DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 629 SP 001 804

By-Beasley, Wayne; Henry, Marvin
Report of the Experimental Summer Professional Semester. June 3 - August 14, 1968.
Indiana State Univ., Terre Haute.
Spons Agency-Indiana State Univ., Terre Haute.
Pub Date Sep 68
Note-38p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.00
Descriptors-College Supervisors, *Educational Experiments, Microteaching, *Student Teachers, *Student Teaching, *Summer Programs, Video Tape Recordings
Identifiers-Indiana, TCAP, Teacher Classroom Activity Profile

A program was initiated at Indiana State University (ISU), Terre Haute, to enable students to complete their student teaching during the summer. Twenty-four students participated in the program which provided four hours of activity daily, two to four hours of which were spent in teaching. Principles of using video tape for studying lesson presentation were taught, and the students observed themselves teaching peers before entering the regular classroom. High school student teachers spent eight weeks teaching, and junior high school student teachers spent six weeks. Subsequently, the junior high school student teachers spent additional time learning to operate the video tape recorder and preparing a report on junior high school teaching. To evaluate the summer professional semester, a questionnaire was administered to the 24 participating students and to 51 student teachers in the regular professional semester. Also, the Teacher Classroom Activity Profile (developed at ISU) was used to compare the teaching skills of the summer student teachers with those of the regular student teachers. Although it was found that certain problems inherent in the summer professional semester, the program proved feasible, and recommendations for improvement were evolved. (Appended are a list of participants and their assignments, a program description and schedule of course work, questionnaires used, and the Teacher Classroom Activity Profile) (SG)

Report of the Experimental

Summer Professional Semester

June 3 - August 14, 1968

Submitted to:

Director of Secondary Student Teaching, ISU

Dean, School of Education, ISU

Submitted by:

Dr. Wayne Beasley

Dr. Marvin Henry

September, 1968

RATIONALE

The summer student teaching program was inaugurated on an experimental basis at Indiana State University as another block of time when students could complete the professional semester. Four factors dictated the rationale for this program:

1. Emphasis on the development of teaching skills as the prime function of student teaching. The recent research and theory concerning the identification and development of specific teaching skills indicates that some revision might need to be made in student teaching programs. The profession has come to realize that the emotional exhiliration or depression of student teaching should not be tolerated without reflection. Experience itself is not enough without analysis. Skills can be developed as the result of knowing what the profession has learned. Smith[1] has indicated that teaching is a way of working with subject matter as well as with students. The work at Stanford University[2] in the field of micro-teaching also leads to the conclusion that teaching skills can be taught. One purpose of the program was to determine whether or not some of the skills of teaching could be more effectively learned by student teaching.

2. Changing nature of summer programs in public schools. More school systems each year seem to be moving in the direction of extending the school program into the summer months. Many of these school systems will expand their summer programs in the near future and a number which have none at present will soon add them. Enrichment, advanced work for the gifted, and acceleration have replaced make-up and remedial work as the most important objectives of summer programs. Instead

---

[1]Smith, B. O., "Teaching: What It Is and What To Do About It," Bul. of NASSP 47:98-105, April, 1963.

[2]Micro-Teaching: A Description, Stanford University, 1967.

of providing assistance only to slower students, the primary purpose of summer schools a few years ago, the emphasis now is upon providing classes for all students. This has resulted in rapid enrollment increases. As a result of this change of philosophy, summer school programs have caused most courses included in these programs to become representative of the classes as they are regularly taught during the school year.

Although the student activity program is curtailed and enrollments are not as large as during the regular school year, the present typical secondary summer school appears to provide the type of climate necessary to develop teaching abilities in student teachers.

3. Possibility of the Earlier Completion of Certification Requirements.

It was found that some applicants for student teaching who would ordinarily graduate at mid-year could arrange their schedules so that they could graduate in time to take a teaching position at the beginning of the school year. This is of great value to the students, but it also should help to relieve the problems of the heavy supervising loads during the regular school year. It should also be of benefit to some schools who are asked to supervise a large number of student teachers each year.

4. To Experiment with an Innovative Student Teaching Program. The research and theory related to teacher education provided the impetus for certain innovative practices.[3] The following were possible within the framework of the experimental program:

   1. Micro-teaching immediately prior to student teaching.
   2. Use of the video-tape recorder in the analysis, illustration and evaluation of teaching.
   3. Professional course work taught concurrently with the student teaching experience.
   4. Increased contact with supervising teachers by university personnel.

[3] In terms of our present program. Many of these are operating at other institutions.

5. Increased contact with student teachers by university supervisory personnel.

6. Seminar-type interaction with supervisors in regard to supervising problems of student teachers.

7. Team teaching of professional course work by university supervisors of student teachers.

8. Team supervision of student teachers.

9. Concluding week for summarization and focus on individual problems.

In summary, the purpose of the experimental program was to:

1. determine the feasibility of summer school student teaching.

2. determine some of the problems connected with completing the professional semester during the summer terms.

3. explore ways of improving the quality of supervision of student teachers.

4. determine the effectiveness of certain innovative practices in professional preparation.

ASSUMPTIONS

The summer experimental program was predicated upon certain assumptions about the nature of professional education and about the way in which a student learns to become a teacher. The following assumptions were made:

1. Certain teaching skills can be learned in a laboratory environment. This assumption seems reasonable on the basis of research by Stanford University with micro-teaching,[4] the lessons learned from the ISU NTC program,[5] the results of various teacher intern programs in the nation,[6] and results of simulation experiences with teacher candidates.[7]

---

[4]Stanford University, op. cit.

