DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 736 SP 003 415

AUTHOR	Bebb, Aldon M.; Monson, Jay A.
TITLE	A New Model for the Supervision of Student Teaching.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Tri-University Project in Elementary Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	22p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20
DESCRIPTORS	College School Cooperation, *College Supervisors, *Cooperating Teachers, Inservice Teacher Education, Models, *Practicum Supervision, *Student Teaching, *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

A pilot inservice training program for supervising (cooperating) teachers was planned in which traditional roles were modified. It was theorized that decentralization of the responsibility for supervision of student teaching would allow better utilization of the college supervisor's training and time, opportunity for inservice growth and increased professionalization for the supervising teachers, and more relevant supervision for student teachers. The focal point of the plan was the acceptance by the supervising teacher of the major responsibility for guiding the professional growth of the student teacher. College supervisors did not observe student teachers or confer with supervising teachers except as invited consultants. Instead they conducted weekly seminars for supervising teachers (during a half day of released time) to provide knowledge and skill development in effective student teacher supervision. Typical seminar topics were role expectations, conference techniques, behavioral objectives, verbal and nonverbal interaction analysis systems, and student teacher evaluation. College supervisors also conducted weekly or bi-weekly seminars for student teachers for application of methods and curriculum background and discussion of problems they faced. An instrument utilizing the critical incident technique and two questionnaires were developed to evaluate the program; overall findings indicated that general reactions by both teachers and students were consistently favorable.

A NEW MODEL FOR THE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING

by

Aldon M. Bebb
Kansas State College of Pittsburg
Pittsburg, Kansas

and

Jay A. Monson
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

This study was conducted within the Tri-University Project in Elementary Education at New York University, 1968-1969. Sponsored by the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is given to the following persons and groups whose cooperation and participation in the pilot study contributed to its success:

Postdoctoral participants at Westfield Field Center:

Aldon Bebb
Gladys Collins
John Lorton
Jay A. Monson
Howard Munson
Bernard Meiring

Tri-University staff at Westfield Field Center:

George Manolakes, Director
Blanche Persky, Westfield Coordinator
Nancy Modiano, Assistant Coordinator

Westfield School District Personnel:

Marie J. Scian, Coordinator of Elementary Education
Shirley Neibart, Tri-University-Westfield Coordinator
Thomas J. Mullen, Audiovisual Coordinator

Special thanks are given to the supervising teachers from the Westfield School District and the student teachers who participated in this program.

Introduction

There probably has never been a period in the history of teacher education when there is such a ferment of ideas as there is at the present time. Segments of the profession whose attention has been focused elsewhere are becoming involved. Large numbers of students are enrolling in teacher education programs, new technology is coming into more general use, and the competence of teachers is being investigated in many parts of the nation. Research is making available more accurate and more useful information about teaching as well as about the learning process. That "grand finale" of the professional sequence, student teaching, (and other portions of the laboratory experiences) has increasingly come into scrutiny and analysis.[1]

It is the purpose of this paper to deal with that phase of the professional preparation of teachers known as student teaching and more specifically, with the problem of supervising student teachers. Even a cursory review of the professional literature dealing with student teaching reveals a tremendous number of plans and ideas for conducting the program of student teaching, each stipulating its specific theories, objectives, and purposes. Incorporated in these programs are many theories and ideas concerning how the supervisory procedures should be organized and conducted. But, amid all the disagreement, there is almost total agreement as Conant found in his study of "The Education of American Teachers" that ". . . before being entrusted with complete control of a public school classroom, a teacher should have had opportunities under close guidance and supervision actually to teach. . ."[2] There is almost nationwide agreement that student teaching experience is one of the most important, if not the most important, phase in the preparation of the teacher.[3] There is also a consensus that the neophyte should begin to apply his learnings from the college classrooms under the helpful guidance of a well-educated, experienced, and successful teacher. In the history of the development of student teaching, never has there been so much emphasis placed on the importance of those who supervise and so many innovations in plans for conducting the supervision.

---

[1]Hans C. Olsen, "Innovation in Supervision Today," Partnership in Teacher Education: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and The Association for Student Teaching, Published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 1966, p. 229.

[2]James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963, p. 59.

[3]National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Who's in Charge Here? Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching. Discussion Paper. Washington, D.C., the Commission, 1966, p. 1.

