DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 277 SP 002 344

By-Armstrong, Robert J.

A Comparative Study Concerning Administrative Aspects of Elementary Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs: Current Practices and Proposed Patterns.

Salem State Coll., Mass.
Pub Date 68
Note-76p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.90
Descriptors-College High School Cooperation, *Comparative Analysis, Cooperating Teachers, *Cooperative Programs, Educational Research, Elementary School Teachers, *Program Administration, Questionnaires, School Superintendents, Statistical Surveys, *Student Teaching, Teacher Educators
Identifiers-Massachusetts, United States

A study was made to determine the current status of selected administrative areas of student teaching programs in Massachusetts and cooperative student teaching programs throughout the nation, the desirability of establishing cooperative programs in Massachusetts, and the organization and impelementation of these programs. Specific administrative areas investigated included the selection of cooperating school systems, the appointment of personnel, the nature of the student teaching experience, the remuneration made by the colleges, the types of orientation programs, the use of nonpublic schools, and the use of supervisory and evaluation practices. The responses to questionnaires of the participants (including all Massachusetts superintendents of elementary schools, all Massachusetts directors of elementary student teaching programs, and directors of cooperative student teaching programs throughout the nation) were gathered and compared, revealing that the profession in Massachusetts is dissatisfied with the current status of student teaching programs and is willing to implement change. (Only 10 percent of the colleges in Massachusetts have cooperative student teaching programs similar to those elsewhere, and over 90 percent of the profession desire them.) (Recommendations and a model for implementation are included.) (SM)

Armstrong, Robert J. "A Comparative Study Concerning Administrative Aspects of Elementary Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs: Current Practices and Proposed Patterns." Salem, Massachusetts: Salem State College, 1968. (Unpublished.)

Today, more than ever before, educators across the nation are calling for school systems and colleges to recognize their joint responsibility to the profession, and to enter into cooperative student teaching programs--that is--programs that are jointly planned, administered and evaluated. Public school personnel claim they should play a major role in the preparation of teachers, and that the administrative arrangements presently governing most student teaching programs are not desirable to either public school or college personnel.

The purposes of this study were:

1. to determine the current status and proposed practices concerning selected administrative aspects of student teaching programs in Massachusetts;

2. to determine the current status concerning these same administrative areas of colleges at the national level which already have cooperatively developed programs;

3. to determine if there were any similarities and/or differences in 1 and 2;

4. to determine the current degree of cooperative student teaching programs in Massachusetts;

5. to determine the desirability of establishing cooperative student teaching programs in Massachusetts, and also the willingness of public school and college personnel to meet to implement these programs;

6. to gather suggestions on how to organize and implement cooperative programs, and to provide examples of programs already developed.

The specific administrative areas investigated were:

1. the selection of cooperating school systems;

2. the appointment of cooperating teachers in terms of procedure and qualifications;

3. the appointment of college supervisors in terms of qualifications;

4. the nature of the student teaching experience in terms of length, level, credit hours, year, level(s), and ratio of teaching to observation;

5. the remuneration made by colleges;

6. the types of orientation programs provided for cooperating teachers and student teachers;

7. the use of non-public schools by colleges for student teaching stations;

8. the supervisory and evaluation practices in terms of the number of student teachers assigned to cooperating teachers and college supervisors at one time, the number of observations made by the college supervisor, and the responsibility for the evaluation of student teachers.

The participants contacted in the study were: 1. all (235) superintendents of schools in Massachusetts (MSS) having elementary school children under their guidance; 2. all (29) directors of student teaching in Massachusetts preparing elementary teachers (MDST); and 3. (97) directors of student teaching (NDST) in thirty-six states. The names of the colleges at the national level were selected since they had indicated in a study conducted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) that their administrative arrangements governing student teaching are either in whole or in part developed cooperatively by college and public school personnel. Three different questionnaires were developed to include questions of a specific nature for each group. The percentage of returns for the groups were: MSS - 80%; MDST - 98%; NDST - 95%.

The study revealed that:

1. the current practices in Massachusetts concerning most administrative aspects of student teaching programs are quite variable--BUT--the proposed practices of the MSS and MDST are quite similar and they differ markedly from the current status;

2. the proposed practices of the MSS and MDST are quite similar to the current status of colleges at the national level which presently have cooperatively developed student teaching programs;

3. only 10 percent of the colleges in Massachusetts presently have cooperative student teaching programs --BUT-over 90 percent of the MSS and MDST not only desire, but are willing to meet to implement sound cooperative student teaching programs.

The significant point of this study is that the profession in Massachusetts (college and public school personnel) is dissatisfied with the current statu of teacher education, and is desirous and willing to cooperatively implement change.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY CONCERNING ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS OF ELEMENTARY OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS: CURRENT PRACTICES AND PROPOSED PATTERNS

by
Dr. Robert J. Armstrong
Professor of Education
Director of Educational Research
Salem State College
Salem, Massachusetts

Introduction to the Problem

It can be concluded from the available literature that there has been a shift during the past thirty years from use of the college campus training school to use of public school facilities for student teaching. Today, more than ever before, educators across the nation are calling for school systems and colleges to recognise their joint responsibility to the profession, and to enter into cooperative student teaching programs -- that is -- programs that are jointly planned, administered and evaluated. Public school personnel claim they should play a major role in the preparation of teachers, and that the administrative arrangements presently governing most student teaching programs are not desirable to either public school or college personnel.

The most important phase of teacher preparation is the student teaching experience. Unfortunately, the improvement of this phase is restricted by the uncoordinated administrative arrangements and policies and the lack of cooperation between public schools and colleges. Therefore, if we ever expect to provide the best possible teaching experience, we must first develop and implement the best possible administrative arrangements and practices between colleges and school personnel.

Purpose

The ultimate objective of this study was to provide the interested associations and departments in Massachusetts with data

directed at overcoming these obstacles deterent to the full development of the student teaching experience. The purposes of this study were:

1. to determine the current status and proposed practices concerning selected administrative aspects of student teaching programs in Massachusetts;
2. to determine the current status concerning these same administrative areas of colleges at the national level which already have cooperatively developed programs;
3. to determine if there were any similarities and/or differences in 1 and 2;
4. to determine the current degree of cooperative student teaching programs in Massachusetts
5. to determine the desirability of establishing cooperative student teaching programs in Massachusetts, and also the willingness of public school and college personnel to meet to implement these programs;
6. to gather suggestions on how to organize and implement cooperative programs, and to provide examples of programs already developed.

The specific administrative areas investigated were;

1. the selection of cooperating school systems;
2. the appointment of cooperating teachers in terms of procedure and qualifications;

3. the appointment of college supervisors in terms of qualifications;
4. the nature of the student teaching experience in terms of length, level, credit hours, year, level(s), and ratio of teaching to observation;
5. the remuneration made by colleges
6. the types of orientation programs provided for cooperating teachers and student teachers;
7. the use of non-public schools by colleges for student teaching stations;
8. the supervisory and evaluation practices in terms of the number of student teachers assigned to cooperating teachers and college supervisors at one time, the number of observations made by the college supervisor, and the responsibility for the evaluation of student teachers.

Procedure

The participants contacted in the study were: 1. all (235) superintendents of schools in Massachusetts (MSS) having elementary school children under their guidance; 2. all (39) directors of student teaching in Massachusetts preparing elementary teachers (MDST); and 3. (97) directors of student teaching (NDST) in thirty-six states. The names of the colleges at the national level were selected since they had indicated in a study conducted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) that their administrative arrangements governing student teaching are either

in whole or in part developed cooperatively by college and public school personnel.

Three different questionnaires were developed to include questions of a specific nature for each group. The MDST were given two part questions concerning these administrative areas. They were asked first for their current practice or operating policy and second, what they preferred, or in other words to develop a proposed pattern. The MSS were asked one part questions concerning these same areas. They were asked what they preferred, or how they felt it should be. Since the NDST supposedly already had developed cooperative programs, they were asked only for the current status concerning these same administrative areas. This procedure allowed the following comparisons to be made:

1. to determine if the MDST are satisfied with their own programs by comparing their current practices with their proposed practices;
2. to determine whether the proposed practices of the MSS are in line with either the current or proposed practices of the MDST:
3. to determine whether the current practices of colleges at the national level (NDST) which have cooperatively developed programs in whole or in part are in line with the current and proposed practices of the MDST and/or the proposed practices of the MSS.

Delimitations of the Study

The part of the study concerning Massachusetts student teaching programs is delimited to:

1. Off-campus elementary student teaching programs in Massachusetts.
2. All Directors of Elementary Student Teaching in Massachusetts, as identified by the Massachusetts State Department of Education.
3. All Superintendents of Schools in Massachusetts, as identified by the Massachusetts State Department of Education.
4. The following administrative aspects of student teaching programs;
   a. the selection of cooperating school systems;
   b. the selection of cooperating teachers;
   c. the nature of the student teaching experience in terms of length, level, and pattern;
   d. the remuneration made by institutions;
   e. the types of orientation programs provided for cooperating teachers and student teachers;
   f. use of student teachers as substitute teachers;
   g. use of parochial schools by the colleges for student teachers;
   h. the supervisory and evaluation practices of student teachers;
   i. cooperative planning, administering, and evaluation of student teaching programs;
   j. the willingness of public school and college personnel to meet to discuss goals and common problems in student teaching; and

k. unique programs they have used or observed.