[5]"The Teacher Corps at Indiana State University", Contemporary Education 34:5 March, 1968

[6]Henry, Marvin A., "Representative Intern Programs", 47th Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching, 1968 (Publication late in 1968).

[7]INSITE Program, Indiana University, and Final Report, Title VII Project Number 5-0950, NDEA, Oregon State System of Higher Education.

2. There is an advantage to having professional course work taught by the same professors who supervise student teachers. One of the problems felt by the directors of this program was that the professors did not get the opportunity to spend enough time with their students. This caused the students to be less accepting of the professors and limited the number of available contacts. It appears that when people are more familiar with each other they work better together. It also seems reasonable that professors who know the student's teaching environment can make course work more meaningful. It also appears that frequency of contact would increase communication.
3. The video-tape recorder can be used effectively in teacher education. It appears that a recorded audio and visual image will help the student teacher view his progress more realistically.
4. The basic skills of teaching can be learned by student teaching in summer school. The same skills which are necessary for teaching are utilized in summer school as in regular school programs.

STUDENT POPULATION

Twenty-four students volunteered to participate in the program.[8] Four students had previous teaching experience but needed the professional semester to complete certification. All students met the necessary course prerequisits for admission to student teaching.[9]

The teaching area assignments among these twenty four participants were distributed as follows: Business (2), English (3½), Geography (1), Home Economics (1), Industrial Education (6), Library Science (½), Mathematics (3), Science (2), and Social Science (5). Grade point averages were comparable to those in any regular

---

[8]See Appendix A.

[9]Two students were granted a waiver of the minimum hour requirement at ISU.

platoon of student teachers.

THE SUMMER STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

The program was designed to provide an eight-week student teaching experience combined with the course work normally taken during the professional semester.[10] The ten and one-half week program[11] was a package program granting 12 hours of credit with planning, instruction and supervision carried out on a team basis by the directors of the program.

The directors met with the students for four hours a day during the initial week. The orientation program which is given to ISU secondary student teachers was completed in the initial part of the week. Instruction in utilization of A-V materials was taught during the first week and focused primarily on use of the motion picture projector as a teaching aid.

During the pre-teaching session, each student was given two opportunities to teach a brief lesson to a group of peers. Each student spent five to ten minutes introducing a topic or an idea to the class. The introduction was in the student teacher's major area and it specifically was designed to arouse the interest of the group. It was stressed that the presentation was to be at the adult level and not a simulated experience for adolescents. Each lesson was video-taped by the instructors and evaluated by the students.[12] The students and one of the program directors viewed the taped presentation the afternoon after the micro-lesson had been taught. The technique was analyzed and the students' evaluations were shared with the student. After this analysis the student re-taught the same lesson to a different group of peers. This second experience was video-taped and analyzed, using the same procedure as with the first presentation.

---

[10]Academic methods courses which are normally completed in the professional semester had to be completed during a regular semester.

[11]See Appendix B.

[12]See Appendix C.

The high school student teachers began teaching the second week of the summer professional semester, which was the first week for the Vigo County summer school program. The student teachers continued for eight weeks to the conclusion of summer school. They were in school four hours a day and taught from two to four hours per day.

Junior high school did not begin until the third week of the ISU summer program, so the mornings of the second week were spent with the directors and in preparation for teaching. They pursued work in audio-visual instruction and visited the Teaching Materials Center room in the library where they received instruction in the use of resource materials. In addition, they made observations of teaching which had been video-taped. One day was spent in micro-teaching utilizing Laboratory School students. Each student taught a group of four or five students, viewed the video-tape recording and then taught the same lesson to a different group of stude ts. This class was also video-taped and analyzed as outlined in the micro-teaching design.

Since junior high student teaching was six instead of eight weeks, those participants who were given junior high student teaching assignments finished teaching one week prior to those who did their student teaching in the high schools. The six junior high student teachers spent the five days of this week as follows: Two days observing at the high schools, one day learning the operation of the video tape recorder, and two days in preparing a report on junior high school teaching.

At least three supervisory visits were made to each student during his student teaching experience. The first visit was administrative in nature with the subsequent visits focused on supervision. All students were visited by both supervisors; in some cases joint supervisory visits were made. Virtually all student teachers were video-taped in the classroom at least once.[13] This lesson was then analyzed

---

[13]No attempt was made to make video-tape recordings of Laboratory classes.

later by the student and one or both of the supervisors.

Two afternoon class sessions were conducted each week. Each of the program directors taught the entire group for an hour and a half. The instructors attempted to make this instruction as relevant to the teaching situation as possible. Topics covered included the influence of teacher behavior on pupil behavior, analysis of teaching skills (students were taught to use the TCAP), techniques of questioning, the discovery method, classroom management, discipline, individual differences, motivation, and test construction. Extensive use was made of the video-tape recorder for demonstration purposes. Several tapes had been prepared in advance which illustrated various teaching skills and behaviors.

After student teaching was completed, the directors met with the student teachers four hours a day for eight days. Major focus was placed on completion of course work in Ed. 447, 448, 449. The students were taught to operate the Sony video-tape recorder as well. In addition, a terminal conference was held with each student teacher where his progress in student teaching was reviewed.

