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CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

During the decade of the 1960's a number of new developments took place within teacher education. Along with new discoveries in the use of media and new methods of analyzing teaching there emerged a new concern for cooperation at all levels to strengthen laboratory experiences in elementary and secondary schools. Although some cooperative efforts had been initiated during the 1950's, school-college partnerships had received relatively little attention until this point in time. One outgrowth of the new concern was the establishment of the Multi-State Teacher Education Project for the purpose of developing "... joint responsibility between local education agencies and teacher education institutions. . .".

Beginning with the latter half of the 1960's, many more institutions and many more educators realized that existing laboratory experience settings, particularly school-college partnerships for student teaching, were inadequate. Perhaps Perdew best sums up the

---

current situation when he states:

Closer school and college relationships are imperative. New mechanisms and new structures are being formed. These new structures call for new roles and fundamental rearrangements of responsibilities. Schools are finding their way toward including teacher education as a primary, high-priority function. Customary arrangements for student teaching are being remodeled here and there. Student teaching in the old form is becoming increasingly ineffective and impossible. A replacement is overdue. For change to become progress, the ferment in teacher education needs full cooperation of schools and colleges and a fundamental review of purposes, functions, roles, and responsibilities.²

The problems and issues which point to new cooperative relationships are many and varied. Some of these are discussed in the pages immediately following.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE STUDY

The student teaching experience is usually considered by students to be the "capstone" of their professional education. Most student teachers say that student teaching was the best part of their professional preparation even though the evidence indicates that for a substantial number the experience was actually a distressing one in a poor learning situation. Current analysis of problems reveals that the traditional approach to providing student teaching experiences for both elementary and secondary teachers has not been uniformly successful. A review of related literature quickly discloses some of the problems which need to be resolved.

Often one or more of the persons actually responsible for directing the work of the student teacher has had limited experience in this role or expertise for it. Supervisors visit but are rarely able to plan and coordinate intensive and extensive experiences effectively for the student teachers. Since there is typically no resident coordinator or college-based supervisor on "the scene," individualization and changes in program are difficult to provide. In essence, college and university resources are not used to their fullest to benefit the student or the cooperating teacher. Andrews has gone so far as to suggest that the problems inherent in the traditional terminal, one-shot student teaching in public schools render it educationally, psychologically, operationally, and financially unsound.

In an article entitled "Role Dilemmas in Student Teaching," Haines suggests that usually the student must establish his own status or be relegated to a subordinate role. Also, difficulties may arise when the student teacher and the supervising teacher are in basic disagreement over child growth and behavior, educational experiences, and the teaching-learning process.

Behling indicates that changes are needed to deal more adequately with an increased number of teacher education students who are finding

---

3. L. O. Andrews, "Teacher Education Center Concept" (Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1971), pp. 1-12. (Mimeographed.)


a limited number of qualified student teaching stations. He further suggests that there is a need to prepare better supervising teachers; a need to involve college and university personnel in public school programs; a need for improved supervisory service; and a need for joint in-service and pre-service programs.6

Evidence that teachers' associations are becoming interested in being involved in teacher education and that they recognize some of the existing problems is contained in The Report of the Classroom Teachers National Study Conference on the Role of the Classroom Teacher in the Student Teaching Program. Some of the major problems are summarized below:

1. Usually there is little cooperation or coordination between persons in the campus-based teacher education program and those involved in providing student teaching experiences.

2. Although the cooperating teacher has the greatest influence in shaping the student teacher, he is least likely to be under the control or influence of the teacher education institution.

3. Usually the cooperating teacher is not involved in planning the teacher education sequence and his perception of his function may be entirely different from that of the teacher education institution.

4. Cooperating teachers are often unaware or unfamiliar with new teaching strategies and techniques and are unable to aid student

---

teachers in experimenting with and implementing such techniques, even though the methods course instructor may recommend them.

5. Despite the fact that student teaching is a cooperative endeavor, in many cases those who are most concerned and involved in the colleges and the entirely separate elementary and secondary schools are not working together closely enough.\(^7\)

The findings in Yee's study on the student teaching triad suggest additional problems in student teaching. Summarizing some of his findings suggests that (1) the student teaching triad more often resembles a competitive triad setting than a cooperative triad situation; (2) typical student teaching programs provide little opportunity and purpose for meaningful interaction; (3) there is a need to provide time and policies for the triad and special selection and training for triad leaders; (4) typically there are too many student teachers for the college supervisor to supervise adequately; and (5) conciliation and facilitation of the relationships between the cooperating teacher and student teacher are superficial.\(^8\)

Such are some of the more acute problems of student teaching which often occur in its common or traditional form. This experience

---


essentially remains a relatively brief encounter with teaching amid uncertainty of roles and responsibilities. There is an apparent wide range in the variety and quality of experiences, as well as in the quality of supervision. Increasing recognition of the problems which seem almost inherent in this form of student teaching has stimulated perceptive teacher educators to seek new arrangements as a means of solving the problems. The center concept has emerged as one of the more promising new arrangements as a supportive setting for more effective, student teaching experiences. However, despite the fact that center variations have been tried around the country for several years, very little information or data about them has been reported in the literature. There is an immediate need then to determine to what extent the center approach has been adopted and in what forms it exists nationally.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Functional cooperative arrangements in teacher education are appearing in greater numbers around the country. The forms such developments may eventually take are still rather unclear. Enough is known and has been written about off-campus centers for elementary school student teachers to suggest much future promise, but so little has been written about similar programs for secondary school teachers that both their present status and their future promise is relatively uncertain.

This study was designed specifically as an exploratory and descriptive survey to locate, identify, and gather information about secondary school student teaching centers in operation around the
country. The dual objectives of the study, therefore, were to determine the status of secondary school student teaching centers nationally and to examine existing designs, operational factors, and perceptions of selected college and center personnel. This research project thus attempted to answer the following questions:

1. How widespread are secondary school student teaching centers which are thought by local institutional personnel to meet the criteria selected for this study?

2. What is the nature of the collegiate and scholastic institutions involved with secondary school student teaching centers?

3. For what purposes do college administrators indicate secondary school student teaching centers were established?

4. What is the role of the center coordinator in secondary school student teaching centers as perceived by college administrators and center coordinators?

5. What are the significant characteristics of secondary school student teaching centers?

6. What are the advantages of secondary school student teaching centers as perceived by college administrators and center coordinators?

7. What are the most difficult problem areas or constraints to maximum center effectiveness as perceived by college administrators and center coordinators?

PROCEDURES

An extensive review of the literature was conducted to identify significant aspects of the student teaching center concept. This
information was used to plan a developmental sequence for locating secondary school student teaching centers and to develop questionnaires for later mailing to college administrators and center coordinators involved with identified centers.

The sequence for collecting data consisted of the following:

1. Identification of existing secondary school student teaching centers and/or institutions operating such centers by:
   a. compiling a list of such centers and/or institutions having such centers which were found mentioned in the readily available literature of teacher education;
   b. corresponding with directors of teacher education in state departments of education;
   c. corresponding with the presidents of state and regional units of the Association of Teacher Educators (A.T.E.); and
   d. corresponding with selected educators known to have worked extensively with student teaching centers to obtain their nominations of institutions and/or secondary school student teaching centers for inclusion in the study.

2. Development of a questionnaire for mailing to college administrators currently involved with secondary school student teaching centers to obtain
   a. descriptive information about the college or university (e.g., location, student enrollment, etc.);
   b. purposes for which the center approach was designed;
   c. characteristics of the center design;
   d. center advantages;
3. Development of a questionnaire for mailing to center coordinators of secondary school student teaching centers to obtain
   a. descriptive information about the cooperating school district(s) (e.g., location, type of school organization, etc.);
   b. characteristics of the center design;
   c. center advantages;
   d. center problem areas; and
   e. suggestions for improving center effectiveness.

4. Analysis of data to determine the status of secondary school student teaching centers nationally and to derive implications as to their operation and effectiveness. (The three main sources of data consisted of objective responses to questionnaire items, requested subjective comments, and various materials received.)

ASSUMPTIONS

The basic assumptions which relate to this study are the following:

1. Cooperative school-college ventures of the type called Secondary School Student Teaching Centers are an increasingly significant aspect of current arrangements for the laboratory phases of teacher education.

2. Neither the colleges nor the schools can do an effective job of providing rich professional learning experiences alone; there-
fore, cooperative efforts which seem to offer promise need to be analyzed.

3. Typical traditional secondary school student teaching placements often result in unsound working arrangements; therefore, other possibilities for providing more adequate learning experiences should be explored.

4. Certain problems which are not found in elementary school centers will appear in the operation of secondary school centers.

5. Appropriate instrumentation can be developed to collect the data needed to conduct this research.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The study encompasses only those secondary school student teaching centers which have been identified by representatives of state departments of education, ATE state and regional presidents, and selected educators known to be involved in center development.

2. Only those centers which met the criteria described in the researcher's definition of secondary school student teaching centers were included in the study.

3. Only selected characteristics of secondary school student teaching centers were studied.

4. The research findings were limited by the exploratory and descriptive nature of the study.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Terminology in student teaching is in a very chaotic state. Attempts at clarification have been made by various committees and
individual teacher educators throughout the years, but diverse definitions remain. Evolving school-college cooperative approaches to student teaching have introduced still newer terminology. A study of this type further supports the basic need to define terms more precisely if future research is going to prove meaningful.

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were appropriate:

**Student Teaching.** A period of guided teaching when a college student assumes increasing responsibility for directing the learning of a group or groups of learners over a period of consecutive weeks.\(^9\)

**Off-campus Secondary School Student Teaching Center.** An off-campus setting in a secondary school or a cluster of schools (numbering no more than four) coordinated by a full-time or regular staff person selected by the college or university, the school district, or both.

**Center Coordinator.** A full-time or regular staff person responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of students assigned to the center. The center coordinator could be a subject area specialist or generalist responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of students assigned to the center.

**Secondary School.** Any middle school, junior high school or high school in which student teachers receive supervised student teaching experiences designed to meet secondary school certification standards.

---

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I consists of an explanation of the nature of the study, background for the study, justification for the study, purposes of the study, assumptions, limitations of the study, definition of terms used in the study, and the general procedures which were followed in the study.

Chapter II provides a review of selected literature which the writer found to be relevant to the study.

Chapter III describes the procedures used to implement the study and includes a description of the instruments employed, the process of instrument development, and the populations involved in the study.

Chapter IV contains the findings of the study.

Chapter V consists of a summary of the study, conclusions, discussion, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature reviewed in this chapter was selected to reflect the historical development of centers, the significant characteristics of centers, and the findings of available research.

CENTER DEVELOPMENTS PRIOR TO 1960

The historical perspective intended here is one which begins with early school-college cooperative attempts and culminates with a consideration of what are identified, for the purpose of this study, as secondary student teaching centers.

Cooperative attempts between schools and teacher preparing institutions were tried around the turn of the century, but it was not until teacher colleges emerged and teacher education enrollments became large that cooperative agreements became a reality. The cooperative agreement developed by Ohio Wesleyan University in 1917 is one example of a rather complex contract between a school district and a university.1 At about the same time other school districts and colleges entered into

a variety of similar cooperative agreements. The features of such agreements included guaranteed facilities, provisions for supervision, benefits provided the school or district and other specific stipulations. The agreements were frequently developed to meet particular college or university needs such as those which evolved at Clemson College, the University of Missouri, and the University of Minnesota to prepare teachers for Smith-Hughes schools of agriculture and home economics. Cooperative arrangements thus evolved in those instances where campus laboratory schools were not feasible or capable of meeting the need. In general, however, program control remained in the hands of the collegiate institutions.

During the 1930's internship programs appeared, some of which were designed and operated by school systems and collegiate institutions jointly. This was a period of increased shared responsibility, but some programs were actually dominated by the schools.

Following World War II, a great increase in the number of college students preparing to be teachers caused most student teaching programs to be moved to off-campus settings. The saturation of nearby schools by teacher education students obviously created problems. Attempts at cooperation were made, but as Olsen indicates:

---

2Ibid., pp. 786-789.


4Patrick J. Johnson, "A Description and Analysis of the Cooperative Teaching Centers at Wayne State University as Formal Organizations and Emerging Institutions" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Wayne State University, 1967); p. 38.
In a large majority of these off-campus student teaching programs, college domination remained. The schools "cooperated" with the college. . . . The relationship was clearly unidirectional.\(^5\)

Problems revolving around joint decision making and definition of roles were yet to be resolved.

New plans began to evolve to handle the increase in prospective teachers. One attempt to accommodate large numbers of student teachers from a university in a small town was Michigan State's Marshall Plan. Although it was originally tried by Troy L. Stearns in the early 1940's, this off-campus program did not really become operational until, with the support of the Kellogg Foundation, it went into effect in Marshall, Michigan in 1947.\(^6\) Essentially, the community was used as a classroom for junior and senior elementary education majors. For twelve weeks of residence during the fall term students focused on the community, available resources for use in the school program, and plans for bringing about community improvement. Future proposals which grew out of the Marshall Plan included closer correlation of field experiences with courses on campus, greater utilization of campus personnel, and expansion of the program to include students in secondary education.\(^7\)


\(^7\)Ibid., pp. 31-33.
Johnson reported that Wayne State University developed its first centers in 1946 with the Detroit Public Schools. Three elementary schools functioned as teacher education centers which were coordinated by the chairman of the Elementary Education Department, who was also the Director of Student Teaching. Principals and teachers were appointed jointly by the school and college. (It should be noted that at this time Wayne State was Wayne University, a municipal institution governed by the Detroit Board of Education.) College supervisors worked in one school for several semesters and developed close working relationships. In general, there was a great deal of shared faculty status and close school-college cooperation. Despite the apparent success of the arrangement "these schools were phased out of teacher education activities during 1956 and 1957 because it was thought that they were artificial situations."9

Another type of cooperative arrangement is evident in a contractual agreement reported by Meyering in 1954.10 Iowa State Teachers College entered into an agreement with the Independent School District, Independence, Iowa which required joint selection of a resident student teaching coordinator. Responsibilities were spelled out and each institution agreed to supply certain resources and facilities.

---


9. Ibid., p. 47.

During the late 1940's and early 1950's there existed a number of variations of on and off-campus college-controlled laboratory schools. One such type was made possible by an agreement with a local public school system pertaining to finance, selection of personnel, and curriculum. The arrangement was somewhat similar to some of today's partnerships, but it included some clearly distinct differences. Typically, the building might be owned and maintained by the district, but the college would hire the teachers, furnish equipment, and control the curriculum (with the approval of the district superintendent of schools). Such an agreement provided a college-controlled setting for course-related observation and student teaching. 11

In 1955, Michigan State initiated a new off-campus resident program. (Apparently an outgrowth of the Marshall Plan.) It began on a voluntary basis and, in 1956, became a required program for all education majors. Selected school systems accommodated from twenty to twenty-five resident student teachers for twelve weeks. Regular university faculty members, mostly full-time personnel, served as coordinators. 12 Reactions to the plan appeared to be generally favorable.


In 1958, Wayne State University made another attempt to establish off-campus centers. At this time the University was no longer under control of the Detroit Board of Education. A graduate faculty member served as center coordinator, each with an office in the district principal's office. According to the information gathered by Johnson, control and working relationships were less effective than in the center plan tried earlier. These centers were phased out when the University thought that the centers had become too school dominated.

Interest in developing cooperative arrangements seemed to show signs of growth in the latter 1950's and 1960's. Olsen suggests, "It was during this period that the trend toward joint ventures in teacher education really got underway."

CENTER DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 1960

One of the earliest attempts to describe existing school-college ventures appeared in the form of a 1964 report developed by the Subcommittee on School-College Relationships in Teacher Education under the chairmanship of E. Brooks Smith. (The Subcommittee had been established in 1962 by the Committee on Studies of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in cooperation with The Association for Student Teaching.) The report, entitled School-College Relationships in Teacher Education: Report of a National Survey of Cooperative Ventures, provided descriptions of various cooperative arrangements

---

14 Olsen, School-College Relations, p. 4.
including "Cooperative Centers for Teacher Education." \(^{15}\)

Among the new cooperative student teaching centers described in the Subcommittee Report were those which began operating at Wayne State University in January 1963. The stated purpose of these cooperative centers was to improve the quality of student teaching activities in terms of the following:

By bringing the school and college more closely together in cooperative planning and supervising of student teaching activities;
   By facilitating communications between school and college about expectancies in student teaching;
   By developing a professional team of school and college personnel for pre-service teacher education;
   By organizing more efficiently for better use of supervising personnel; and
   By providing for in-service education of new supervisory personnel at school and college. \(^{16}\)

All of the centers established by Wayne State in 1963 were limited to elementary schools.

The 1964 Subcommittee Report also included a description of a special Ford Foundation center project at the University of Missouri at Kansas City (UMKC). The Center Concept employed in this project was

... devised to overcome the artificial hiatus which frequently exists in the teacher education curriculum between theory and practice and between the teaching roles, activities, and guidance functions of college teachers of general and professional education and public school teachers. \(^{17}\)


\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 29.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 32.
Six centers (three elementary and three secondary) were cooperatively organized with the Kansas City, Missouri public schools with a UMKC faculty member serving as coordinator at each center.

Other institutions had reported to Smith's committee that they were operating cooperative centers for teacher education, but descriptions of their programs were not clear and did not appear in the Subcommittee's publication.

In 1965 the Subcommittee issued Cooperative Structures in School-College Relationships for Teacher Education, Report Number Two. This report focused primarily on cooperative organizational structures and arrangements rather than on program descriptions.18

In the fall of 1966 five Teacher Education Centers, two secondary and three elementary, were opened by the University of Maryland in cooperation with Montgomery County. The general purpose was "to achieve a joint sovereignty for teacher education shared by the colleges, state departments, schools, and associations."19 The concept was conceived as a program which united pre-service and in-service components of teacher education. Schools and colleges achieved overlapping responsibility for educating "students of teaching." A significant aspect associated with this center was a jointly-selected, jointly-financed


19James F. Collins (ed.), "The Teacher Education Center: A Unifying Approach to Teacher Education" (paper presented at the A.S.T. Clinic on the Teacher Education Center Concept, April 8, 1970, Gaithersburg, Maryland), p. 2.
center coordinator.