The part of the study concerning student teaching programs at the national level is delimited to:

1. The current status at the national level regarding the organizational and administrative practices of student teaching programs.
2. The current status at the national level concerning public school-college relationships.

Definition of Terms

The following terms appear regularly throughout this study. In order that those terms may be interpreted in a consistent manner, they are defined below:

Institution refers to all universities and colleges that have student teaching programs.

Student teaching is the experience of the college student in his work in the public school under the direction of a cooperating teacher.

Student teachers are the college students actually participating in student teaching.

College supervisors are the college representatives responsible for supervising student teachers.

Cooperating teachers are classroomteachers in cooperating school systems who supervise the work of student teachers assigned to them.

Cooperating school systems are the public school systems which cooperate with institutions by providing facilities for student teaching

Campus schools or laboratory schools are those elementary schools which are fully controlled by the college and are usually located on the college campus.

Director of student teaching is the administrative head of the student teaching program in a college.

Superintendent of schools is the administrative head of the cooperating school system.

Results of the Study

Most of the tables contain a standard form of heading code to allow more information in a less-congested way to be presented in each table. They are as follows:

Code	Definition
MDST	Massachusetts Directors of Student Teaching
MSS	Massachusetts Superintendents of Schools
NDST	Directors of Student Teaching at the National Level
CP	Current Practices (of the group)
PP	Proposed Practices (of the group)
%	Per cent (indicates the numbers in the tables are percentages)
F	Frequency (indicates the numbers in the tables are frequencies or the number of times an option has been chosen)
N	Number (indicates total number of people in the group)

A few tables will contain codes of a specific nature to that table, and in each case these will be defined for the reader at the appropriate place.

Table 1 is used to show the types of groups in the study, the number of participants contacted, and the number and percentage of people within each group that cooperated in the study.

TABLE 1

PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY*

Groups	Universe N	Study N	Responded N	Participation %
MSS	235	235	189	80
MDST	39	39	38	98
NDST	97	97	92	95

*Code Reminder:
MSS - Massachusetts Superintendents of Schools
MDST - Massachusetts Directors of Student Teaching
NDST - Directors of Student Teaching at National Level
& - Per cent (numbers in column are percentages)
N - Number (total number of people in group)

The first group is the Massachusetts Superintendents of Schools having elementary school children under their guidance. The list of these was obtained from the 1966 Educational Directory published by the Massachusetts State Department of Education. This list was updated in November, 1966. The total number or universe N was 235, and all of these were contacted. The study N is, therefore, the same as the universe N. The number of participants, or people answering the questionnaire, was 189 or 80 per cent of the universe.

The second group is the Massachusetts Directors of Student Teaching having an elementary student teaching program. The list

was obtained from the Massachusetts State Department of Education, Division of Certification. The total number or universe N was thirty-nine, and all of these were contacted. The study N is, therefore, the same as the universe N. The number of participants, or people answering the questionnaire, was thirty-eight or 98 per cent of the universe.

The third group consists of Directors of Student Teaching at the national level. The list was obtained from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). These colleges were listed as having in whole or in part cooperative programs between public school and college personnel and were obtained from a study conducted by AACTE. The total number or universe N was ninety-seven, and all of these were contacted. The study N is the same as the universe N. The number of participants, or people responding to the questionnaire, was ninety-two or 95 per cent of the universe.

Table 2 deals first with the current practices of MDST and NDST and their provisions for systematic planning and evaluation of teacher education by both college and public school personnel. At the national level, 53 per cent of the colleges provide this now, and an additional 24 per cent are in the process of developing cooperative programs in this area. This total of 77 per cent at the national level is quite different from the 10 per cent of Massachusetts colleges reporting this as a current operative policy.

The second part of Table 2 reflects the desirability of a systematic cooperative program of planning and evaluation by MDST

and the MSS. Both groups are in agreement as 97 per cent of the MSS and 90 per cent of the MDST indicated that a cooperative planning and evaluation policy should be developed.

Part III goes beyond the desirability of cooperative programs, as it indicates the willingness of participants to meet to discuss implementation of such a program. Once again a very high degree of desirability was expressed by both the MDST (90 per cent) and the MSS (95 per cent).

Table 2 has been presented at the beginning of the study to:

1. reveal the large discrepancy between the trend of cooperative planning and evaluation programs at the national level and the current practice in Massachusetts;
2. reveal the high desirability of such a program, and the willingness to participate in its implementation by both the MDST and the MSS; and
3. develop a mind set on the preceding points by the reader, since most of the tables reflect agreement in the proposed administrative practices by the MSS and MDST, and the current practices by the MDST, but these disagree with current practices in Massachusetts reported by the MDST.

Table 3 illustrates the current and proposed practices regarding the selection of cooperating school systems.

TABLE 2

SYSTEMATIC COOPERATIVE PLANNING AND EVALUATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION BY PUBLIC SCHOOL AND COLLEGE PERSONNEL

Part I
Current Provisions

Group	Provision %	No Provision %	Development Stage %	N
NDST	53	23	24	92
MDST	10	90	0	38

Part II
Desirability of Cooperating Program

Group	Desire %	No Desire %	N
MDST	90	10	38
MSS	97	3	189

Part III
Willingness to Meet to Discuss Implementation of Cooperative Programs

	Willing %	Unwilling %	N
MDST	90	10	38
MSS	95	5	189

TABLE 3

SELECTION OF COOPERATING SCHOOL SYSTEMS*

Criteria	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a. Quality of staff	63	84	93	91
b. Proximity	82	11	43	85
c. Size of system	16	14	15	25
d. Instructional materials available	29	68	73	71
e. Cooperation of community administrators	71	79	89	85
f. Home town of student teacher	32	5	9	8
N -	38	38	189	92

*Code Reminder:
CP - Current Practices (of the group)
PP - Proposed Practices (of the group)

Currently, 53 per cent of MDST indicated (option a) quality of staff as a factor in the selection of cooperating school systems, and 84 per cent reported it as a proposed or desirable practice. The proposed percentage (84) by the MDST seems to be in line with the proposed percentages (93 and 91) reported by the MSS and NDST.

Proximity (option b) is currently used by 83 per cent of the MDST, but only 11 per cent considered it as a proposed factor. About half (43 per cent) of the MSS considered it a choice, yet 85 per cent of the NDST indicated their use of

proximity as a factor. On the surface there seems to be a conflict, but added comments by participants tend to clarify the discrepancies. At the national level, the directors have cooperative programs and have been able to form these within a reasonable distance. Massachusetts directors indicated their high use of proximity but were not satisfied with current relationships, hence reflecting a very low proposed use of proximity as a factor. Superintendents were split on this issue. It appears that proximity for proximity's sake is highly undesirable. Another reason that caused discrepancies was the interpretation of proximity. Does it mean ten miles, twenty miles, or could thirty miles be considered as within the definition of proximity?

All groups revealed little use or desire to use the size of the system (option c) in the selection of cooperating school systems.

The use of instructional materials (option d) as a current factor was reported by 29 per cent of the NDST, but 68 per cent indicated their desire to use it. This proposed desire is in conflict with their current practice but is in line with the thinking of the MSS (73 per cent) and NDST (71 per cent).

Cooperation of community administrators (option e) was considered a desirable factor by all groups in either current or proposed practices.

The use of the home town of the student teacher is

currently used by 32 per cent of the MDST, but only 5 per cent indicated this to be a desirable practice. This low proposed use of the home town (5 per cent) is once again in line with the proposed use by the MSS (9 per cent) and the NDST (8 per cent).

The table, in general, reflects that the quality of staff (option a), instructional materials available (option d), cooperation of community administrators (option e), and (option b) proximity (with reservations) are the proposed factors to be used in the selection of cooperating systems.

There is uniformity in the proposed practices by the MSS, MDST and the current practices of the NDST, but these are not in line with the current practices in Massachusetts.

Table 4 is a comparison of the current and proposed practices used in the selection of cooperating teachers.

Option (a) refers to a list of volunteers, with little or any evaluation, being sent to the college by school administrators for assignment as a cooperating teacher by the college. Although 21 per cent of the MDST reported this as a current practice, only 2 per cent indicated this as a proposed practice. This low desirability was also reflected by the MSS and NDST. Option (b) is quite similar to option (a); the only difference is that the assignment of student teachers is done by the public school administrator. These two options (a and b) combined show very little desirability as a proposed practice by the MDST (4 per cent) and the MSS

TABLE 4

SELECTION OF COOPERATING TEACHERS

Criteria	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a. List of volunteers sent to the college by school administrators for assignment	21	2	2	7
b. Assignments made by public school administrators from list of volunteers	45	2	10	9
c. Joint evaluation and assignment	24	79	74	97
d. Evaluation and assignment by colleges	11	5	4	5
e. Evaluation and assignment by school administrators	37	5	7	16
f. Student teacher selects-- college confirms	5	2	0	0
g. No Comment	0	5	0	0
N =	38	38	189	92

(12 per cent), or a current practice by the NDST (16 per cent), yet 66 per cent of the MDST report it as a current practice in Massachusetts.