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROFESSIONAL SEMESTER

A questionnaire[14] was administered to the summer student teachers and to a group of regular teachers in order to compare the perceptions of students about different programs of preparation. The questionnaire was administered to all 24 summer student teachers and to 51 student teachers who were supervised by the directors during the second semester, 1968. The results are summarized as follows:

---

[14]See Appendix D.

Table 1. Role of the University Supervisor

	Regular		Summer	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
1. Liason between student teacher and supervising teacher	23	45	1	4
2. Evaluation	21	41	7	29
3. Sees that requirements are fulfilled	17	33	-	-
4. Supervisor of student teachers	12	23	12	50
5. Provides communication between university, school, teachers	7	14	-	-
6. Helps student teacher in case of problems	5	10	2	8
7. Interprets student teaching to public school	4	8	1	4
8. Deals with welfare of student teachers	4	8	-	-
9. Orients student teacher to student teaching	3	6	1	4
10. Assists supervising teacher in case of problems	2	4	-	-
11. Sees that student teacher has a favorable experience	2	4	-	-
12. Places student teachers	1	2	-	-
13. Selects good supervisors	1	2	-	-
14. Keep student teacher informed of progress	1	2	-	-
15. Teaches professional courses	-	-	3	13
16. Coordinates student teaching with course work	-	-	2	8
17. Provides a learning experience	-	-	1	4
TOTAL	103		30	

In regard to the question, "What is the role of the university supervisor?", the regular student teachers most frequently reported that he was a liason person in the student teaching program. Close behind this was the report that the supervisor is an evaluator who "criticizes, checks-up, and determines student teacher progress." It was also rather frequently reported that the university supervisor is to see that university requirements are fulfilled.

The summer student teachers reported most frequently that the university supervisor is a person who supervises the progress of the student teacher. Statements indicated that he "guides, helps with problems, and suggests alternatives." Fifty per cent of the summer students reported in this category. The summer student teachers also reported that the university supervisor is an evaluator, although not as frequently as was reported by the group of regular student teachers.

The second question asked the students to list the major difficulties which were experienced during student teaching. The difficulties were organized into the categories which were used by Henry[15] in his research on student teacher difficulties. This system is one which has commonly been used by researchers in this area. Results of this question are reported in Table 2.

A total of 130 difficulties, an average of 2.4 per student, was reported by the regular student teachers. A total of 36 difficulties, an average of 1.5 per student, was reported by the summer student teachers.

The difficulty reported most frequently by the regular student teachers was difficulty in development of desirable pupil behavior, reported by 51% of the students. Second was difficulty in directing learning activities, reported by 24 per cent of the students. Twenty-two per cent indicated difficulty in planning and twenty per cent indicated a lack of communication with the supervising teacher and other teachers. The difficulties reported most frequently by the summer student teachers were: difficulty in providing for individual differences, difficulty in

---

[15]Henry, Marvin A., The Relationship of Difficulties of Student Teachers to Selected Aspects of the Professional Sequence of Education, Unpublished doctor's thesis, Indiana University, 1963.

Table 2. Difficulties Experienced While Student Teaching

	Regular		Summer	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO GENERAL INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES				
1. Difficulty in directing learning activities	12	24	3	13
2. Difficulty in communication of ideas	8	15	-	-
3. Difficulty in providing for individual differences	7	14	4	17
4. Difficulty adjusting content to student's level	3	6	-	-
DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO PUPIL CONTROL AND GUIDANCE				
1. Difficulty in developing desirable pupil behavior	26	51	4	17
2. Difficulty understanding students and how they learn	3	6	-	-
3. Difficulty keeping students busy	3	6	-	-
4. Difficulty establishing rapport with pupils	1	2	3	13
DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO PERSONAL DEFICIENCIES AND HANDICAPS				
1. Difficulty in learning names	5	10	1	4
2. Difficulty in command of subject matter	4	8	-	-
3. Ineffective teaching voice	1	2	-	-
4. Illness	-	-	1	4
DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO DEFICIENCIES IN GENERAL TEACHING PERSONALITY				
1. Lack of confidence	7	14	3	13
2. Lack of adaptability	3	6	-	-
3. Emotional problems	1	2	-	-
DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO PLANNING AND ORGANIZING LEARNING ACTIVITIES, MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES				
1. Difficulty in planning	11	22	4	17
2. Lack of time	5	10	1	4
3. Testing and evaluating	5	10	1	4
4. Difficulty in selection and organization of materials	1	2	1	4
5. Difficulty finding time for observation	-	-	1	4

Table 2. (Continued)

	Regular		Summer	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO DEFICIENCIES IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT				
1. Lack of familiarity with school policies	5	10	-	-
2. Difficulty keeping records	4	8	-	-
3. Lack of availability of tools or equipment	4	8	2	8
4. Classroom management	1	2	1	4
OTHER DIFFICULTIES				
1. Lack of communication with supervising teacher and other teachers	10	20	4	17
2. No opportunity to observe supervising teacher	-	-	1	4
3. Did not get realistic picture of school system	-	-	1	4
Total	130		36	

development of desirable pupil behavior, difficulty in planning, and lack of communication with supervising teachers and other teachers.

Twenty-three per cent of the difficulties reported by the regular students were related to the general category of difficulties related to general instructional techniques. Sixteen per cent of the difficulties reported by the summer students were in this category.