Partnership in Teacher Education, published in 1968, discusses solutions to problems in cooperative teacher education and probably contains the most recent collection of center descriptions. In a selection of the book entitled "Cooperative Student Teaching Centers," centers affiliated with six different institutions are discussed. Centers at Harvard, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, University of Utah, Wayne State, State University College, Buffalo, and Central Missouri State College are described and various characteristics identified. The purposes of the centers presented appear to focus to a great extent on improving student teaching, but variations in purpose and organization serve as reminders that often cooperative programs are developed to meet specific local needs. Only two of the six programs mention secondary student teaching.

The multi-institutional student teaching center of the type reported in Mercer and Kanawha counties of West Virginia represents another variation of the center concept which evolved in the latter half of the 1960's. County schools, the West Virginia Department of Education and nearby colleges and universities banded together to

---


21 W. R. Cooke, Mercer County Teacher Education Center (Princeton, West Virginia: Mercer County Schools).

22 Kathryn Maddox, Kanawha County Teacher Education Center (Multi-Institutional), (Charleston, West Virginia: Kanawha County Schools).
provide carefully designed pre-service and in-service programs.

The student teaching center concept has thus evolved in several notable forms. Despite the existing variations, one thing is clearly evident:

One of the most significant developments in the preparation of school personnel during the last decade has been the changing relationship between schools and colleges. There has been a marked shift from relatively loose affiliation to partnership, from unilateral decision making and independent action to shared judgment and joint procedures. While this change has not penetrated all sections of the teacher education community, the trend is underway.23

The historical overview of cooperative developments presented above shows that in the literature where schools are identified, elementary schools were more frequently mentioned than secondary schools. Since less information has been reported about secondary student teaching centers, the researcher thought it more appropriate to study selected aspects of secondary centers only.

THE CENTER APPROACH TO TRADITIONAL PROBLEMS

Trends revealed in the literature suggest that schools and colleges have realized a need to enter into true partnerships with public school systems. It is doubtful that either of the institutions will be satisfied much longer with cooperative arrangements which provide for anything less than complete joint responsibility.

Collins reports that both full-time center coordinators and joint councils with policy making responsibility are becoming more

23 Olsen, School-College Relations, p. 2.
prevalent. It is becoming more common to find councils consisting of representatives from the state department of education, all the participating institutions of higher education, and the school systems.

An example of what it may take to enable the center approach to succeed has been synthesized from several sources by Olsen. From contributions by Smith and others he has combined eight key elements into a rationale for cooperation and partnership. An abbreviated version of his rationale suggests that partnership (1) provides a needed "inter-institution" which fills an area "between existing institutions"; (2) "furnishes structure needed for joint policy making and ... administration"; (3) requires "collaboration by professional equals"; (4) "demands clearly defined roles and responsibilities"; (5) "serves to establish common purposes for all who participate"; (6) "provides enough flexibility" for changes to be made and continuity to be maintained; (7) rests upon "shared authority" in the decision making process, and (8) "requires that resources of the participating institutions . . . be committed to the joint venture." These elements tend to represent the components which participants in contemporary cooperative efforts will likely demand.

The center approach appears to contain the potential to resolve some problems which have plagued teacher education since student teaching

---


25 Olsen, School-College Relations, pp. 6-7.
moved off campus. The literature does not verify the success of centers at this point in time, but it does reveal some fairly common purposes for which centers are being established. Authorities such as Collins and Smith seem to agree that center objectives include the integration of theory and practice, the merging of pre-service with in-service education and the development of a setting in which educational improvements are developed and disseminated.

Some recurring center problems can be identified in the literature. Barnes, Davies, and Behling each point out such problems as those dealing with genuine collaboration, differences over the nature of teacher preparation, and role clarification and responsibility. Other problems were also evident in the literature, but it was difficult to determine their scope.

The researcher found in the literature evidence of trends and


27 E. Brooks Smith, "Needed: A New Order in Student Teaching that Brings Joint Responsibility for Professional Development" (Detroit: Wayne State University, October, 1968), p. 10. (Mimeographed.)


30 Herman E. Behling, Jr., Toward a Partnership in Teacher Educa-
attempts at defining needed collaborative components. The potential success inherent in the center approach as well as apparent problems, were also evident. In general, however, information tended to come from a rather limited number of sources and did not pertain to elementary or secondary centers individually.

RELATED RESEARCH

A review of the literature revealed that few studies have been done which pertain to student teaching centers of any type. These few, as well as could be determined, dealt with elementary centers.

Manuel, in an exploratory and descriptive study of six cooperative elementary student teaching centers, concluded that the center concept was sound and promising. She found that satisfactory experiences were provided for student teachers and that the most pressing problems identified were

... frequent changes in school and college personnel, lack of commitment on the part of the supervising teacher, and the scheduling of student teachers from a quarter-college term to a school-semester placement.31

Data were collected from center documents (e.g., reports, publications, etc.), tape recorded interviews, results of responses to questionnaires, student teachers' responses to a check list about the cooperative activities of the centers, and research files of the Subcommittee on

School-College Relationships of the AACTE.

Johnson, in an attempt to determine whether or not cooperative teaching centers could exist as viable organizations between the school and college, studied three of nine elementary centers operated by Wayne State and schools in the Detroit area. His findings indicated that (a) a center is an organization which can exist with an identity of its own between the school and college and yet still serve the interests of both institutions; (b) faculty members from the school and the college can develop loyalties to the center; and (c) the school and college have become equal partners in the teacher education process. 32

Mauritsen's study which was conducted in an elementary center in Salt Lake City revealed no significant changes in attitude by student teachers in the center or student teachers in the control group. Furthermore, there was no real difference in the amount of supervision between the student teaching center and the traditional setting. A specially designed questionnaire and the Minnesota Teaching Attitude Inventory were used to gather data. 33

Young attempted to determine changes in behavior and attitudes in his study at the University of Maryland. Among other things, he


found center student teachers to be more stimulating, creative, and student-centered in comparison to non-center students. Although at least one group of secondary teachers was considered, Young dealt primarily with elementary teachers.  

Data collected on Harvard's pilot Student Teaching Centers revealed the following:

(a) positive student teacher comments about supervision received in the Centers contrasted with somewhat less favorable student teacher comments concerning traditional supervising teacher arrangements; (b) resident supervisors agreed that this new role afforded more opportunity for supervision and curriculum development; (c) resident supervisors commented in effect that the new role--its status and authority--breathed new life into their teaching careers.

These centers were assumed to be secondary in nature with programs functioning in mathematics, social studies, French, and English.

Hess reported that in a recent survey of the 50 state departments of education a trend toward greater use of student teaching centers was identified. The national study indicated that about one-third of the states each had from one to forty student teaching centers in operation. State officials seemed to look favorably upon the establishment of student teaching centers in their states.

Generally speaking, the literature provides little information

---


35 VanderLinde, "Cooperative Student Teaching Centers," p. 60.

about the status or characteristics of off-campus secondary student teaching centers. It is apparent that a national survey is only the initial step in obtaining needed information about secondary student teaching centers. It is equally clear that future studies must examine in depth the fundamental principles which support the center concept in teacher education.

The methodology employed in this study is described in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the development of the instruments used in the study, procedures followed to locate secondary school student teaching centers, implementation of the questionnaires, and the processing of the data.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENTS

The exploratory nature of the study required that two types of survey instruments be developed to gather the necessary data. First, since no list of secondary school student teaching centers existed, forms were devised for use in locating secondary school student teaching centers. Second, instruments had to be developed to gather data from administrators of collegiate institutions and center coordinators cooperatively involved in the operation of secondary school student teaching centers.

Locator Forms

The literature contained very little information about secondary school student teaching centers so it became necessary to locate centers by employing other means. Knowledgeable persons across the country were surveyed to locate and identify operating secondary school student
teaching centers. Three groups were included in the survey: presidents of state and regional units of the Association of Teacher Educators (A.T.E.), persons responsible for teacher education in state departments of education, and selected teacher educators known to have had experience with centers who probably could provide some information. Originally it was thought that one form would serve to gather data from all of the groups. However, since the writer and his major adviser anticipated slightly different information from educators known to be involved with centers, two forms were developed.

Locator Form A (see Appendix B) was designed to gather information from A.T.E. presidents and persons responsible for teacher education in state departments of education. Locator Form B (see Appendix B) was designed to gather information from selected individual teacher educators. Both instruments were intended to be simple, one-page forms on which persons could list pertinent identifying information. The instruments were similar in that they each provided a description of a secondary student teaching center (as defined for the purpose of the study) and requested respondents to list relevant center information consisting of (1) the name of collegiate institution; (2) the names of directors, liaison persons, or general coordinators of secondary student teaching centers; (3) addresses of persons identified in item (2); (4) names of center coordinators; and (5) addresses of center coordinators. Both instruments also asked that the person supplying data identify himself.

The two instruments were different in basically two ways. First, Locator Form A requested the A.T.E. president or state department
person to identify his state or area. *Locator Form B* asked the person supplying data to indicate whether he would be willing to participate in a later phase of the study. Second, *Locator Form A* asked that the person supplying data provide as much information as possible and/or forward the form to someone in the area who could supply more information. *Locator Form B* asked individual teacher educators to list the names and addresses of the people most knowledgeable about student teaching centers in their area.

The two survey instruments requested all of the information needed in order to develop a comprehensive list of collegiate institutions and their centers. Special cover letters were also prepared for each group which was surveyed (see Appendix A).

**College Form—A Questionnaire on Secondary Student Teaching Centers**

The writer reviewed the literature to uncover samples of survey forms used in earlier studies related to student teaching. Association for Student Teaching Yearbooks and Johnson's *A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs*\(^1\) proved to be helpful.

A thorough examination was made of all literature related to student teaching centers to identify, as completely as possible, those aspects of such centers about which information seemed to be most needed. An attempt was made to develop items which would lead to the collection of data sorely needed but not available anywhere.

\(^1\)James A. Johnson, *A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs* (Baltimore, Maryland: Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1968), pp. 91-97.
The first questionnaire developed consisted of nine pages and included sections dealing with general college information, general school information, goals of the center, center features, center advantages, center problem areas, relevant research findings, and related literature. This rather lengthy questionnaire was carefully examined by two of the researcher's colleagues, as well as by his major adviser. Several important changes were suggested. One result of this preliminary review of the instrument was the decision to divide the original questionnaire into two forms, one to obtain the perceptions of college personnel responsible for laboratory experiences and the other one to obtain the perceptions of center coordinators.

After two revisions, the College Form (see Appendix B) evolved as one of the questionnaires for the study. The main sections of the questionnaire dealt with general college information, center coordinator's names and addresses (not previously identified), goals of the center, center features, center advantages, center problems areas, descriptive literature, and completed center research studies.

The "General College Information" section was included to obtain basic descriptive information about the institutions working in or operating secondary school student teaching centers. In this section respondents provided the name, location, type, geographical setting, and enrollment of the institution.

A definition of the off-campus secondary student teaching center was provided so that respondents could compare their centers with the definition developed for the purpose of the study. The definition which appeared in the questionnaire read as follows:
Off-campus secondary student teaching center is defined for this study as a laboratory setting within a secondary school or cluster of two to four schools developed for pre-service and/or in-service teacher education. A full-time person (or a continuing regular staff person) selected by the college or university, the school district, or both, who could be a subject area specialist or generalist is responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of teacher education students and teachers assigned to the center.

Those respondents who decided that their institution was not involved with centers of the type described could indicate so by checking a space provided for that purpose. Those persons who indicated that they did not have a center as defined for the study were asked to identify themselves, give the date on which they completed the form, and return the questionnaire without answering any of the other questions.

A section for "Center Coordinators' Names and Addresses" was included so that responding college administrators could provide the writer with an accurate listing of their center coordinators. This section was used only by those respondents whose center coordinators had not been identified earlier.

The "Goals of the Center" section consisted of two parts. In the first part college administrators were asked to list the goals identified by their collegiate institutions when they established their centers. In this way respondents were given an opportunity to list goals unique to their centers. In the second part, college administrators were asked to rank in importance eight goals the writer found stated in the literature. (The center goals identified by Collins

---

2James F. Collins (ed.), "The Teacher Education Center: A Unifying Approach to Teacher Education" (paper presented at the A.S.T. Clinic on The Teacher Education Center Concept, April 8, 1970, Gaithersburg, Maryland), pp. 2-3.
and Behling, Jr. were found to be particularly helpful in developing this survey item.)

The "Center Features" section contained six items to which college administrators were expected to provide objective responses. The items dealt with selection of coordinators, salaries, roles, and responsibilities. It was thought that this section would provide needed information about selected center features, particularly those aspects related to the center coordinator's role.

The section entitled "Center Advantages" consisted of an open-ended item which asked college administrators to list and rank in order of significance the advantages provided by their centers (as compared to traditional student teaching arrangements). This section was intended to reveal the areas of strength of the center approach as perceived by college administrators.

The section on "Center Problem Areas or Constraints to Maximum Effectiveness" gave respondents an opportunity to check (√) perceived areas of difficulty (eight provided). College administrators were also asked to rank the areas checked beginning with the most difficult. The section was intended to provide some insight into the type and frequency of problems currently hindering center effectiveness. The problems listed are those identified by Behling in Toward a Partnership in Teacher Education.

---


4 Ibid., pp. 20-22.
The final two sections of the College Form were entitled "Descriptive Literature" and "Research Studies Completed at the Center(s)." The literature section asked that the respondents list and/or mail available printed material which might describe their centers in greater detail. The research section invited persons completing the questionnaire to describe any research findings related to the effectiveness of their centers.

Center Coordinator's Form--A Questionnaire on Secondary Student Teaching Centers

The Center Coordinator's Form was the second instrument which evolved from the original questionnaire described earlier. This form was specifically designed to obtain the perceptions of center coordinators. After several modifications, the final form (see Appendix B) was developed to include sections dealing with general school information, center features, center advantages, center problem areas, and special recommendations. Some items in this instrument were similar to those used in the College Form.

The "General School Information" section enabled the writer to obtain descriptive information about the school districts providing settings for centers. Data gathered in this section included school names, locations, and center names with collegiate institutions identified. Information was also collected about the geographical settings, organizational structures, and school enrollments.

The description of an off-campus secondary student teaching center (as defined for the study) was provided so that center coordinators might examine their center definitions before completing the
questionnaire. Those coordinators who decided that their centers did not qualify for the study were able to so indicate. If respondents indicated that they did not qualify for the study, they were asked only to identify themselves, fill in the date, and return their questionnaires without completing any other items.

The section on "Center Features" was more comprehensive than the section with the same title in the College Form. Sixteen objective items were designed to gather information about the length of time the center had been in existence, general design and organization, personnel assignments, and curricular offerings. Information about the center coordinator's role, responsibilities, and perceived influence was also collected by means of the objective items. One open-ended item in this section asked coordinators to list special services made available as a result of the center, and a second open-ended item asked respondents to list specific distinctive features of their centers.

In the section on "Center Advantages" center coordinators were asked to list what they perceived to be the advantages of their centers (as compared to traditional student teaching arrangements). Persons responding to this item were also asked to rank advantages which they listed beginning with the one thought to be most significant.

The section on "Center Problem Areas or Constraints to Maximum Effectiveness" was designed to give center coordinators an opportunity to check (√) perceived areas of difficulty. This section contained items identical with those found in a similar section of the College Form.

The final item asked center coordinators to assume that they
had at their disposal all the necessary human and material resources
and then to list recommended changes which hopefully would improve their
centers. This item assumed that center coordinators, given ideal con-
ditions, could identify the changes most needed to promote center effec-
tiveness.

LOCATION OF CENTERS

A review of the literature provided very little help in locating
secondary school student teaching centers around the country. A pre-
liminary national survey to locate centers had to precede any attempt
to determine the status of existing centers.

A survey of all colleges and universities affiliated with the
American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education to obtain assis-
tance in locating centers in operation was seriously considered. This
approach seemed to be very expensive and relatively inefficient.
Letters to each teacher preparing institution in the country seemed to
be even less feasible.

The plan finally adopted called for a survey of three informed
groups in teacher education. These groups were unit presidents of the
Association for Teacher Educators (A.T.E.), persons responsible for
teacher education within state departments of education, and selected
teacher educators known to the writer and his adviser and believed to
have worked with centers. The latter group included educators who
attended the A.S.T. (A.T.E.) Clinic on The Teacher Education Center
Concept which was held in Maryland in April, 1970. Thus the three
groups which assisted in locating centers were A.T.E. presidents,
teacher education personnel in state departments of education, and
selected teacher educators.

The writer obtained a list of all unit presidents of the A.T.E.
and selected thirty-eight names which were placed on the first part of
the writer's mailing list. Of the forty-three names which originally
appeared on the A.T.E. list, five names were eliminated because they
either appeared on another mailing list or the writer was able to contact
them personally. A special cover letter was prepared for mailing with
Locator Form A (see Appendix A).

The second part of the mailing list which was derived from the
1970-71 Roster of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification
consisted of names of persons responsible for teacher education in state
departments of education.\(^5\) The names of fifty persons representing the
fifty states and one person representing the District of Columbia were
added to the mailing list. A special cover letter was prepared for
mailing with Locator Form A (see Appendix A).

Thirty names of persons thought to have been involved with
centers were placed in the third part of the mailing list. An addi-
tional seventy-four persons whose names were selected from a roster of
participants at the Association for Student Teaching Clinic on the
Teacher Education Center Concept (Maryland, 1970) were also placed on
this third part of the mailing list. The total number of selected

\(^5\) National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education
and Certification, 1970-71 Roster of State Directors of Teacher Education
and Certification (Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher
Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association,
1970).
educators on this part of the mailing list totaled 104. A special cover letter was prepared for mailing with Locator Form B (see Appendix A).

