

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 287

SP 008 417

AUTHOR Sherwin, Susan S.
TITLE Teacher Education: A Status Report.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 64p.
AVAILABLE FROM Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. 08540 (\$2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; Credit Courses; Degree Requirements; Evaluation Techniques; Field Experience Programs; Grading; Graduate Surveys; *National Surveys; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

This survey of undergraduate teacher education was cosponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the Teacher Programs and Services Group of Educational Testing Services (ETS). Questionnaires were sent out in June 1973 to AACTE member institutions. A copy of the questionnaire is included as an appendix. Results are described in the text; supportive tables accompany the description. Among the topics covered are the following: percent of students in teacher education compared to total undergraduate student body; average number of graduates in teacher education, 1971-73; subjects required for elementary education majors; course requirements in general education for secondary evaluation majors; course hours required in general education; total number of hours required in professional education; course hours required in field experiences; criteria used to evaluate students in professional education courses; grading systems used in teacher education institutions; field experience offered by the institutions; specialized programs; admission requirements into teacher education; characteristics of selection into teacher training; how follow-up studies are done; and criteria used for graduation from teacher education programs. (JA)

TEACHER EDUCATION: A STATUS REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICRO-
FICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Educational Testing Service
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Susan S. Sherwin

Co-sponsored by Teacher Programs and Services of Educational Testing Service
and The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

FOREWORD

The purposes of AACTE and ETS come together often because of common interests. This national survey of undergraduate preparation of teachers is a good example. The results of this cooperative survey, contained in this publication, are recommended for careful study and appropriate action by individuals in all types of agencies and institutions of the teacher education community.

The study was conceived as a result of ETS's role as publisher of the National Teacher Examinations and of the Teacher Education Examination Program. ETS wanted to know how pertinent its tests are in relation to what teachers are trained to do. Useful clues for future test versions and general input for ETS planning and programming for its diverse service activities were secured through the study.

The AACTE has more than a half-century commitment to and competence for moving teacher education forward. Knowing of its member institutions' need for factual data, the AACTE staff reviewed the preliminary ETS survey instrument and made some suggestions for revision. The AACTE then assisted in mailing the survey and encouraged AACTE member institutions to complete the survey instrument. An exceptionally high response was secured. Since AACTE member colleges and universities prepare more than 90 percent of America's teachers, the survey report sample is very comprehensive.

To promote interest in and use of the survey results, the AACTE collaborated with ETS in organizing a major reporting session at the 1974 AACTE Annual Meeting. This document is the latest in efforts to disseminate

the survey. The results report the status of teacher education in 1973 and suggest its future direction.

The preparation of America's educational personnel is complex and changing. In this context, the AACTE is pleased to be a partner in the ETS survey and publication efforts. These efforts have been worthwhile as teacher education moves forward. Ideas and information are critical elements in progress!

James R. Deneen
Director
Teacher Programs and Services
Educational Testing Service

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director
American Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education

PREFATORY NOTE

This report was prepared with the assistance of James R. Deneen, Richard M. Majetic and Edward J. Masonis, of the Teacher Programs' staff at Educational Testing Service. It was also reviewed by George Elford of ETS, and members of the staff of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Special thanks go to Peggy Parell for the typing of the drafts and preparing the final copy of the report.

Susan S. Sherwin

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreword.....	iii
Prefatory Note.....	v
List of Tables.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
The Survey.....	3
Purposes.....	3
Composition.....	3
Representativeness.....	5
A Note on the Method of Questionnaire Analysis.....	6
Results.....	7
Institutional and Student Characteristics.....	7
Program Characteristics.....	10
Admission Requirements into Teacher Education.....	29
Graduation Requirements.....	31
General Information.....	32
Summary.....	37
Appendix A.....	40
Appendix B.....	52
Appendix C.....	54
Appendix D.....	55