In the general category of difficulties related to pupil control and guidance, twenty-five per cent of the difficulties reported by the regular students were reported in this category. The summer student teachers reported 16 per cent of their difficulties in this category.

Eight per cent of the difficulties reported by the regular student teachers were in the general category of difficulties related to personal deficiencies and handicaps. Five per cent of the difficulties reported by the summer student teachers were in this category.

In the general category of difficulties related to general teaching personality, eight per cent of the difficulties reported by the regular students were reported in this category. The summer student teachers reported seven per cent of this difficulty in this category. Consistency of results was also apparent in the category of difficulties related to planning and organizing learning activities, materials, and procedures. Seventeen per cent of the difficulties reported by the regular student teachers were in this category, compared to 18 per cent of the summer student teachers.

In the general category of difficulties related to deficiencies in classroom management, eleven per cent of the difficulties reported by the regular student teachers were in this category. The summer student teachers reported seven per cent of their difficulties in this category.

In the miscellaneous category (other problems) the regular student teachers reported eight per cent of their problems. Fourteen per cent were reported by the

summer student teachers.

In the third question, the student teachers were asked to list the skills they felt they needed to become a competent teacher. Results are indicated in Table 3.

Table 3. Skills Needed to Become a Competent Teacher

	Regular		Summer	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
1. Better discipline	19	37	6	25
2. Need for planning and organization	16	31	10	42
3. Need to develop better speech techniques	13	26	-	-
4. Need more academic preparation	11	22	3	13
5. Need to know and understand students better	11	22	2	8
6. Need to develop techniques of promoting interest	7	14	-	-
7. Experience	6	12	1	4
8. Need to develop a greater variety of teaching techniques	6	12	5	21
9. Need to develop confidence	5	10	1	4
10. Need to provide for individual differences	4	8	1	4
11. Need to make content more meaningful	4	8	1	4
12. Need to adapt presentation to student's level	4	8	-	-
13. Need to better present ideas	4	8	-	-
14. Knowledge of psychology	2	4	-	-
15. Knowledge of testing procedures	2	4	1	4
16. Ask more thought-provoking questions	2	4	2	8
17. Emotional stability	2	4	-	-
18. Improve use of English	2	4	-	-
19. Show more enthusiasm	2	4	1	4
20. Improve classroom management	-	-	1	4
21. Ability to involve students in discussion	-	-	4	17
Total	122		39	

The regular student teachers listed better discipline most frequently (37% of the students reporting). Listed second most frequently was the need for planning and organization (31%). Reported third was the need to develop better speech techniques.

The skill reported most frequently by the summer student teachers was the need for planning and organization, reported by 42 per cent of the students. Second was better discipline (25 per cent). Twenty-one per cent of the student teachers reported the need to develop a greater variety of teaching techniques.

- A total of 122 skills was submitted by the regular student teachers, an average of 2.4 per student. A total of 39 skills was reported by the summer student teachers an average of 1.6 per student.

The final question asked the students to indicate how they felt the student teaching program could be improved. The results of this question are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. How Could Student Teaching Program Have Been More Effective?

	Regular		Summer	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
1. Extend period of student teaching	18	35	0	0
2. Have methods courses prior to student teaching	5	10	0	0
3. Eliminate student teaching Journal	4	8	0	0
4. More contact with student teachers and supervisors in teaching areas	4	8	1	4
5. Teach in more than one area	3	6	2	8
6. Be alone in the classroom more	3	6	0	0
7. Be directly responsible for discipline	2	4	0	0
8. More university support	2	4	0	0
9. More observation prior to professional semester	2	4	0	0
10. More freedom in determining content and technique	2	4	0	0
11. Less busy work	2	4	0	0
12. No professional course work after student teaching	2	4	0	0
13. More communication with supervising teacher	2	4	2	8
14. Less time in classroom	1	2	0	0
15. An opportunity to visit other schools	1	2	0	0
16. Taper off final week	1	2	0	0

Table 4. (Continued)

	Regular		Summer	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
17. Need more equipment	1	2	2	8
18. Evaluations by greater number of teachers	1	2	0	0
19. Actual teaching in methods class prior to student teaching	1	2	0	0
20. Complete methods courses after student teaching	1	2	0	0
21. Specific assignments made in advance so advanced planning can be done	1	2	1	4
22. Better supervising teacher	1	2	0	0
23. More problem discussions in class	0	0	3	13
24. Experience in grading	0	0	2	8
25. More instructions on testing and evaluation	0	0	1	4
Total	60		14	

A total of 58 suggestions was submitted by the regular student teachers, an average of slightly more than one per person. Only seven suggestions were submitted by the summer student teachers, an average of .3 per student.

Thirty-five per cent of the regular student teachers indicated that the period of student teaching should be extended. Ten per cent felt that methods courses should be completed prior to student teaching. Comments from the summer student teachers indicated a desire to teach in more than one area, a need for better communication with the supervising teacher and the need for more equipment.

A questionnaire[16] was administered to the summer student teachers at the conclusion of the summer professional semester. Since the purpose was to secure the students' candid comments about their feelings and about the innovative aspects of this sequence, it was requested that the students submit their responses anonymously. Completed questionnaires were submitted by 22 of the 24 participants. Table summarizes the reasons the students enrolled in the summer professional semester.