A grand total of 194 locator forms with cover letters and stamped, self-addressed envelopes were mailed during the first week of October, 1971. By early November 115 forms (including four unsolicited responses) had been returned. At that time a careful examination was made of the extent of geographical coverage indicated by the returns. On the basis of that examination a follow-up list consisting of fifty-one names was developed. A follow-up letter (see Appendix A) was prepared to accompany another copy of the locator form. Fifty-one follow-up letters were mailed during the first week of November, 1971.

As returns were collected and analyzed, it became evident that some new names and addresses not on any of the earlier mailing lists had been identified. Every attempt was made to locate as many centers as possible; therefore, new leads were analyzed and an additional fifty-four persons were added to the original mailing list. A supplemental cover letter (see Appendix A) was prepared and the additional forms were mailed in mid-November.

Table 1 shows the general response of persons to whom locator forms were mailed. Out of 248 forms mailed, a total of 186 were returned by December 1, 1971 and six additional forms arrived in January of 1972. The number of respondents totaled 192 or 77 percent.

During the process of locating centers, the writer obtained from some institutions lists of coordinators and their centers, but some respondents failed to indicate whether theirs were elementary or secondary student teaching centers. Before a final list of centers
Table 1

General Response by Groups to the Forms Used to Locate Secondary School Student Teaching Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.T.E. Presidents</th>
<th>State Departments of Education</th>
<th>Selected Educators</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mailing</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51(^a)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrespondents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Includes the District of Columbia.
was developed, coordinators of centers not identified as either elementary or secondary were contacted by mail to resolve the conflict. A special letter and a postcard (see Appendix A) were prepared for this purpose. A total of twenty-nine center coordinators were contacted.

As a result of the survey 101 collegiate institutions were identified as currently involved with secondary school student teaching centers. A total of 179 centers were located.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Between the first week in December, 1971 and the first week in January, 1972 the writer mailed a packet consisting of a cover letter (see Appendix A), the College Form of the questionnaire, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to each of the 101 institutions identified in an earlier phase of the study. Approximately 75 percent of the questionnaires were received by the first week in February. During the second week of February follow-up letters (see Appendix A), each accompanied by another College Form of the questionnaire, were mailed to institutions from which no reply had been received.

The data in Table 2 show that 101 institutions were mailed questionnaires. Ninety-two institutions replied and, of these, fifty-seven provided usable data. The thirty-five institutions which replied but did not supply data generally included those institutions which did not have centers which met the definition of secondary school student teaching centers used in this study.
Table 2

General Response by Institutions to the College Form Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions in the study</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable responses</td>
<td>57a</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrespondents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Thirty-three of thirty-five respondents indicated that they had no centers as defined for the purpose of the study. One respondent indicated that his center was no longer functioning due to a lack of funds. One questionnaire arrived too late to be included in the study.

During the last two weeks in January, 1972 the writer mailed 179 packets consisting of a cover letter (see Appendix A), the Center Coordinator's Form of the questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. By the first of March approximately 60 percent of the questionnaires were returned. Follow-up letters (see Appendix A), each with another copy of the Center Coordinator's Form of the questionnaire, were mailed during the first week of March. Table 3 shows that a total of 146 (82 percent) were ultimately returned. Ninety-seven of the responses were used in this study. Thirty-three persons failed to respond.

PROCESSING OF THE DATA

Objective Responses

Both the College Form and the Center Coordinator's Form of the questionnaire contained items to which persons could respond with either
a check mark (✓) or a numerical figure. Most of these responses were hand tallied and converted to percentages. Mean favorability scores were computed for some items, and these were ranked accordingly.

Table 3

General Response by Center Coordinators to the Center Coordinator's Form Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center coordinators identified</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable responses</td>
<td>97(^a)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrespondents</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Forty-six respondents indicated that they had no secondary school student teaching centers as defined in this study. Three questionnaires were eliminated because they lacked sufficient data.

Subjective Responses

In various places on each form of the questionnaire respondents were asked to list subjective comments to expand on their perceptions of the center concept. These comments were noted, analyzed, and ranked beginning with those comments which most frequently occurred.

Supplemental Materials

Institutional respondents were encouraged to list and/or forward available research findings and other descriptive materials. All of the materials received were reviewed and a complete list of the titles was prepared (see Appendixes C and D).

The data received has been analyzed and is reported in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analysis of the data is presented in this chapter. The data were collected from fifty-seven college administrators and ninety-seven student teaching center coordinators. The College Form questionnaire (see Appendix B) was used to gather data from college administrators and the Center Coordinator's Form questionnaire (see Appendix B) was used to collect data from center coordinators. The data from each of the groups were organized and analyzed for presentation here.

This chapter contains two major sections. The first section presents data related to the perceptions of college administrators. The second section deals with the perceptions of center coordinators.

PERCEPTIONS OF COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS

The initial research question which needed to be answered was how widespread are secondary school student teaching centers which are thought by local institutional personnel to meet the criteria selected for this study.

The responses reported (see Table 2, p. 42) represented a high degree of interest in this study of centers. The procedures used in this study located a total of ninety-seven (see Table 3, p. 43)
student teaching centers, either comprised solely of secondary schools or of secondary schools and elementary schools combined in each center. These centers are located in thirty-two states.

Nature of Collegiate Institutions with Centers

Another research question was concerned with the nature of the collegiate institutions involved with secondary school student teaching centers. Tables 2 and 4 present information about those collegiate institutions which reported this type of center affiliation.

Classification of collegiate institutions with centers, as reported in Table 4, indicated that 84 percent of the institutions were either state universities or state colleges. Only 16 percent were private colleges or universities and no city colleges or universities were reported having centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Number of Institutions (N=57)</th>
<th>Percentage of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State university</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State college</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private university</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City college</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City university</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aRounded to equal 100 percent.
The data in Table 4 clearly show that state supported collegiate institutions are most likely to be involved with secondary student teaching centers; a very small number of other types of institutions reported involvement with such centers.

The geographical settings of collegiate institutions with centers appear in Table 5. This table shows that 84 percent of the institutions were somewhat equally distributed in three types of areas: medium-sized cities, small towns or villages, or urban areas. The remaining 16 percent were almost equally distributed between suburban and rural areas.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Setting</th>
<th>Number of Institutions (N=57)</th>
<th>Percentage of Institutions(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium-sized city</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town or village</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban area</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Rounded to equal 100 percent.

The range of full-time undergraduate student enrollment among collegiate institutions with secondary school student teaching centers is reported in Table 6. This table indicates that 34 percent of the institutions enrolled 5000-9999 students during 1971-72. The table further shows that most (88 percent) institutions with centers enrolled
from 1000 to 24,999 students. A mere 12 percent were very small colleges enrolling under 1000, or huge many faceted institutions enrolling over 25,000 students.

Table 6

Full-time Undergraduate Enrollment in Collegiate Institutions with Centers for the Academic Year 1971-72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Number of Institutions (N=56)</th>
<th>Percentage of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-2999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-4999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 or above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* aRounded to equal 100 percent.

The percentage of full-time undergraduate students preparing to be teachers in collegiate institutions with centers is reported in Table 7. This table shows that in nearly one-half (48 percent) of the institutions 25 percent or less of the students enrolled were preparing for teaching. In forty-five percent of the institutions 26 to 75 percent of the students were preparing to be teachers. Only seven percent of the institutions reported that over 75 percent of their students were preparing to be teachers. Most single purpose teachers' colleges are now known to have become state colleges or universities and this fact is reflected in the small number of institutions having secondary school
student teaching centers and having most students in teacher preparation curricula.

Table 7
Percentage of Full-time Undergraduate Students Preparing to be Teachers in Collegiate Institutions With Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Institutions (N=56)</th>
<th>Percentage of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rounded to equal 100 percent.*

Center Goals

An important research question in the study dealt with the goals of centers in operation. Data related to center goals are presented in Tables 8 and 9.

College administrators surveyed were asked to list goals which were proposed when their centers were considered and established. The writer reviewed the goals presented and grouped them by the ideas involved. Table 8 shows that twenty-eight goals were finally determined and listed in order of frequency of identification by college administrators. The most frequently identified goals were to improve college supervision, coordination, and supplemental service by placing a well informed person on the scene; to improve school-college working relations; and to provide a realistic teaching situation with opportu-
nities for involvement in a wide range of experiences. Goals one through eight appeared to be directed toward improving school-college cooperation or laboratory experiences.

In summary, Table 8 shows that centers were established primarily to facilitate school-college cooperation to improve off-campus experiences for prospective teachers and to solve a number of operational and educational problems with special reference to teacher education.

Respondents were asked to react to seven goals which had been derived from the literature and listed in the instrument. The administrators surveyed were asked to rank these seven goals beginning with the most important (1) and concluding with the least important (7). In order to determine the mean favorability score of each goal the researcher assigned values ranging from 7 (for items ranked first) to 1 (for items ranked seventh). The writer counted the number of responses in each of the categories one through seven for each item. The sum of the responses in each category was then multiplied by the value assigned to that category. Products from all of the categories in each item were summed and divided by the number (N) of committed respondents for that item to obtain a mean favorability score. The items were then ranked according to their mean favorability scores.

Table 9 shows that items one through five received mean favorability scores of 4.78 to 4.29. Items six and seven were ranked considerably lower (3.02 and 2.71).

The emphasis of the goals, as indicated in Table 9, appears to be directed toward cooperative planning and implementation of effective off-campus laboratory experiences. The data clearly show a high degree
Table 8
Goals for the Establishment of Centers as Perceived by College Administrators
N=49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To improve college supervision, coordination, and supplemental service by placing a well informed person on the scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To improve school-college working relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To provide a realistic teaching situation with opportunities for involvement in a wide range of experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>To integrate theory and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>To involve state and school personnel in teacher education by using and enlarging their clinical expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To provide in-service teachers with opportunities to become aware of new developments in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>To provide superior laboratory experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>To provide flexibility for an individualized student teaching assignment with emphasis on a performance-based approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>To reduce the cost of supervision and to alleviate other traditional problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>To provide students with opportunities to demonstrate an understanding of the teacher's professional role in a variety of school and community settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>To make better use of educational technology in pre-service and in-service teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>To develop and test curriculum materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>To increase college involvement and influence in the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>To develop a model teacher education program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>To merge pre-service and in-service teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>To provide student teachers with opportunities to observe several models of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>To provide a laboratory for module development in a competency-based program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>To improve cooperation among collegiate institutions and other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>To enable student teachers to develop skills in planning and developing appropriate activities under conditions of minimum difficulty and maximum support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>To provide a setting in which student teachers could develop self-awareness through examination of their attitudes and philosophies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>To provide an inner-city setting for student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>To facilitate exchange of ideas and encourage mutual support among student teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>To provide team teaching experience for student teachers placed in a differentiated staffing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>To provide opportunities for student teachers to develop an awareness of pupils' needs and the importance of interpersonal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>To provide a laboratory for early experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>To combine instructional and supervisory aspects of methods and student teaching by making better use of the joint efforts of college and school personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>To provide a better opportunity for real joint evaluation of student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>To increase student commitment to the profession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Center Goals Ranked in Order of Importance by College Administrators\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Center Goals</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency (^b)</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To unite the college and school facilities in ways which would facilitate working together on common instructional and supervisory problems.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To integrate theory with practice by merging on-campus with off-campus experiences.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To individualize professional development for the pre-professionals as well as the practicing professionals.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To merge pre-service and in-service education into a continuing program.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To cooperatively design and implement a model teacher education program.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To alleviate traditional problems of coordinating off-campus pre-service experiences.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To utilize educational technology in pre-service and in-service preparation.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(N = 57.\)

\(^b\)Sum of the products (assigned category value times frequency of response) from all of the categories for each item.
of emphasis on greater involvement of schools in teacher education.

Role of the Center Coordinator

Another question which this study attempted to examine concerned the college administrator's perception of the center coordinator's role. Data collected pertaining to various aspects of the center coordinator's role are presented in Tables 10 through 15.

Nearly all (98 percent) of the college administrators perceived the selection of the center coordinator, as reported in Table 10, to be the responsibility of the collegiate institution alone or the school and collegiate institution jointly. Fifty-one percent of the administrators thought that selection of the center coordinator should be reserved to the collegiate institution while 47 percent indicated that the selection should be a joint responsibility. Thus the college administrators clearly indicated that the collegiate institution should be no less than an equal partner in the selection process, with very few suggesting that the school alone should select the center coordinator.

Table 10

Responsibility for the Selection of the Center Coordinator as Perceived by College Administrators\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>College or University</th>
<th>School and Collegiate Institutions Jointly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Fifty-seven respondents.
Findings regarding the percentage of the center coordinator's salary provided by the collegiate institution are reported in Table 11. The data show that 61 percent of the institutions paid the entire salary of the center coordinator. Eleven percent of the institutions paid either 25 percent or 50 percent of the coordinator's salary. Twenty-eight percent of the institutions were involved in various other salary arrangements. A summation of both types of responses indicates that less than one-third of the school districts paid any portion of the center coordinator's salary.

Table 11

Percentage of the Coordinator's Salary Provided by the College or University as Reported by College Administrators\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Salary Paid by the College or University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Fifty-six respondents.

\(^b\)There were 12 "other" salary arrangements listed by 16 (28 percent) of the administrators who responded. The variations included: entirely school paid; entirely state funded; entirely special grant funded; fee based on number of students assigned to center; additional amount added to regular school salary; one-third portions divided among two collegiate institutions and county; $1000 by school district; $250 by college; 60 percent by college; two-thirds by college; and unpaid service provided by doctoral candidate.

Collegiate administrators were asked to rank five components (four stated items plus the possible "other" category) of the center coordinator's role beginning with the most important (1) and ending
with the least important (5). In order to determine the mean favorability of each goal the researcher assigned values ranging from 5 (for items ranked first) to 1 (for items ranked fifth). A favorability score for each item was computed by counting the number of responses in each category from one to five. The sum of the responses was then multiplied by the value indicated for that category. Values from all of the categories for each item were summed and divided by the number (N) of committed respondents.

The mean favorability scores reported in Table 12 indicate that every college administrator perceived Instruction as the prime component of the center coordinator's role. The Administrative and Evaluative components were ranked a little lower, but the Curricular component was ranked considerably lower. The item identified as "Other" was given a rank value for determining mean favorability but it was not ranked in the table.

Table 12

Importance of the Components of the Center Coordinator's Role as Perceived by College Administrators\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curricular</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Fifty-six respondents.

\(^b\)"Other" components identified included: change agent in school; public relations person; and liaison with funding agency.
College administrators were asked to identify personnel thought to be primarily responsible for center policy development. The findings, as reported in Table 13, indicate that more than two-thirds of the college administrators surveyed thought that center policy should be developed through some type of joint school-college coordination. Less than 2 percent of the respondents thought that the school alone should be responsible, and a small percentage of college administrators identified various other groups.

Table 13

Primary Responsibility for Center Policy Development as Perceived by College Administrators^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Responsible</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School and college or university jointly</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating-advisory committee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff of schools, principals, and coordinators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro area coordinating and advisory committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aFifty-seven respondents.

In an attempt to obtain data on another aspect of the center coordinator's role college administrators were asked to identify the person or group perceived to be primarily responsible for center policy implementation. Table 14 shows that 55 percent of the respondents thought that the center coordinator was primarily responsible. A
center committee was identified by 20 percent and the principal-center coordinator team was identified by 11 percent of the college administrators. The percentage of respondents who identified other persons or groups was 14 percent. In a majority of cases the center coordinator was considered to be solely responsible for center policy implementation or at least partially responsible as a member of a team or group.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person or Group Responsible</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center coordinator</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center committee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-center coordinator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-center coordinator-director of student teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-college administrative representative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator-cooperating teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator-center committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Fifty-six respondents.

College administrators were asked to identify the primary source of expertise and direction for student teachers in the center. Table 15 shows that college administrators perceived teachers to be the primary source of professional expertise and direction for student teachers, with the center coordinator listed second. Teachers and/or center coordinators were listed alone or in various combinations in nearly
four-fifths of the cases. The college supervisor alone or school supervisor alone or in combination were indicated by only 13 percent of the college administrators.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers in center schools</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Center coordinator</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers-center coordinator-college supervisor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers-college supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 College supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Teachers-center coordinator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. School supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Center coordinator-college supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. School supervisor-college supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Otherb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aFifty-seven respondents.

b"Other" includes various persons and combinations of persons who were listed only once by college administrators.

Center Advantages

An important question which this study attempted to answer pertained to the advantages of student teaching centers as perceived by college administrators. The findings which related to this question appear in Table 16.

College administrators were asked to list advantages provided
by their centers (as compared with the common cooperating teacher-student teacher-college supervisor triadic arrangement). They were then instructed to rank the advantages they had identified beginning with the most significant. The advantages listed were ranked from 1 to a maximum of 10.

In order to obtain a mean favorability score for each item the researcher assigned values ranging from 10 (for a ranking of first) to 1 (for a ranking of tenth). The number of responses in each category from one to ten was determined. The sum of the responses in each category was then multiplied by the value indicated for that category. Values from all of the categories for each item were summed and divided by the number (N) of committed respondents.