List of Tables*

Table	Page
1. Percent of Students in Teacher Training Compared to Total Undergraduate Student Body by Total Sample and by Size.....	8
2. Average Number of Undergraduates in Teacher Education (1972-73) Classified by Race, Sex and Ethnic Background.....	8
3. Average Number of Graduates in Teacher Education for 1971-72 and 1972-73.....	9
4. Subjects Required for Elementary Education Majors.....	11
5. Course Requirements in General Education for Secondary Education Majors.....	13
6. Course Hours Required in General Education.....	14
7. Total Number of Hours Required in Professional Education.....	15
8. Number of Course Hours Required in Curriculum and Instructional Methods.....	16
9. Course Hours Required in Field Experiences.....	17
10A. Course Requirements in Psychological Foundations for Elementary Education Majors.....	18
10B. Course Requirements in Psychological Foundations for Secondary Education Majors.....	18
11A. Course Requirements in Social Foundations for Elementary Education Majors.....	19
11B. Course Requirements in Social Foundations for Secondary Education Majors.....	19
12. To what extent are the following used in the Professional Education sequence of courses?.....	21
13. Criteria Used to Evaluate Students in Professional Education Courses.....	22
14. Grading Systems Used in Teacher Education Institutions.....	23

Table	Page
15. Field Experiences Offered by the Institution.....	24
16. Specialized Programs Offered by Respondents.....	26
17. Directions and Emphases in Teacher Education.....	28
18. Admission Requirements into Teacher Education.....	29
19. Who are most involved in the Selection Process?.....	30
20. Characteristics of Selection into Teacher Training.....	31
21. Criteria Used for Graduation from Teacher Education Programs.....	32
22. Criteria Used to Evaluate the Effectiveness of the Teacher-Training Program.....	33
23. How Follow-Up Studies of Graduates Are Done.....	34

*Percentages given in the tables have been rounded off to the nearest whole number so that totals can be 99, 100 or 101%.

TEACHER EDUCATION: A STATUS REPORT

Introduction

This survey of undergraduate teacher education was co-sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the Teacher Programs and Services Group of Educational Testing Service (ETS). Both organizations are actively involved in teacher education: the AACTE coordinates conferences and various activities for its membership, functions as a clearinghouse for material on teacher education and provides a central voice for educators; ETS sponsors the National Teacher Examinations (NTE), the Teacher Education Examination Program (TEEP), various services to institutions and a Teacher Behavior Research Group, currently investigating teacher performance and competency-based education.

It has been nearly a decade since any baseline data on teacher preparation has been accumulated. Conant's heralded report in 1963, The Education of American Teachers, included the sixteen most populous states and covered the academic preparation of teachers as well as the certification practices of states and local school districts. He visited 77 institutions and described the academic power struggle among teacher educators making a series of recommendations in all areas discussed. Concerning academic institutions he concluded that each institution should have the "maximum degree of freedom to develop its own program".¹ Other studies such as Koerner's The Miseducation of Teachers, have not collected full scale data but rather have scornfully criticized "the chaotic nature

1. Conant, James B., The Education of American Teachers, McGraw, Hill Co., 1963, p. 217.

of the whole effort".² Koerner used case studies of 32 institutions to report on the quality (or lack thereof) of the students and the quantity of education courses in their programs. Many other books have been written on teacher education particularly after the impetus of Sputnik, seeking to re-evaluate teaching practices in the nation's schools; a great deal of material has been collected both by the National Education Association (NEA) and the National Commission for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) but no recent major national surveys have been done.

This study, then, attempts to fill a void—not in all aspects of teacher education—but in the specific area of curriculum, and will provide both a status report for the educational community and a beginning of systematic and routine collection of information about teacher education.

2. Koerner, J., The Miseducation of Teachers, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1963, p. 52.

THE SURVEY

Purposes

The specific purposes of this survey are fourfold:

- 1) to provide the most current information on undergraduate teacher education curriculum: course hours, subjects, programs, etc.
- 2) to gather information on the changes and new directions evolving in teacher education programs on the campuses.
- 3) to gain a sense of national academic opinion on the selection and certification of teachers.
- 4) to indicate directions for further studies in this area.