---

[16]See Appendix E

Table 5. Why Did You Choose to Complete Professionsal Semester During The Summer?

	Number	Per cent
1. Enable student to begin teaching in fall	9	41
2. Enable student to graduate in January instead of June	6	27
3. Could take course work and student teaching simultaneously	3	14
4. Could complete certificate requirements without loss of income	3	14
5. Enabled student to stay in the local area	1	4
6. Scheduling reasons	1	4
7. Time factor	1	4

The results of Table 5 indicate that 41 per cent of the participants entered the program because they could begin teaching in the fall. Twenty-seven per cent indicated they could graduate in January instead of June. These two responses account for two-thirds of the participants.

The next question asked to the students to indicate what they considered to be the strengths of the program. The results are indicated in Table 6.

Table 6. Strengths of Program as Viewed by Summer Student Teachers

	Number Reported	Per-cent
1. Availability of university supervisors	12	55
2. Being with students from beginning to close of term	9	41
3. Close contact with other student teachers	7	32
4. Coordination of course work and actual teaching experience	6	27
5. Use of video-tape recorder	4	18

Table 6. (Continued)

	Number Reported	Per-cent
6. Team teaching approach	3	14
7. Ready availability of resources (films, library)	3	14
8. Smaller classes to teach	2	9
9. Availability in summer	1	5
10. Challenge presented by the unique teaching situation	1	5
11. Good supervising teacher	1	5
12. Less time lapse from student teaching to beginning teaching	1	5
13. Felt more secure in front of a group	1	5
14. Reports by other students	1	5
15. Micro-teaching	1	5
16. Good text books	1	5
17. Variety of course work	1	5
18. Interest on the part of directors	1	5
19. Received more individual attention	1	5

More than half of the participants felt that a strength of the program was the availability of the university supervisors. Almost half (41 per cent) of the students indicated that teaching from the beginning to the end of a term was a strength. A total of 7, or 32 per cent, valued the close contact with other student teachers. Other values were considered to be coordination of course work and actual teaching experience, use of the video tape recorder, the team teaching approach, and the ready availability of resources.

The students were asked to report any suggestions they had for the improvement of the program. Results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Suggestions for Improvement

	Number	Percent
1. More class discussions concerning the teaching experience	8	36
2. More video-tape observations	2	9
3. Need more time for preparation before beginning student teaching	2	9
4. Student teaching in high school, not junior high	2	9
5. More breaks	1	4.5
6. Lack of participation in school extra-curricular programs	1	4.5
7. Make any large library assignments at beginning of summer	1	4.5
8. Better orientation of supervising teachers	1	4.5
9. More in depth work with projectors, overheads, etc.	1	4.5
10. Should have discussed the book, Revolution in Teaching	1	4.5
11. Assign student teachers to classes where there are larger numbers only	1	4.5
12. Supervising teachers should be expecting the student teachers	1	4.5
13. Reduce the number of observations	1	4.5
Total	23	

A total of 23 suggestions was submitted. This amounted to approximately one per student, although they were encouraged to submit as many as they wished. Some students submitted several suggestions, while others offered no suggestions.

The suggestion most frequently submitted was that more class discussions be held concerning the teaching experience. This was suggested by more than one third of those who submitted the questionnaire. Other suggestions submitted included more observations by video-tape, the need for more time to prepare prior to student teaching, and student teaching in high school, not junior high. It should be noted that it is assumed that the latter suggestion was reported by

junior high student teachers. This number (2) would constitute 33 per cent of the junior high student teachers.

The next reaction solicited from the students was their feeling about the various innovative practices of the program. Results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Reactions to Innovative Aspects of Summer Program

	Favorable	Unfavorable	No Reaction
1. Pre-student teaching micro-teaching	21	2	
2. Team approach to instruction and supervision	21		1
3. Combination of course work and student teaching	18	6*	
4. Use of the video tape recorder for analysis	16		6**
5. Use of the video tape for observation and demonstration	19***	3	1

The student teachers were asked to react to the five most innovative aspects of the Indiana State summer student teaching program. Virtually complete favorable reaction was given to each of the features.

In order to evaluate the students reactions to the topics covered in the class work, the participants were asked to suggest any topics which should be eliminated. Table 9 presents those results.

---

*Five of the six felt that the combination was good, but that they tended to neglect the course work.

**Not taped during student teaching.

***One person thought the device was excellent for demonstrations, but not for observations.

Table 9. Topics in Instruction Which Might Be Deleted

	Number	Per cent
1. None	16	73
2. Some topics were a repeat of 305	3	13.6
3. Testing	3	13.6
4. More suitable textbook than Stone	1	4.5
5. Section on philosophy was irrelivant	1	4.5
6. Observation of other teachers	1	4.5
7. Do not neglect A-V	1	4.5

A total of 16, or 73 per cent of those reporting, felt that none of the topics should be deleted. There was some hint of duplication with other courses, with reports that some topics were a repeat of Education 305 and that testing had been a repeat. (13.6 per cent).