Table 16 shows that sixteen advantages were listed at least three times. The items with the highest mean favorability scores were "increased opportunities for students to observe and apply theory in a realistic setting" (9.27), and "considerably more college personnel time spent in performance of professional duties and less in travel, etc." (9.20). The favorability range for items ranked three through five was 8.92 to 8.35. These items dealt with broader experiences for student teachers (8.92); continuous college supervision and evaluation of student teachers in a school setting (8.75); and better student teacher placement (8.35). Ten items received mean favorability scores of 7.90 to 7.00. Two items received favorability scores of 6.75 and 6.33 respectively. Eight "other" advantages which were each listed fewer than three times were assigned rank values but were not ranked in Table 16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increased opportunities for students to observe theory applied and apply theory themselves in a realistic setting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Considerably more college personnel time spent in performance of professional duties and less in travel, etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Much greater involvement of student teachers in a wide range of experiences in the school and community</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continuous college supervision and evaluation of student teachers in a school setting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greater familiarity with school faculty and program resulting in better student teacher placement and increased flexibility</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Greater involvement of teachers in teacher education resulting in increased professional concern and commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Closer school-college cooperation in implementing an effective teacher education program</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Committed N</td>
<td>Value X Frequency</td>
<td>Mean Favorability Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Immediate availability of the coordinator to assist student teachers and cooperating school personnel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Improved communication and coordination between school and college personnel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Greater flexibility in designing experiences and more individualization of assignments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>More effective integration of school and college expertise in instruction and supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increased availability of college expertise and privileges to school faculty resulting in improved in-service education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Better coordination of both pre- and in-service teacher education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Greater acceptance of college students as team members resulting in increased shared responsibility, particularly in providing individual assistance to pupils in schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Increased opportunities for new cooperative programs and curricular changes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Better peer group support and sharing of ideas among student teachers in on-site seminars</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Thirty-four respondents.

<sup>b</sup>"Other" consisted of advantages listed fewer than three times. Among these were better supervised induction process for student teachers; multi-institutional (collegiate) cooperation and sharing of expertise; facilitation of unique experiences in rural and/or urban settings; and more effective use of school and college resources.
Using the mean favorability formula gives one dimension for ranking, but because of the lower numbers of respondents for some of the high ranking items and the small range in most of the mean favorability scores another dimension is worthy of note. The fact that certain items were listed for this free writing question by large numbers of the responding college administrators may be of special significance. Table 17 gives the five items reported most frequently.

Center Problem Areas or Constraints

A major question which this study attempted to answer related to the identification of center problem areas or constraints. The data collected appear in Table 18.

College administrators were asked to rank a maximum of nine items beginning with the problem or constraint perceived to be the most difficult. In order to obtain a mean favorability score for each item the researcher assigned values ranging from 9 (for items ranked first) to 1 (for items ranked ninth). The number of responses in each category were summed. The sum of the responses in each category was then multiplied by the value indicated for that category. Values from all of the categories for each item were summed and divided by the number (N) of committed respondents.

Table 18 shows that the problem areas or constraints which were ranked most difficult were Finance (7.83) and Communication (7.78). Role Identification and Clarification ranked third (7.65) and Human Relations ranked fourth (7.38). Location of Center and Qualifications of Personnel ranked fifth and sixth with mean favorability scores of
Table 17
Advantages of Student Teaching Centers Listed Most Frequently by College Administrators\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Identification(^b)</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Much greater involvement of student teachers in a wide range of experiences in the school and community</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Closer school-college cooperation in implementing an effective teacher education program</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increased availability of college expertise and privileges to school faculty resulting in improved in-service education</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greater familiarity with school faculty and program resulting in better student teacher placement and increased flexibility</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Immediate availability of the coordinator to assist student teachers and cooperating school personnel</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Extracted from data originally presented in Table 16, p. 60.

\(^b\) Rank established for Table 16 with mean favorability formula.
Table 18

Center Problem Areas or Constraints to Maximum Effectiveness as Perceived by College Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Role identification and clarification</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Location of centers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Qualifications of personnel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Incentives and rewards</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Development of expertise</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Fifty-five respondents.

b "Other" problem areas identified were the freedom to experiment; attitudes of union members; and accountability.
7.19 and 7.00 respectively. The Incentives and Rewards item ranked seventh (6.79) and Development of Expertise ranked a low eighth (4.63). Three "Other" problem areas were identified and assigned rank values for mean favorability score computation but were not ranked in Table 18. College administrators tended to rate a number of operational and organizational items more highly than some other items, but the range in mean favorability scores for the first seven items was small being only 1.04 on a nine point scale.

CENTER COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS

The Center Coordinator's Form questionnaire (see Appendix B) was used to gather data from center coordinators. The results indicated (see Table 3, p. 43) that of 179 questionnaires mailed, 146 or 82 percent were returned. Ninety-seven responses were used in the study. Fairly good geographical coverage was indicated by the fact that thirty-two states were represented in the study.

The ninety-seven usable responses were divided into two groups. One group consisted of forty-eight responses from persons who were responsible for coordinating programs for secondary school student teachers only. The second group consisted of forty-nine responses which came from coordinators who were responsible for coordinating center programs for both elementary and secondary school student teachers. (Only secondary aspects of these centers were considered in the study.) The data are reported here for each of the two groups described above and for both groups taken together.
Nature of Center Schools

The researcher attempted to gather data about the secondary schools which comprised the centers. Tables 19 through 22 provide data on this aspect of the study.

Table 19 shows the number of secondary schools participating in center programs in five geographical settings. Over 80 percent of the schools, regardless of center type, were located in urban areas, medium-sized cities, and suburban areas.

Secondary schools in more populous areas were generally selected for centers. This seemed to be true for secondary centers as well as for elementary-secondary centers. The suburban area seemed to be preferred for secondary school centers. Elementary-secondary centers seemed to consist of more schools than secondary school centers even when elementary schools were not counted.

Center coordinators were asked to identify the grade level organization of schools functioning as centers. The responses, as reported in Table 20, show that 90 percent of the schools in either center type or both were junior high schools or high schools. Middle schools made up 10 percent or less of the schools functioning as centers, regardless of center type. Among secondary school centers, high schools tended to be used more frequently than junior high schools. Among elementary-secondary centers junior high schools were most frequently identified as participating schools.

In order to obtain some idea of the size of schools used as centers, the researcher asked respondents to indicate the approximate
Table 19

Center Secondary Schools in Five Selected Geographical Settings
as Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Setting</th>
<th>Schools in Secondary School Centers^a (N=47)</th>
<th>Secondary Schools in Elementary-Secondary Centers^b (N=40)</th>
<th>Secondary Schools in Both (N=87)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town or village</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-sized city</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban area</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban area</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Four secondary school centers each consisting of more than four were included, even though the center definition as given in the form specified that a center should consist of one to four secondary schools. One center consisted of five secondary schools; two centers consisted of seven schools; and one center consisted of ten schools.

^b Nineteen elementary-secondary centers each including more than four secondary schools, as specified in the center definition, were included. Twelve centers consisted of five to nine schools; six centers consisted of ten to fifteen schools; and one center consisted of twenty-nine schools. (Only secondary schools are included in this table and in all the data presented in this study.)
Table 20
Grade Level Organization of Secondary Schools in Centers as Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School Organization</th>
<th>Schools in Secondary School Centers (N=46)</th>
<th>Secondary Schools in Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=44)</th>
<th>Secondary Schools in Both (N=90)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Five different types of middle schools were identified. Seventy-six percent of the middle schools were organized for grades six through eight.

\(^{b}\)Three different types of junior high schools were identified. Eighty-five percent of the junior high schools were organized for grades seven through nine.

\(^{c}\)Six different types of high schools were identified. Sixty-seven percent of the high schools were organized for grades ten through twelve.
enrollment of their center schools. The data in Table 21 show that over 85 percent of both types of centers had enrollments of 500 or more students. Small secondary schools were used much less frequently with only 12 percent of the secondary schools in both types of centers having combined enrollments under 500 pupils. Thus large secondary schools functioned as center schools much more frequently than small ones, but elementary-secondary centers made somewhat greater use of smaller schools than did secondary school centers.

Center coordinators were asked to indicate the extent of participation by teachers in center programs. Table 22 shows that in 53 percent of the schools in both types of centers, one-fourth or fewer teachers participated in the center program. Sixty-six percent of the schools in secondary centers and 48 percent of the secondary schools in elementary-secondary centers involved approximately up to one-fourth of the teachers. In both types of centers 27 percent of the schools had from one-fourth to one-half of the teachers participating, but the secondary schools in elementary-secondary were smaller (see Table 21) and did show a higher percentage of teachers involved.

Center Features

Most of the items in the questionnaire submitted to center coordinators dealt with various center features. The results of these items are presented in Tables 23 through 41.

The data in Table 23 (page 73) indicate that a majority (66 percent) of the centers studied had been in existence for three years or less. Most (79 percent) of the secondary school centers had only
Table 21

Range of Pupil Enrollment in Secondary Schools in Centers as Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupils Enrolled</th>
<th>Schools in Secondary School Centers (N=44)</th>
<th>Secondary Schools in Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=38)</th>
<th>Secondary Schools in Both (N=82)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-199</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-699</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1499</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 and above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>256</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 22

**Percentage of Teachers in Secondary Schools Participating in Center Programs**

*as Reported by Center Coordinators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
<th>Schools in Secondary School Centers (N=46)</th>
<th>Secondary Schools in Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=44)</th>
<th>Secondary Schools in Both (N=90)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
been in existence up to three years. Nearly 55 percent of the elementary-
secondary centers had been in existence for at least four years, but 42
percent of these centers had been in operation for eight or more years. 
Thus secondary school centers, as such, are a more recent development
generally.

Table 23

Number of Years Centers had been in Existence as
Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Years</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=48)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=48)</th>
<th>Both (N=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Center coordinators were given an opportunity to identify pur-
poses for which their centers were designed. Table 24 shows that 56
percent of both types of centers were designed for student teaching
and/or other pre-service experiences. Forty-two percent of all centers
were designed for both pre-service and in-service activities.

Table 25 presents data on how college student participants were
assigned for their center experiences. In over 50 percent of all
centers students were assigned to the center coordinator, the subject
area department or to some combination involving one or both of the
preceding. Students were assigned directly to individual teachers in
Table 24

General Purposes for Which Centers Were Designed as Perceived by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes of the Centers</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=47)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=49)</th>
<th>Both (N=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching only</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service (including student teaching)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service and in-service</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service and internship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching and curriculum improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25
Assignment of Student Participants to Center Programs as Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Assignment</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=48)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=49)</th>
<th>Both (N=97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>15 31</td>
<td>18 37</td>
<td>33 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The center</td>
<td>10 21</td>
<td>11 22</td>
<td>21 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center and individual teachers</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>7 14</td>
<td>11 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments and individual teachers</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>5 10</td>
<td>9 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject area departments</td>
<td>6 13</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center, departments, and individual teachers</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers and teams</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>3 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center and departments</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^a)</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td>5 10</td>
<td>8 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)A total of eight "Other" assignment arrangements were reported. These included interdisciplinary teams; department and teaching teams; principal, departments, and individual teachers; etc.
34 percent of the centers reporting. In nearly 28 percent of the centers, college students were assigned to various combinations involving individual teachers.

Table 25 shows that students were generally assigned to individual teachers first or, secondly, to the center. Often students were assigned to teachers, the center, or to teachers and the center jointly. Assignments to departments were generally the third choice among secondary school centers, but such assignments did not exist among elementary-secondary centers. The assignment of students to individual teachers or a team combination including teachers was most prevalent.

Responses to the questionnaire item concerning compensation to cooperating teachers in center programs are presented in Table 26. Fifty-six percent of both types of centers compensated their cooperating teachers by individual honorarium or free tuition arrangement, but individual honorarium was the most frequent compensation. Outside of the "Other" category an honorarium was in combination with other arrangements 15 percent, free tuition in combinations 10.5 percent, and faculty privileges in combination with other arrangements in 14 percent of the responses.

Center coordinators were asked to describe opportunities for pre-service education. The results, as presented in Table 27, show that 59 percent of both types of centers offered both intensive (concentrated, long-term) and extensive (broad range of short term) opportunities, while intensive experiences alone were offered by 37 percent of both center types. Only elementary-secondary centers reported offering extensive experiences alone (10 percent).
### Table 26

**Compensation to Cooperating Teachers Involved in Center Programs as Reported by Center Coordinators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Compensation</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=48)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=49)</th>
<th>Both (N=97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual honorarium</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free tuition arrangement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium, free tuition, and college faculty privileges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium and college faculty privileges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium and free tuition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium and released time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty privileges and funds for professional improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty privileges and free tuition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific compensation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of sixteen "Other" methods of compensation were reported. These included such methods as college or university faculty privileges; faculty privileges and one-half tuition waiver; faculty privileges and money to school district; and other various combinations of the above listed methods.
Table 27
Opportunities for Pre-service Education in Center Programs as Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Opportunities</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=47)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=45)</th>
<th>Both (N=92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both intensive and extensive</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive (concentrated, long term assignments)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive (broad range of short term experiences)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intent of this question was to ascertain if student teachers were assigned for other than an intensive experience primarily with one teacher. The wording of the question and the nature of the replies both suggest that the respondents considered the question to refer to using the center for intensive experiences, i.e., student teaching, or extensive experiences, i.e., a wide range of less responsible experiences such as participation and other pre-student teaching experiences.
Center coordinators were given an opportunity to indicate the kinds of pre-student teaching experiences offered in their centers. Their responses, as presented in Table 28, show that among both types of centers all of seven suggested experiences (observation, non-teaching duties, small group work, bit teaching, tutoring, assisting as an instructional team member, and planned exploratory teaching of full lessons) grouped under "ALL OF THE ABOVE" were provided most frequently (49 times). "Observation" experiences were reported 42 times by both center types indicating that such experiences were made available much more commonly than non-teaching duties, small group work, bit teaching and tutoring—each of which was reported from 23 to 20 times. Thus centers typically attempted to provide a wide range of pre-student teaching experiences; secondary school centers offered a greater variety of experiences a little more often than did elementary-secondary centers.

Center coordinators were asked to indicate how often pre-service courses were taught in their centers. Table 29 shows that 62 percent of all the centers offered pre-service courses often or always, with secondary school centers doing so in greater numbers than elementary-secondary centers. Only sixteen of the centers, or 18 percent, never offered pre-service courses in the centers.

If pre-service courses were offered in their centers, center coordinators were asked to list them. Table 30 shows that student teaching seminars were listed most frequently (36 times) by all of the center coordinators and more frequently in elementary-secondary centers (21 times). Methods courses were listed second by all center coordinators (15 times), and more frequently by secondary center
Table 28

Pre-student Teaching Experiences Provided in Center Schools as Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=46)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=46)</th>
<th>Both (N=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teaching duties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bit teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting as an instructional team member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned exploratory teaching of full lessons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL OF THE ABOVE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>"Other" experiences were special visits and microteaching.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Offerings</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=45)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=42)</th>
<th>Both (N=87)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percentage</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No. Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30

Variety of Pre-service Courses or Seminars Taught in Center Schools as Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-service Offerings</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=45b)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=42b)</th>
<th>Both (N=87b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching seminars</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods courses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human development and learning courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary purposes and curriculum courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social foundations courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading courses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests and measurements courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two "Other" offerings were teaching in the middle school and mental hygiene.

N's were derived from the number of responses to the objective part of item 15. Not all respondents to item 15 indicated that courses or seminars were offered.
coordinators (9 times) than by elementary-secondary coordinators (6 times). Other course offerings were widely dispersed.

Professional in-service teacher education offerings were identified by center coordinators. Table 31 indicates that student teaching orientation programs and courses on the role of classroom teachers in student teaching were very frequently identified as in-service offerings available in both types of centers. Analysis of teaching courses and special workshops were offered less frequently, but in a total of 55 and 46 centers respectively. Supervision and curriculum courses were offered predominantly in elementary-secondary centers. Microteaching for skill improvement was offered noticeably more often in secondary centers.

Role of the Center Coordinator

Tables 32 through 34 present the results of how center coordinators perceived the importance of various components of the center coordinator's role. In responding to this item on the questionnaire center coordinators were asked to rank four, or a maximum of five (if a fifth component had been added), components of the role of the coordinator in order of importance.

In order to obtain a mean favorability score on each item the researcher assigned values ranging from 5 (for items ranked first) to 1 (for items ranked fifth). The number of responses in each category from one through five were summed. The sum of the responses was then multiplied by the value indicated for that category. Values from all of the categories for each item were summed and divided by the number
Table 31

Professional In-service Teacher Education Offerings Available in Center Schools as Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-service Offerings</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=42)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=47)</th>
<th>Both (N=89)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to student teaching program</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of classroom teachers in student teaching</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of teaching</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special workshops</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision and curriculum courses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching for skill improvement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Eleven "Other" offerings were identified. The most frequently mentioned were seminars on evaluation, uses of videotape, and techniques of team supervision.
(N) of committed respondents. The results for secondary school centers are reported in Table 32, for elementary-secondary centers in Table 33, and for both center types in Table 34.

Table 32 shows that secondary school center coordinators viewed the Instructional component as their most important responsibility. The Administrative and Evaluative components were rated as second and third in importance. The Curricular component appeared to be the least important in the minds of the center coordinators. The "Other" components identified received rank values but were not ranked in Table 32.

Table 33 reveals that coordinators of elementary-secondary school centers placed the most importance on Administration. Instruction was also considered fairly important, and Evaluative responsibilities were perceived to be somewhat less important. Curricular responsibilities were apparently viewed as relatively unimportant.

The mean favorability scores for both types of center coordinators' responses are reported in Table 34, which indicates that coordinators from all centers perceived Instruction to be of prime importance in their roles. Administration was viewed as less important but more important than Evaluation. Little importance was placed on Curricular responsibilities.

Data concerning the amount of center coordinator's time allotted for teacher education responsibilities appear in Table 35. This table shows that in 62 percent of both types of centers coordinators had their full time allocated to teacher education. Seventy-two percent of the elementary-secondary centers and 52 percent of the secondary centers employed full-time center coordinators. Twenty-three percent of both
Table 32

Importance of the Components of the Center Coordinator's Role as Perceived by Center Coordinators in Secondary School Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Committed N (N=48)</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curricular</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Most commonly identified "Other" components included communicative, facilitative, and advisory.
Table 33

Importance of the Components of the Center Coordinator's Role as Perceived by Center Coordinators in Elementary-Secondary Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Committed Value X</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>49    192</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>47    183</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>47    178</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curricular</td>
<td>35    88</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7     16</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Most commonly identified "Other" components included communicative and advisory.
Table 34

Importance of the Components of the Center Coordinator's Role as Perceived by All Center Coordinators in Both Center Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Committed N (N=97)</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curricular</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Center types allocated center coordinators to teacher education responsibilities on either a one-half time or three-fourths time basis.

