the responsibility for teacher education than public school personnel presently desired to assume.

Conclusions

From the three populations surveyed, public school superintendents, teacher educators, and college professionals, and the review of recent state department and professional publications, the
following conclusions were made:

1. The proposed functions were not being fulfilled today.
   (This was based upon the relatively high number of low values--one and two--accrued on the left side of the scale.)

2. The proposed functions were given decidedly higher ratings in the ideal column. This would seem to indicate that both public school and college teacher educators saw a need to improve all suggested functions.

3. Several of the functions that were given low ratings in the ideal column by college personnel were thought to be the responsibility of some other professional, e.g., principal, supervisor, professor, and was so designated. The results here tend to be inconclusive as the number of respondents selecting another professional were too few upon which to draw precise conclusions.

4. Generally, the items did not discriminate functions on the basis of their relative importance as a part of the role of the public school teacher educator. Instead, the items suggested were without exception given higher priority in the ideal column.

5. There appeared to be a greater willingness to share teacher education functions on the part of the college
jury than the schools were willing to accept. This was inferred in comparative value ratings given, such as, for developing and evaluating pre-service teacher education programs.

6. Recent state department and professional organization publications have recommended that school systems and specifically their administrative and supervisory personnel assume greater responsibility for the laboratory phase of teacher education. Policies and procedures have also been recommended and the study reveals that public school officials are showing increased awareness and assumptions of these responsibilities.

Implications

Guidelines for the Teacher Educator in the Public School

The following guidelines for the position of teacher educator in the public school were formulated from information secured from the three instruments, and the review of literature. They were developed in basic reference to the following questions: (1) what is the present status of the teacher educator in the large city school systems in the United States? (2) what are the varying concepts that professionals hold about the functions of this role? and (3) what are the functions which are deemed important to the role of the public school
teacher educator? These suggested guidelines were divided into three categories: assumptions, policies, and functions of the position of the public school teacher educator.

1. ASSUMPTIONS:

a. The public schools are being asked to assume an ever-increasing share of the responsibility for teacher education.

b. Collaboration between public schools and universities has been strongly recommended for more than twenty years.

c. The position of public school teacher educator represents a focal point through which collaborative efforts between public schools and colleges in teacher education can be channeled.

d. Recognition of the potential of the public school teacher educator position may be enhanced by:

(1) designating it as a central office position, (2) providing adequate financial support, (3) developing policies covering the position and its relationships, and (4) outlining the functions which should be provided through this position.
2. **POLICIES:**

   a. The position of the public school teacher educator should be a line position with central office status, with the coordination of the experience phase of teacher education as its primary responsibility.

   b. The position should serve as the focal point for liaison between the teacher preparing college(s) and the public school system.

   c. The position should be financed from regular school funds with specific allocations from these sources: (1) regular school budgets, (2) state department of education foundation programs, and, (3) whenever practicable by agreement, from college teacher education budgets.

   d. Other phases of the special services of school systems with which this position might logically be functionally related are: staff development, continuing education, and any organizational pattern which includes in-service teacher education.

3. **FUNCTIONS:**

   (High priority functions are listed first.)

   a. Providing liaison with teacher education institutions.

   b. Selecting supervising teachers.
c. Coordinating pre-service teacher education programs.
d. Selecting teacher education laboratories.
e. Coordinating experience programs of several colleges.
f. Placing teacher education students.
g. Arranging orientation programs for pre-service teacher education students.
h. Keeping records.
i. Organizing experience programs for teacher education.
j. Providing in-service programs for supervising teachers.
k. Evaluating pre-service teacher education programs.
l. Coordinating research activities for teacher education.
m. Liaison with professional organizations.
n. Facilitating resources for pre-service teacher education.
o. Publicizing teacher education programs.
p. Coordinating tutorial programs.
q. Organizing teacher education councils.
r. Coordinating in-service programs for teachers.
On the basis of data collected in this study, the above guidelines should provide reference for the establishment of a position of teacher educator in the central office of the large public school system. Although the data collected in this study came from systems of 25,000 pupils or more, the literature suggests that most smaller school systems should provide the same teacher education services even though the position might not always be one with full-time responsibilities.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

1. The interrelationships between institutions responsible for teacher education should be studied to provide new organizational structures for innovative programs in teacher education.