The next request was for the students to express the topics covered which they felt to be of most value to them. These results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Topics Considered to be of Most Benefit

	Number	Per cent
1. Discipline	10	45
2. Testing and Evaluation	10	45
3. A-V instruction	7	32
4. Questioning	6	27
5. Philosophy	5	23
6. Topics covered final week (organization, law, tenure, etc.)	3	14
7. TCAP	3	14
8. Typical problems of student teachers (Drayer?)	2	9
9. Discussion of learning process	2	9
10. VTR demonstrations	1	4.5
11. Methods of instruction	1	4.5
12. Organization	1	4.5
13. Communications between student and instructor	1	4.5
14. How teacher affects student behavior	1	4.5
15. Micro-teaching	1	4.5
16. Motivation	1	4.5
17. Legal aspects	1	4.5
18. Individual differences	1	4.5
19. Objects	1	4.5
Total	58	

A total of 58, or 2.6 per student, was submitted. The students most frequently reported that instruction in discipline and testing and evaluation were of value. A total of 19 topics was submitted at least once.

The final question asked the summer school participants to indicate whether or not a similar program should be conducted next year, and they were also asked for reasons for their answers. Results are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Recommendations for Continuation

	Yes	No
1. Do you recommend that a similar program be conducted next year?	22	0

Why?	No.
1. Summer is best time for several students	12
2. Can be completed in 10 instead of 16 weeks	2
3. Close communication between student and university supervisors	2
4. Relates course work to experience	2
5. Economic advantage	1
6. Opportunity to work with difficult students	1
7. Fast and efficient--no cafeteria duty, night activities, etc.	1
8. One learns flexibility	1
9. Sees school from start to finish	1

All 22 participants who submitted completed questionnaires indicated that the program should be continued. The predominant reason given was that summer is the best time for many students.

In order to compare the teaching skills of the summer student teachers, a comparison was made with the performance of the regular student teachers at ISU. As part of a federal research project at Indiana State University entitled "Isolating Relevant Variables in Student Teaching Assessment," a Teacher Classroom Activity Profile was developed. This instrument[17] has been used for some time to determine

[17] See Appendix F

the activities of student teachers. The instrument was also used in the observation of summer student teachers. Comparisons were made of the summer group with the mean scores tabulation for regular student teachers. Results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Comparison of TCAP Scores of Regular Indiana State University Student Teachers with the Profiles of ISU Summer Student Teachers

	Per cent of teaching time	
	Regular	Summer
MNL	5.10	4.26
ML	27.03	17.32
P	20.44	36.75
R	26.33	16.89
D	9.82	1.55
L.T.	9.49	21.64
T.P.	1.76	1.55
n	1097	42

The data indicate that regular student teachers spend more time in recitation than in any other category, while summer students spent the greatest amount of time with presentation. Both spent about the least amount of time in the "thinking process" category and in the "management non-teaching category."

The greatest difference between the two groups is in the "presentation" category, with a total of 16.31 percentage points separating them. The next greatest difference is in the "logical thinking" category with a difference of 12.15 percentage points (21.64 for summer student teaching as opposed to 9.49 for the regular students). Differences ranging from eight to ten percentage points were found in the categories of "management-Learning, Recitation, and Discussion" with the regular students utilizing a greater amount of the time in these categories.

PROBLEMS

One purpose of the summer professional semester was to determine the few problems that might be extant during the summer professional semester. The problems observed by the directors and those submitted by the participants were not considered to be of such severity that they destroyed the effectiveness of any given situation. The predominent problems observed are listed below with no attempt being made to rank them in terms of difficulty:

1. It was not possible to assign students to specific teaching assignments far enough in advance to make a pre-teaching visit. Enrollments were not confirmed in summer school until after the beginning of the summer student teaching orientation; consequently, assignments could not be finalized until two or three days prior to student teaching. This resulted in a few teachers not knowing they were to have student teachers until the student reported for his experience. It is felt that in the future tentative assignments can be announced sooner with any last minute adjustments being made as they are needed.
2. Small Classes. In a few cases student teachers worked in classes of ten students or less. This prevented the student from having the experience of directing a large group. On the other hand, it seemed to illustrate the value of individualized instruction.
3. Junior high school less realistic. A last-minute change in Vigo County school policy decreased the length of junior high summer school from eight to six weeks. In addition, no grades were given to junior high students. This obvious shortcoming was somewhat compensated for by the fact that the role of motivation in learning was vividly dramatized.
4. Limited observation time. The fact that summer school ended at noon made it difficult for some students to complete the required number of observations. Students were given the opportunity to make some video-

taped observations in the afternoons.

5. Homogeneity of student population. It appears that summer students may be more homogeneously grouped than regular students. As a result, some student teachers worked only with slow students while others worked completely with classes which were more gifted. This problem was not as severe as had been anticipated and the students seemed to appreciate the challenge of the homogeneous classes.

6. No additional contact with supervising teachers by college supervisors. It was felt in the planning stage that the program would provide more opportunity for the college supervisors to work with the public school supervisors. As the program developed it became apparent that the college supervisors could only spend as much time with the cooperating teachers as they do in the normal situation. This was not serious, however, in that all of the supervisors were experienced in supervising student teachers and did not necessarily need increased attention from university personnel.

7. Less teaching time. Summer student teachers did not complete as many actual teaching hours as regular student teachers. Whereas, the students on the traditional program teach three to four hours per day, summer students taught an average of two to three hours. The regular students often have opportunity to list certain after-school functions as teaching.