Center coordinators had their time allocated to teacher education in the center for only one-fourth time, less than one-fourth time, or some other time arrangement in 14 percent of both types of centers. Twenty-two percent of the secondary school centers and 9 percent of the elementary-secondary centers had coordinators allocated to teacher education responsibilities in their center for one-fourth time, less than one-fourth time, or some other time arrangement.

In summary, Table 35 indicates that center coordinators were generally assigned full-time teacher education responsibilities. This was particularly true among elementary-secondary centers, but more varied distributions of center coordinators' time were reported among secondary school centers.

The perceptions of center coordinators concerning the allocation of primary responsibility for center policy development are reported in Table 36. Fifty-four percent of the coordinators in both types of centers indicated that policy development should be the responsibility of the school and college jointly. Table 36 shows that a majority of center coordinators thought that the primary responsibility for center policy development should be shared jointly by the school and college under some pattern of cooperation. A very small percentage (11 percent) of coordinators indicated that the college or university should be primarily responsible, and a relatively insignificant percentage (2 percent) thought that the school should be primarily responsible for center policy development.
Table 35

Amount of Center Coordinators' Time Allotted for Teacher Education Responsibilities as Reported by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Allotted for Teacher Education</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=48)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=47)</th>
<th>Both (N=95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-quarter time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-half time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-fourth time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one-fourth time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other* time allotments included 90 percent; reduced load for center responsibilities; one-third time; one or two periods; and part-time load of principal who also functioned as center coordinator.

bRounded to nearest whole percent and does not equal 100 percent.
Table 36
Primary Responsibility for Center Policy Development as Perceived by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Responsible</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=47)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=49)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Both (N=96)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and college jointly</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coordinating-advisory committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff of the schools, principals, and coordinators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff of the schools, principals, coordinators, and college personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coordinator and school adminis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coordinating-advisory committee together with other school and college personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coordinating-advisory committee together with the staff of schools, principals, and coordinators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Four "Other" combinations of school and college personnel were also identified.

\(^b\) Rounded to nearest whole percent and does not equal 100 percent.
The perceptions of center coordinators regarding the primary responsibility for center policy implementation appear in Table 37. Sixty-three percent of the coordinators of both types of centers indicated that the center coordinator was primarily responsible for center policy implementation. In nearly every other case the center coordinator was designated in combination with other personnel as primarily responsible for center policy implementation. Table 37 reveals that the center coordinator was perceived to be solely or partially responsible for center policy implementation in a majority of cases. A center committee was mentioned in 7 percent of the cases, but the import of other combinations would suggest a committee or some joint responsibility in an additional 15 percent of the replies. The principal alone was indicated in 6 percent of the responses and with the coordinator in an additional 8 percent of the replies. No other individual person approached the frequency with which the center coordinator was identified as primarily responsible for center policy implementation.

Center coordinators gave the responses presented in Table 38 when asked to indicate by whom center activities were predominantly designed. Sixty-seven percent of the coordinators indicated that college and school personnel were jointly responsible. Twenty-four percent of the center coordinators thought that the primary responsibility for designing center activities belonged to college personnel. A small percentage (9 percent) thought that the designing of center activities was the primary responsibility of school personnel or the center coordinator alone.

Center coordinators' views concerning the primary source of
Table 37

Primary Responsibility for Center Policy Implementation as Perceived by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Responsible</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=47)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=49)</th>
<th>Both (N=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Coord.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and center coord.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coord. and college supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coord. and teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coord. and center committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Eight "Other" group combinations of school and college personnel were identified.
Table 38

**Primary Responsibility for Designing Center Activities as Perceived by Center Coordinators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Persons</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=48)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=49)</th>
<th>Both (N=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percentage</td>
<td>No. Percentage</td>
<td>No. Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and school personnel jointly</td>
<td>33 69</td>
<td>32 65</td>
<td>65 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College personnel</td>
<td>10 21</td>
<td>13 27</td>
<td>23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School personnel</td>
<td>5 10</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coordinator</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
professional expertise and direction for center student teachers are reported in Table 39. Teachers were most frequently (30 percent) identified by center coordinators as the source of professional expertise. Thirty-five percent of the elementary-secondary center coordinators and 26 percent of the secondary center coordinators viewed teachers as the primary source of expertise. Teachers alone, or teachers in combination with other personnel were reported as the primary source of professional expertise in 60 percent of the replies not including the "Other" category. Conversely, the center coordinator alone or in combination with other personnel was considered by the coordinators themselves as the primary source of professional expertise in 48 percent of the replies. In summary, Table 39 indicates that coordinators generally perceived teachers as the primary source of professional expertise in centers.

The extent to which center coordinators thought that college resources were made available to school personnel as a result of center participation is reported in Table 40. Fifty-five percent of the respondents indicated that the availability of college resources had been moderately or considerably increased since the center began functioning. Sixty-nine percent of the elementary-secondary center coordinators and 43 percent of the secondary center coordinators thought that the availability of college resources had been moderately or considerably increased. Well over half of the elementary-secondary center coordinators thought that moderate or considerable increases had occurred, while over half of the secondary center coordinators
Table 39

Primary Source of Professional Expertise and Direction for Center Student Teachers as Perceived by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Professional Expertise and Direction</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=47)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=49)</th>
<th>Both (N=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percentage</td>
<td>No. Percentage</td>
<td>No. Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in center schools</td>
<td>12  26</td>
<td>17  35</td>
<td>29  30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and center coordinators</td>
<td>10  21</td>
<td>7   14</td>
<td>17  18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coordinator</td>
<td>7   15</td>
<td>9   18</td>
<td>16  17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College supervisor</td>
<td>2   4</td>
<td>3   6</td>
<td>5   5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center coordinator and college supervisor</td>
<td>1   2</td>
<td>4   8</td>
<td>5   5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, center coordinator, and college supervisor</td>
<td>3   6</td>
<td>0   0</td>
<td>3   3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, center coordinator, department chairman, \school supervisor, and college supervisor</td>
<td>1   2</td>
<td>2   4</td>
<td>3   3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and college supervisors</td>
<td>1   2</td>
<td>1   2</td>
<td>2   2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 39 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Professional Expertise and Direction</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=47)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=49)</th>
<th>Both (N=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and school supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and center coordinators who also function as college supervisor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of twelve "Other" sources of professional expertise and direction were identified which consisted of various combinations of school and college personnel.
Table 40

Extent Center Coordinators Reported That College Resources Were Made Available to School Personnel Since the Advent of Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Change</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=47)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=48)</th>
<th>Both (N=95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably increased</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately increased</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly increased</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicated that the availability of college resources had increased only slightly or had remained unchanged. Secondary school centers were reported in general as having been rather recently established and thus had had less time during which college resources could have been made available.

Center coordinators were asked to list special services made available to school personnel as a result of center involvement. Table 41 shows that in-service workshops, seminars, and courses were listed 67 times by all of the respondents. College consultants and other resource people were listed 39 times while library privileges and greater access to media were listed 36 times. Availability of coordinators' expertise was listed 25 times, while eight other items represented a variety of services which were listed less frequently. In summary, various in-service offerings were made available to school personnel most frequently followed by the availability of resource people and campus privileges in various forms.

Center Advantages

Center coordinators were asked to list specific advantages of student teaching centers (as compared with the common cooperating teacher-student teacher-college supervisor arrangement). They then ranked these advantages in order beginning with the most significant.

In order to determine the order of significance for the advantages listed, the researcher obtained a mean favorability score for each item. This was done by assigning rank values ranging from 10 (for items ranked first) to 1 (for items ranked tenth). The number of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Services Made Available</th>
<th>Frequency in Secondary School Centers (N=35)</th>
<th>Frequency in Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=42)</th>
<th>Frequency in Both (N=77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In-service workshops, seminars, and courses conducted in schools</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. College consultants and other resource people</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Campus library privileges and greater access to available media (e.g., motion pictures, video recordings, etc.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinator's expertise readily available for assistance, assignment modification, etc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acquisition of and orientation to new equipment for use in teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Additional help for pupils in center schools while providing student teachers with a realistic look at teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services Made Available</td>
<td>Frequency in Secondary School Centers (N=35)</td>
<td>Frequency in Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=42)</td>
<td>Frequency in Both (N=77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Improved honoraria, tuition waiver arrangements, and other personal privileges (e.g., athletic tickets, bookstore discounts, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Development of a professional library</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Financed opportunities to visit other schools, special conferences, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Research and computer assistance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 Diagnostic testing services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 Publication of center newsletter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
responses in each category were counted. The sum of the responses was then multiplied by the value indicated for that category. Values from all of the categories for each item were summed and divided by the number (N) of committed responses to obtain mean favorability scores.

The advantages of student teaching centers, as perceived by center coordinators, are presented in Tables 42 through 44. Perceptions of secondary school center coordinators, elementary-secondary center coordinators, and both types of center coordinators combined are discussed separately.

Table 42 shows that secondary school coordinators ranked in the upper third (9.00-9.71) advantages dealing with improved laboratory experiences for student teachers, closer school-college cooperation, and increased availability of college personnel.

The middle third of the ranked items (8.75-8.90) focused on improved supervision, better designed experiences, improved communication and coordination, and greater involvement of teachers in teacher education. The lower third (7.50-8.40) of the ranked advantages related to the professional development and contributions of student teachers and more effective use of school and college resources.

The responses of elementary-secondary center coordinators are reported in Table 43. The data show that advantages related to improved laboratory experiences, increased availability of college personnel, and improved supervision frequently appeared in the upper third (9.00-9.50) of the rankings. Advantages involving closer school-college relationships and better designed experiences dominated the middle third of the rankings (8.62-8.83). The advantages ranked in
Table 42

Advantages of Student Teaching Centers as Perceived by Coordinators of Secondary School Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increased opportunities for student teachers to observe and apply theory in a realistic setting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Closer school-college cooperation in implementing an effective teacher education program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Immediate availability of the coordinator to assist student teachers and cooperating school personnel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Considerably more college personnel time spent in performance of professional duties and less in travel, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Increased availability of college expertise and special privileges to school faculty resulting in improved in-service education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continuous supervision and evaluation of students in a school setting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Greater flexibility and more individualization in designing experiences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Committed N</td>
<td>Value X Frequency</td>
<td>Mean Favorability Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Improved communication and coordination between school and college personnel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Greater involvement of teachers in teacher education resulting in increased professional concern and commitment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Better supervised induction process for student teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Better peer group support and sharing of ideas among student teachers in on-site seminars</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Much greater involvement of student teachers in a wide range of experiences in the school and community</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Greater acceptance of college students as team members resulting in increased shared responsibility, particularly in providing individual assistance to pupils in schools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greater familiarity with school faculty and program resulting in better student placement and increased flexibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 42 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>More effective use of resources by school and college</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NOT RANKED</strong> Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Forty-two respondents.

<sup>b</sup>"Other" consisted of advantages listed fewer than three times. These included facilitation of unique experiences in rural and/or urban settings; increased opportunities for school districts to evaluate student teachers for possible future employment; and increased opportunities for new cooperative programs and curricular changes.
Table 43
Advantages of Student Teaching Centers as Perceived by Coordinators of Elementary-Secondary Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increased opportunities for student teachers to observe and apply theory in a realistic setting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Immediate availability of the coordinator to assist student teachers and cooperating school personnel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Considerably more college personnel time spent in performance of professional duties and less in travel, etc.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continuous supervision and evaluation of students in a school setting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Closer school-college cooperation in implementing an effective teacher education program</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Much greater involvement of student teachers in a wide range of experiences in the school and community</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Greater familiarity with school faculty and program resulting in better student placement and increased flexibility</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Committed N</td>
<td>Value X Frequency</td>
<td>Mean Favorability Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Better peer group support and sharing of ideas among student teachers in on-site seminars</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Greater acceptance of college students as team members resulting in increased shared responsibility, particularly in providing individual assistance to pupils in schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>More effective use of resources by both school and college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Increased availability of college expertise and special privileges to school faculty resulting in improved in-service education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Improved communication and coordination between school and college personnel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Thirty-four respondents.

<sup>b</sup>'Other' consisted of advantages listed fewer than three times. Among these were multi-institutional (collegiate) cooperation and sharing of expertise; greater flexibility and more individualization in designing experiences; greater involvement of teachers in teacher education resulting in increased professional concern and commitment; and increased opportunities for school districts to evaluate student teachers for possible future employment.
the lower third (7.57-8.25) were primarily related to greater professional involvement of student teachers and more effective use of school and college resources.

Table 44 shows the ranked responses of all of the center coordinators. The upper third (9.00-9.63) advantages were generally related to improved laboratory experiences, greater availability of college personnel, and closer school-college cooperation. The middle third (8.41-8.93) of the rankings focused on improved supervision, better designed experiences, better peer group support, and greater accessibility to college expertise. The lower third of the rankings (7.00-8.40) seemed to concentrate on more effective use of school and college resources and more significant professional responsibilities for student teachers.

Since the range of the mean favorability scores was only 2.63 on a 10 point scale special note should also be made of the frequency of mention of items by the combined groups of center coordinators. Seven items were reported by approximately one-fifth of the coordinators up to a high of fifty-one or two-thirds of the respondents. These items are presented in Table 45 in order of frequency mentioned.

**Center Problem Areas or Constraints**

Center coordinators were presented with eight areas of difficulty which the researcher had found identified in the literature. In addition, they were provided the opportunity to list a problem area of their own choosing under "Other." The coordinators were asked to check those items which they perceived to be areas of difficulty and to rank
Table 44

Advantages of Student Teaching Centers as Perceived by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increased opportunities for students to observe and apply theory in a realistic setting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Immediate availability of the coordinator to assist student teachers and cooperating school personnel</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Considerably more college personnel time spent in performance of professional duties and less in travel, etc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Closer college-school cooperation in implementing an effective teacher education program</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Greater flexibility and more individualization in designing experiences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continuous supervision and evaluation of student teachers in a school setting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Better supervised induction process for student teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Better peer group support sharing of ideas among student teachers in on-site seminars</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Committed N</td>
<td>Value X Frequency</td>
<td>Mean Favorability Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Greater familiarity with school faculty and program resulting in better student placement and increased flexibility</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Increased availability of college expertise and special privileges to school faculty resulting in improved in-service education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Much greater involvement of student teachers in a wide range of experiences in the school and community</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Greater involvement of teachers in teacher education resulting in increased professional concern and commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Improved communication and coordination between school and college personnel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greater acceptance of college students as team members resulting in increased shared responsibility, particularly in providing individual assistance to pupils in schools</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>More effective use of resources by both school and college</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>Value X Frequency</td>
<td>Mean Favorability Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Increased opportunities for school districts to evaluate student teachers for possible future employment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NOT RANKED Other</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Seventy-six respondents.

<sup>b</sup>"Other" consisted of advantages listed fewer than three times. These included multi-institutional (collegiate) cooperation and sharing of expertise; facilitation of unique experiences in rural and/or urban settings; closer working relations with state department; and increased opportunities for new cooperative programs and curricular change.
Table 45

Advantages of Student Teaching Centers Listed Most Frequently by Center Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Much greater involvement of student teachers in a wide range of experiences in the school and community</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate availability of the coordinator to assist student teachers and cooperating school personnel</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closer school-college cooperation in implementing an effective teacher education program</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater familiarity with school faculty and program resulting in better student placement and increased flexibility</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous supervision and evaluation of student teachers in a school setting</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved communication and coordination between school and college personnel</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater acceptance of college students as team members resulting in increased shared responsibility, particularly in providing individual assistance to pupils in schools</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Extracted from data originally presented in Table 44, p. 109.

*b* Rank established for Table 44 with mean favorability formula.
them beginning with the most difficult. Thus center coordinators could have checked and ranked one problem area or as many as nine.

In order to determine the degree of severity for each problem item, the researcher developed a rank order based on mean favorability scores. These were determined by assigning rank values ranging from 9 (for items ranked first) to 1 (for items ranked ninth). The number of responses in each category were summed. The sum of the responses was then multiplied by the value indicated for that category. Values from all of the categories for each item were summed and divided by the number (N) of committed respondents. The mean favorability scores are reported in Tables 46, 47, and 48.

Table 46 shows that secondary school center coordinators ranked Human Relations considerably higher (7.30) than the other problem areas. Communication and Personnel Problems, including Incentives and Rewards, were considered rather serious. Secondary school center coordinators were less concerned about the administrative problems of Finance, continued Development of Expertise, and Location of Centers.

Table 47 reveals that elementary-secondary center coordinators ranked Finance as the most difficult (7.74) problem, and Communication was also a rather serious concern. The items ranked third through sixth seemed to reflect a concern for personnel problems. Location of Centers was not perceived to be a serious problem and Incentives and Rewards tended to cause elementary-secondary center coordinators the least amount of concern.

The data in Table 48 indicate that coordinators of both types of centers ranked Human Relations as the most difficult (7.75) problem
Table 46

Center Problem Areas or Constraints to Maximum Effectiveness as Perceived by Center Coordinators in Secondary School Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Qualifications of personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Role identification and clarification</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Incentives and rewards</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Development of expertise</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Location of centers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Forty-two respondents.

<sup>b</sup>"Other" problem areas or constraints included lack of cooperating teachers in certain subject areas; shortage of resources in center; little emphasis on urban experience; and insufficient community support.
Table 47

Center Problem Areas or Constraints to Maximum Effectiveness as Perceived by Center Coordinators in Elementary-Secondary Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Role identification and clarification</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Qualifications of personnel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Development of expertise</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Location of centers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Incentives and rewards</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Forty-two respondents.