Current practices of the NDST (97 per cent) and the proposed practices of the MDST (79 per cent) and MSS (74 per cent) are in agreement, but once again are in conflict with the current practice reported by the MDST (24 per cent) regarding option (c), joint evaluation and assignment.

The use of option (d), evaluation and assignment by college only, appears to be in agreement by all three groups concerning both their current and proposed practices. The table reveals very little use or desirability to establish this as a practice in the selection of cooperating teachers. Evaluation and assignment by the school administrator, option (e), is currently used by 37 per cent of the MDST, but only 5 per cent desire this as a practice. This low desirability was also indicated by the MSS (7 per cent) and the MDST (16 per cent).

Option (g) means that the student teacher requests the college to assign him to a certain cooperating teacher, and the college would then approach the superintendent and cooperating teacher for confirmation. This is used very little presently and has little or no desirability as a proposed practice by all groups.

The overall table reveals agreement in the proposed practices of the MDST and the MSS, and the current practices of the MDST in the use of option (c), joint evaluation and assignment, as the best approach in the selection of cooperating teachers. This does not, however, reflect the current trend in Massachusetts as reported by MDST.

Table 5 shows the proposed practices desired by the MSS and MDST and the current practices of the MDST regarding minimum qualifications of cooperating teachers. Additional comments are also shown below the table.

TABLE 5

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS

Criteria	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a. No comment	2	1	0
b. Less than 3 years' experience	7	4	1
c. 3 or more years' experience	24	47	24
d. Superior teacher	47	29	57
e. 5 or more years' experience	0	5	8
f. Master's Degree and 3 years' experience	13	14	10
g. Master's Degree and 5 or more years' experience	7	0	0
h. At least 3 years' experience but no Master's Degree	71	81	89
i. Master's Degree and 3 or more years' experience	20	14	10
Additional Comments			
1. Tenure in system	8	0	0
2. Tenure somewhere; 1 year in system	0	4	0
3. 3 years' experience; 1 year in system	4	15	10
4. 2 years in system	11	0	4
5. State critic teacher credentials	0	0	9
6. Master's Degree desirable	27	40	45

Options (b), (c), (d), and (e) deal with qualifications calling for less than a Master's Degree. Very few people either propose or use option (b); that is, using cooperating teachers with less than three years' experience. Options (c) and (d) are shown separately and also their combined percentages, since they are quite similar. Option (d), a superior teacher, was selected in place of option (c) by those who did not want to put any standard on this because there are times when you might, for example, find a superior second-year teacher. Their choice, therefore, is really option (c) but allowing for flexibility. The MDST and NDST tend to prefer option (d) over option (c) and the MSS indicate that option (c) is more desirable. However, the combined percentages of each group display a very close similarity.

Options (e) and (g) were selected by only a small percentage of each group. This indicates that establishing a minimum of five years' experience, with or without a Master's Degree, is neither a proposed nor a current practice.

The three groups also tend to be in agreement regarding option (f). A smaller percentage of each group prefers the Master's Degree and three years' experience (f) to options (c) and (d) combined: MSS, 71 per cent (c and d) to 13 per cent (f); MDST, 76 per cent (c and d) to 14 per cent (f); NDST, 81 per cent (c and d) to 10 per cent (f).

Options (h) and (i) are used to show the combined percent-

ages of options (b), (c), (e), and (d), at least three years' experience but a Master's Degree not required, against options (f) and (g), Master's Degree and at least three years' experience required. All three groups tend to prefer option (h) to option (i). Although there is a discrepancy within option (h) as to whether the groups prefer option (c) or (d), since this was an open-end question, the author feels there is more of a play on words than a difference.

The additional comments section was added since these were made in addition to their comments reported in the table. Options 1, 2, 3, and 4 are quite similar, since they all call for at least one year in the town. Although the percentages are small, they are worth mentioning since 23 per cent of the MDST, 19 per cent of the MSS, and 10 per cent of the NDST took time to write in their desire for at least one year of experience in the system. Option 5 reflects an interesting point; 9 per cent of the NDST reported that the state has requirements for co-operating or critic teachers. Option 6 shows that 27 per cent of the MDST, 40 per cent of the MSS, and 45 per cent of the NDST, although stating originally that a Master's Degree was not essential, added that it was desirable.

The table as a whole indicates that the proposed practices of the MDST and MSS are in agreement with current practices of the NDST. Overall, it appears that:

1. a Master's Degree is not essential but is desirable;

2. at least three years of experience is preferred, but this should be flexible for an exceptional case.

Table 6 concerns itself with the minimum qualifications of college supervisors. Options (b), (c), and (d) relate to the qualifications when a Master's Degree is not required; and options (e), (f), (g), and (h), the qualifications when a Master's Degree is required. Options (j) and (k) are a comparison of options (b), (c), and (d) combined with options (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) combined.

Option (k), Master's Degree not required, appears to be neither used nor a desirable practice by all three groups (MDST, 11 per cent; MSS, 18 per cent; and NDST, 10 per cent). The use of option (j), Master's Degree and at least three years' experience required, was highly chosen by all three groups (MDST, 85 per cent; MSS, 78 per cent; and NDST, 88 per cent).

Within options 'j) and (e), 'f), (g), (h), and (i), there appears to be a big discrepancy, especially between options (f) and (g). The author feels the major reason for this is that the table reflects a comparison of proposed programs to a current program. The MSS are about even in their choice of (f) or (h), while the NDST and MDST reflect a complete reversal in their choices of options (f) and (h). Perhaps the table would be best reflected by saying that all three groups agree that the minimum qualifications should be a Master's Degree and three years' teaching experience with

TABLE 6

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS OF COLLEGE SUPERVISORS

Criteria	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST PP %
a. No comment	4	4	2
b. Less than 3 years' experience	0	0	0
c. 3 or more years' experience	3	7	4
d. Superior teacher	8	11	6
e. Master's Degree but less than 3 years' experience	0	0	0
f. Master's Degree and 3 years' experience	11	33	62
g. Master's Degree and 5 or more years' experience	8	12	3
h. Master's Degree; 3 years' experience; experience as an administrator and/or cooperating teacher	63	29	21
i. C.A.G.S. or doctoral candidate and 3 years' experience	3	4	2
j. At least a Master's Degree and 3 years' experience	85	78	88
k. Master's Degree not required	11	18	10
N =	38	189	92

experience as an administrator and/or cooperating teacher being desirable.

Table 7 illustrates the current and proposed practices regarding reimbursement policies to cooperating teachers and/or school systems.

TABLE 7

REIMBURSEMENT TO COOPERATING TEACHERS AND/OR SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Criteria	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a. None	11	0	9	8
b. Money honorarium	14	71	66	65
c. Free course voucher	53	11	29	24
d. Book or dinner	8	3	0	2
e. Consultant services	14	5	41	12
f. Inservice course, use of reading or speech clinics, etc.	11	6	45	11
g. Use of college library	24	24	5	27
h. No comment	3	11	0	0
N -	38	38	189	92

Option (a) indicates that presently 11 per cent of the colleges in Massachusetts do not provide any type of reimbursement to cooperating teachers or systems, but all of the MDST indicated that some type should be given. The current practice at the national level (8 per cent) and the

proposed practices of the MSS (9 per cent) are also in line with the MDST in their low desirability of option (a). Generally, all groups desire or use some plan of reimbursement to cooperating teachers and/or school systems.

Options (b), (c), and (d) are usually associated with the types of reimbursement given to cooperating teachers, although not exclusively. Approximately 90 per cent of the participants agreed that some form should be given to the cooperating teacher. Most indicated, for example, in the use of a free course voucher, option (c), that the cooperating teacher would have first refusal. In the event it was rejected, the participants were split over whether (a) the cooperating teacher could pass it on to someone else, (b) the school system would have the option to dispose of it, or (c) it would revert back to the college and go unused. Some of the typical problems reported by the participants in the use of course vouchers were the following:

1. Teachers A and B are enrolled in graduate study at different colleges and are taking student teachers from the opposite colleges. In this case they would like to swap their course vouchers, since they have no use for the one they will receive.

2. Teacher C would like to pass the voucher on to a friend since, for several valid reasons, she has no use for it.

3. Some colleges will not permit the transfer of vouchers in either case 1 or 2. In case 1, they claim the tuition costs are not the same, etc., and in case 2 they feel that too often the new recipient is a person who has refused student teachers from the college and would now be receiving a course voucher anyway.

4. Teacher D may be enrolled in a graduate program in a different college from the one at which he is entitled to a free course and may not have the opportunity of swapping the voucher with another teacher in a mutual situation. In this case, he would prefer the money so he could enroll in another school for graduate study.