8. Lack of participation in extra-curricular program. This was not considered to be a problem by the directors, but it does represent a deviation from traditional student teaching. The question of what prior preparation is necessary for participation in extra-curricular activities as a teacher is debatable.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the questionnaires completed by the student teachers, the following conclusions seem reasonable:

1. The nature of the summer student teaching program causes the students to view the college supervisors with a different perspective. Regular student teachers feel that the college supervisor more generally performs administrative tasks and solve problems which might exist between the public school and cooperating school. The summer participants, on the other hand, seemed to view the college supervisor more as a guide who helps the student teacher with his teaching problems--the more traditional concept of supervision.
2. Summer student teachers seemed to experience fewer difficulties than regular student teachers. Regular student teachers reported an average of 2.4 per student in comparison with 1.5 for the summer students.
3. Summer student teachers experienced fewer difficulties than regular student teachers in the general areas of instructional techniques and pupil contact and guidance. The instructors spent quite a bit of time in class developing these in their classes. A considerable amount of summer school class time was spent in developing ideas in these two categories.
4. Summer students place higher priorities than regular students on planning and organization, developing teaching techniques and involving students in discussion. Regular student teachers place higher priorities than summer student teachers on better discipline, better speech techniques, the need to know students better, and the need to develop techniques of promoting interest.

5. The regular student teachers submitted a greater list of needed skills than the summer student teachers.

6. A greater number of suggestions for program improvements was submitted by the regular student teachers; summer students indicated greater satisfaction. Most suggestions from the regular student teachers were for the extension of the period of time. They felt that at the end of eight weeks they were just beginning to know how to teach.

7. Students entered the summer student teaching program chiefly because they could finish school a semester earlier or because they could complete student teaching without a loss of a semester's income.

8. Summer student teachers felt the strengths of the summer program to be the availability of university supervisors, the opportunity to be with students for a complete term, and the close contact with other student teachers.

9. Provision should be made in the program foremat for more seminar-type discussion focusing on common problems of the student teachers.

10. Almost unanimous support was given to the innovative aspects of the program (micro-teaching, team approach to instruction and supervision, combination of course work and student teaching, use of the video-tape recorder and instruction in analysis of teaching).

11. Student teachers felt that the course content was relevant to their interests and needs.

12. Course instruction seemed to relate to the needs of virtually every student. This is evidenced by the number of courses submitted which were considered to be of most benefit.

13. Course work is considered of value when it is combined with direct experience.

14. The summer students feel that the program should be continued because it is the best time for many people to complete the professional semester.

15. Summer student teachers used more logical thinking in their presentations in their teaching than is evidenced by the performance of a regular student teacher.

16. Summer student teachers utilized more presentation in their classes than do the regular student teachers.

17. Summer students and regular students consume approximately the same amount of time in management activities and in pursuing the thinking process.

18. College supervisors were more effective in changing teaching behavior of summer school students than with regular students. During the summer program, the college supervisors got to know the students quite well. More importantly, perhaps, was the fact that the college students became better acquainted with their supervisors. The students were receptive of the supervisors suggestions and sought their advice, whereas regular students are more reluctant to discuss teaching problems with their supervisors.

19. Summer school can present as much of an opportunity for the development of teaching skills as a regular semester. The combination of instruction in analysis of teaching and the public school practice of teaching skills gives the student teacher a vivid picture of the skills needed for teaching effectiveness. In many cases, the directors felt that the teachers were more concerned about student progress in summer school than they manifest during the regular school year. This concern is often evidenced in more creative teaching behaviors.

20. Summer student teaching is practical from the cost standpoint. Travel expenses for supervision were eliminated, many additional students were placed in Laboratory school where no honorarium is paid, and supervisors

in the public schools were paid for one-half load instead of a full load for supervision. The university supervisors had loads which were compared to one-half semester of work during the regular year. Four class sections of twenty-four students were taught by the directors of the program.

21. The experience of being able to teach for a full term is of value to the students because they can see progress from the opening of a class to the final evaluation.

22. Group video-taped observations of teaching performance can enhance the value of the observation of teaching in that the instructor can control the types of presentation observed and assist in analysis.

23. The quality of supervision can be improved by the procedure involved in the summer professional semester.

24. Summer school student teaching is feasible.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the experience of the summer professional semester and the results of the questionnaries administered to students, the following recommendations seem to be justified:

1. The summer professional semester should become an integral part of the teacher education program at Indiana State University.
2. Consideration should be given to expanding the program to other cities so that more students may complete the professional semester in the summer.
3. The innovative aspects of the summer professional semester (micro-teaching, team approach to instruction and supervision, combination of course work and student teaching, use of the video-tape recorder for demonstration, observation and evaluation, and instruction in analysis of teaching) should continue basically as they were implemented with consideration that as many of these features as possible be applied to the traditional professional semester.
4. Consideration be given to the advisability of placing student teachers in schools which have terms shorter than eight weeks, which do not give credit and which do not give grades.
5. In order to increase the number and improve the quality of observations, it is recommended that more observations be offered by the medium of video tape.
6. The program should include more seminar-type discussions of immediate problems and experimentation with simulated experiences.
7. Consideration should be given to the elimination of grades for the entire twelve hours instead of for just six hours of student teaching. Instead, a rating scale of performance skills should be filed with the credentials.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