I. An Analysis of the Functions and Roles of Supervision

When taking a close look at the field of supervision in student teaching, there are a number of questions being raised and many more which should be raised. Of all the positions in teacher education today, that of the college supervisor is the one most under attack for being redundant and therefore unnecessary. If some critics of present day teacher education had their way, the role of college supervisor would be eliminated.[4] This may be an over exaggeration, but there is enough ferment regarding college supervision for teacher educators to take a considered look at the role to see if it is a defensible and necessary position in the program of teacher education, or at least whether a redefinition of the role is needed. What is a college supervisor by definition? Is his role important enough to warrant its existence? Can he do something for the student teaching program which the classroom supervising teacher and other school personnel cannot do? Could the classroom teacher incorporate these functions into his role? Is the financing of proper college supervision, which is one of the most costly aspects of a college program in teacher education, worth the expenditure? For this one reason alone, there needs to be a reassessment of the role.

For these indictments it should not be concluded there is no longer a need for college representation and involvement in the program. There seems to be a clear indication of opinion among educators that college involvement in some form or other should very definitely remain a part of the total plan for the supervision of student teaching or any other form of internship. As long as the college continues to be the main agent for approving individuals for certification, then the college is obligated to stay in the field.

Another prime contribution of the college is the advancement of knowledge even though the community would have it stress professional service. Translating these concepts into educational terms, the college should involve itself in real school situations in such a way that it advances knowledge on one hand and performs service on the other. The operation is economically and efficiently sound when both functions are achieved simultaneously. It then seems obvious that the college representative is necessary as an agent of the college, but perhaps his role should be altered somewhat as is indicated by the major thesis of this paper.

---

[4]E. Brooks Smith, "The Case for the College Supervisor," The College Supervisor--Conflict and Challenge. Forty-Third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1964, p. 132.

New roles for the college supervisor cannot be viewed without turning attention to the laboratory for teacher education, the public school. It is a well-established fact that the public schools of America are a definite partner in the plan for teacher training. Statistics reveal that currently more than 150,000 regular classroom teachers cooperate with nearly 1,200 colleges to provide student teaching experiences for more than 200,000 students.[5]

Educators responsible for the preparation of student teachers have displayed increasing concern for the role of the public school in the program of student teaching. This concern is expressed by way of the many questions those involved in teacher education are asking. The specific questions are numerous and varied, but in the main they have asked: How can a truly cooperative partnership be developed between teacher preparing institutions and the public schools? In such a partnership, how should the respective roles and responsibilities of key personnel (principals, teachers, and college supervisors) be defined? To quote from the Forty-Third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching:

> "Attention has been focused on this problem by at least two factors. First, the rapid growth of public education since World War II has placed increasing demands upon the colleges to prepare even larger numbers of teachers. The colleges, in their efforts to meet these demands, have had to continuously increase their utilization of off-campus schools for student teaching. The broader use of public schools has resulted in a heightened interest in defining their role in the total program of teacher education. Secondly, it is obvious to many observers that the public schools have reached a new level of professional maturity, are staffed with well-prepared teachers, and display an increased responsibility for the education of teachers."[6]

It is clearly evident that the public schools have had and will continue to play a vital part in the process of preparing

---

[5]National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Who's in Charge Here? Fixing Responsibility for Student Teaching. Discussion Paper. Washington, D. C., the Commission, 1966, p. 1.

[6]Glenn Hontz, "Redefining Roles in the Supervision of Student Teachers," The College Supervisor--Conflict and Challenge: Forty-Third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1964, p. 132.

teachers. Without a doubt there is a great need for continued study of how the partnership role of the colleges and public schools could and should be performed, what responsibilities each should assume in relation to its capabilities, and how the personnel involved should be prepared for their function. Closer school and college relationships are imperative. New mechanisms and new structures are being formed rapidly. These new structures call for new roles and fundamental rearrangements of responsibilities. Schools are finding their way toward including teacher education as a primary, high-priority function. Customary arrangements for student teaching are being remodeled here and there. Student teaching in the old form is becoming increasingly ineffective and impossible. For change to become progress, the ferment in teacher education needs full cooperation of schools and colleges and a fundamental review of purposes, functions, roles, and responsibilities.

While the nature and scope of the work of the college supervisor has undergone considerable change over the years, the central charge to the college supervisor has been, and is, to facilitate continuity of the professional sequence in student teaching and to facilitate continuity of student teaching in those aspects of professional education that follow.[7] Obviously, while different college supervisors have demonstrated widely different competence in realizing the goal of continuity, the goal itself came into being with the initial establishment of the position of college supervision of student teaching. Over the years, its dimensions have been extended and its achievement has become increasingly difficult as the number of schools involved in student teaching has increased and the scope of student teaching activities has expanded.