5. Teacher E is a veteran in Massachusetts and, in the case of the state colleges, is entitled to these courses free of charge with his veteran's status. Therefore, if he takes student teachers from any of the state colleges, he has no use for the vouchers.

These are by no means all of the problems but do point out some which arise when the free-course voucher system is used.

In Massachusetts, 55 per cent of the colleges use the voucher system (option c) and 14 per cent use option (b), a cash honorarium; but 71 per cent of the MDST indicated in their proposed program the desire to use option (b), a cash honorarium, and only 11 per cent indicated a desire to continue using the free-voucher system. This high desirability of option (b) was also reflected in the proposed program of the MSS (66 per cent). About half of those using and/or preferring the use of a cash honorarium indicated the amount. A vast variety of programs were mentioned, reflecting a range from $5 to $500 per student teacher, with most reporting from $75 to $125 per student teacher. If paid by the year, the range was from $100 to $2000 with a mode of $1000. Many indicated they were not sure of the amount but agreed that this was the best approach. Others added that the possibility of uniformity in the type and amount awarded by colleges should be investigated. Several suggested that the area of state

and/or federal support should be explored, with some colleges at the national level indicating the present use of state aid. Another form of reimbursement to the cooperating teacher is mentioned in option (d), the awarding of a book or a dinner. This appears to be neither a current nor a desirable practice by all three groups.

Options (e), (f), and (g) are usually associated with reimbursement to the school system. A few indicated this exclusively, but for the most part this is used or desired in addition to either options (b), (c), or (d). When combined, options (e), (f), and (g) reflect that 49 per cent of the MDST and 50 per cent of the NDST currently offer these services (option e) and the inservice courses, clinics, etc. (option f), but the colleges at both levels disagree with this and would tend to offer option (g), the use of the college library.

Overall, the table reflects that:

1. some type of reimbursement should be made to cooperating teachers and/or school systems;
2. a cash honorarium of some type is preferred and should be given to the cooperating teacher, although this is not the current practice in Massachusetts;
3. in addition to a cash honorarium to the cooperating teacher, about half of the participants agreed that services should be given to the school system;

4. the areas of support, such as state and/or federal aid and the possibility of uniformity by the colleges on the amount and/or form of reimbursement, should be investigated.

Table 8 deals with orientation programs for student teachers provided by the public schools. Part I relates the proposed practices of the MDST and the current practices of the NDST. Part II reflects the current practices of public schools in Massachusetts in the orientation of student teachers.

There is agreement in the proposed and current practices of the MDST (88 per cent) and the NDST (96 per cent) regarding their high desirability of option (b), orientation of student teachers by the public schools should be handled the same as for a regular teacher. The refersal of this is reflected in option (e), indicating that an orientation program is not necessary. Only 2 per cent of the MDST indicated this and nobody at the national level felt that orientation programs for student teachers were not desirable.

Options (a) and (d) were added for the most part to their statement indicating option (b). The author feels that perhaps option (b) would include options (a) and (d) in the thinking of many people. Option (c) also was an additional statement but is one that really could not be classified as a part of option (b). Only a small percentage of the MDST (12 per cent) and the NDST (11 per cent) added this comment.

TABLE 8

ROLE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL IN ORIENTATION PROGRAMS OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Part I
Role of Public School

Criteria	MDST PP %	NDST CP %
a. Use of handbook	25	27
b. Same as a regular teacher	88	96
c. Use of weekly seminars	12	11
d. Visits prior to training	45	65
e. It is not needed	2	0
f. No comment	15	0
N -	38	92

Part II
Current Provisions for Orientation Programs

Group	Provision CP %	No Provision CP %
MSS	23	67

This low percentage for option (c) does not necessarily mean it is an undesirable practice; the author feels it can be accounted for in the following three ways:

1. since this was an open-end question, some people indicated a general comment to fit option (b) only;
2. some probably classified seminars or meetings, although maybe not weekly, under option (b); and
3. some may have considered this very desirable, but realistically not practical.

Part I can be summarized by saying that Directors of Student Teaching desire an orientation program by the public schools for student teachers. This gould usually take the same form as that provided for regular teachers. Part I of this table, however, reflects a completely different picture. Presently, only 23 per cent of the public schools in Massachusetts provide any orientation program for student teachers.

Part I of Table 9 refers to the current and proposed orientation programs for cooperating teachers provided by colleges. The second part of this table discloses the current provisions for cooperating teachers made by the public schools.

In Part I, option (a) indicates that only a few participants either do not provide or feel that such a program is not necessary. Option (b), a handbook, appears to be both a current and a desirable practice for future use: MDST, CP, 61 per cent; MDST, PP, 66 per cent; MSS, PP, 68 per cent; and

TABLE 9

ORIENTATION PROGRAMS FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS

Part I
Programs Provided by College

Criteria	NDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a. None	11	2	1	1
b. Use of handbook	61	66	68	87
c. Course in supervision of student teachers	8	37	44	54
d. Workshop for supervision of student teachers	0	31	33	11
e. Orientation meeting held at college for cooperating teachers and/or administrators	45	21	22	30
f. Limited use of option (e) in place of option (d)	0	0	0	21
g. Role of public school, not college	2	0	5	5
N =	38	38	189	92

Part II
Current Programs Provided by Public School

Group	Provision CP %	No Provision CP %
MSS	17	83

NDST, CP, 87 per cent.

Options (c) and (d) are shown separately and also combined, since their meanings are very similar. Option (c) indicates that a course be given in the supervision of student teachers, while option (d) indicates that the use of a workshop with periodic meetings throughout the year would be enough. Interestingly, about 40 per cent of each group added that this program is the responsibility of the college, but involvement of public school administrators and experienced cooperating teachers in the planning and conducting of it should help develop it into a superior program for prospective cooperating teachers. They felt this is the crux of the program and is too often handled haphazardly. If the student teaching program is going to run smoothly, channels of communication must be kept open and a good sound cooperative program developed. Meetings must be held to define the role of participants, to discuss problems and innovations, and to appraise the student teaching program. The use of a course (option c) or a workshop (option d) seems to be very desirable as proposed practices by the MDST (68 per cent) and the MSS (77 per cent) and are in line with current practices at the national level (65 per cent). However, only 8 per cent of the MDST reported this as a current operative program.

Option (e) refers to an orientation meeting that would include public school administrators and cooperating teachers as well as college personnel. This means that the orientation

program would not be a workshop or course but would be accomplished through one meeting yearly with all concerned parties. Currently, about half (45 per cent) of the NDST use this practice, but only 21 per cent indicated this as their choice for future use. This low desirability on the part of the NDST is similar to that expressed by the MSS (PP, 22 per cent) and the NDST (CP, 10 per cent).

The use of option (f) was reported by only the NDST and is closely related to options (c), (d), and (e). This means that, although 65 per cent of the NDST indicated using either a workshop or a course approach, 21 per cent (f) of these indicated that the course or workshop was desirable and highly recommended but not required. These colleges usually indicated that most of the cooperating teachers took it and that those who had participated were given preference in the selection of new cooperating teachers. Some colleges also indicated a differential in money paid to cooperating teachers depending on completion of the course or workshop.

Option (g) indicates that all groups, whether a current or proposed program, feel that it is not the sole responsibility of the public school to establish orientation programs for cooperating teachers.

The overall table reflects that:

1. a handbook for cooperating teachers is highly desirable;
2. a course or workshop should be required for all new

cooperating teachers;

3. it is the responsibility of the college to provide this program, but involvement of school administrators and experienced cooperating teachers is desirable; and
4. periodic meetings of public school administrators, cooperating teachers, and college personnel should be held throughout the year to discuss problems and innovations, appraise the program, and keep channels of communication open.

Table 10 deals with the current role of the public schools in the orientation of cooperating teachers and student teachers. The responses in this table are those made by the MSS only.

Option (a) indicated that 17 per cent of the public schools in Massachusetts provide orientation for at least cooperating teachers, while option (b) indicates that 3 per cent of the schools provide orientation for cooperating teachers only. Although only a small percentage of the public schools provide orientation for cooperating teachers, those that do usually provide it for student teachers as well.

Provisions for orientation programs for student teachers by the public schools are made by approximately one-fourth of the systems as indicated by option (c). Option (d) indicates a similar response to option (b); that is, when

TABLE 10

CURRENT ROLE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL IN ORIENTATION OF BOTH COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS

Criteria	MSS Provision CP %	MSS No Provision CP %
a. Cooperating teachers	17	83
b. Cooperating teachers only	3	97
c. Student teachers	23	77
d. Student teachers only	6	94
e. Both	14	86
f. Cooperating and/or student teachers	26	74

N - 189

Provisions are made for orientation programs for student teachers, they are usually made for cooperating teachers also. Option (e) reveals that 14 per cent of the school systems provide orientation programs for both student and cooperating teachers. Only 26 per cent or sixty-one different school systems provide this for cooperating and/or student teachers as reflected by option (f).