2. The interrelationship of roles, e.g., teacher educator, principal, college coordinator, and state department personnel should be studied to create new approaches for pooling resources to improve teacher education.

3. Avenues for extending financial support for teacher education programs should be explored.

4. The status of partnership agreements in the United States needs to be examined. Such a study, with local modifications, could develop models which would increase and
expand collaborative efforts.

5. Public schools of less than 25,000 enrollment need to be considered as a source of information for teacher education programs.

6. The evolving nature of this position demands the establishment of objective operational structure. Therefore, the governance of this position needs careful examination.

7. The in-service component of the public school teacher educator should be examined as a potential bridge between the university and the schools.
Dear Superintendent:

Would you take a few minutes to assist us with a study involving the experience aspect of pre-service teacher education? This area is being increasingly recognized now as a joint responsibility of public schools and colleges. Emerging from this partnership is a professional role for the teacher educator in the public school. The results of this inquiry will be utilized to examine and sharpen the role of the pre-service teacher educator.

In this investigation the emphasis is placed on such pre-service activities as laboratory experience, student teaching, and internship. To facilitate this study, I am requesting two bits of information from you: (1) name, title and address of the professional(s) responsible for pre-service teacher education in your system and (2) completion of a checklist regarding pre-service teacher education functions.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours truly,

W. R. Williams
Field Experience Office
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio  43210

Dear Superintendent:

We believe that now is an appropriate time to evaluate this development and to secure a sharper focus on the potential role of the teacher educator in the public schools.

Your response is a key factor in the successful completion of this doctoral study that I am directing.

Cordially yours,

L. O. Andrews
Professor Area of Teacher Education

W. R. W. : sk
L. O. A. : sk
Please complete and return this information in the enclosed stamped envelope. Return to:

W. R. WILLIAMS
FIELD EXPERIENCE OFFICE
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43210

Do you have a professional educator who is assigned administrative and coordinating responsibilities for pre-service teacher education? ___________yes ___________no.

If the answer is yes, please give the name, title, and address below of this person or persons in your school system. (Either school or joint appointment.) Please indicate for joint appointment the cooperating institution(s).

NAME __________________________________________________________
TITLE ___________________________________________________________
ADDRESS
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

Name and title of person completing inquiry.

________________________________________
School system

________________________________________
Address
The following are functions that a teacher educator could possibly be assigned. Please indicate by a (✓) the items that presently are assigned to the teacher educator in your school system. Space has been provided for you to add any functions that have been omitted.

___ a. Administering the placement process of teacher education students.

___ b. [Blank]

___ c. [Blank]

___ d. Administering the placement process of teacher education students.

___ e. Developing and improving pre-service teacher education programs.

___ f. Serving as liaison between public school and college(s).

___ g. Developing criteria for selecting teachers and schools for teacher education services.

___ h. Coordinating in-service programs to upgrade cooperating or supervising teaching skills.
Dear Colleague:

Would you take a few minutes to critically review an instrument that I have prepared to survey the public school teacher educator? Your comments as to clarity, organization, structure, and purpose are most welcome. I am requesting eight other respected professionals in the Columbus area to critique this instrument. Your prompt reply would be very much appreciated as I hope to begin mailing this by May 21st.

Thank you,

Bill Williams
Field Experience Office
College of Education
The Ohio State University
May 31, 1969

Dear Superintendent,

Recently, I wrote you requesting information on teacher education in your system. To date my records indicate that you have not responded. Would you take a minute to supply the name, title, and address of the professional on your staff with responsibility for pre-service teacher education? Pre-service includes such activities as observation and participation, student teaching and internship.

Do you have a professional who is assigned responsibilities in pre-service teacher education? __________Yes _________No

Name ____________________________
Title ______________________________
Address ____________________________

Thank you,

W. R. Williams
Student Field Experience Office
The Ohio State University
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Dear Teacher Educator:

You have been designated as one of the professionals in your school system who performs the role of the teacher educator. The teacher educator is defined in this study as one who has responsibility for public school programs dealing with college students preparing to become teachers.

Would you take a few minutes to assist us with a study of your role in pre-service teacher education?

In this investigation the emphasis is placed on such pre-service activities as laboratory experience, student teaching, and internship. You can make a contribution to this study by completing and returning the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope.

If your system has a teacher education policy statement or a job description of your position, it would be very helpful in this study if you would send such materials under separate cover and bill me for any costs.