Composition

An ETS committee, comprised of the staff of Teacher Programs and Services, formulated the first draft of the questionnaire, after a review of college catalogues and other literature on teacher education. The draft was then piloted in three different types of institutions and altered where difficulties were noted, mainly to allow for more variation within programs (or as much as was considered possible). Dr. Joost Yff of AACTE offered many valuable suggestions which were incorporated into the final draft.

The survey instrument is composed of 36 questions requesting a great deal of information, some of which was not readily available to the respondents. Eighteen of these questions provide space for "other", or comment where necessary. It is divided into 5 sections:

1. Institutional and Student Characteristics - enrollment in teacher education and various characteristics of the institutions.
2. Program Characteristics - information about the Professional and General Education components in teacher education, course hours, grading practices and criteria used, field experiences and new programs offered.
3. Admission Requirements into Teacher Education Programs - criteria used in selection and those persons involved in the process.
4. Graduation Requirements - criteria used by the institutions and those required by the teacher education program.
5. General Information - program evaluation, follow-up studies of graduates, opinions on certification and possible ETS services.

The survey was mailed in June 1973 to the 871 AACTE member institutions. (Their representative at the college or university is usually the Dean of the School of Education.) A follow-up mailing went out in late July. (See Appendix A for a sample survey.)

By September 1, 719 questionnaires were ready for computer processing—a gratifying 82% return. (The actual number received was 731, or 83%, but 12 surveys were unusable, either because the schools were closing or because the institution had no undergraduate teacher education program.) The institution's Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) code was recorded on each survey (for possible future use of the data) and the surveys were reviewed for problems and comments.

The basic data and the cross-tabulations present a voluminous amount of material. What follows here is a preliminary presentation of the data without extensive analysis or comparison. It is "preliminary" because further studies can, and hopefully will, be conducted with the information. In addition to the data presented here, complete regional tabulations, tabulations by size of institutions and data from the 31 predominantly black institutions in the sample are available.

Representativeness

The 82% return on the survey insures an ample representation of teacher training institutions throughout the country. (A review of the non respondents showed no particular pattern emerging; no further investigation for bias was made.) AACTE's membership includes 73% of the approximately 1,200 institutions which train teachers. The response therefore is nearly 60% of all the institutions involved in the education of pre-service teachers.

A closer look at the responding institutions by the criteria of governance (public or private), size and region describes the representativeness of the sample. The respondents are fairly evenly distributed; 47% are public institutions, 51% are private institutions, (2% did not answer the question). Seven regional categories were used, giving ample representation in each area. The North Central region, with 36% comprises the largest number of schools. (See Appendix B for the regional distribution of respondents and C for a list of the states included in each region.)

For purposes of cross-tabulation of various questions in the survey, 5 categories of size were used, 0-999, 1,000-5,099, 5,100-10,999 and

11,000 or more. (See Table II in Appendix B.) Nearly one-half of the institutions in the sample are in the 1,000-5,099 range, with public institutions comprising 81% of the schools in the 5,100-10,999 range and 92% of the largest institutions (11,000+) in the sample. Ninety-one percent of the private institutions are made up by institutions of less than 1,000. (See Table III in Appendix B.)

Cross tabulations were done for all 35 questions in the survey by the 5 categories of size, the 7 regions and for the 31 black institutions identified in the sample.* Results of these tabulations will be selectively cited in the report which follows.

A Note on the Method of Questionnaire Analysis

In making up the coding system for the survey, the three cross-tabulations mentioned above were chosen in addition to the reporting of the total data. Each response was reviewed so that individual variations could be included. For the report, data from cross-tabulations were reviewed for substantial differences or variations from the national totals. "Substantial" was defined as more than 10% variation from the base data. Only some of this data from the cross-tabulations have been selected here in areas deemed most interesting to the educational community. Unless specifically noted, all data reported is based on the total number of respondents to the survey (719), (or, as indicated, on size, regional or ethnic comparisons).

*The following formula was used to define "Black" and "White" institutions:

An institution was considered Black if the response to a request for information on the number of blacks enrolled in teacher education was 70% or more of the total number of students enrolled in teacher education.