The overall picture of the table indicates that currently only 14 per cent of the public schools provide orientation programs for both groups and only 26 per cent provide for either one or the other. The absence of an orientation

program for student teachers is in conflict with the desirability of one reported in Table 9 by the MDST and the NDST. The absence of an orientation program for cooperating teachers apparently is not in conflict, as all three groups indicated in Table 10 that this is the responsibility primarily of the colleges.

Table 11 illustrates the number of student teachers assigned a cooperating teacher at any one time. All participating groups seem to be in agreement that option (a), the assignment of only one student teacher to a cooperating teacher at a time, is not only the current but also the desirable pattern: MDST, CP, 92 per cent; MDST, PP, 95 per cent; MSS, PP, 96 per cent; and NDST, CP, 98 per cent.

Additional comments were made by a few from each group. Comment 1 means that a small percentage of the participants who had indicated that only one student teacher should be assigned to a cooperating teacher added that two could be assigned in a rare case. Comments 2, 3, and 4 mean that a few colleges are or would like to experiment with more than the one-to-one ratio. A few of the MSS and NDST added the restriction that a cooperating teacher may work with only one student teacher in any year, and some indicated that the children could be exposed to only one student teacher in a year.

Table 12 is used to disclose the number of student teachers considered to be the equivalent of a full-time college teaching load. The variability in this table is great,

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO COOPERATING TEACHER AT ONE TIME

Number of Student Teachers		MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a.	1	92	95	96	98
b.	2	5	5	2	2
c.	3	0	0	2	0
d.	6	3	0	0	0
	N-	38	38	189	92

Additional Comments

1.	Rare exception 2	2	5	9	7
2.	Experimenting with 2	2	3	0	1
3.	Experimenting with 3	3	3	0	0
4.	Experimenting with 4	4	0	0	1
5.	One per year	0	0	8	6

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS CONSIDERED EQUIVALENT OF FULL-TIME COLLEGE TEACHING LOAD

Number of Students	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	NDST CP %
a. 10 or less	6	6	1
b. 11 - 15	5	10	7
c. 16 - 20	10	51	55
d. 21 - 25	27	10	12
e. 26 - 30	13	5	7
f. 31 - 35	6	3	1
g. 36 - 40	3	0	5
h. Varies	3	5	1
i. No comment	27	10	11
j. 20 or less	21	67	63
k. More than 20	52	23	26
N -	38	38	92

as the range for both groups is from less than 10 to 40 student teachers. Although the variability within each group is large, there tends to be agreement between the proposed pattern of the MDST and the current practice of the NDST. About the same percentage of each group indicated use or a desire to use each option. About half of each group selected option (c) as their choice, with the rest spread proportionately over a wide range.

Options (j) and (d) condense the table into a simple comparison of twenty or less (option j) or more than twenty (option k). In Massachusetts, only 21 per cent currently have a policy that uses option (j), twenty or less student teachers, to be the equivalent of a full college teaching load. However, at the national level 63 per cent of the colleges currently use option (j) and 67 per cent of the MDST indicated a desire to have a load of twenty or less student teachers (option j) be the equivalent of a full teaching program.

On the whole, although there is a great deal of variability, there tends to be agreement between the proposed practices of the MDST and the current practices of the MDST that twenty or less student teachers should be considered the equivalent of a full teaching load. Part of the variability expressed can be probably accounted for in the following two ways:

1. The use of several buildings in one town, clustering of student teachers in these buildings, and/or the use of a resident coordinator might account for a higher student teacher load.

2. Even though two colleges might use the same ratio (e.g., 2 student teachers = 1 semester hour of teaching), the use of a different number of semester hours equivalent to a full teaching load (e.g., 9 versus 15) would cause a discrepancy. When using 9 hours, the student teacher load would be 18; but using 15 hours, it would increase the student teacher load to 30.

Table 13 concerns itself with the number of contact hours considered to be a full-time teaching load for a college

TABLE 13

NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS CONSIDERED AS FULL-TIME TEACHING LOAD FOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTOR WITH NO ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES AND NO SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Hours	MDST CP %
a. No comment	11
b. Do not know	3
c. Varies	3
d. 9	11
e. 12	61
f. 15	11
N =	38

instructor with no administrative responsibilities and no supervision of student teachers. The MDST were the only ones asked this question.

Options (a) and (b) combined indicate that 14 per cent of the MDST either left this question unanswered or indicated they did not know the answer. Option (c) implies that 3 per cent responded that the number of hours varies or there is not a set policy. Actually, only three patterns appear in this table:

1. Option d - 11 per cent - 9 contact hours
2. Option e - 61 per cent - 12 contact hours
3. Option f - 11 per cent - 15 contact hours

It is clear from this table that more colleges in Massachusetts

consider option (e), twelve contact hours, to be the equivalent of a full teaching load with no other administrative or supervisory responsibilities.

Part I of Table 14 reveals the current use of nonpublic schools by the MDST and the NDST. This section indicates almost a complete reversal by the two groups, as approximately two-thirds (63 per cent) of the MDST use nonpublic schools, while only one-fourth (25 per cent) of the colleges at the national level use them.

Part II concerns itself with whether those responding "yes" to Part I were doing so out of necessity or desire. It appears that it is about equal; that is, about as many do it out of necessity as desire.

Part III involves the area of increased use of nonpublic schools. About 30 per cent of the MDST and 45 per cent of the NDST feel there will be an increase in the use of nonpublic schools, but most of these felt it would be small.

Part IV is a breakdown in the amount of use of both parochial and private schools. It should be noted that everyone who answered "yes" to Part I did not give the percentage of use of the nonpublic schools, so this is a partial picture. Except for a few, most of the colleges use the nonpublic schools on a very small scale. For example, ten of the fourteen MDST reporting the use of parochial schools indicated this use was less than 5 per cent. This, of course,

TABLE 14

PLACEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Part I
Present Placement

Group	%Yes	%No
MDST	63	37
NDST	25	70

Part II
Reason for Placement

Group	Necessity %	Desire %	No Comment %
MDST	38	47	15
NDST	40	50	10

Part III
See Increase in Nonpublic School Use

Group	Yes %	No %	Large %	Small %
MDST	30	70	2	98
NDST	45	55	6	94

Part IV
Placement in Private Schools--Placement in Parochial Schools

%	MDST F	NDST F	%	MDST F	NDST F
a. less than 5	13	8	a. less than 5	10	7
b. 10	0	11	b. 10	0	0
c. 15	2	0	c. 15	0	0
d. 20	0	0	d. 20	0	1
e. 30	0	0	e. 30	2	0
f. 100	0	1	f. 100	2	0
Total	15	20	Total	14	8

helps to clear up the large discrepancy in Part I. Although, proportionately, Massachusetts colleges use nonpublic schools more than colleges at the national level, both for the most part do this on a very limited basis.

Table 15 reflects the year(s) in which student teaching takes place as reported by the MDST and NDST.

TABLE 15

YEAR(S) IN WHICH STUDENT TEACHING TAKES PLACE

Year(s)	MDST CP %	NDST CP %
a. Junior only	0	2
b. Junior or senior	13	8
c. Junior and senior	5	11
d. Junior	18	21
e. Senior only	78	71
f. Senior or graduate	0	6
g. Senior	96	96
h. Graduate only	3	2
i. Graduate	3	8
N -	38	92

Currently, 96 per cent of both groups reported the use of the senior year either exclusively or in part, with 78 per cent of the MDST and 71 per cent of the NDST reporting exclusive use of the senior year (options e and g). The

table, in general, reveals that colleges use the senior year much more than either the junior or graduate years, either exclusively or in part. Most of the colleges that use the senior year exclusively reported that the pattern is used to allow completion of pretraining course requirements. These requirements were usually set by the college, but a few colleges reported that the requirement was established by the state. Most of the colleges using option (b), the junior or senior year, indicated that an insufficient number of cooperating teachers caused the pattern. A few more colleges indicated that they did not know the reason for their pattern, while some indicated tradition as the factor.

Table 16 relates the current and proposed practices of the three groups concerning the length of the student teaching period. The patterns that appear in the table; e.g., eight weeks, were not the only ones. A variety of programs was reported, and the author condensed these into the basic ones reported in the table for ease of interpretation.

Part I is a breakdown of the various lengths and the percentage of current and desirable use of each. Option (g), ideal, refers to a program that would fit the individual needs of each student, as the length of training would depend on the progress made by the student teacher. The range revealed in Part I is from three to thirty-two weeks, or ideal (option g), which might be longer than thirty-two weeks for some student teachers.