Your response will be very much appreciated.

Yours truly,

William R. Williams

Dear Teacher Educator:

We believe that now is an appropriate time to evaluate this development and to secure a sharper focus on the potential role of the teacher educator in the public schools. Your response will be a key factor in the successful completion of this doctoral study that I am directing.

Cordially yours,

L. O. Andrews
Professor
Area of Teacher Education
THE ROLE OF THE PROFESSIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOL
TEACHER EDUCATOR

You have been named as a professional in your school system
who performs the role of a teacher educator. Please complete or
(✓) check appropriate item(s). Your comments on any item are
solicited.

1. Would you please list your title? _____________________________

2. How many years have you served as a teacher educator in your
present position or other public school systems?
   a. _____ two years or less          c. _____ 5-10 years
   b. _____ 3-5 years                  d. _____ over 10 years

3. Is your position as teacher educator considered a joint appoint-
ment, i.e., do you receive a salary from both public school and
college? _______ yes _______ no. If yes, what fraction
of your salary is paid by the college?
   a. _____ 1/4                           c. _____ 1/2
   b. _____ 1/3                           d. _____ other,
      indicate __________________________

4. What priority is placed upon pre-service teacher education (lab-
   oratory experiences) by your school system?
   a. _____ highest                        d. _____ low
   b. _____ high                           e. _____ lowest
   c. _____ average

5. Do you consider your role as a teacher educator to be primarily
   a. _____ administrative                     d. _____ curricular
   b. _____ instructional                     e. _____ other,
   c. _____ evaluative                       indicate __________________________

6. What other agencies or institutions are involved with your teacher
   education program? Check any that apply.
   a. _____ college(s)                        c. _____ federal
   b. _____ state department                   d. _____ other,
      indicate __________________________
7. By whom are teacher education policies developed? Check any that apply.
   a. ___ public school personnel
   b. ___ college personnel
   c. ___ joint representation (school and college personnel)
   d. ___ state department, public school, and college personnel
   e. ___ representation from professional associations
   f. ___ other, indicate ____________________________________________

8. Check any of the following pre-service teacher education programs for which you have some responsibility. Use a "J" to indicate joint school and college responsibility.
   a. ___ September field experience (a full-time exploratory experience in a public school--usually the first two weeks of Fall term)
   b. ___ student teaching
   c. ___ internship (post undergraduate degree program)
   d. ___ tutoring
   e. ___ observation and participation
   f. ___ other, indicate ____________________________________________

9. In what ways have college personnel contributed to pre-service teacher education programs for your school system? Please check any that apply.
   a. ___ consultant services
   b. ___ teaching in public school
   c. ___ committee work
   d. ___ evaluation
   e. ___ research
   f. ___ supervision of student teachers
   g. ___ other ____________________________________________________

10. In what ways have you contributed to the college pre-service teacher education program? Please check any that apply.
    a. ___ consultant services and other college activities
    b. ___ teaching in college
    c. ___ supervision of student teachers
    d. ___ research
    e. ___ evaluation
    f. ___ committee work
    g. ___ other ___________________________________________________
11. Please rank order the following constraints or limitations to a strong teacher education program in your situation. Rank number 1 as the most serious constraint.
a. _____ college domination (i.e., each college dictates their unique program)
b. _____ financial support
c. _____ inadequate programming (local school system has not assumed or been granted a true partnership role)
d. _____ lack of cooperation among educational institutions (i.e., public schools, state department, and colleges)
e. _____ lack of proper supervision from college
f. _____ inadequate role conception by "student teaching team" (cooperating teacher, principal, etc.)
g. _____ lack of research

12. What are promising innovations in pre-service teacher education with which your school is associated? Please check any that apply.
a. _____ jointly financed programs
b. _____ clinical professorship
c. _____ micro teaching
d. _____ simulation
e. _____ student teaching center
f. _____ others, indicate

13. What phases of your school program, other than classroom teaching, are utilized for student teaching or other pre-service experiences. Please check any that apply.
a. _____ psychological services (testing and diagnostic services)
b. _____ health services
c. _____ student personnel services (guidance, visiting teacher, etc.)
d. _____ administrative services
e. _____ other, indicate

14. Do you involve community agencies as a planned phase of pre-service teacher education? _____yes _____no. Please list all that are directly involved.
15. What priority in terms of effort or time do you give to each of the following teacher education functions? Please respond in two ways, first on the left side of the page respond as the role is today. And second on the right side respond as you would ideally have it.