RESULTS

Institutional and Student Characteristics

Institutions were asked what calendar system was in use—semester, trimester or quarter system. According to the responses, the semester system is predominant, with 440 or 61% of the institutions using that method. One hundred thirty-four, (19%), use the quarter system, 31, (4%), use the trimester system, with 87, (12%), using some variation thereof, such as, mini-courses offered in January (a 4-1-4 or a 3-1-3 calendar). A notable difference by the criterion of size is the percent of large institutions (11,000+), on the quarter system (37%). An interesting difference by region is the larger percent of New England (81%), Middle Atlantic (82%) and West South Central (87%) schools on the semester system, while a larger percent (44%) of the Mountain Pacific schools are on the quarter system.*

Each institution was asked to estimate what percentage of their undergraduate student body population was enrolled in teacher preparation. As shown in Table 1, 78% of all the institutions responding said that 50% or less of their undergraduate students are enrolled in teacher training, indicating a continuing decrease of single-purpose teachers' colleges. Only 5% of the respondents enroll more than 75% of their students in teacher preparation programs. A striking difference is noted on this question when applied to the category of size; 63% of the larger institutions (11,000+) have 25% or less of their undergraduates registered in teacher education.

*Survey questions dealing with course hour requirements were computed by the indicated calendar system in order to present accurate data. In this report data on course hours will be given only for those respondents on the semester system.

Table 1
Percent of Students in Teacher Training Compared to
Total Undergraduate Student Body by Total Sample and by Size

		0-25%		26-50%		51-75%		76-100%		N.A.	
Total Population 719		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
		249	35%	310	43%	121	17%	32	5%	7	1%
Size	Number										
0-999	157	26	17%	80	51%	35	22%	14	9%	2	1%
1,000-5,099	337	120	36%	144	43%	56	17%	16	5%	1	.3%
5,100-10,999	124	39	32%	59	48%	23	19%	2	2%	1	.8%
11,000+	95	60	63%	26	27%	7	7%	-	-	2	2%

Information was also requested on the total number of undergraduates enrolled in teacher education programs. An average enrollment of 1,075 students per institution was computed, as well as means for male and female students, and an ethnic breakdown of the student population. Some institutions declined to give any ethnic information, either because it was unavailable or because they thought it was illegal to collect. Table 2 shows the means calculated and their breakdown according to the size of the institution.

Table 2
Average Number of Undergraduates in Teacher Education (1972-73)
Classified by Race, Sex and Ethnic Background

Criterion	No.	Under- graduates	Male	Female	American Indian	Mex. American	Black or AF.	P.R. or SP.	Oriental or Asian
All Schools	719	1,075	351	612	5	12	70	12	4
less than 1,000	157	239	83	162	1	1	28	1	2
1,000-5,099	337	703	266	430	6	5	63	15	2
5,100-10,999	124	1,892	633	1,067	8	37	139	20	5
11,000+	95	2,699	728	1,389	6	24	79	7	12

The undergraduate mean naturally increases in proportion to the size of the institution with an exception for the mean for black students in the medium large institutions (5,100-10,999), indicating that black (and Mexican-American, Puerto-Rican and Indian) students favor the institutions in that size range, (or perhaps those size institutions favor them). The ratio of females to males is invariably about 2 to 1.

The total numbers of students graduating from teacher education programs in 1971-72 and 1972-73 show a slight decline from a mean of 314 in 1972 to 295 in 1973—most probably a reaction to the indicators of the job market. Table 3 below shows the mean of graduates according to the total sample and by the criterion of size.

Table 3
Average Number of Graduates in Teacher Education
for 1971-72 and 1972-73

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>1971-72</u>	<u>1972-73</u>	<u>% of decrease</u>
All Schools	719	314	295	7%
less than 1,000	157	77	76	1%
1,001-5,099	337	195	188	4%
5,100-10,999	124	557	540	3%
11,000+	95	803	703	13%

The enrollment numbers and characteristics of the institutions in the sample provide a good picture of the majority of institutions in the country which are training teachers, and useful background material from which various aspects of the curriculum can be discussed.