<sup>b</sup> "Other" problem areas or constraints included evaluation; excessive time demands; lack of resources; and unclear decision-making authority.
area and Communication second (7.44) in difficulty. The area of Role Identification and Clarification was third (7.35), followed closely by Finance ranked fourth (7.28). The coordinators ranked fifth (7.09) in order of difficulty the Qualifications of Personnel. The lowest three items were closely ranked. These included the areas of Incentives and Rewards (6.68), Development of Expertise (6.61), and Location of Centers (6.60). The item identified as "Other" included problem areas discussed in Tables 46 and 47.

Table 48 shows that the combined groups of center coordinators surveyed thought Human Relations was their most difficult problem area. The first three ranked items seemed to reflect a serious concern about problems involving center personnel. Finance was considered a moderately serious problem, as was the area concerning personnel qualifications. The three lowest ranked problem areas appeared at nearly an equal level of less significance among center coordinators.

Since the range in the favorability scores was small, 1.15 on a nine point scale, the coordinators as a group actually rated all the items as very significant problems or constraints even though they varied greatly in their individual rankings. Communication was marked as a problem by 54 of the 84 respondents, while Location of Centers was only checked ten times.

CENTER COORDINATORS' RECOMMENDATIONS

Table 49 shows how center coordinators responded when they were asked to list recommendations for improving their centers. The respondents indicated most frequently that more continuous in-service offerings
Table 48

Center Problem Areas or Constraints to Maximum Effectiveness as Perceived by Center Coordinators in Both Center Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Committed N</th>
<th>Value X Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Role identification and clarification</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Qualifications of personnel</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Incentives and rewards</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Development of expertise</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Location of centers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RANKED</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aEighty-four respondents.
for center personnel were needed as much as additional room facilities and supportive staff. Significant but identified less frequently were more opportunities for campus and on-site exchange of ideas between center and college personnel followed by released time for center personnel. Elementary-secondary center coordinators alone recommended greater availability of pre-service and in-service specialists from subject areas. Table 49 reveals fourteen other recommendations listed in the order of frequency suggested by the respondents.

DESCRIPTIVE LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Numerous printed and duplicated items related to specific student teaching centers and other aspects of student teaching programs were sent to the researcher. Under the direction of some respondents, information from specific sections of accompanying supplemental materials was used to answer questions asked in the survey forms.

The literature which the writer thought to be descriptive in nature was organized into seven groups and listed in alphabetical order (see Appendix C). The literature was divided into brochures, bulletins and handbooks, cooperative agreements, descriptions of center programs, general student teaching information, and center program proposals. In total, the materials were varied and informative, but provided no data which was significant beyond what was requested in the questionnaire.

A few (7) research and related reports were sent to the writer. These consisted of both printed and duplicated items. These were reviewed, organized, and listed in alphabetical order (see Appendix D).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=41)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=42)</th>
<th>Both (N=83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5 More continuous in-service offerings for center personnel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Expanded center facilities (offices, storage areas, etc.) and staff (clerical, technical, etc.)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More opportunities for informal campus and on-site exchange of ideas between various center personnel and college personnel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Released time for center personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Greater availability of video recording and other audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Greater use of the center as a laboratory for college courses; encouragement of more college faculty involvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Greater availability of resource material to center personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Wider range of pre-student teaching experiences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 49 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=41)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=42)</th>
<th>Both (N=83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Introduce center concept into a broader geographical area; involve more teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5 Determine a workable student load for center coordinators and individual schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5 Greater availability of pre-service and in-service specialists from subject areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Develop centers in schools with the best cooperating teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Increase amount of time assignment for student teachers or add complete flexibility (e.g., no set time limits)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Better research on the total effect of the center approach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5 Professional library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5 Clarify roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5 Improve the nature of honoraria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5 More money to finance clinics, consultants, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 49 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Secondary School Centers (N=41)</th>
<th>Elementary-Secondary Centers (N=42)</th>
<th>Both (N=83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Better living accommodations for students in center area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Other\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}"Other" recommendations included establishment of an advisory council, elimination of part-time supervision and extra paper work, program expansion to include all student teachers, addition of an internship program, increased emphasis on training minority personnel, and development of a diagnostic learning component.
The reports, although generally brief, nearly uniformly noted accomplishments and urged continued refinement of the programs to which they referred.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the study, conclusions of the study, discussion, and recommendations for further research.

SUMMARY

This study was an exploratory descriptive design developed to gather information otherwise not available. Specifically, answers to seven basic questions were sought concerning student teaching centers located in secondary schools during the early 1970's. The dual objectives of the study were to determine the status of student teaching centers in secondary schools nationally and to examine existing designs, operational factors, and perceptions of selected college and center personnel.

The complete findings of the study were presented in Chapter IV. A summary of those findings in relation to the major questions asked in the study follows:

Question 1. How wide spread are secondary school student teaching centers which are thought by local institutional personnel to meet the criteria selected for this study?

A substantial number of secondary school student teaching centers were located throughout the country. Data were collected from
fifty-seven collegiate institutions and ninety-seven centers. (Secondary school aspects of forty-nine elementary-secondary centers were included in this number.) Thirty-two states were represented in the study indicating that secondary school student teaching centers were fairly well distributed geographically.

Question 2. What is the nature of the collegiate and scholastic institutions involved with secondary school student teaching centers?

In the sample studied collegiate institutions using secondary school student teaching centers were most frequently identified as state supported institutions. Most of the institutions in the study were located in medium-sized cities, small towns or villages, and urban areas. About one-third of the institutions in the survey reported student enrollments ranging from 5,000 to 9,999. In over 90 percent of the institutions studied the proportion of the student body preparing to be teachers ranged from about one-fourth but seldom more than three-fourths of the total enrollment.

The survey revealed that secondary schools in more populous areas were most frequently used in centers. These schools were most often large junior high schools. In a majority of secondary schools used in centers from one-fourth to one-half of the teachers participated in the center program.

Some minor exceptions to the findings described above were noted when secondary school centers and elementary-secondary school centers were considered separately. Secondary school centers were located more frequently in suburban areas than elementary-secondary centers. Secondary school centers, compared with elementary-secondary
centers, more frequently included high schools (within grades 9-12) as opposed to junior high schools or middle schools. Elementary-secondary centers included more secondary schools per center, but they included smaller schools than those in the secondary school centers. Elementary-secondary center coordinators reported a greater percentage of teacher involvement in their schools than did the secondary school center coordinators, but, as noted above, they used more schools of smaller size.

Question 3. For what purposes do college administrators indicate secondary school student teaching centers were established?

College administrators indicated that centers were established primarily to unite schools and colleges in a joint effort to improve off-campus experiences for prospective teachers. The data clearly revealed a high degree of emphasis on greater involvement of schools in teacher education.

Question 4. What is the role of the center coordinator in secondary school student teaching centers as perceived by college administrators and center coordinators?

The collegiate institutions or the school and college jointly were primarily responsible for selecting the center coordinator, but in over 60 percent of the cases the center coordinator's entire salary was paid by the college or university. In a majority of cases center coordinators were assigned full-time teacher education responsibilities, but split assignments were almost as common as full-time assignments among secondary school student teaching center coordinators. The center coordinator's chief role responsibility was generally perceived to be
instructional. Only coordinators of elementary-secondary centers thought their role was administrative in nature. Center policy development as well as the design of center activities were clearly perceived to be the shared responsibility of the school and college, but center policy implementation was thought to be the primary responsibility of the center coordinator. Teachers were viewed as the primary source of professional expertise and direction for student teachers in the center, but the center coordinator alone or in a combination with teachers was also identified a significant number of times.

Question 5. What are the significant characteristics of secondary school student teaching centers?

Most secondary school student teaching centers had been in existence for three years or less. Over half of the elementary-secondary centers had been in existence for more than three years and over 40 percent had been in operation for eight or more years. A majority of the centers had been designed for student teaching and other pre-service experiences, but nearly half of the elementary-secondary centers had been designed for both pre-service and in-service experiences. A majority of respondents indicated that student participants in center programs were typically assigned to individual teachers, the center, or both. Assignments to subject area departments appeared among secondary school centers only. The individual honorarium was the most frequently reported method of compensation to cooperating teachers, but the individual honorarium and free tuition arrangement in combination with other forms of compensation were reported in a majority of cases.
Most respondents indicated that their centers provided both intensive (concentrated, long term) and extensive (broad range of short term) experiences. (Some of the replies suggest that the terms intensive and extensive were somewhat confusing to the respondents.) A wide range of pre-student teaching experiences were offered in most of the centers. Most of the center coordinators indicated that their centers offered pre-service courses often or always with secondary school center coordinators indicating that their centers did so more frequently. Student teaching seminars and methods courses were the course offerings most frequently given in the center location. Both types of offerings were made available more often in secondary school centers. Typical in-service offerings included student teaching orientation programs and courses on the role of classroom teachers in student teaching. In most cases the availability of college resources to school personnel had been moderately or considerably increased. More elementary-secondary center coordinators than secondary school center coordinators reported a favorable increase in the availability of college resources, but most elementary-secondary centers had been in existence longer. In-service workshops, seminars and course offerings were the most frequently listed services made available to the schools as a result of the existence of student teaching centers.

Question 6. What are the advantages of secondary school student teaching centers as perceived by college administrators and center coordinators?

College administrators and center coordinators agreed more frequently in identifying center advantages than they did in deter-
mining their significance. The specific center advantages which both administrators and coordinators identified most frequently included greater involvement of student teachers in a wide range of experiences in the school and community; increased availability of professional assistance; closer school-college cooperation; and greater familiarity with school faculty resulting in better placement and increased flexibility.

Question 7. What are the most difficult problem areas or constraints to maximum center effectiveness as perceived by college administrators and center coordinators?

The four most serious problems in order of difficulty, as perceived by college administrators and elementary-secondary center coordinators, were finance, communication, role identification and clarification, and human relations. Secondary school center coordinators, as well as the total group of center coordinators in the study, ranked human relations first and finance fourth.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings:

1. A substantial number of centers involving secondary schools are in operation around the country and many more are still evolving. Many collegiate institutions are either involved or interested in adopting some form of the center concept.

2. Medium-sized, state supported institutions seem to be most actively involved in developing secondary school student teaching
centers. Most frequently centers develop in areas of concentrated population.

3. The center coordinator's role appears to be more instructional than administrative in nature. The coordinator is thoroughly involved in policy development and implementation while serving along with teachers as a key source of professional expertise to student teachers. The coordinator tends to be an on-site expert rather than a college-based visitor.

4. Secondary school centers are generally smaller than elementary-secondary centers in number of schools and, therefore, center coordinators in such centers tend to be more readily available and more closely involved with center personnel in a greater variety of ways.

5. The purposes for the establishment of centers found in the literature and the purposes identified by college administrators are very similar in nature. The advantages of centers as perceived by college administrators and center coordinators show a high correlation. Apparently in the view of the concerned college administrators and their center coordinators the primary reasons for the existence of centers are being met.

6. Coordinators who tend to work most closely with school personnel are greatly concerned about the impact of human relations problems upon center effectiveness. Those persons who by the nature of their positions work with teachers less frequently appear more concerned about administrative matters such as finance.

7. Responses from college administrators and center coordinators indicate that secondary student teaching centers alleviate at
least some of the problems inherent in the usual student teaching situation.

The survey suggests that school-college cooperatively developed secondary school student teaching centers should be considered a viable organizational pattern for providing prospective teachers with sound learning experiences.

DISCUSSION

Integration of the findings of this study and the writer's own experience in supervision have helped to answer some personal questions about secondary student teaching centers and to focus more clearly on other important questions which still need to be resolved. From the opinions expressed by college administrators and center coordinators, as well as the information gleaned from miscellaneous descriptive materials and reports, it is clearly evident that teacher educators are keenly interested in the secondary student teaching center concept.

The advantages of secondary student teaching centers as perceived by those who participated in the study are highly consistent. In addition, the prevailing problems associated with centers are fairly uniformly reported.

The findings of the study are generally helpful in obtaining an overview of secondary student teaching center status in the early 1970's. Unfortunately, a very important aspect of center development received little or no attention—the fundamental concepts upon which the secondary student teaching center design is based. Obviously the nature of this study limited consideration in this area; nevertheless,
the findings revealed little or no cognizance of research completed in the 1960's on the needs of student teachers. This suggests that perhaps centers have been and are being established primarily to eliminate gross administrative problems such as those dealing with student placement and costs of supervision. It appears that more fundamental concerns such as those dealing with the student teacher's personal well-being during student teaching have not been major concerns. Perhaps the human relations problems which continue to hamper secondary student teaching center effectiveness throughout the country are, at least in part, due to the failure of those who have established and maintained the centers to deal with the fundamental limitations of the usual patterns of student teaching—a collegiate curricular activity carried on in entirely separate school systems.

This study suggests that at this time there exists a rather common concern nationally over the development of successful college partnerships. Characteristics of effective student teaching centers were not clearly revealed in this study, but it seems reasonably clear that a teacher education commitment jointly shared by the school and the college must be considered one of the undergirding forces which must be utilized fully to ensure future success for student teaching centers.

In this study center coordinators recommended that more in-service offerings be made available in centers. Apparently center coordinators think that teachers in center schools need and want more preparation and that they can become more effective partners in teacher education if they are given ample opportunity. However, even though
center coordinators generally recognize the cooperating teacher as a primary source of professional expertise in the center, the matter of who should provide subject matter expertise still needs to be resolved. There is no longer any question about the importance of the cooperating teacher's influence on the student teacher, thus it seems only reasonable to assume that the teacher, in the role of a teacher educator, must receive adequate ongoing assistance in order to exert a truly positive influence on the preparation of prospective teachers.

Genuine interest in secondary student teaching centers exists nationally. These student teaching centers exist now in sufficient number to warrant state or regional workshops for center coordinators. State department officials should review the possibilities for much can be done to make the existing secondary centers function more effectively.

Unfortunately, the existing reasons for the development of centers seldom represent a real thrust toward resolving the truly basic problems in student teaching. True partnerships with equally shared responsibilities appear absolutely essential if the center concept is to succeed. Obviously, there are those who will choose to reject parity, and instead attempt to maintain or gain power in a struggle which no one can win. Teachers are the heart of our educational process, and they play a significant role in the careers of future teachers. This writer must conclude that only those well designed student teaching programs which fully utilize school-college professional expertise hold promise for making a major contribution to better teacher education.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Data gathered about secondary student teaching centers through this study tend to support the following recommendations:

1. Research should be carried out to obtain the perceptions of student teachers, teachers, and principals in a representative sampling of centers in order to examine further the role of the center coordinator.

2. The role of the center coordinator should be further analyzed to determine what preparation is needed to enable persons to function effectively as center coordinators.

3. More research is needed to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the various positions which emerge as a necessary result of the center approach.

4. State department personnel charged with teacher education responsibilities should carefully consider financial support for center concept exploration and development through pilot studies of significant center types.

5. More research is needed to develop center models for continuous pre-service and in-service teacher education.

6. Research is needed to determine the availability and effectiveness of different kinds of center related expertise.

7. Research is needed to determine whether the center approach deals effectively with the problems which have now been identified by research on the traditional student teacher-cooperating teacher-college supervisor triadic arrangement.
8. More research is needed to determine the most significant aspects of a truly effective school-college partnership.
Correspondence
We are interested in compiling an accurate list of all colleges in the United States which currently work in off-campus secondary student teaching centers. Note that for the purposes of our list and future study a center is defined as an off-campus laboratory setting in a secondary school or a cluster of schools coordinated by a specifically designated staff member selected by a college, a school district, or jointly. The center coordinator may be a subject area specialist or generalist responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of prospective teachers assigned to the center.

We are seeking your help because you may be in the unique position of knowing much about current operations in teacher education in your area. The list of centers being compiled will ultimately serve as a basis for a national survey. Your assistance in giving "handles" by which we can contact those responsible on college faculties for direction, liaison, or coordination of secondary student teaching centers will be greatly appreciated. A special form and a stamped, self-addressed envelope are provided for your convenience. We would especially appreciate hearing from you prior to October 20, 1971.

If you do not know of any centers, please send this letter on to someone (outside of the State Department) whom you know to be acquainted with centers in your area. Please nominate any other person in your area of the country whom you know to be very knowledgeable about student teaching centers in various institutions.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gene Telego

This study is designed to accumulate data (not currently available anywhere) on student teaching centers and to do some preliminary evaluation of center objectives, operation and effectiveness. I hope you or someone you know in your area can assist in identifying such centers in your state or region.

L. O. Andrews
Professor of Teacher Education
The Ohio State University
We are interested in compiling an accurate list of all colleges in the United States which currently work in off-campus secondary student teaching centers. Note that for the purposes of our list and future study a center is defined as an off-campus laboratory setting in a secondary school or a cluster of schools coordinated by a specifically designated staff member selected by a college, a school district, or jointly. The center coordinator may be a subject area specialist or generalist responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of prospective teachers assigned to the center.

We are seeking your help because we hope you and your staff may be in the unique position of knowing much about current operations in teacher education in your area. The list of centers being compiled will ultimately serve as a basis for a national survey. Your assistance in giving "handles" by which we can contact those responsible on college faculties for direction, liaison, or coordination of secondary student teaching centers will be greatly appreciated. A special form and a stamped, self-addressed envelope are provided for your convenience. We would especially appreciate hearing from you prior to October 20, 1971.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gene Telego

This study is designed to accumulate data (not currently available anywhere) on secondary student teaching centers and to do some preliminary evaluation of center objectives, operation and effectiveness. I hope someone in your office can assist in identifying such centers in your state.

L. O. Andrews
Professor of Teacher Education
The Ohio State University
We are interested in compiling an accurate list of all colleges in the United States which currently work in off-campus secondary student teaching centers. Note that for the purposes of our list and future study a center is defined as an off-campus laboratory setting in a secondary school or a cluster of schools coordinated by a specifically designated staff member selected by a college, a school district, or jointly. The center coordinator may be a subject area specialist or generalist responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of prospective teachers assigned to the center.