TABLE 16

LENGTH OF STUDENT TEACHING TRAINING PERIOD

Part I

Length of Period	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a. 3 weeks	5	0	0	0
b. 5 weeks	21	3	1	3
c. 8 weeks	40	8	18	32
d. 12 weeks	18	13	1	27
e. 16 weeks	21	52	68	35
f. 32 weeks or intern	0	13	12	3
g. Ideal	0	8	0	0
h. No comment	0	3	0	0

Part II

Length of Period	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
i. 8 weeks or less (a+b+c)	61	11	19	35
j. 12 weeks or more (d+e+f+g)	39	86	81	65
N =	38	38	189	92

Part II brings the table into a much clearer perspective. Option (i), which combines options (a), (b), and (c), indicates a program of eight or less weeks. Option (j), which combines (d), (e), (f), and (g), indicates a program of twelve or more weeks. Currently, 61 per cent of the MDST report using option (i), while only 11 per cent of the MDST and 19 per cent of the MSS indicate the desirability of this plan. This reflects the trend at the national level (35 per cent). Option (j) reveals that 86 per cent of the MDST, 81 per cent of the MSS, and 65 per cent of the NDST either use or desire a program of at least twelve weeks in length; but this is not the practice in Massachusetts presently (39 per cent). The three groups are in agreement about their desirability of option (j), but within option (j) there is discrepancy. The MSS and the MDST tend to prefer option (e), sixteen weeks, which is double the current trend in Massachusetts; and the NDST, although agreeing on the use of more than eight weeks, are split over the choice of twelve or sixteen weeks. Some of this discrepancy can be accounted for in two ways:

1. more colleges at the national level use the trimester (twelve-week plan) than Massachusetts colleges; hence, the program would tend to dictate twelve weeks and not sixteen; and
2. the comparison is being made of a current with a proposed program.

Table 17 concerns itself with the ratio of teaching

TABLE 17

RATIO OF TEACHING TO OBSERVATION TIME

Ratio	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a. Equal	65	68	77
b. 2 - 1	10	10	9
c. 3 - 1	7	7	4
d. 4 - 1	3	4	3
e. 5 - 1	3	3	4
f. 1 - 2	3	0	1
g. 1 - 3	3	0	0
h. Varies	63	70	80
i. No comment	3	8	2
N -	38	189	92

to observation time during the student teaching period. It is a comparison of the proposed practices of the MDST and the MSS and the current practices of the MDST.

The proposed practices of the MDST (65 per cent) and the MSS (68 per cent) are in line with the current practices of the NDST (77 per cent) in the use of option (a), about an equal amount of teaching and observation. Options (b), (c), (d), and (e) combined indicate that only 23 per cent of the MDST and 20 per cent of the NDST currently feel a great deal more teaching than observation should take place; and this is very similar to the proposed practice of the MSS (24 per

cent). Options (f) and (g) combined are also in agreement by all three groups, as only 6 per cent of the Massachusetts colleges desire a great deal more observation than teaching; and this low desirability is also reflected in the proposed practices of the MSS (0 per cent) and the current practices of the NDST (1 per cent). Option (h) was added by a substantial percentage of each group to emphasize that their response was meant to fit most students, but expected deviates to receive more or less teaching depending upon their rate of growth.

The table as a whole reveals that the proposed practices of the MDST and MSS are in line with the current practices of the NDST, that the total training period should involve about an equal amount of teaching and observation for most students, allowing flexibility for additional teaching or observation in individual cases. Additional responses indicated that a typical training period would:

1. consist of mostly observation at the beginning;
2. increase in the amount of teaching so that by the half-way point, it is about equal;
3. allow the student teacher eventually to take over the complete teaching assignment over an extended period; and
4. reflect an overall teaching-observation ratio of 50:50 for most students.

Table 18 illustrates the current and proposed practices of the participants regarding the portion of time spent at

TABLE 18

PORTION OF TIME SPENT AT PRIMARY AND/OR INTERMEDIATE LEVEL(S)*

Portion of Time	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a. All	25	5	6	14
b. M+O	28	8	23	16
c. 2	37	61	44	36
d. M+O+L	7	18	27	34
e. ISC	0	3	0	0
f. No comment	3	5	0	0
g. All+	53	13	29	30
h. 2+	44	79	71	70
N =	38	38	189	92

*Code for Tables 18 and 19:

1. All - training takes place completely at one level.
2. M+O - training takes place almost completely at one level, with a few observations at another.
3. 2 - training is divided evenly over two different levels.
4. M+O+L - about two-thirds of training is at one level, allowing one-third of the period to be spent observing and teaching at another.
5. ISC - student teacher decides whether he will undertake his training at one or more levels.
6. All+ - combination of 1 and 2.
7. 2+ - combination of 3 and 4.

the primary and/or intermediate level(s). The code presented at the top of the table will be used in Table 19 also.

Options (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) present a breakdown of the responses of the participants. It appears at first that there is not much uniformity in either the current or the proposed practices of the groups. However, a review of the definitions indicates that four of these options are quite similar in nature, and these are reported in combined form in options (g) and (h). Option (g) combines (a) and (b) since the only difference between these two is that option (b) allows a few observations at another levelaand option (a) requires all the training at one level. Option (c) indicates that the training is split equally over two levels, and option (d) indicates that two-thirds is completed at one level and one-third at the other. Since these are also close in nature, they are combined into option (h). Currently, 53 per cent of the MDST indicated the use of option (g) (all+), but their proposed program indicates that 79 per cent of them prefer option (h) (2+). The current practices of the NDST and the proposed practices of the MSS are in line with the increased desirability of the MDST to use option (h), teaching experience at more than one level (2+).

Generally, the table reflects the use of more than one level (2+) is preferred, and the results of Table 16 indicated preference for a longer student teaching period. The author, therefore, investigated to see if there is a tendency

for example, for those preferring a longer training period also to prefer more than one level. This is presented in Table 19.

The table, in general, deals with the comparison of the length of training to the portion of time spent at the primary and/or intermediate level(s). Parts I and II are summaries of Tables 16 and 18 and are presented here so the reader will not have to refer back to these tables while interpreting Part III.

Part I indicates that 61 per cent of the MDST currently use eight weeks as the length of the training period; Part II indicates that 53 per cent currently use the (all+) approach. These are reflected in Part III as the MDST currently tend to use the (eight-week) and (all+) approach. Part I reveals the proposed program of the MDST is for (12+) weeks, and Part II indicates a shift to the (2+) level program. Bothe of these are refle cted in Part III as 76 per cent of the MDST prefer (12+) and the (2+) program. Currently, only 30 per cent of the MDST use (12+) and (2+), but 76 per cent prefer this (12+) and (2+). The proposed programs of the MSS (60 per cent) and the NDST (57 per cent) tend to agree with the MDST (76 per cent) in the use of (12+) and (2+) combined.

Generally, the table reveals that:

1. the current practices at the national level are in agreement with the proposed practices of the MDST

TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF LENGTH OF TRAINING TO USE OF ONE OR MORE LEVELS

Part I
Summary of Length of Training (Table 16)

Length	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
8 weeks	61	11	19	35
12+ weeks	39	86	81	65

Part II
Summary of Level(s) at Which Training Is Done (Table 18)

Level	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
All+	53	13	29	30
2+	44	79	71	70

Part III
Comparison of Length and Level(s)

Length	Level	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
8 weeks	All+	44	8	9	22
8 weeks	2+	14	3	11	13
12+ weeks	All+	9	5	20	8
12+ weeks	2+	30	76	60	57

and MSS that the length of training should be more than the current practice in Massachusetts of eight or less weeks;

2. training should take place at more than one level which is somewhat different from the current plan in Massachusetts; and
3. regardless of whether it is a current or a proposed practice, all three groups reflect that when the training is eight or less weeks, then there is a tendency to use one level (all+); and as the training period increases in length (12+), the use of more than one level (2+) is prevalent.

Table 20 illustrates the number of semester-hour credits awarded for student teaching by colleges in Massachusetts and at the national level. It reflects a great deal of variability, as the range for both groups is from two to sixteen credits. Currently, the amount awarded by the MDST is quite variable, with perhaps a little more preference for approximately six credits (option b) than any other. The proposed number of credits awarded, although still quite variable, reflects an overall desire to increase the number of credits awarded, with more indicating a preference for approximately twelve hours (option d) than any other amount. At the national level, there seems to be a tendancy to use nine or twelve hours (options c and d), with a little more use of nine hours than any other.

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS OF CREDIT AWARDED FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Credits	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	NDST CP %
a. 2 - 4	13	3	3
b. 5 - 7	35	23	10
c. 8 - 10	20	18	35
d. 11 - 13	21	41	33
e. 14 - 16	8	13	18
f. No comment	0	3	0
g. 7 or less	48	26	14
h. 8 or more	52	74	86
N -	38	38	92

Option (g) is a combination of options (a) and (b), and option (h) is a combination of options (c), (d), and (e). Currently, 48 per cent of the MDST award seven or less credits, but 73 per cent indicated their desire to award more which is similar to the current pattern of the NDST (86 per cent, option h).

The table was designed to indicatedthe number of semester hours awarded for student teaching only. Because of the variability in this table and the fact that Table 16 also revealed variability and a desire to increase the length of student teaching, Table 21 was developed to see if the dis-

crepancies here could be accounted for by the current and proposed patterns regarding the length of student teaching. For example, do those using or requiring sixteen weeks tend to award more credit than those using or requiring eight weeks?