Program Characteristics

The second section of the questionnaire focuses on the curriculum pursued by undergraduate majors in teacher education. There are some noticeable changes in the programs, generally in the area of practice teaching and field experiences, but little change in course hour requirements as will be shown. More programs now begin in the sophomore year (43%) than in the junior year (31%). Sixteen percent begin in the freshman year, indicating a change which is supported by evidence of field experiences available to students who are enrolled or interested in teacher education. Those institutions not responding (9%) to this question usually indicated that entrance into teacher education varied according to particular programs within their education department.

Large institutions (11,000+) remain more solidly with the junior year, 42%, as a point of entry into teacher education, with 25% beginning in the sophomore year. Black institutions also favor the junior year, with 52%, as opposed to 39% for the sophomore year. Regional data show a considerable number of institutions in New England (33%) offering their students an opportunity to begin teacher training in the freshman year.

Subject requirements for elementary and secondary education majors were listed according to the way in which most college catalogues described them; for elementary teaching the specific subjects were listed, for secondary teaching a block or unit system was most frequent.

Table 4
Subjects Required for Elementary Education Majors
(N=719)

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Required</u> % of <u>Institutions</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Required</u> % of <u>Institutions</u>	<u>No Response</u> % of <u>Institutions</u>
Anthropology	7%	66%	27%
Art	66%	16%	19%
Biological Science	70%	13%	18%
English/Language Arts	87%	2%	11%
Economics	16%	56%	28%
Geography	44%	31%	24%
Government	44%	34%	23%
Health-Physical Education	76%	11%	13%
History	75%	10%	15%
Mathematics	82%	7%	11%
Music	63%	17%	20%
Physical Science	67%	15%	18%
Philosophy	27%	48%	25%
Psychology	68%	15%	17%
Sociology	29%	45%	27%
Other	45%	-	54%

The relatively high numbers of no responses on this question were generally from institutions whose programs varied too much to "fit" into the chart. In the response provided for "other" some of these respondents described a block system or a variation of categories, similar to those used for secondary education majors, from which the elementary education majors could choose their courses. The subjects listed in the "other" category were most frequently in the field of human relations and

communications but also included courses in drug and alcohol abuse, black culture, etc. The subjects required by 70% or more of the respondents are, English (87%), mathematics (82%), health-physical education (76%), history (75%), and biological science (70%). Some respondents noted (usually with arrows linking each subject) that their students could choose between music and art, biological science and physical science, history and government and so on. Others noted that general education requirements varied according to specific programs for elementary teachers.

Some differences are notable in the cross-tabulations for general education subjects. A consistently larger percent of the small institutions (less than 1,000) require each subject listed 5-10% or more, (e.g., philosophy 48%, psychology 83%). Regional differences reveal a higher percent of schools requiring these subjects in the South Atlantic, East and West South Central schools and a lower percent in the New England and Middle Atlantic schools. Two subject examples witness this pattern:

	<u>New England</u>	<u>Middle Atlantic</u>	<u>South Atlantic</u>	<u>East South Central</u>	<u>West South Central</u>
English/Language Arts	67%	69%	93%	94%	98%
Mathematics	64%	60%	90%	100%	94%

Black institutions also consistently show a higher percent requiring specific subjects, (e.g., art - 81%, biological science - 97%, mathematics - 100%).

The answers to a similar question on subjects required in general education for secondary education majors are shown below. For secondary education the subjects were grouped together into the fields or categories which were known to be most commonly used, (according to college catalogues).