A second purpose or goal important to the role of the college supervisor is to facilitate the efforts of two staffs working in partnership and jointly contributing to the education of teachers.[8]

Again, the college supervisor's role is that of articulation, in this case, of two professional groups. These two major purposes need not be mutually exclusive, and indeed, should not be. While these stated purposes are fundamentals of college supervision, the question does need to be asked: In terms of current findings in the behavioral sciences and in the analysis of the teaching process itself, what new guidelines emerge for the college supervisor as he seeks to make his contribution to providing high-level learning opportunities for student teachers?

---

[7]Florence B. Stratemeyer, "The College Supervisor--Guidelines for Action," The College Supervisor--Conflict and Challenge, Forty-Third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1964, p. 149.

[8]Ibid., p. 150

II. Other Factors Contributing to a Need for Redefinition of Roles in the Supervisory Program

A careful look at various practices and conditions in the total supervisory program for student teaching reveals a need for new roles and responsibilities for the personnel involved.

A. Status

When thinking of the hierarchy of college positions, that of the college supervisor often lacks status. It is not often that full or associate professors are found in this position. The common practice seems to be to assign assistant professors and instructors as supervisors of student teaching. The practice in many graduate schools of using doctoral candidates to supervise student teachers underrates the importance of the responsibilities of this all important task. It is not an uncommon practice to find retired public school personnel used to supervise student teaching. It is easy to speculate how often these procedures have contributed to the practice of using student teaching as a stepping stone to another position for many individuals.

B. A Frustrating Experience

An all too common procedure used by most colleges is to assign the supervisor a certain number of student teachers, often more than can be effectively supervised, and place them in various schools or even school systems. Much of the supervisor's time is spent traveling, meeting, and greeting school people as the different schools are visited, holding short and unsatisfactory conferences with the student teacher and the supervisory teacher, then rushing on to the next school. This is followed by a trip back to campus or his home at the close of day, only to be repeated for the next several days. This procedure leaves supervisors exhausted and frustrated for they do not feel a real sense of accomplishment nor can they see real change taking place in public education nor teacher education. If the college supervisor has real innovations to make in teaching, the public school is not the place to make them known when he is only a guest in the school system. Every college supervisor has had the experience of discussing the results of an observation with a student teacher, knowing that he is discussing the plans, methods, and ideas of the supervising teacher rather than those of the student teacher.

Equally often, the student teacher is put on the spot and becomes a pawn for changes the college supervisor would like to see made, but to the supervising teacher may not seem practical.

C. A Question of Qualification

The college supervisor, because of the nature of his duties, has often been out of touch for sometime with children and youth and the classroom environment; therefore, is not the best qualified person to be doing direct supervision. Recall the college supervisor who does not orient himself adequately to the classroom and school situation, makes proposals that are presently unrealistic for the particular situation, and does not consider with either the student or the supervising teacher how and under what conditions steps might be taken to try out the given idea or proposal.

D. The Connotation of Supervisor

Despite the attempts of modern educators to redefine the role of a supervisor in democratic terms, the popular connotation of "snoopervisor" persists. The new meaning has even a more limited acceptance when tied with "college." Again, it retains some of its popular meaning because of the theory-versus-practice debate. Add to this the unfortunate status difference prevalent in our society and classroom teacher between college teacher and the effect of the popular connotation is compounded resulting often in feelings of resentment. For this very reason, the college supervisor must practice all measure of caution when desiring to create change in the school situation where the student teacher is working.

E. Roles in Conflict

In our present plan of working with student teachers where the college supervisor does some observing and supervising and the classroom teacher does even more, there is often room for conflict and difference of opinion. Rather than placing the representatives of theory in conflict with the representatives of practice, why not put them to work in

concert, one contributing to the wisdom of the other?[9] Both are teachers and educators, and members of one profession. Each member is responsible for the initiation of the novice into the profession. Since no one person can be expected to know everything about the theory and practice of teaching, then we should divide the responsibilities of teacher preparation according to resources, talents, and experience. The role for each supervisor as proposed in this study will be delineated more clearly and placed in its rightful position.