**KEY:**
- 5 = highest priority
- 4 = high priority
- 3 = average priority
- 2 = low priority
- 1 = lowest priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TODAY</th>
<th>IDEALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (a) Liaison with your personnel department for recruitment and employment
- (b) Selecting cooperating or supervising teachers
- (c) Coordinating tutorial programs
- (d) Developing pre-service teacher education programs
- (e) Providing resource personnel for education classes in college
- (f) Providing in-service programs for cooperating or supervising teachers
- (g) Working with state department on curriculum or certification
- (h) Arranging for all types of field experience in the school
- (i) Developing cooperative programs for pre-service education between school system and college
- (j) Liaison with teacher training institutions
(k) Working with professional organizations directly concerned with teacher education
(l) Promoting teacher education councils
(m) Evaluating pre-service teacher education
(n) Research in pre-service teacher education
(o) Coordinating placements of teacher education students

Thank you very much for your assistance with this study.
APPENDIX D
June 1969

THE ROLE OF THE PROFESSIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER EDUCATOR

Dear Teacher Educator:

You have been identified as an expert in the area of direct experiences in Teacher Education. We would appreciate your response to a survey concerning the Public School Teacher Educator. The Teacher Educator in this study is defined as a professional, primarily public school based, with responsibilities for programs dealing with college students preparing to become teachers. In this investigation the emphasis is placed on such pre-service activities as laboratory experience, student teaching, and internship. These professionals, usually central office personnel, will have varying titles, e.g., "Director or Coordinator of Teacher Education," "Director of Personnel," "Director of Instruction," "Curriculum Specialist," etc.

This is one phase of a doctoral study now in progress under Dr. L. O. Andrews. I have identified persons occupying such a position in school systems of 25,000 plus enrollment and am conducting a survey of their positions and activities. Before developing a set of guidelines for this position, I believe it imperative to have the best judgment of college personnel with extensive experiences in teacher education.

Your response will be very much appreciated.

Thank you,

William R. Williams
Assistant Coordinator
Field Experience Office
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

We believe that now is an appropriate time to examine the potential role of the emerging position of teacher educator in the
public schools. Your assistance with this study will be greatly appreciated.

Cordially yours,

L. O. Andrews
Professor
Area of Teacher Education
The Ohio State University
Please complete and return this form in the enclosed stamped envelope. Return to:

W. R. WILLIAMS
FIELD EXPERIENCE OFFICE
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
1945 NORTH HIGH STREET
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43210

Please complete or (✓) check appropriate item(s). Your comments are solicited.

1. Do you believe that public school systems should have a designated professional teacher educator (coordinator or director) for the system? ____________yes ____________no.
   Comments______________________________________________________________

2. If your answer to number 1 is yes, should this position have central office status? ____________yes ____________no.
   Comments______________________________________________________________

3. To what institution(s) should this position be responsible? Check any that apply.
   a. ______public school(s)
   b. ______college(s)
   c. ______joint appointment (equally responsible to both a and b institutions)
   d. ______state department
   e. ______other, indicate________________________________________________

4. How would you conceive the task function of this position?
   a. ______line
   b. ______staff
   c. ______advisory (coordinating)
   d. ______other, indicate________________________________________________

5. Do you believe that the authority and responsibility for the field experience phase of teacher education should be located in:
   a. ______public school(s)
   b. ______college(s)
   c. ______joint setting
   d. ______a neutral center
   e. ______other, indicate________________________________________________
6. The position of teacher educator in the public schools should be supported by the funds from:
   a. ______ public school(s)
   b. ______ college(s)
   c. ______ a joint setting
   d. ______ other, indicate ________________________________

7. Financial support for pre-service teacher education experiences in the public school should be provided for by the following:
   Check those that apply.
   a. ______ public school(s)
   b. ______ college(s)
   c. ______ college and public school
   d. ______ state
   e. ______ other, indicate ________________________________

Do you wish a copy of the results? ______ yes ______ no

Your name ________________________________________________

Your address ________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
Please respond in two ways to the following suggested teacher education functions. On the left side of the page check the columns which describe the role of the public school educator today. On the right side check the columns that describe the function of the teacher educator as you would ideally conceive his role. (Key: HIGHEST IMPORTANCE 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 LOWEST IMPORTANCE)

Should those functions that you rated low be the responsibility of some other professional? In the space at the right margin please identify the title of the professional in whose role you would rate this an important function, e.g., college supervisor, professor, public school supervisor, teacher, principal.