Table 5
Course Requirements in General Education
for Secondary Education Majors

<u>Category</u>	<u>Mean Course Hours of Those Responding</u>	<u>No. Responding</u>
Humanities	14.0	558
Social Sciences	11.5	576
Sciences	9.6	505
Mathematics	6.2	367
Health and Physical Ed.	4.5	435
Other	10.4	277

As with the requirements for elementary education majors, substantial numbers of respondents did not or could not fit the above categories. Some institutions said they have no general education requirements for secondary education majors; some noted that their students preparing to teach in secondary schools did not even have to be registered in the Department of Education. Courses listed under "other" were most frequently communications, and human relations. Some respondents noted that there were many variations depending on the specific major and individual departmental requirements. (Science and mathematics were often grouped together as requirements but were counted two times where this was indicated.)

The total number of course hour requirements in general education ranged from 46-60 hours for 40% or more of those institutions on a semester system for both elementary and secondary education majors as shown in Table 6. By comparison, an NEA report on 294 NCATE-accredited institutions in 1957-58 showed a median semester hour requirement of 46 for elementary

and secondary teachers with a range of 11-97 hours.¹ Koerner's study also contained an academic profile drawn from the transcripts of 435 elementary teachers and 446 secondary teachers, showing a mean of 72 semester hours in academic education for elementary teachers and 96.5 for secondary teachers (based on 1960 or 1961 graduates from 32 schools).² National averages, as Koerner stated, are sometimes misleading and unrealistic and more often than not reveal the disparity in requirements among and within various institutions.

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Table 6</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Course Hours Required in General Education</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(N=440)</p>				
	<u>Elementary Teaching</u>		<u>Secondary Teaching</u>	
	<u>No. of Inst.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No. of Inst.</u>	<u>%</u>
30 hours or less	24	6%	48	11%
31-45 hours	119	27%	109	25%
46-60 hours	181	41%	189	43%
61-75+ hours	75	17%	53	12%
NA	<u>41</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>9%</u>
Totals	440	100%	440	100%

A majority of institutions indicated that the total number of hours required in general education has been and will continue to be the same. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents noted a decrease in this requirement in the past three years, 8%, an increase, while 59% remained the same,

1. Cited in The Education of Teachers, G. K. Hodenfield and T. M. Stinnett, Prentice-Hall, 1961, p. 158.
2. Koerner, op.cit., p. 128.

(4% not responding). For the next three years, 4% indicated an increase in this requirement, 20% a decrease with 68% not planning to change, (8% not responding).

Similar questions relating to course hour requirements for professional education and for specific areas within professional education reveal some shifts, but little overall change, when comparisons are made to earlier data. Nearly one-half of the institutions on a semester system require 26-35 hours of course work in professional education for their elementary education majors and 76% require 16-25 semester hours for their secondary education majors (see Table 7). Koerner, op.cit., cited the NEA report previously mentioned which gave an average of 34.8 semester hours devoted to professional education for elementary teachers, and 23.6 hours for secondary teachers.¹ Again, disparities are shown by the ranges (18-69 for elementary teachers, 10-51 for secondary), disparities which, according to the table below, still exist.

Table 7

Total Number of Hours Required in Professional Education
(N=440)

	<u>Elementary Teaching</u>		<u>Secondary Teaching</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
15 hours or less	6	1%	23	5%
16-25 hours	81	18%	336	76%
26-35 hours	202	46%	52	12%
36-45 hours	85	19%	8	2%
46-55 hours	20	5%	1	.2%
56-65+ hours	10	2%	3	.7%
NA	<u>36</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>4%</u>
Totals	440	99%	440	99.9%

1. Koerner, op.cit., p. 122.

In the majority of institutions these requirements in professional education have remained the same, and will continue to do so. Sixty-two percent noted no previous changes in the past two years, 72% noted no planned changes.

Professional education was further subdivided into curriculum and instructional methods, field experiences and psychological and social foundations. The total number of hours required in curriculum and instruction, (not including student teaching), differ for elementary and secondary teaching; 72% of the secondary education majors need 10 hours or less while 69% of the elementary education majors take 11 hours or more. (See Table 8.) Koerner's report showed a mean of 12 semester hours devoted to methods of teaching for elementary teachers.