F. Lack of Continuity

Due to the nature of their schedule, college supervisors, for the most part, do not visit their student teachers on an average of more than every other week with a total of three, and possibly four, observations. He is inadequately equipped to give specific help to the student teacher because of the infrequency of his visits and the lack of knowledge of what happens between visits. Likewise, the college supervisor is handicapped in his observations by a lack of knowledge concerning the children, the school program, and the expectations of the supervising teacher. The supervising teacher in the classroom would seem to be in a much better position to supervise and direct the learning of the student teacher because he knows the children in his class, better understands the program of the school, and can best determine the type of instruction which is best suited to the situation. He is also in the best position to provide continuous, specific, and individualized help to the student teacher with his unique, day-to-day problems of teaching.

III. The Need to Teach Teachers How to Study Teaching

Changes in the field of education with the last decade have opened up a new area of study that focuses on the process of teaching, and should have profound influence on the process of

---

[9]E. Brooks Smith, "The Case for the College Supervisor," The College Supervisor--Conflict and Challenge. Forty-Third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1964, p. 172.

supervising student teachers. This area of study is to be distinguished from other efforts focusing on teacher personality traits, on teacher effectiveness, and on how people learn. This expression of interest in understanding the nature of teaching has taken many forms because of the diversity of the people who constitute the investigators. Several investigators have identified and developed important variables and strategies to the point where immediate use of them is possible. Teachers can: (a) begin to use and test selected logical dimensions in their daily teaching; (b) define and test certain strategies for cognitive growth; (c) identify, program, and test selected pedagogical moves for teaching; and (d) propose and test ideas on inquiry. This means that analysis of classroom interaction can be accomplished with a relatively high degree of accuracy after training. The shift from studying teaching effectiveness and teacher personality to analyzing the teaching process itself, brings the hope that this approach will yield clues to what constitutes effectiveness. Studying teaching directs teachers to look for the significant in the interaction between teacher and pupil. Once teaching is viewed as an interaction process, the content, methods and materials, media, and evaluation aspects of teaching gain a new vitality. They become means by which a teacher creates conditions which help students learn. Viewing and analyzing the classroom group, school, or school system can place values, goals, and expectations in proper prospective for effective learning and behavioral change.

The systematic study of teaching is fascinating in itself. It can stand alone as a subject of inquiry. But, in a program of teacher education, it is but one important phase of a total program, and is meaningful only if it leads to more appropriate behavior on the part of the teacher. It opens a whole new field of inquiry that will give supervision new vitality and purpose. Supervision will now become relevant and important in a new light which in turn will call for new roles for supervisors of student teaching.

IV. New Dimensions for the Supervisory Conference

There is no question about the importance of the supervisory conference in student teaching when it comes to guiding the future teacher. It is a potentially powerful way of guiding professional growth. Skillfully conducted, it is the most immediately useful and available method of giving the student the help he needs. There is, however, a great lack of knowledge of how to confer with student teachers on important dimensions of their teaching. Too often, supervisors have given the most attention to peripheral matters, such as, appearance, mannerisms, gestures, and the like, to the exclusion of more important matters of teaching and learning. The end result is that the classroom practitioner tends to operate at this relatively low level of professional sophistication unless carried beyond this level. Recent research identifies and provides much more accurate and detailed knowledge about these central behaviors, such as, questioning, controlling, responding to questions, and so on.

Lindsey and McGeoch, among others, point to this need to add new dimension to the supervisory conference:

> "The individualized teaching which takes place in the supervisory conference tends to rely upon giving general, rather than specific, help and upon the subjective, rather than the objective, analysis of performance by student teachers. Emphasis tends to be upon emotional climate in the classroom, on rapport between pupils and student teachers, and on personality factors. Desirable as they emphases are, they have often been disproportionate in relation to other dimensions of the teaching-learning situation. That practice can be justifiably so characterized is due neither to unwillingness nor lack of concern on the part of those who work with student teachers. It is clearly due to lack of knowledge of how to work with student teachers on some important dimensions of their teaching."[10]

With this new knowledge being made available to programs on the study of teaching at the preservice level, and college supervisors working with supervising teachers to transmit this information and skill as suggested in this paper, the supervisory conference should take on new dimension and purpose. Supervising teachers will have new knowledge and skill that will enable them to focus their attention and activities more on the central matters of teaching as they confer with their student teachers.

If the supervisory conference is to take on new life, certain conditions must prevail: (1) a desire for change on the part of the student teacher and the supervising teacher, (2) a climate of support in the laboratory situation for both parties, and (3) a system which objectively describes and records what occurs in the classroom and which can be used by the student teacher and supervisor for feedback at the time of the conference.