Table 21 is a comparison of the length of student teaching (Table 16) and the number of semester hours of credit awarded for student teaching (Table 20). Part I is a summary of Table 16, and Part II is a comparison of length and credit.

In Part II a comparison is made of the three most commonly used patterns of length (eight, twelve, and sixteen weeks) to the number of credits awarded for each. It clearly indicates that the number of credits awarded increases as the number of weeks increases. For example, the combination of eight weeks and option (b), five to seven credits, is currently used by 35 per cent of the MDST, 9 per cent of the NDST, and 8 per cent of the MDST desire it for future use. When compared to twelve weeks, only 5 per cent of the MDST considered it a desirable practice; and it is not used currently in Massachusetts or at the national level. In the case of sixteen weeks, 10 per cent of the MDST desire it, and only 2 per cent of the NDST and 0 per cent of the MDST reported it as a current practice. However, when option (d), eleven to thirteen credits, is compared to these lengths, the results are quite different. Only 1 per cent of the NDST and 3 per cent of the MDST report it as a current practice, and

TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF CREDITS AWARDED AND LENGTH OF TRAINING

Part I
Summary of Length of Training (Table 16)

Length	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	NDST CP %
a. 8 or less weeks	61	11	35
b. 12 weeks	18	13	27
c. 16 or more weeks	21	73	38

Part II
Comparison of Credits Awarded and Length of Training

Group Practice	Length		Credits 2-4 %	5-7 %	8-10 %	11-13 %	14-16 %
MDST	CP	8-	13	35	10	3	0
MDST	PP	8-	3	8	0	0	0
NDST	CP	8-	2	9	22	1	1
MDST	CP	12	0	0	13	5	0
MDST	PP	12	0	5	8	0	0
NDST	CP	12	0	0	3	23	1
MDST	CP	16+	0	0	0	13	8
MDST	PP	16+	0	10	10	41	13
NDST	CP	16+	1	2	10	9	16

none of the MDST indicated it desirable when used with eight weeks. When combined with twelve weeks, 5 per cent of the MDST and 23 per cent of the NDST currently use it, and 0 per cent of the MDST desire it. Currently, 13 per cent of the MDST, 9 per cent of the NDST, and 41 per cent of the MDST desire the combination of sixteen weeks and eleven to thirteen credits. In summary, there tends to be an increase in the number of semester hours of credit awarded, as the length of student teaching increases, regardless of whether it is a proposed or a current practice. This table accounts for the great amount of variability in Table 20 concerning only the number of credits awarded.

An interesting factor disclosed by this comparison is that the NDST tend to award more credits for the eight-and twelve-week patterns when compared to the MDST. When the eight-week plan is used, MDST tend to award five to seven credits, and the NDST tend to award eight to ten credits. The twelve-week pattern reveals that the NDST tend to award eleven to thirteen credits and the MDST eight to ten credits. The MDST tend to award eleven to thirteen credits with the sixteen-week pattern, but the NDST are split over the use of eight to ten, eleven to thirteen, and fourteen to sixteen credits.

Table 22 is composed of two parts. Part I is a breakdown of the number of observations of a student teacher made by the college supervisor during training. Part II is a

TABLE 22

OBSERVATIONS AND LENGTH OF TRAINING

Part I
Number of Observations of Student Teachers Made by College Supervisors

Observations	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	NDST CP %
a. 1-3	60	18	16	13
b. 4-6	35	55	35	49
c. 7-9	7	28	28	18
d. 10-12	0	9	3	13
e. 13-16	0	0	13	6
f. 32-64	0	0	5	1

Part II
Comparison of Number of Observations to Length of Training

Group	Practice	Length	Observations 1-3 %	4-6 %	7-9 %	10-12 %	13-16 %	32-64 %
MDST	CP	8-	35	19	7	0	0	0
MDST	PP	8-	3	3	5	0	0	0
MSS	PP	8-	3	7	9	0	0	0
NDST	CP	8-	9	12	14	0	0	0
MDST	CP	12+	25	14	0	0	0	0
MDST	PP	12+	15	52	13	9	0	0
MSS	PP	12+	13	28	19	3	13	5
NDST	CP	12+	4	37	4	13	6	1

comparison of the number of observations to the length of training.

In Part I, presently, 60 per cent of the MDST use option (a), one to three observations, but only 18 per cent indicate their desire to continue using only one to three observations. The proposed practices of the MDST and the current practices of the NDST tend to be in agreement that there should be more than three observations, and they both tend to prefer option (b), four to six observations, but seem more variable in their responses of how much more. Although the groups are somewhat similar in their responses, the variability is great as the number of observations ranges from one to sixty-four. In other words, there is more variability within than between the groups.

Part II was designed to see if those indicating more observations were also using a longer training period, and it is quite obvious that it does. For example, 25 per cent of the MDST indicated the combined plan of sixteen weeks and one to three observations, and 14 per cent the plan of sixteen weeks and four to six or more observations. The proposed program of the MDST indicates only 15 per cent desire the sixteen-week and one to three observation plan, while 52 per cent indicated they would use the combined sixteen-week, four to six observation plan, and 71 per cent the sixteen-

week and four or more observation approach. The proposed combinations of the MDST are in line with the MSS and the NDST. The NDST indicated that only 4 per cent currently use the combination of sixteen weeks and one to three observations; 35 per cent use sixteen weeks and four to six observations; while 61 per cent use a plan of sixteen weeks and four or more observations. Only 13 per cent of the MSS prefer sixteen weeks and one to three observations; 20 per cent indicated sixteen weeks and four to six observations; and 65 per cent, the sixteen weeks and four or more observations plan.

The overall table reveals the following:

1. There is agreement between the proposed practices of the MDST and the MSS and the current practices of the NDST that the length of training should be longer than the present trend of eight weeks in Massachusetts.
2. The proposed practices of the MDST and the MSS are similar to those at the national level, calling for more observations than the current trend in Massachusetts of from one to three observations.
3. There is a trend, regardless of whether it is a proposed or current practice, for those requiring eight or less weeks of training to use fewer observations than those requiring sixteen weeks. This accounts for much of the dispersion or variability in Part II of this table.

Table 23 involves the current and proposed practices concerning the responsibility for the evaluation of student teachers.

TABLE 23

RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Criteria	MDST CP %	MDST PP %	MSS PP %	MDST CP %
a. College supervisor only	20	5	1	10
b. Director of student teaching	5	3	0	0
c. Cooperating teacher only	0	0	1	0
d. Equal	18	74	70	63
e. Mostly college supervisor	50	11	5	21
f. Mostly cooperating teacher	7	3	20	6
g. No comment	0	4	0	0
N -	38	38	189	92

Options (a) and (b) are listed separately but are quite similar in nature. Option (a) refers to the college supervisor only marking the student teacher, and option (b) indicates that the director of student teaching would be the sole judge, after averaging evaluations of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor. Currently, these two options (a and b) combined indicate that 25 per cent of the MDST use this approach, but only 8 per cent of the MDST and 1 per cent of the MSS indicated their desire to use it. This low desir-

low desirability of the MDST and MSS is similar to the current trend reported by the NDST (10 per cent). Option (c) is the reverse of option (a) as it means that the cooperating teacher is the sole judge of the grade. None of the directors at either level indicated this to be a desirable or current practice, and only 1 per cent of the MSS prefer this pattern.

Options (e) and (f) are also quite similar in nature. Option (e) means that the college supervisor would rate the student teacher but would take the evaluation of the cooperating teacher into consideration. Currently, 50 per cent of the MDST use option (e), but this does not reflect eitherthe proposed patterns of the MDST (11 per cent) and the MSS (5 per cent) or the current trend at the national level (21 per cent). Option (f) is the opposite of option (e); that is, the cooperating teacher has more to say about the final grade than the college supervisor. This seems to be neither a current nor a desirable practice by all three groups: MDST, CP, 7 per cent; MDST, PP, 3 per cent; MSS, PP, 20 per cent; and NDST, CP, 6 per cent.

The pattern of equal weight and responsibility of both the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher is reflected in option (d). The current practices of the NDST (63 per cent) and the proposed practices of the MDST (74 per cent) and the MSS (70 per cent) are quite similar, but are in contrast with the current practices in Massachusetts.

Only 18 per cent of the MDST reported currently using a joint but equal responsibility pattern in the evaluation of student teachers.

The table generally reflects that:

1. when options (e) and (f) are used, directors tend to slightly favor more weight for the college supervisor (option e) and superintendents more weight for the cooperating teacher (option f); and
2. all three groups prefer the use of equal evaluation (option d), but this is not the current practice in Massachusetts.

Table 24 is concerned with unique programs or innovations the participants have developed or observed. Only about 25 per cent of the participants answered this question, but they revealed some interesting innovations in teacher education.