The list toward which you are being asked to contribute will ultimately serve as a basis for a national survey so your response is extremely important. We are seeking your help because we believe you have either been involved in the development or operation of centers and, therefore, possess extensive knowledge about the center concept. Your assistance in giving "handles" by which we can contact those responsible on college faculties for direction, liaison, or coordination of secondary student teaching centers will be greatly appreciated. A special form and a stamped, self-addressed envelope are provided for your convenience. We would especially appreciate hearing from you prior to October 20, 1971.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gene Telego

This study is designed to accumulate data (not currently available anywhere) on student teaching centers and to do some preliminary evaluation of center objectives, operation and effectiveness. I hope you or someone you know in your area can assist in identifying such centers in your state, region or the nation at large.

L. O. Andrews
Professor of Teacher Education
The Ohio State University
A letter requesting your assistance in locating secondary student teaching centers was mailed to you early in October. You will recall that a special form for your reply accompanied the letter. We would greatly appreciate receiving that special form from you in the very near future. (Enclosed is another form for your convenience.) Please return the form even though you may not have been able to identify secondary centers in your area.

Thank you for giving this matter your prompt attention.

Sincerely,

Gene Telego

The study toward which you are being asked to contribute is designed to accumulate data (not currently available anywhere) on secondary student teaching centers. This study which is being conducted under the advisement of Dr. L. O. Andrews will include an evaluation of center objectives, operation, and effectiveness in order to develop a needed understanding of the status of centers currently in operation around the country.
We are interested in compiling an accurate list of all colleges in the United States which currently work in off-campus secondary student teaching centers. Note that for the purposes of our list and future study a center is defined as an off-campus laboratory setting in a secondary school or a cluster of schools coordinated by a specifically designated staff member selected by a college, a school district, or jointly. The center coordinator may be a subject area specialist or generalist responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of prospective teachers assigned to the center.

The list toward which you are being asked to contribute will ultimately serve as a basis for a national survey so your response is extremely important. We are seeking your help because we believe you have either been involved in the development or operation of centers and, therefore, possess extensive knowledge about the center concept. Your assistance in giving "handles" by which we can contact those responsible on college faculties for direction, liaison, or coordination of secondary student teaching centers will be greatly appreciated. A special form and a stamped, self-addressed envelope are provided for your convenience. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gene Telego

This study is designed to accumulate data (not currently available anywhere) on student teaching centers and to do some preliminary evaluation of center objectives, operation and effectiveness. I hope you or someone you know in your area can assist in identifying such centers in your state, region or the nation at large.

L. O. Andrews
Professor of Teacher Education
The Ohio State University
Dear

A study is being conducted under the advisement of L. O. Andrews which is designed to accumulate data on secondary student teaching centers and to do some preliminary evaluation of center objectives, operation and effectiveness. Note that for the purpose of our study a secondary center is defined as an off-campus laboratory setting in a secondary school or a cluster of schools coordinated by a specifically designated staff member selected by a college, a school district, or jointly.

Your center has been listed among those which are being considered for further study. However, information which was received earlier about your program did not indicate whether your center should have been classified as elementary or secondary. You can help us to resolve this problem by filling out the enclosed self-addressed postcard and returning it as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gene Telego
Dear Gene,

Our center (should, should not) be included in your study. This center is for (elementary, secondary) experiences.

Center:__________________________

Center coordinator:_______________________

Mailing address:
We are seeking your assistance in determining the status of secondary student teaching centers currently in operation throughout the country. For the purpose of this study, we have defined a secondary student teaching center as a laboratory setting within a secondary school or cluster of two to four schools developed for pre-service and/or in-service teacher education. A full-time person (or a continuing regular staff person) selected by the college or university, the school district or both who could be a subject area specialist or generalist is responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of teacher education students and teachers assigned to the center.

Your center has been identified as one which should be included in our study. In order to obtain the data necessary to evaluate center purposes, operation, and effectiveness, we need as much information as you can supply in the enclosed questionnaire. Please complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience. (A different form will be sent to each of the centers which you identify.)

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gene Telego

This research project has two objectives: first, to get a picture of the present development of secondary student teaching centers (not now available anywhere) and, second, to do some preliminary evaluation of their operation and effectiveness. I urgently solicit your cooperation with this study which is being done under my direction.

L. O. Andrews  
Professor Emeritus  
(Area of Teacher Education)  
The Ohio State University
Several weeks ago you received a questionnaire designed to collect data about secondary student teaching centers. Our records indicate that as of this date we have not received a reply from you. We hope that in the very near future you will be able to fill out and return the specially prepared instrument. (Another questionnaire is enclosed for your use.) Since your response is very important to the successful completion of the study, we would appreciate a reply from you at your earliest convenience. The results of the study should be much more significant and useful to teacher educators if we have a comprehensive report on secondary centers.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours respectfully,

Gene Telego
We are seeking your assistance in determining the status of secondary student teaching centers currently in operation throughout the country. For the purpose of this study, we have defined a secondary student teaching center as a laboratory setting within a secondary school or cluster of two to four schools developed for pre-service and/or in-service teacher education. A full-time person (or a continuing regular staff person) selected by the college or university, the school district or both who could be a subject area specialist or generalist is responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of teacher education students and teachers assigned to the center.

Your center has been identified as one which should be included in our study. In order to obtain the data necessary to evaluate center purposes, operation, and effectiveness, we need as much information as you can supply in the enclosed questionnaire. Please complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience. (A different form has been sent to the collegiate institution(s) with which your center is affiliated.)

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gene Telego

This research project has two objectives: first, to get a picture of the present development of secondary student teaching centers (not now available anywhere) and, second, to do some preliminary evaluation of their operation and effectiveness. I urgently solicit your cooperation with this study which is being done under my direction.

L. O. Andrews
Professor Emeritus
(Area of Teacher Education)
The Ohio State University
Dr. L. Stanley Ratliff  
Director of Student Teaching  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Dear Dr. Ratliff:

Several weeks ago you received a questionnaire designed to collect data about secondary student teaching centers. Our records indicate that as of this date we have received a reply from your center but not from you. We hope that in the very near future you will be able to fill out and return the specially prepared instrument. (Another form is enclosed for your use.) Your response is very important to the successful completion of the study.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Gene Telego
APPENDIX B

Instruments
**LOCATOR FORM A**

**DEFINITION:** A secondary student teaching center is an off-campus laboratory setting in a secondary school or a cluster of schools coordinated by a specifically designated staff member selected by a college, a school district, or jointly. The center coordinator may be a subject area specialist or generalist responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of prospective teachers assigned to the center.

State of ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION</th>
<th>2. DIRECTOR, LIAISON OR COORDINATOR OF SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS</th>
<th>3. ADDRESS</th>
<th>4. CENTER COORDINATOR</th>
<th>5. ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person supplying data_____________________________________________ Title_________________________________

**PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE TO:**

Gene Telego
1410 Meadow Lane
Ashland, Ohio 44805

**IN CASE YOU KNOW THE NAME AND ADDRESS OF A CENTER COORDINATOR BUT DO NOT KNOW THE IDENTITY OF THE RESPONSIBLE COLLEGE PERSON, PLEASE GIVE AND IDENTIFY THE INFORMATION YOU HAVE AVAILABLE. SIMILARLY, IF YOU HAVE LIMITED DATA ON YOUR STATE, BUT YOU KNOW A PERSON IN YOUR AREA WHO COULD SUPPLY MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE FORWARD THIS FORM TO THAT PERSON. THANK YOU. G.T.**
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LOCATOR FORM B

DEFINITION: A secondary student teaching center is an off-campus laboratory setting in a secondary school or a cluster of schools coordinated by a specifically designated staff member selected by a college, a school district, or jointly. The center coordinator may be a subject area specialist or generalist responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of prospective teachers assigned to the center.

I (would, would not) be willing to participate in a later phase of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION</th>
<th>2. DIRECTOR, LIAISON OR COORDINATOR OF SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS</th>
<th>3. ADDRESS</th>
<th>4. CENTER COORDINATOR</th>
<th>5. ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People most knowledgeable about student teaching centers in our area are: (name and address)

Person supplying data __________________________________________________________ Address ______________________________
A Questionnaire on
SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS
Part of a study to analyze
SELECTED ASPECTS OF OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS

General College Information
1. Name of Collegiate Institution:_________________________________________
2. City, State, and Zip Code:____________________________________________
3. Classification of Institution:
   ____ state university   ____ private university   ____ state college
   ____ city university     ____ private college     ____ city college
4. Geographical setting of college campus:
   ____ rural                ____ medium-sized city     ____ urban area
   ____ small town or village  ____ suburban area
5. Full-time undergraduate enrollment for the academic year 1971-72:
   ____ 0-999             ____ 3,000-4,999        ____ 10,000-14,999
   ____ 1,000-2,999       ____ 5,000-9,999        ____ 15,000-24,999
   ____ 25,000 or above
6. Percent of full-time undergraduate students preparing to be teachers:
   ____ 0-25%              ____ 26-50%             ____ 51-75%             ____ 76-100%

DEFINITION: (for the purpose of this study)

   Off-campus secondary student teaching center is defined for this study as a laboratory setting within a secondary school or cluster of two to four schools developed for pre-service and/or in-service teacher education. A full-time person (or a continuing regular staff person) selected by the college or university, the school district, or both, who could be a subject area specialist or generalist is responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of teacher education students and teachers assigned to the center.

   We have___, or do not have___, an off-campus secondary student teaching center as defined for this study. If you do not have such a center(s), so indicate and complete the next two lines and return the questionnaire without answering any of the other questions. Thank you.

NAME of person reporting_____________________________________________________
Title_________________________________________ Date___________________________
Center Coordinators' Names and Addresses
7. Please list the name and address of each of your center coordinators:

Goals of the Center
8a. Please list the goals identified by the college or university when you considered and established your center(s):

8b. Some colleges and universities have stated center goals such as those below. Please rank these in order of importance as they might be perceived by your faculty (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.).

RANK
____ A. To cooperatively design and implement a model teacher education program.
____ B. To integrate theory with practice by merging on-campus with off-campus experiences.
____ C. To merge pre-service and in-service education into a continuing program.
____ D. To unite the college and school faculties in ways which would facilitate working together on common instructional and supervisory problems.
____ E. To individualize professional development for the pre-professionals as well as the practicing professionals.
____ F. To utilize educational technology in pre-service and in-service preparation.
____ G. To alleviate traditional problems of coordinating off-campus pre-service experiences.
9. The center coordinator is selected by:
   ___the school  ___the college or university
   ___the school and college or university jointly

10. The portion of the coordinator's salary provided by the college or university is:
   ___25%  ___50%  ___75%  ___100%  ___other, specify______________

11. Rank these chief components of the role of the center coordinator in order of importance (e.g., 1, 2, 3, 4):
   ___administrative  ___evaluative  ___other, specify
   ___instructional  ___curricular

12. The primary responsibility for center policy development belongs to:
   ___the school
   ___the college or university
   ___the school and college or university jointly
   ___the staff of the schools, principals and coordinators
   ___a coordinating-advisory committee for this center
   ___other, specify___________________________________________

13. The primary responsibility for center policy implementation belongs to:
   ___principal  ___center coordinator  ___a center committee
   ___other, specify___________________________________________

14. Professional expertise and direction for student teachers in the center is expected to be provided primarily by:
   ___teachers in the center school(s)  ___school supervisor
   ___center coordinator  ___college supervisor
   ___department chairman(men)  ___other, specify_______________

Center Advantages

15. Please list the advantages generally provided by your center (as compared with the common cooperating teacher-student teacher-college supervisor triadic arrangement) and rank them in order of their significance to you (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.).

   RANK
Center Problem Areas or Constraints to Maximum Effectiveness

16. Check (√) each item that represents an area of difficulty. Briefly describe the problem in the space provided for each problem area. After you have identified the problem areas, go back and rank them, beginning with the most difficult (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEMS (√)</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ( ) Human relations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ( ) Communication:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ( ) Role identification and clarification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ( ) Qualifications of personnel:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ( ) Development of expertise:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ( ) Location of centers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. ( ) Finance:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. ( ) Incentives and rewards:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. ( ) Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Literature

Please list and/or forward items which explain your program in greater detail. (Bill me for any special charges.)
Research Studies Completed at the Center(s)

Please summarize research findings below and/or forward copies of findings, if available, which relate to the operation and effectiveness of your center.

___ I would like a summary of the results.

Name ____________________________________________

Address ________________________________________

PLEASE PLACE THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED AND MAIL IT AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

G.T.
A Questionnaire on
SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS
Part of a study to analyze
SELECTED ASPECTS OF OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS

General School Information
1. Name of Cooperating School District: _________________________________
2. City, State, and Zip Code: _________________________________
3. Name of the Center: _________________________________
   3.1 Sponsoring Collegiate Institution(s): _________________________________
4. Geographical setting of center secondary school(s). (Please indicate the number of schools in each setting):
   ___ rural  ___ medium sized city  ___ urban area
   ___ small town or village  ___ suburban area
5. Center school organization (please indicate number of each type and include the grade level range):
   ___ middle school (grades ____________)
   ___ junior high school (grades ____________)
   ___ high school (grades ____________)
   ___ other, specify ________________________________
6. Approximate number of pupils enrolled in center school(s). (Please indicate the number of schools in each category.):
   ___ 1-199  ___ 500-699  ___ 1000-1499
   ___ 200-499  ___ 700-999  ___ 1500 and above
7. Percent of teachers in the school(s) participating in the center program:
   ___ 0-25%  ___ 26-50%  ___ 51-75%  ___ 76-100%
DEFINITION: (for the purpose of this study)

_Off-campus secondary student teaching center_ is defined for this study as a laboratory setting within a secondary school or cluster of two to four schools developed for pre-service and/or in-service teacher education. A full-time person (or a continuing regular staff person) selected by the college or university, the school district, or both, who could be a subject area specialist or generalist is responsible for coordinating and/or directing assignments and activities of teacher education students and teachers assigned to the center.

We have__, or do not have__, an off-campus secondary student teaching center as defined for this study. If you do not have such a center(s), so indicate and complete the next two lines and return the questionnaire without answering any of the other questions. Thank you.

Name of person reporting_____________________________________________________
Title_________________________________________ Date________________________

**Center Features**

8. The center has been in existence for:

    ___ less than 1 year ___ 1-3 years ___ 4-7 years ___ 8 or more years

9. The center has been organized for:

    ___ secondary teacher education ___ elementary teacher education

10. The center is designed for:

    ___ student teaching only ___ pre-service and in-service teacher education
    ___ pre-service teacher education (including student teaching) ___ other, specify ____________

11. Students participating in the program are assigned to:

    ___ the center ___ individual teachers ___ a subject area
    ___ other, specify____________________________

12. Cooperating teachers are compensated by:

    ___ individual honorarium ___ released time
    ___ free tuition arrangement ___ no specific compensation
    ___ college or university faculty privileges ___ other, specify__________________
13. Opportunities for pre-service education in the center might best be described as:

- intensive (concentrated, long term assignments such as student teaching, internships, etc.)
- extensive (broad range of short term experiences such as tutoring, assisting, participation, etc.)
- both intensive and extensive

14. Pre-student teaching experiences typically include:

- observation
- non-teaching duties
- bit teaching
- assisting the teacher as a junior member of the instructional team

- small group work
- tutoring
- planned exploratory teaching of full lessons

- all of the above

15. Pre-service seminars and/or undergraduate teacher education courses are taught at the center:

- never
- seldom
- often
- always

15.1 If pre-service courses or seminars are taught at the center, please list them below:

16. In-service offerings include:

- orientation to student teaching program
- role of classroom teachers in student teaching
- supervision and curriculum courses
- analysis of teaching

- special workshops
- microteaching for skill improvement

- other, specify

17. Rank these chief components of the role of the center coordinator in order of importance (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.):

- administrative
- evaluative
- instructional
- curricular

- other, specify

18. The center coordinator's teacher education responsibility is considered to be:

- full-time
- half-time
- three-quarter time
- one-fourth time

- other, specify
19. The primary responsibility for center policy development belongs to:

- the school
- college or university
- school and college or university jointly
- a coordinating-advisory committee for this center
- the staff of the schools, principals & coordinators
- other, specify

20. The primary responsibility for center policy implementation belongs to:

- principal
- center coordinator
- center committee
- other, specify

21. Professional expertise and direction for student teachers in the center is expected to be provided primarily by:

- teachers in the center school(s)
- school supervisor
- college supervisor
- center coordinator
- other, specify
- department chairman(men)

22. The extent to which college resources have been made available to school personnel since the development of the center has been:

- slightly increased
- considerably increased
- moderately increased
- unchanged

23. Please list special services which have been made available as a result of the center:

24. Generally speaking, the nature of the center's activities have been designed predominantly by:

- school personnel
- college personnel
- joint planning
Please list below additional distinctive features of the center which should be noted:

25.

26.

27.

Center Advantages

28. Please list the specific advantages provided by your center (as compared with the common cooperating teacher-student teacher-college-supervisor triadic arrangement) and rank them in order of their significance to you (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.).

RANK

Center Problem Areas or Constraints to Maximum Effectiveness

29. Check (✓) each item that represents an area of difficulty. Briefly describe the problem in the space provided for each problem area. After you have identified the problem areas, go back and rank them beginning with the most difficult (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.).

PROBLEMS (✓) RANK
.
.1 ( ) Human relations: ________________________________
.2 ( ) Communication: ________________________________
.3 ( ) Role identification and clarification ________________________________
.4 ( ) Qualifications of personnel: ________________________________
.5 ( ) Development of Expertise: ________________________________
.6 ( ) Location of centers: ________________________________
.7 ( ) Finance: ________________________________
.8 ( ) Incentives and rewards: ________________________________
.9 ( ) Other: ________________________________
30. If the human and material resources were available, what would you recommend be done to improve your center?

I would like a summary of the results of the study.