V. A Plan for Action

It seems quite evident that the study of teaching has far-reaching implications for the future of teacher education with the ultimate goal being that of improving our total educational system. Teaching implies action or behavior. Since teaching is behavior, it can be studied systematically. Student teaching programs should offer opportunites for self-appraisal of the appropriateness of various styles of teaching for accomplishing specific objectives.

---

[10]Margaret Lindsey and Dorothy McGeoch, "Supervisory Conferences and the Analysis of Teaching," The Study of Teaching, Dean Corrigan, editor. The Association for Student Teaching, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., 1967, p. 64.

Student teaching should be thought of as a time to study teaching as well as practice teaching. The study of teaching requires specialized skills. Prospective teachers can learn these skills, and college supervisors can be trained to help preservice and inservice teachers to analyze behavior. Teacher education programs, therefore, must include experiences which prepare preservice teachers in the study and practice of teaching as well as experiences which prepare supervising teachers in the study and practice of better supervision.

The big question is how to get this new emphasis in our present teacher training program. Until such time that classrooms are staffed with teachers who have had such training, present teaching staffs must have the opportunity for this kind of experience. One of the solutions to the problem of training classroom teachers in analysis systems, so they in turn can be more effective with their student teachers, would be for college supervisors to provide this training for classroom supervising teachers while the student teacher is assigned in the classroom. Soon a staff of supervising teachers would be available in the schools that could work with student teachers in the process of studying teaching. Since such study is already a part of many teacher training programs and will become even more so, the supervising teacher and the student teacher would reinforce each other and become a team in the process of learning how to identify and use conceptual models in the study of teaching. School principals and other staff members should also become involved in how to study teaching.

This type of program appears to have many factors in its favor. (1) The college supervisor would be freed of the present plan of supervising student teachers and become a teacher and supervisor of classroom supervising teachers. The college staff member would then perform a job more in keeping with his training and position and become the key person in promoting the professional growth of the supervising teacher. (2) The college supervisor would be more in a position to affect change in teaching and consequently in public education than under the present method of dropping in now and then to see a student teacher. The study and analysis of teaching should have far reaching implications for improving the American educational system. (3) The college supervisor would no longer be looked upon as a "snoopervisor" coming around to inspect the classroom to see if things are going smoothly. (4) The supervising teacher would be elevated to his rightful position and fully in charge of supervising the student teacher. How many times have supervising teachers said to their student teachers, "We will wait until next week when the college supervisor comes to see what he will say before we try this plan," or "What does the University of Centerville expect of me?" (5) Student teachers would no longer feel they are serving two masters, and that at times there was conflict between two points of view, one expressed by the supervising teacher and the other by the college supervisor. (6) School systems would become much more involved in the student teaching program and feel definite and clearly defined responsibility for the program. The entire staff of a school would be encouraged to become involved with the administrator of the school serving as coordinator. It is obvious in many cases that the public schools have reached a new level

of professional maturity, are staffed with many well-prepared teachers, and display increased feeling of responsibility for the education of teachers.

In this suggested pattern of supervision for student teachers, it is obvious that public school systems will need to assume much more responsibility for operating a program for the training of future teachers. This does not mean that the college or university can, nor should, relinquish its role of professional influence in the laboratory phase of teacher preparation. In fact, it must assume greater leadership in helping the public school systems become a vital force in teacher preparation as is provided for in the new role for a college supervisor.

The whole administrative team of a school system will need to become aware of how it can create an atmosphere for teacher training.[11] The principal in general is responsible for the educational leadership in each school. He sets the overall tone of the school, and his conception of what constitutes a good school will determine the range of laboratory experiences possible for the student teaching program. He should participate in the selection of well-qualified supervising teachers and assume an active role with the supervising teachers in planning the student teaching experiences. The development of appropriate professional relationships with the faculty, staff, pupils, and community should largely be under his direction, and he should be informed at all times about the progress of the student teacher. The principal should help student teachers become informed about school policy and the role they have in it.

It has been found that where the faculty has shown concern for the student teaching program everyone has profited.[12] Because of this influence of all faculty members in creating a total school environment for the professional growth of student teachers, it is essential that each faculty member define his role and function in the process. The professional responsibilities of the faculty and a program of action should be cooperatively planned. The plan for action would include consideration of what preparation the faculty can make before the student teachers arrive, how the faculty can get acquainted with the student teachers, and what are the professional responsibilities of the staff to the student teachers.