Table 8
Number of Course Hours Required
in Curriculum and Instructional Methods
(N=440)

	<u>Elementary Teaching</u>		<u>Secondary Teaching</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
10 hours or less	90	21%	315	72%
11-15 hours	129	29%	70	16%
16+ hours	176	40%	23	5%
NA	45	10%	32	7%

The number of hours required for field experiences (including student teaching) has increased noticeably according to the survey responses. (See Table 9. For further information on field experiences see p. 24.) Thirty-seven percent of the respondents have 10 or more hours of field experiences for elementary teaching; the figure is noticeably less for secondary

teaching, 25%. Koerner's academic profile of transcripts cited a mean of 8 semester hours for elementary teachers and 7 semester hours for secondary teachers in practice teaching which was, in 1959, generally the only field experience a future teacher had.

<u>Table 9</u>				
<u>Course Hours Required in Field Experiences</u> (N=440)				
	<u>Elementary Teaching</u>		<u>Secondary Teaching</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
3 hours	21	5%	26	6%
4-6 hours	75	17%	115	26%
7-9 hours	133	30%	164	37%
10-14 hours	104	24%	75	17%
15+ hours	59	13%	33	8%
NA	48	11%	27	6%

In the area of psychological and social foundations specific courses were listed according to the most frequently-found course titles in college catalogues. These titles varied considerably from institution to institution. The highest number of institutions responded for the requirement in educational psychology both for elementary and secondary teaching, 474 and 504, respectively. Some institutions wrote in guidance or human relations in the "other" category or grouped two or three of the course listings; others indicated one general requirement which included all the topics listed. Six hundred and forty-five institutions have at least one course requirement for elementary teachers and 665 for secondary teachers. Few changes have taken place or are anticipated in the next 3 years.

Table 10A
Course Requirements in Psychological Foundations
for Elementary Education Majors
(N=719)

<u>Course</u>	<u>Mean Course Hours</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>No. Inst. Responding</u>
Gen./Intro. Psychology	3.4	1.0	365
Child Psychology	3.1	.8	303
Adolescent Psychology	2.7	.9	46
Educational Psychology	3.2	1.0	474
Human Growth & Development	3.4	1.2	283
Tests & Measurements	2.7	.8	222
Other	3.6	2.1	56

Table 10B
Course Requirements in Psychological Foundations
for Secondary Education Majors
(N=719)

<u>Course</u>	<u>Mean Course Hours</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>No. Inst. Responding</u>
Gen./Intro. Psychology	3.4	.9	359
Child Psychology	2.7	.9	49
Adolescent Psychology	3.0	.7	259
Educational Psychology	3.2	1.0	504
Human Growth & Development	3.4	1.1	205
Tests & Measurements	2.7	.8	237
Other	3.6	2.1	43

The responses to a similar question concerning the social foundations requirement of professional education are shown in Table 11.

Table 11A
Course Requirements in Social Foundations
for Elementary Education Majors
(N=719)

<u>Course</u>	<u>Mean Course Hours</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>No. Inst. Responding</u>
Introduction to Education	2.9	1.7	257
Philosophy of Education	2.9	.9	148
History of Education	2.6	.9	61
School in American Society	3.1	.8	111
Foundations of Education	3.2	1.1	221
Other	3.2	1.4	62

Table 11B
Course Requirements in Social Foundations
for Secondary Education Majors
(N=719)

<u>Course</u>	<u>Mean Course Hours</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>No. Inst. Responding</u>
Introduction to Education	2.9	.9	244
Philosophy of Education	2.9	.9	146
History of Education	2.7	.9	61
School in American Society	3.2	1.0	123
Foundations of Education	3.2	1.1	234
Other	3.2	1.3	58

As with the psychological foundations requirement, some institutions grouped all the courses listed into one course requirement for this category. Five hundred and ninety-five respondents (83%) have at least one requirement

for elementary teachers in this area, and 609 (83%) for secondary teachers. Very little change was indicated for these course requirements and no significant patterns emerged in the cross-tabulations. Some institutions listed urban education or another elective under "other" and others emphasized a range of alternatives possible in this area, sometimes dependent on a student's specialization.