SUMMER ASSIGNMENTS 1968

Anthony, Earl	Sarah Scott	Geography	Mr. Charles Dunlap
Bertram, Michael	Woodrow Wilson	Mathematics	Mr. Richard Auer
Boyd, Terry	Wiley	Economics	Mr. James Richards
Bradbury, Raymond	Sarah Scott	Indus. Ed.	Mr. Otis Witham
Brittain, Donald	Wiley	Business	Mr. Lyle Barr
Bunton, Mark	Honey Creek	Mathematics	Mr. Glen Aukney
Caton, John	Wiley	U. S. History	Mr. Robert Brown
Dowell, Pamela	Woodrow Wilson	Home Econ.	Miss Dorothy Gummere
Gray, James	Wiley	Pol. Science	Mr. Frank Allen
Hardaway, Linda	Wiley	Sociology	Mr. Vern Whitlock
Harrold, Mark	Laboratory	Biology	Mr. Harry Wunker
Judkins, Joseph	Indiana State U.	Machine Shop	Mr. Harry Barrick
Kamman, Ronald	Laboratory	Algebra	Mr. Max Lynch
Long, Rebecca	Laboratory	Business	Mr. Warren Gardiner
Noble, Howard	Honey Creek	Indus. Ed.	Mr. Bernard Ridens
Norris, Robert	Laboratory	World History	Mr. Ramon Roman
Ross, David E.	Laboratory	Ind. Ed.--Woods	Mr. Braxton Duvall
Secord, Marvin	Laboratory	Chemistry	Mr. Noble Corey
Sharp, Fred	Laboratory	Voc.--Drafting	Mr. Braxton Duvall
Swaby, Janice	Sarah Scott	English	Mr. Robert Arnett
Volz, Richard	Woodrow Wilson	Ind. Ed.--Metals	Mr. Robert Stiller
Wilkinson, Patricia	Laboratory	English Lib. Science	Mr. Tom Makosky Mrs. Christine Clark
Wood, Barbara	Wiley	English	Mrs. Waldola Wasson
Woolf, Nadene	Laboratory	English	Mr. Dick Williams

Appendix B

BASIC STRUCTURE

EXPERIMENTAL SUMMER SUPERVISED
STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM SECONDARY LEVEL

Summer --- 1968

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

1. Completion of student teaching and the concurrent block of professional course work during the 1968 summer session (June 3 - August 14).

2. Student Teaching to be completed in a junior or senior high school in Vigo County.

SCHEDULE OF COURSE WORK:

1. Twelve hours of course work as follows:

Education 447	Educational Technology	1 hour
Education 448	Problems in Secondary Teaching .	2 hours
Education 449	Foundations of Secondary Educ. .	2 hours
Education 498	Individual Study in Education. .	1 hour
Supervised Teaching 431		1 hour
Supervised Teaching 453		2 hours
Supervised Teaching 454		3 hours
Total		12 hours

2. Course Work and Student Teaching to be completed in the following sequence:

June 3-June 7	Orientation to Student Teaching and Analysis of Teaching	4 hours daily
June 10-August 2	A.M. -- Student Teaching	4 hours daily
June 10-August 2 . . .	P.M. -- Professional Course Work and Seminars	6 hours weekly
August 5-August 14 . . .	Completion of Professional Course Work	4 hours daily

Appendix C

Name of Teacher_____

	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 Low
Objectives were clear							
Appropriate technique used							
Friendly, pleasant, etc.							
Interesting presentation							
Stimulating and imaginative							
Showed self-confidence							
No distracting mannerisms							
Planned and organized							
Knows subject well							
Communicates well							
Over-all rating							

1. The best part of the lesson was

2. The part that needs the greatest improvement is

Appendix D

1. What is the role of the university supervisor?

2. List in order your major problems while student teaching.

3. List in order skills that you feel you need to acquire to become a competent teacher.

4. How could have the student teaching program been more effective for you?

Appendix E

To: Summer Student Teaching Participants

From: Directors of Summer Student Teaching Program

The answers to the following questions will be used to determine the participants' reaction to the summer program. It is felt that student comments are valuable in making an accurate assessment of the summer professional semester. Please respond with complete candidness. In order that you may feel free to do this, we request that you submit this evaluation anonymously.

1. Why did you choose to complete the Professional Semester during the summer:

2. What were the strengths of the program as you see them now?

3. How might any weaknesses that you observed as a participant in the program be corrected through modification of the program?

4. What is your reaction to the value of the following:

   a. Pre-student-teaching micro-teaching sessions?

b. Team approach to instruction and supervision?

c. Combination of course work and student teaching?

d. Use of the video-tape recorder for observation of student teaching? (if you were taped)

e. Use of the video-tape recorder for observation of other teachers and for demonstration purposes?

5. If there were topics covered which might be deleted from discussion or postponed to graduate courses, what are they?

6. Specifically, what topics covered in the course work were of the most benefit to you?

7. Do you recommend that a summer program similar to this one be offered each summer? Why or why not?

TEACHER CLASSROOM ACTIVITY PROFILE STUDENT TEACHER _____ Date _____
TCAP FORM B

I.S.U. DIVISION OF TEACHING, 1966 CLASS _____ TYPE _____ SUPERVISOR _____

Teacher Activity	3 Minute Intervals																				Summary	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Approx. Min.	Approx. %
Management-Non-Learning MN																						
Management-Learning ML																						
Presentation P																						
Recitation R																						
Discussion D																						
Logical Thinking L.T.																						
Thinking Process T.P.																						

Explanatory Notes

Anecdotal Records