VI. A Pilot Inservice Training Program for Supervising Teachers

A. Introduction and Background

The Tri-University Project in Elementary Education was organized with the purpose of improving elementary school teacher

---

[11]Pauline Hilliard, Charles L. Durrance, Guiding Student Teaching Experiences, Bulletin Number One, Association for Student Teaching, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C., 1968, p. 4

[12]Ibid., p. 6

preparation programs. Universities included in the project are New York University, University of Nebraska, and the University of Washington. At each project center, twelve college teachers are afforded the opportunity to study individually and together concerning teacher training curriculums. At New York University (where this pilot study originated) the 1968-69 project included two public school field center components, one located at Great Neck, New York, and another at Westfield, New Jersey. Each field center component included eight student teachers (or interns) all of whom were liberal arts graduates especially selected to participate in the Tri-University program and who were working toward elementary teaching and master's degrees. The pilot program discussed in this paper was proposed and developed by six postdoctoral Tri-University participants at New York University who were assigned to the Westfield field center and charged with the responsibility of providing (among other things) a program of supervision of the eight Westfield student teachers.

In recognition of factors outlined in foregoing sections of this report, a decision was made by the participating professors and staff members working in the Westfield center to undertake a pilot study regarding the effects of redefinitions of roles of supervising teachers and college supervisors in student teaching programs.

As the pilot program reported here represented a departure from the established pattern of student teaching supervision at New York University (or for that matter, at a vast majority of colleges and universities across the nation), it was necessary to initially obtain the cooperation of the Westfield School District personnel and the Tri-University staff at N.Y.U. Both groups expressed immediate and continuing support throughout the pilot program.

B. Development of a Pilot Program

In the fall of 1968, the postdoctoral participants assigned to the Westfield center met together and outlined the rationale upon which this pilot program was based. This rationale formulated the framework for the development and implementation of the program.

Theoretical Assumptions Inherent in the Study

The pilot program was based upon certain assumptions concerning the roles of supervising teachers and college supervisors. These assumptions included the following:

The college supervisor:

--the supervision of student teachers is a time consuming and not a particularly rewarding task

--the one to one relationship demanded by the present scheme of supervision is not the most efficient use of professors' time

--the college supervisor can be more influential in improving the quality of student teaching experiences

by assisting supervising teachers in improving their knowledge and skills

The supervising teacher:
--is the "key" person in actual "on-the-job" supervision
--is in the most logical position to provide continuous, specific, and individualized help to the student teacher
--is a professional person who can acquire skill and understanding in supervision and assume major responsibility for such.

As an outgrowth of these assumptions, a pilot program was planned in which the college supervisor's role was changed from the traditional "visitor" and "inspector" to that of "teacher" and "invited consultant." As the focal point of the proposed plan, the supervising teacher was encouraged and expected to assume major responsibility for the actual supervision of the student teacher.

In summary, it was theorized that decentralization of the responsibility for supervision of student teaching would make possible opportunity for better utilization of the college supervisor's training and time, opportunity for inservice growth and increased professionalization for the supervising teachers, and opportunity for more relevant supervision for the student teachers themselves.

Public Schools and Personnel Involved

The quality of the schools and teachers involved and their cooperation in the development of the program were considered to be "key" factors in the pilot program.

All of the public schools involved were located in the Westfield, New Jersey, school district. Each school had been previously involved with student teachers and had worked with universities and colleges in the area on a "service" basis in their student teacher placement programs.

The teachers selected had volunteered to work with student teachers from the Tri-University Project. Each had participated in "traditional type" supervision programs with previous student teachers. The final selection of supervising teachers was made by the Westfield administrative staff in cooperation with Tri-University's Westfield coordinator.

Unique Characteristics of the Project Design

Four major features characterized the uniqueness of the pilot project and distinguished it from the usual program of student teaching supervision.

(1) Visits made to the school by the college supervisor for the purpose of observing the student and conferring individually with the supervising teacher were discontinued. However, it was emphasized that college supervisors were to remain "invited

consultants" and visit upon request by either student teacher or supervising teacher.

(2) The supervising teacher was given major responsibility for guiding the professional growth of the student teacher. Through the seminar training sessions, supervisory skills were identified, discussed, and simulated.

(3) Supervising teachers had an opportunity to try immediately, in a real situation, theoretical ideas obtained from the seminars. This practicum or laboratory facet of the study was considered an essential feature.

(4) Supervising teachers were given "equal voice" in planning inservice training seminar topics to be covered. The purpose of the seminars was to assist supervising teachers in increasing their effectiveness in supervision of student teachers.