You are requested to add any functions that you consider pertinent to the role of the public school teacher educator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Today (Real)</th>
<th>Tomorrow (Ideal)</th>
<th>Other Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Recruiting teacher education - - - - - students for staff employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Selecting supervising teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Coordinating tutorial programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Developing pre-service programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Acting as a resource person for college classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Conducting in-service programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Collaborating with state department officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Arranging field experience for prospective teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Serving in a liaison capacity with college(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Serving through professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Developing teacher education councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Evaluating pre-service programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(m) Conducting research in teacher education</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(n) Placing teacher education students</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(o) Administering pre-service programs</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(p) Supervising pre-service programs</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(q) Teaching &quot;methods&quot; classes (pre-service)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(r) Conducting in-service programs for administrators and supervisors</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(s) Continuing professional growth after pre-service</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(t) Supervising student teaching</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(u) Counselling student teachers</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(v) Recruiting teacher candidates for the profession</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(w)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>(y)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** HIGHEST IMPORTANCE 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 LOWEST IMPORTANCE

Thank you very much for your assistance with this study.
### College Teacher Educators: The Jury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Christenbury</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Clothier</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard E. Collier</td>
<td>Association for Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James F. Collins</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Edwards</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Giles</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Horton, Jr.</td>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duaine Lange</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleo Mabrey</td>
<td>Southeast Missouri State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Martin</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Nash</td>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Nelson</td>
<td>Troy State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Ruman</td>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Brooks Smith</td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmitt D. Smith</td>
<td>West Texas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey Southall</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Tyree</td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer H. Williams</td>
<td>Jersey City State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Willson</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiles VanAntwerp</td>
<td>George Peabody College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
William Beisel  
Beatrice Chait  
Simon Chavez  
John Evans  
Robert Goble  
John Kirker  
James Lifer  
Robert MacNaughton  
Mary Michael  
Lorrene Ort  
Robert Pfeiffer  
John Walters  
Edward Wingard  
Franklin Young

University of Akron  
Wright State University  
University of Dayton  
Ohio University  
Miami University  
Capital University  
Ashland College  
Cleveland State University  
Ohio Dominican College  
Bowling Green State University  
Kent State University  
Youngstown State University  
Central State University  
Otterbein College
### School Districts Providing Data on the Public School Teacher Educator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>City - State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>Birmingham, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville City</td>
<td>Huntsville, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Public</td>
<td>Birmingham, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile County</td>
<td>Mobile, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Union High</td>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Public</td>
<td>Tucson, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Union High School</td>
<td>Anaheim, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Unified</td>
<td>Fremont, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Grove Unified</td>
<td>Garden Grove, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno City Unified</td>
<td>Fresno, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach Unified</td>
<td>Long Beach, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haywood Unified</td>
<td>Haywood, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City</td>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebelle Unified</td>
<td>Montebelle, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Diablo Unified</td>
<td>Concord, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport - Mesa Unified</td>
<td>Newport Beach, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk - La Mirado Unified</td>
<td>Norwalk, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena City</td>
<td>Pasadena, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Unified</td>
<td>Richmond, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>City, State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Unified</td>
<td>Riverside, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>Sacramento, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernadino City Unified</td>
<td>San Bernadino, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Unified</td>
<td>Carmichael, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Stockton, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrence</td>
<td>Torrence, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>Colorado Springs, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Public</td>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>Lakewood, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo District 60</td>
<td>Pueblo, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>Hartford, Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools of the District of Columbia</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard County</td>
<td>Titusville, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale Public</td>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade County Public Schools</td>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville Public Schools</td>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambia County Florida</td>
<td>Pensacola, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>Orlando, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach County</td>
<td>West Palm Beach, Florida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearwater
Polk County
Volusia County Schools
Fulton County
Savannah
Cobb County
Macon
Dekalb County
Atlantic Public
Muscogee County
Richmond County
Honolulu
Chicago City
Peoria
Evansville - Vanderburgh
Rockford Public
Fort Wayne Community Schools
City Schools of Gary
Indianapolis Public
South Bend Community Schools Corporation
Des Moines Independent Community
Kansas City District 500