Name _______________________

Address _______________________

PLEASE PLACE THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED AND MAIL IT AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

G.T.
APPENDIX C

Descriptive Literature
DESCRIPTIVE LITERATURE RECEIVED

A. Brochures

"Capital/Pace" ESEA Title III Newsletter
1411 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

"Operation: Saturation
A Michigan State Innovation in Student Teaching"
Cassopolis Public Schools
Cassopolis, Michigan 49031

"SERL (Secondary Education Residency Lansing) Project:
A Project to Improve the Preparation of Teachers"
Michigan State University Student Teaching Office
East Lansing, Michigan

"Student Teachers"
Kanawha County Schools
200 Elizabeth Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25311

B. Bulletins and Handbooks for Student Teaching

Cooperative Teachers' Handbook
Bloomsburg State College
Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania

"Multi-Institution Teacher Education Center (MITEC):
University of Kansas Student Bulletin" (Mimeographed.)
Shawnee Mission
Kansas City, Kansas

"MITEC: Guidelines for Participation for Secondary
Student Teachers" (Mimeographed.)

"MITEC: Shawnee Mission Staff Bulletin" (Mimeographed.)

Student Teaching (General Guidelines; Tri-Level Student
Teacher Competencies)
College of Education
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, Missouri
St. Cloud State College
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301

"Student Teaching Manual" (Mimeographed.)
Bloomsburg State College
Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania

Suggestions for Teachers and Administrators Cooperating
With Southeast Missouri State College in the Student
Teaching Phase of the Teacher Education Program
Office of Student Teaching
304 Education and Psychology Building
Southeast Missouri State College
Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63701

"Syllabus for Student Intern Teaching" (Mimeographed.)
Northeastern State College
Tahlequah, Oklahoma

**Teacher Education Handbook for Elementary and Secondary**
**Student Teachers**
Arkansas State University
Jonesboro, Arkansas

C. Cooperative Agreements

"Addenda to the Agreement for Cooperation in Student
Teaching with Cooperating Off-Campus Centers" (Mimeographed.)
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

"Agreement with Schools for Clinical Clusters for Student
Teaching" (Mimeographed.)
Michigan State University
Student Teaching Office
East Lansing, Michigan

"Supplement to Agreement with Schools for Clinical Clusters--
Responsibilities in Clinical Cluster Program" (Mimeographed.)
Michigan State University

"MEMO: Student Teaching Center--An Agreement Between School
Districts and Farmington State College" (Mimeographed.)
Farmington State College of the University of Maine
Farmington, Maine 04938

**Organization and Operation Manual: Central Minnesota**
**Teacher Education Council**
St. Cloud State College
St. Cloud, Minnesota
D. Descriptions of Center Programs

"Center for Student Teachers" (Mimeographed.)
University of Connecticut
School of Education
Storrs, Connecticut

Institute for Educational Development Thrust for Change:
Summer Clinics and Follow-Up
Teacher Education Centers
District of Columbia Public Schools
Washington, D.C.

Mercer County Teacher Education Center
Professional Center
1420 Honaker Avenue
Princeton, West Virginia 24740

"Metro-Atlanta Teacher Education Center Model" (Mimeographed.)
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Multi-Institutional Kanawha County Teacher Education Center
Kanawha County Schools
200 Elizabeth Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25311

"The Teacher Education Center: A Unified Approach to Teacher Education" (Mimeographed.)
Southwest Minnesota State College
Marshall, Minnesota

"The Teacher Training Program at the Union School District #32 High School" (Mimeographed.)
Johnson State College
Johnson, Vermont

E. Descriptions of Teacher Education Programs
(Including Student Teaching)

"Career Teacher Education Program" (Mimeographed.)
College of Education
Florida Technological University
Orlando, Florida

"Secondary Teacher Preparation at Wheeling College: A Model Based Upon Person, Performance, and Partnership" (Mimeographed.)
Wheeling College
Wheeling, West Virginia 28003
F. Student Teaching Program Information (General)

"A Description of Michigan State's Full-Time Student Teaching Program" (Mimeographed.)
Michigan State University
College of Education
East Lansing, Michigan

"Instructional and Management Load of Student Teaching Faculty" (Mimeographed.)
Michigan State University

Policies and Procedures for Admission to Professional Education and Student Intern Teaching
Northeastern State College
Tahlequah, Oklahoma

"Directory of Practicum Experiences" (Secondary Student Teachers, Mt. Pleasant Center) (Mimeographed.)
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan

"The Professional Laboratory Semester" (Mimeographed.)
Central Michigan University

"Professional Program" (Mimeographed.)
Division of Secondary Education
Lock Haven State College
Lock Haven, Pennsylvania

"Professional Semester in Secondary English" (Mimeographed.)
State University of New York
Oneonta, New York

"Student Teaching at Shippensburg" (Mimeographed.)
Shippensburg State College
Office of Student Teaching
Shippensburg, Pennsylvania 17257

G. Proposals for Center Programs

"Cooperative Education Center at Forest Park High School" (Mimeographed.)
Morgan State College Center for Urban Affairs
Baltimore, Maryland

"The Forest Park High School Magnet" (Mimeographed.)
Morgan State College Center for Urban Affairs
Proposed Cooperative Education Centers of The Center for Urban Affairs
Morgan State College Center for Urban Affairs

"Proposal for a Revised Student Teaching Center for Harrison County" (Mimeographed.)
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

"Proposal for Teacher Education Centers" (Mimeographed.)
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon
APPENDIX D

Research and Related Reports
"Progress of Teacher Education Centers" (Mimeographed.)
Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service
Metro-Atlanta Committee on Teacher Education Centers
Atlanta, Georgia

Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

"Harrison County Teacher Center (Report Submitted December 10, 1971)" (Mimeographed.)
Harrison County Schools
301 W. Main Street
Clarksburg, West Virginia 26301

Institute for Educational Development: Focus on its Components
Teacher Education Centers
District of Columbia Public Schools
Washington, D.C.

Institute for Educational Development: Staff Development
District of Columbia Public Schools

University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

The Center for Urban Affairs: First Annual Report
Morgan State College
Baltimore, Maryland

"Vermont Staff Development Cooperative: Overview Catalogue of Program Accomplishments" (Mimeographed.)
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont
APPENDIX E

Collegiate Institutions Which Were Included in the Study
Arizona
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

California
U.C.L.A.
Los Angeles, California

Colorado
Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado

Connecticut
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Delaware
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

Florida
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida
Florida Technological University
Orlando, Florida

Georgia
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Iowa
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Kansas
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Kentucky
Morehead State University
Morehead, Kentucky

Louisiana
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Maine
University of Maine at Farmington
Farmington, Maine

Maryland
Loyola College
Baltimore, Maryland
Morgan State College
Baltimore, Maryland
Towson State College
Towson, Maryland
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Massachusetts
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

Michigan
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Minnesota
Moorhead State College
Moorhead, Minnesota
St. Cloud State College
St. Cloud, Minnesota
Southwest Minnesota State College
Marshall, Minnesota

Missouri
Southeast Missouri State College
Cape Girardeau, Missouri
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri
Nebraska
University of Nebraska
Lincoln Campus
Lincoln, Nebraska

New Jersey
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

New York
Long Island University
Greenvale, New York
State University at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York
State University of New York
at Oneonta
Oneonta, New York
Utica College of Syracuse
University
Utica, New York

Ohio
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio

Oklahoma
Northeastern State College
Tahlequah, Oklahoma

Oregon
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Pennsylvania
Bloomsburg State College
Bloomsburg, Pa.
Edinboro State College
Edinboro, Pa.
Lock Haven State College
Lock Haven, Pa.

Millersville State College
Millersville, Pa.
Shippensburg State College
Shippensburg, Pa.
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Rhode Island
Rhode Island College
Providence, Rhode Island

Tennessee
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Utah
Weber State College
Ogden, Utah

Vermont
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

West Virginia
Concord College
Athens, West Va.
Davis and Elkins College
Elkins, West Va.
Marshall University
Huntington, West Va.
Salem College
Salem, West Va.
West Virginia State
Institute, West Va.
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Va.
West Virginia Wesleyan
Buckhannon, West Va.
Wheeling College
Wheeling, West Va.

Wisconsin
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
APPENDIX F

Secondary School Student Teaching Centers Which Were Included in the Study
Arizona

University of Arizona:
Apono Student Teaching Center
Sunnyside School District
Tucson, Arizona

Cholla High School
Tucson School District #1
Tucson, Arizona

California

University of California, Los Angeles:

Emerson-Mark Twain Student Teaching Center
Los Angeles Unified School District
Los Angeles, California 90012

Connecticut

University of Bridgeport:

Harding High School
Bridgeport Schools
Bridgeport, Conn. 66602

Delaware

University of Delaware:

Alfred I. DuPont Student Teaching Center
Alfred I. DuPont School District
Wilmington, Delaware 19810

Iowa

University of Northern Iowa:

Cedar Falls Student Teaching Center
Cedar Falls Community Schools
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

Kansas

Kansas State University, et al.:

MITEC (Multi Institutional Teacher Education Center)
Unified School District #257
Wichita, Kansas 67208
Kentucky

Morehead State University:

Paul Blazer High School
Ashland Independent
Ashland, Kentucky 41101

Maryland

Loyola College:

Herring Run-Loyola Student Teaching Center
Baltimore City Schools
Baltimore, Maryland 21206

Morgan State College:

Forest Park High School
Baltimore City Schools
Baltimore, Maryland 21207

Towson State College:

Baltimore City Secondary Center
Baltimore City Public Schools
Baltimore, Maryland

Ridgely-Dulaney Teacher Education Center
Baltimore County Schools
Towson, Maryland 21204

Towson English Center
Baltimore County Schools
Towson, Maryland 21204

University of Maryland:

Anne Arundel Teacher Education Center
Anne Arundel County Public Schools
Annapolis, Maryland

D.C. Secondary Teacher Education Center
District of Columbia Public Schools
Washington, D.C. 20011

Parkdale-Nicholas Orem Teacher Education Center
Prince George's County Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870
University of Maryland:

Secondary Student Teaching Center
Howard County Public Schools
Clarksville, Maryland

Springbrook-Key Teacher Education Center
Montgomery County Public Schools
Rockville, Maryland

Wheaton-Bell-Randolph Teacher Education Center
Montgomery County Schools
Wheaton, Maryland

Massachusetts

Boston College:

Newton South High School
Newton Public Schools
Newton, Mass. 02159

Michigan

Michigan State University:

M.S.U. Southwest Michigan Center
Benton Harbor Public Schools
Benton Harbor, Michigan 49022

M.S.U. Teacher Education Center
Pontiac Public Schools
Pontiac, Michigan

Wayne State University:

Macomb County Student Teaching Center
Warren Consolidated Schools
Warren, Michigan 48092

Minnesota

Southwest Minnesota State College:

Canby Teacher Education Center
Independent School District #891
Canby, Minnesota 56220
New York

Utica College of Syracuse University:

Teacher Education Center
Utica City School District
Utica, New York 13501

Ohio

Bowling Green State University:

Arbor Hills-Sylvania Secondary School Student Teaching Center
Sylvania City Schools
Sylvania, Ohio 43560

Bowling Green Secondary School Student Teaching Center
Bowling Green City Schools
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

DeVilbiss High School Center
Toledo City Schools
Toledo, Ohio

Napoleon Student Teaching Center
Napoleon City Schools
Napoleon, Ohio

Parma Senior-Schaaf Jr. High School Center
Parma Schools
Parma, Ohio 44129

Whitmer Center
Washington Local Schools
Toledo, Ohio 43613

Cleveland State University:

Lincoln-West Center
Cleveland Public Schools
Cleveland, Ohio 44109

Middle School Center
Beachwood City Schools
Beachwood, Ohio 44121

Social Studies Center
St. Edward High School
Lakewood, Ohio 44107
Cleveland State University:

W.H. Kirk Jr. High School Center  
East Cleveland City Schools  
East Cleveland, Ohio 44112

Oklahoma

Northeastern State College:

Muskogee-Tahlequah Student Teaching Center  
Muskogee-Tahlequah Public Schools  
Muskogee-Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74464

Oregon

Oregon State University:

Crescent Valley High School  
Corvallis Public Schools  
Corvallis, Oregon

Student Teaching Center  
Hillcrest School of Oregon  
Salem, Oregon 97310

Clinical Division, John Adams High School  
School District #1  
Portland, Oregon 97221

Maclaren School for Boys  
Woodburn, Oregon 97071

Pennsylvania

Lock Haven State College:

Central Pennsylvania West Center  
Bald Eagle Area  
Wingate, Pa.

Philadelphia Inner City Center  
School District #5  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19133

Millersville State College:

Elco Senior High School  
Eastern Lebanon County Schools  
Myerstown, Pa. 17067
Rhode Island

Rhode Island College:

Cranston West High School
Cranston School District
Cranston, R.I. 02921

Park View Junior High
Cranston School Department
Cranston, R.I. 02910

Tennessee

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville:

Greeneville Center
Greeneville City Schools
Greeneville, Tennessee

Utah

Weber State College:

Sand Ridge Junior High School Center
Weber County School District
Roy, Utah 84067

Washington

Western Washington State College:

South East Center
Seattle School District
Seattle, Washington 98108
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Elementary-Secondary Student Teaching Centers
Which Were Included in the Study
Colorado

Colorado University:

Cherry Creek Student Teaching Center
Cherry Creek School District #5
Englewood, Colorado 80110

Florida

Florida State University:

Leon County Center
Leon County Schools
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Three Counties Center
Orange, Hillsborough, and Pinellas County Schools
Eatonville, Florida 32751

Iowa

University of Northern Iowa:

Cedar Rapids Center
Cedar Rapids Community Schools
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402

Charles City-New Hampton Center
Charles City and New Hampton School Districts
Charles City, Iowa 50616

Council Bluffs Center
Council Bluffs Community Schools
Council Bluffs, Iowa 51501

Lakes Teaching Center
Spencer, Estherville, and Spirit Lake Community Schools
Spirit Lake, Iowa 51360

Marshalltown Teaching Center
Marshalltown Community Schools
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158

Newton Student Teaching Center
Newton Community Schools
Newton, Iowa 50208

Waterloo Secondary Teaching Center
Waterloo Community School District
Waterloo, Iowa 50705
Kansas

University of Kansas (Multi-Institutional):

Shawnee Mission-Kansas City Teaching Center
Shawnee Mission-Kansas City Schools
Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66204

Louisiana

Louisiana State University:

L.S.U.-Baton Rouge Teaching Center
East Baton Rouge Parish School System
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821

Maine

University of Maine at Farmington:

Capital Area Field Experience Center
Augusta School System
Augusta, Maine 04330

Lewiston-Auburn Field Experience Center
Lewiston-Auburn School Districts
Lewiston, Maine 04240

Oxford County Field Experience Center
Oxford County Schools
North Leeds, Maine 04263

Maryland

Towson State College:

Welde Labe Middle School
Howard County Schools
Clarksville, Maryland 21043

Michigan

Central Michigan University:

Farmington Center
Farmington Public Schools
Farmington, Michigan 48024

Mt. Pleasant Center
St. Lewis-Hemlock School Districts
St. Lewis, Michigan
Central Michigan University:

Northeastern Center
Oscoda-Tawas City-Alpena School Districts
Oscoda, Michigan 48750

Saginaw Regional Center
Saginaw School District
Saginaw, Michigan 48601

Michigan State University:

Battle Creek Area Teacher Education Center
Battle Creek-Hastings-Pennfield School Districts
Battle Creek, Michigan 49017

Traverse City Student Teaching Program
Traverse City Public Schools
Traverse City, Michigan 49684

University of Michigan, et al.:

Monroe Living and Learning Center
Monroe School District
Monroe, Michigan 48161

Minnesota

St. Cloud State College:

Minneapolis Student Teaching Center
Minneapolis Special District #1
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Robbinsdale Student Teaching Center
Independent District 281
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55427

Sauk Rapids Student Teaching Center
Sauk Rapids Public Schools
Sauk Rapids, Minnesota

Southwest Minnesota State College:

Granite Falls Center
Granite Falls Schools #894
Granite Falls, Minnesota 56241

Marshall Teaching Center
Marshall Public Schools
Marshall, Minnesota 56258
Southwest Minnesota State College:

Montevideo Teaching Center
Independent School District #129
Montevideo, Minnesota 56265

Pipistone Teacher Education Center
Pipistone Public School
Pipestone, Minnesota 56164

Missouri

Southeast Missouri State College:

Cape Girardeau Student Teaching Center
Cape Girardeau Public Schools
Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63701

North Dakota

Moorhead State College (Minnesota):

Fargo Teaching Center
Fargo Public Schools
Fargo, North Dakota 58102

Oklahoma

Northeastern State College:

Educational Service Center\(^a\)
Tulsa School District
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135

Pennsylvania

Bloomsburg State College:

Bucks County Center
Pennsburry and Council Rock School Districts
Bloomsburg, Pa. 17815

Lock Haven State College:

Bucks-Mont Center
Bucks, Berks, Chester and Montgomery County Schools
Lock Haven, Pa. 17745

\(^a\)This actually represents three centers, each coordinated by a different person.
Shippensburg State College:

Harrisburg Teacher Education Center
Harrisburg Public Schools
Harrisburg, Pa.

York Teacher Education Center
York Public Schools
York, Pa.

Tennessee

University of Tennessee

Chattanooga-Hamilton County Center
Chattanooga and Hamilton County Schools
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37409

Farragut Teaching Center
Knox County Schools
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Lenoir City-Loudon Teaching Center
Lenoir City and Loudon County Schools
Lenoir City, Tennessee

Morristown City Center
Morristown City Schools
Morristown, Tennessee 37814

Oak Ridge Secondary Student Teaching Center
Oak Ridge School District
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

West Virginia

West Virginia University (Multi-Institutional):

Kanawha Valley Teacher Education Center
Kanawha County Schools
Charleston, West Virginia

Harrison County Teacher Education Center
Harrison County Schools
Clarksburg, West Virginia 26301
Wyoming

University of Wyoming:

Student Teaching Center
Laramie Public Schools
Laramie, Wyoming 82070

University of Wyoming Field Office
Laramie County School District #1
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

Upper Big Horn Basin Center
Powell Public School District #1
Powell, Wyoming 82435
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