C. Description of Program Procedures

Shortly after the beginning of the 1968-69 school year, the Tri-University postdoctoral participants and staff members responsible for student teachers at the Westfield center agreed to propose a pilot study of a new model for the supervision of student teaching. Although it was initially recognized that the size of the group of student teachers was small (eight), it was believed that a model might result which could be replicated by colleges and universities in improving supervisory programs in student teaching.

In December, 1969, Westfield school district administrators, the selected supervising teachers, and the Tri-U participating professors and staff met together to discuss the proposed project. Theoretical assumptions concerning the study and questions regarding its implementation were discussed. Supervising teachers, recognized as "key" personnel in the success or failure of the program, were asked to consider their willingness to participate in the study and to render a decision by the end of the following week. An affirmative reply was received.

In January, 1969, a planning meeting was held between college supervisors and supervising teachers. The meeting focused on a discussion of the topics for the inservice training sessions. Topics subsequently outlined included those suggested by college supervisors but were largely formulated by supervising teachers. A decision was made to begin the sessions the following week.

A meeting was held shortly thereafter with the student teachers to outline the proposed program. All students agreed to participate with the understanding that each could request a visit by his college supervisor at any time that such a visit was desired. He was further encouraged to contact the college supervisor by telephone whenever such contact was deemed desirable.

Inservice Training Seminars with Supervising Teachers

Inservice training seminars with supervising teachers were held each week for ten weeks. Meetings were held in the Westfield Curriculum Center on Thursday mornings. Arrangements were made by administrators to release supervising teachers from their classroom responsibilities on these mornings. The purpose of the seminars was to provide supervising teachers with the opportunity for knowledge and skill development in effective student teacher supervision.

The following are representative of the topics and problems dealt with:

--planning and expectations of roles
--conferencing and role playing
--establishing effective personal and working relationships
--goal setting and behavioral objectives
--questioning and measuring pupil attention
--observing behavior and recording of observations
--self-assessment, helping student teachers assess themselves
--developing basis for evaluation--verbal interaction analysis systems
--developing basis for evaluation--nonverbal interaction analysis systems
--evaluating student teacher progress

Seminars with Student Teachers

Student teaching seminars, under the direction of the college professors, were held weekly (and most often bi-weekly) at the Westfield Curriculum Center. These seminars were previously scheduled by the Tri-U staff for providing students with methods and curriculum background and its application in a school setting. Problems the students were facing were often discussed and attempts were made to assist them in other concerns as cooperatively determined.

Activities, Experiences, and Resources

As part of the pilot study, a wide range of activities, experiences, and resources were deployed. These included the following:

--lectures, discussions, demonstrations
--simulation, role playing
--use of printed materials--including publications of the Association for Student Teaching, professional magazines and journals, handbooks (student teaching), etc.
--use of video and audio tapes previously developed which had relevance for particular seminar topics
--use of video tapes, audio tapes and slides developed by college supervisors specifically for the pilot study
--video taping by individual supervising teachers and student teachers (most of which were analyzed by the respective groups)

--evaluative instruments as designed by college supervisors and completed by both the supervising teacher and student teacher groups.

Inasmuch as the pilot program was conducted "on-the-job," it was posited that the program of supervision and direction would be a continuing rather than a sporadic process. The above activities, experiences, and resources were aimed at realization of such a position.

D. Data and Instrumentation

It was recognized that the size of the group of student teachers in the pilot study was small. Nevertheless, an attempt was made to evaluate the program. Three non-parametric instruments were developed and administered. These instruments were as follows: (1) An instrument, utilizing the critical-incident-technique, was prepared and administered to the supervising teachers both prior to and at the conclusion of the seminar training sessions. (2) A questionnaire was designed to further gather reactions concerning various features of the program from the same group. Open-ended statements were used to allow supervising teachers maximum latitude in expressing reactions. This instrument was also administered prior to and at the conclusion of the seminar sessions. Both of the above-mentioned instruments were answered anonymously, but a four-digit-sequence remembrance-code was used for comparison purposes. It was thought that such a comparison would help determine whether a change had occurred in perceptions of the role of supervisor of student teachers. (3) A second questionnaire was developed and administered to the student teachers near the end of their anonymity. It attempted to involve the student teachers in making value judgments concerning change and emphasis in the supervision program as a result of the training seminars with supervising teachers.

General Findings

Overall findings indicated that general reaction to the program by the supervising teachers and student teachers were consistently favorable. There appeared to be general acceptance for the major features of the project, and considerable enthusiasm for certain specific aspects thereof.