Clearwater, Florida
Bartow, Florida
De Land, Florida
Atlanta, Georgia
Savannah, Georgia
Marietta, Georgia
Macon, Georgia
Decatur, Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia
Columbus, Georgia
Augusta, Georgia
Honolulu, Hawaii
Chicago, Illinois
Peoria, Illinois
Evansville, Illinois
Rockford, Illinois
Fort Wayne, Indiana
Gary, Indiana
Indianapolis, Indiana
South Bend, Indiana
Des Moines, Iowa
Kansas City, Kansas
Wichita Public
Fayette County
Louisville City
Jefferson County Public
Caddo Parish Schools
Calcasieu Parish
New Orleans Public
East Baton Rouge
Rarides Parish School
Jefferson Parish Schools
Anne Arundel County
Baltimore City Public
Towson
Montgomery County Public
Prince Georges County Schools
Boston Public
Public Schools of Springfield
Worcester Public
Detroit Public
Flint Community Schools
Grand Rapids School
Lansing School District
Livonia

Wichita, Kansas
Lexington, Kentucky
Louisville, Kentucky
Louisville, Kentucky
Shreveport, Louisiana
Lake Charles, Louisiana
New Orleans, Louisiana
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Alexandria, Louisiana
Gretna, Louisiana
Annapolis, Maryland
Baltimore, Maryland
Towson, Maryland
Rockville, Maryland
Upper Marlboro, Maryland
Boston, Massachusetts
Springfield, Massachusetts
Worcester, Massachusetts
Detroit, Michigan
Flint, Michigan
Grand Rapids, Michigan
Lansing, Michigan
Livonia, Michigan
Robbinsdale Public
Independent School District 281
Minneapolis Public
New Hope
St. Paul Public
School District of Kansas City
St. Louis City
Lincoln Public
Omaha Public
Clark County
Newark
Patterson
Buffalo City
Rochester City
Cumberland County
Winston-Salem/Forsyth County
Greensboro Public Schools
Charlotte-Mecklenbury
Gaston County
Akron City
Cincinnati Public

Minneapolis, Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
New Hope, Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota
Kansas City, Missouri
St. Louis, Missouri
Lincoln, Nebraska
Omaha, Nebraska
Las Vegas, Nevada
Newark, New Jersey
Patterson, New Jersey
Buffalo, New York
Rochester, New York
Fayetteville, North Carolina
Winston-Salem, North Carolina
Greensboro, North Carolina
Charlotte, North Carolina
Gastonia, North Carolina
Akron, Ohio
Cincinnati, Ohio
Cleveland Public
Columbus City Schools
Dayton Public
Toledo Public Schools
Youngstown City Schools
Oklahoma City
Tulsa Public
Portland Public
Philadelphia
Pittsburgh
Providence
Aiken County
Charleston County
School District of Greenville County
Richland County
Chattanooga Public
Chattanooga City
Knoxville City
Shelby County
Metropolitan Public Schools
Memphis
Austin Independent
Cleveland, Ohio
Columbus, Ohio
Dayton, Ohio
Toledo, Ohio
Youngstown, Ohio
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Tulsa, Oklahoma
Portland, Oregon
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Providence, Rhode Island
Aiken, South Carolina
Charleston, South Carolina
Greenville, South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
Chattanooga, Tennessee
Chattanooga, Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee
Memphis, Tennessee
Nashville, Tennessee
Memphis, Tennessee
Austin, Texas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Public</td>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Independent</td>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth Independent</td>
<td>Fort Worth, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Branch</td>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock Public</td>
<td>Lubbock, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>Pasadena, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis School</td>
<td>Farmington, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite School</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County</td>
<td>Fairfax, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton City Schools</td>
<td>Hampton, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Public</td>
<td>Richmond, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico County</td>
<td>Richmond, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News Public</td>
<td>Newport News, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Public</td>
<td>Norfolk, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach Public</td>
<td>Virginia Beach, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds School District No. 15</td>
<td>Lynwood, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline School District 401</td>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Public</td>
<td>Spokane, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Public</td>
<td>Tacoma, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanawha County</td>
<td>Charleston, West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Madison, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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