TABLE 24

UNIQUE PROGRAMS

b. Resident or Center Coordinator

a. Student Teaching Center

c. Student Teaching Advisory Council

f. State Department of Education Involvement

g. State Association Involvement (e.g., AST or TEPS)

d. Clinical Professor

e. Regional Intercollege and School Center

Response (a) usually implies the clustering of student teachers in one or more buildings within one school system. Sometimes in this type of program, the college and public school systems jointly appoint a coordinator (response b) to implement the smooth operation of the student teaching center. The student teaching advisory council (response c) refers to a highly organized cooperative program. It is usually one in which every aspect of the student teaching program is cooperatively planned and evaluated by a committee consisting of both college and public school personnel. The use of response (d), a clinical professor, usually implies the use of public school personnel in teaching method courses or seminars for student teachers. The regional intercollege and school center approach (response e) means a cooperative program among several colleges and school systems. Most of these have been established, first of all, to eliminate the competition of several colleges in the same area for the so-called better school systems and, secondly, to standardize somewhat the student teaching programs so that school systems and cooperating teachers are not faced with perhaps five completely different sets of requirements from five different colleges. The use of responses (f) and (g), state department of education or state associations, are similar but yet very different. Response (f), state department of education involvement, usually implies the establishment of laws concerning such areas as length of student teaching, credentials

for cooperating teachers, reimbursement to cooperating teachers, etc. Response (g) state association involvement, usually implies that the state professional association (e.g., AST) establishes its own minimum or uniform standards which will usually prevent the need and, therefore, the establishment of state laws governing these areas.

It should be pointed out that most of the participants used several responses in the establishment of their cooperative programs. Operative examples of the preceding programs may be found in Appendix D.

The first part of Table 25 is a review of Table 2, Part I. It indicates that 77 per cent of the colleges at the national level either provide or are in the process of developing a program of systematic planning and evaluation, but only 10 per cent of the MDST reported the current use of such a program. Part II yields a completely different picture, as 90 per cent of the MDST and 97 per cent of the MSS expressed the desirability of this type of program.

Part III deals with the area of anticipated functions and/or rules of such a program. Generally, the participants indicated it should result in cooperatively developed ideal student teaching programs with continuous evaluation. Most of the responses were of a general nature and were incorporated into the preceding statement. A few of the participants added examples of specific areas, and these are also listed in the table. Most of these were defined, and

TABLE 25

CURRENT AND PROPOSED PROVISIONS FOR COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS--COMPENDIUM OF ANTICIPATED FUNCTIONS AND/OR ROLES OF COOPERATIVE PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Part I

Review of Table 2, Part I--Current Provisions

Group	Provision %	No Provision %	Development Stage %	N
NDST	53	23	24	92
MDST	10	90	0	38

Part II

Review of Table 2, Part II--Proposed Provisions

Group	Desire %	No Desire %	N
MDST	90	10	38
MSS	97	3	189

Part III

General: Cooperatively Developed Ideal Student Teaching Programs--Compendium of Anticipated Functions and/or Roles of Cooperative Planning and Evaluation

1. Student teaching centers
2. Student teaching advisory council
3. Clinical professors
4. Excellent communications
5. Joint planning by several colleges and school systems
6. Higher professional standards
7. Sharing of facilities and equipment
8. Increase in the quality and quantity of cooperating
9. Mutual gains through cooperative constructive criticism
10. Better prepared teachers
11. State and/or federal aid
12. Establishment of minimum standards in some areas (e.g., length of training)
13. Standardization of some areas (e.g., handbook)

examples appear in Table 24.

Part I of Table 26 is a review of Table 2, Part III. This goes one step beyond the desirability of a program of systematic planning and evaluation, since it involves the willingness to meet to discuss implementation of a program(s). Over 90 per cent of both groups stated a willingness to participate.

The second part of this table describes the various suggestions made to initiate action. Options (a) and (b) indicate that only 9 per cent thought it should be initiated by either the area or state superintendents' association. Option (c) means that 20 per cent felt that it should be initiated by the state association of directors, and 18 per cent (option d) indicated that the initiative should be by the individual colleges. Option (e) appears to be the most desirable as 53 per cent of the participants selected it. This plan would bring together key personnel to lay the groundwork for implementation of sound cooperative planning and evaluation programs.

TABLE 26

WILLINGNESS TO MEET TO DISCUSS IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS--SUGGESTED PLANS TO INITIATE THE MEETING

Part I

Willingness to Meet to Discuss Implementation of Cooperative Programs (Review of Table 2, Part III)

Group	Yes %	No %	N
MDST	90	10	38
MSS	95	5	189

Part II

Suggestions to Accomplish the Meeting

Suggestion	All Groups %
a. Initiative should be by Area Superintendents Associations.	6
b. Initiative should be by State Superintendents Associations.	3
c. Initiative should be by Massachusetts Association for Student Teaching.	26
d. Initiative should be by individual colleges, not area or state wide.	12
e. Cooperative meeting of key personnel from all groups to lay the groundwork for cooperative programs.	53
N -	195

Summary

The study revealed that:

1. the current practices in Massachusetts concerning most administrative aspects of student teaching programs are quite variable -- BUT-the proposed practices of the MSS and MDST are quite similar and they differ markedly from the current status;
2. the proposed practices of the MSS and MDST are quite similar to the current status of colleges at the national level which presently have cooperatively developed student teaching programs;
3. only 10 percent of the colleges in Massachusetts presently have cooperative student teaching programs -- BUT-over 90 percent of the MSS and MDST not only desire, but are willing to meet to implement sound cooperative student teaching programs.

The significant point of this study is that the profession in Massachusetts (college and public school personnel) is dissatisfied with the current status of teacher education, and is desirous and willing to cooperatively implement change.

The following is a "model" of what the three groups recommended:

1. The selection of cooperating school systems should

be based upon:

a. quality of staff,

b. instructional materials available,

c. cooperation of community administrators, and

d. proximity (with reservations).

2. The selection and assignment of cooperating teachers should be accomplished cooperatively by college and public school personnel.

3. The minimum qualifications of cooperating teachers should be:

a. a Master's degree desirable but not essential, and

b. three years of experience.

4. The minimum qualifications for college supervisors should be:

a. a Master's degree required, and

b. three years of teaching experience, with experience as an administrator and/or cooperating teacher highly desirable.

5. Reimbursement should be made to cooperating teachers in the form of a cash honorarium.

6. The orientation of student teachers should be handled by the public school system and should be consistent with that provided regular teachers.

7. All new cooperating teachers should be required to

take part in a workshop or course in the supervision of student teachers. This orientation program should be co-sponsored by college and public school personnel.

8. A handbook should be developed which would specifically define the roles of all personnel involved in the preparation of teachers.

9. The maximum number of student teachers assigned to a cooperating teacher at one time should be limited to one.

10. The number of student teachers considered to be the equivalent of a full teaching load is difficult to determine since in some cases they may all be clustered in one building and in another case spread over eight towns.

11. Colleges should not hesitate to use nonpublic schools if they are highly desirable training stations or if the student desires this experience.

12. Student teaching should be completed during the senior year.

13. The minimum length of student teaching should be sixteen weeks and experience provided at two different levels.

14. Twelve semester hours of credit should be awarded for student teaching.

15. The ratio of teaching to observation should be equal for most students, with deviates to receive more or less teaching depending upon their rate of growth. Programs should consist of mostly observation at the beginning, and eventually

allow the student teacher to take over the complete teaching assignment over an extended period of time.

16. Each student teacher should be observed a minimum of ten times by the college supervisor during training.

17. The final evaluation of the student teacher should be arrived at cooperatively by the college and public school personnel involved, each sharing equal weight and responsibility.

18. Since these will be cooperatively developed programs, the author recommends that the use of student teaching centers and resident coordinators be seriously considered.

Recommendations

The author recommends that a statewide coordinating or advisory council be established. The formation of such a council will serve to illustrate that the profession in Massachusetts is not so complacent that it is willing to wait for new legislation, new certification patterns, or to rely completely on the research findings of others, but is a profession very much interested in the preparation of its future members. The pruposes of this council would be to:

1. study and make recommendations on all aspects of student teaching;
2. coordinate but not necessarily unify programs;
3. work in an advisory, not an administrative, capacity;

4. serve as a clearinghouse of information pertaining to student teaching both at the state and national levels; and

5. encourage research and help develop the best designs, as well as eliminate duplication.

The membership of the council should include representatives from the following:

1. All member colleges
2. Massachusetts Association for Student Teaching
3. Massachusetts State Department of Education--Elementary Division
4. Massachusetts State Department of Education--Division of Certification
5. Massachusetts State Department of Education--Division of Research and Statistics
6. Massachusetts Superintendents Association--Subcommittee on Teacher Education
7. Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association--Subcommittee on Teacher Education
8. Cooperating teachers

Each college should establish a committee consisting of college personnel and representatives from all their cooperating school systems. This committee should actively work together in planning, administering, and evaluating student teaching programs, and thus make the preparation of

teachers a truly cooperative venture. In situations where several colleges are in close proximity, the development of an inter-regional committee consisting of these colleges and the cooperating systems should be seriously considered.