Supervising Teacher Responses

The reactions of supervising teachers to the seminar training sessions were highly favorable. All were positive in nature and many used such words as "great" and "very worthwhile," in describing the training seminars. Among other specific benefits, they stated that the seminar sessions enabled them to "now enjoy and understand my role as a teacher of teachers," and to "grow professionally." Most teachers had initially indicated that their sole training for supervising student teachers was having had previous student teachers.

Three persons reported such training on the first questionnaire as "nil." In response to this same item on the concluding questionnaire, all of the supervising teachers expressed a feeling of personal improvement in their supervisory preparation.

Conclusions determined from data received from administering the four comparative instruments included the following:

--supervising teachers were highly favorable of the seminar training sessions
--supervising teachers reported the sessions to be the first "real" training for working with student teachers
--a better understanding of the practice of supervision seemed to result
--an improvement in supervising teacher-student teacher relationships was generally noted

Several supervising teachers commented that it would have been well to have had the student teachers occasionally participate in the seminar training sessions.

Student Teacher Responses

The student teachers reacted favorably to the pilot study. One of them felt a "team supervision between cooperating teacher and college supervisor would be great--IF they could get together frequently." Most of the student teachers reported no marked changes observed in relationships existing between themselves and their supervising teachers (however, such relationships were initially reported as highly favorable). A general trend was reported toward the supervising teacher becoming "less directive." One of the student teachers reported that "there was a major change in emphasis on the study of teaching as a process and use of some teacher analysis system." A general satisfaction with conferences was reported with two student teachers reporting improvements here as a direct result of the training sessions.

E. Summary and Conclusions

The major purpose of this pilot program was to create a new model for the supervision of student teachers. The model was based upon redefinitions of the roles of the supervising teacher and the college supervisor in the student teaching program.

It is believed that this model program achieved the purpose for which it was formulated. However, this pilot study was limited in nature in regard to the total number of students and teachers involved, therefore, any conclusions or recommendations emerging therefrom are necessarily considered tentative.

As a result of this pilot program, the following conclusions are posited: (1) Supervising teachers can satisfactorily assume major responsibility in student teacher supervision provided they

receive training for such. (2) College supervisors, supervising teachers, and student teachers all favor such a supervisory program and the results obtained therefrom. (3) College supervisors can make better utilization of their professional time and training by conducting inservice training sessions for supervising teachers rather than by directly supervising student teachers in classroom situations. (4) By using analysis systems developed to study teaching, supervising teachers cannot only better provide analytical supervision for student teachers, but also improve their own classroom instruction. (5) An on-site inservice training program provides for an immediate opportunity to try theoretical ideas in a real situation. (6) A college and local school district cooperatively planned and oriented program of student teacher supervision results in improved relationships between these two groups and enhances the overall student teaching program.

It is recommended that further study be given the central question to which this pilot program was directed. It is further felt that the model outlined here could be replicated and researched at other teacher training institutions. Further research is needed in related concerns such as possible follow-up programs for supervising teachers who have completed the initial training seminars. Another area for possible study concerns with the student teacher seminars and just what should take place with the student teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amidon, Edmund and Hunter, Elizabeth. Improving Teaching: The Analysis of Classroom Verbal Interaction. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.

The Association for Student Teaching. Professional Growth Inservice of the Supervising Teacher. Forty-fifth Yearbook, The Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 1966.

Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers, A Perceptual View of Teacher Preparation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

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

Hilliard, Pauline and Durrance, Charles L. Guiding Student Teaching Experiences. Bulletin Number One, Association for Student Teaching, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 1968.

Hontz, Glenn, "Redefining Roles in the Supervision of Student Teachers." The College Supervisor--Conflict and Challenge. Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1964.

Lindsey, Margaret and McGeoch, Dorothy, "Supervisory Conferences and the Analysis of Teaching." The Study of Teaching, Dean Corrigan, editor. The Association for Student Teaching, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 1967.

National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Who's in Charge Here? Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching. Discussion Paper. Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1966.

Smith, E. Brooks, "The Case for the College Supervisor." The College Supervisor--Conflict and Challenge. Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1964.

Smith, E. Brooks, and others. Partnership in Teacher Education. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Association for Student Teaching, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 1966.

Stratemeyer, Florence B., "The College Supervisor--Guidelines for Action." The College Supervisor--Conflict and Challenge. Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1964.

Verduin, John R., Jr. Conceptual Models in Teacher Education, An Approach to Teaching and Learning. The American Association of Colleges and Teacher Education, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 1967.