The lack of much visible change in overall requirements for general and professional education does not, however, tell the whole story. Many training programs have been active in developing and implementing new strategies, in exploring the area of teaching behavior in an attempt to develop competencies which are critical to teaching, and in expanding the field-work component of teacher education.

Some techniques, like simulation and microteaching, have been around for a decade, but are experiencing heavier use in teacher training than previously. Seminars and lectures, which have traditionally been the mainstay of postsecondary education, still predominate, and computer-assisted instruction (CAI) is barely used at all. As shown in Table 12, if the categories of "moderately" and "a great deal" are combined, 84% of the respondents use individualized instruction, 76% use microteaching, and 73% use videotapes of student teachers. Somewhat fewer institutions use modules or minicourses, 52%, or simulation, 61%.

Table 12

To what extent are the following used in
the Professional Education sequence of courses?

	<u>Not at</u> <u>all</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Moderately</u>	<u>A Great</u> <u>Deal</u>	<u>N.A.</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Computer Assisted Instruction	54%	27%	8%	.3%	10%
Individualized Instruction	1%	11%	62%	22%	4%
Interaction Analysis	8%	30%	46%	9%	6%
Lectures	4%	7%	52%	37%	3%
Microteaching	3%	19%	54%	22%	3%
Modules and Minicourses	11%	31%	39%	13%	6%
Seminars	1%	11%	56%	30%	3%
Simulation	3%	31%	53%	8%	5%
Videotapes of student teachers	6%	18%	50%	23%	4%

Some of the variations are interesting in the cross-tabulations. More of the larger institutions use microteaching a great deal (33%) while more of the New England institutions emphasize individualized instruction (31%).

Institutions were asked to indicate if the usage checked varied from major to major within their teacher education program. Three hundred twenty-eight respondents, (46%), indicated that it did; 391, (54%), did not check the box provided.

A question concerning the criteria used for evaluating students in professional education courses drew some interesting comments. Many respondents noted that they were giving only their own opinion, or indicated that there was wide variation in criteria used depending on the particular course and the perspective of each professor. Table 13 shows the responses.

Table 13
Criteria Used to Evaluate Students
in Professional Education Courses
(N=719)

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Moderately Important</u>	<u>Of Little Importance</u>	<u>Not Important</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Participation in class discussion	46%	48%	3%	.1%
Scores on tests	26%	63%	6%	1%
Grades on term papers/projects	32%	60%	4%	1%
Performance on pre-determined behavioral objectives	42%	41%	10%	2%

The large number of institutions checking performance on pre-determined behavioral objectives in the "very important" and "moderately important" categories, (595-83%), indicates an awareness and acceptance of relatively new ways to formulate the components of professional education courses. Some respondents noted that this was becoming increasingly important to their faculty, particularly those schools in states which have mandated performance-based certification. Scores on tests received the lowest number of checks in the "very important" category and participation in class discussion the highest. All four criteria were equally weighted, however, between the categories of "very important" and "moderately important". The number of institutions checking the two other categories was very small.

A question on the grading system predominantly used in teacher-training shows a large majority (80%) of institutions using letter/number grades or letter/number grades with pass/fail options.

Those checking "other" generally indicated a different combination of grading patterns, e.g., incomplete-complete, credit-no credit along with letter and number grades or some variation. One institution noted that grades were decided by the professor's evaluation but, the student's self-evaluation was also taken into account.

Table 14

Grading Systems Used in Teacher Education Institutions

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Letter/number grades	259	36%
Letter/number grades with pass/fail options	316	44%
Pass/Fail	30	4%
Self-Reporting	0	0%
Other	16	2%
NA	98	14%

As noted on Table 9, students are required to spend an increasing number of hours on field experiences. Table 15 focuses more specifically on these field experiences—when they take place, and what kinds of experiences. Fifty-three percent of the respondents noted that the field experiences do vary according to the programs but were asked to indicate when most students generally participated. The results are shown below.

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Table 15</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Field Experiences Offered by the Institution</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(N=719)</p>				
<u>Experience</u>	<u>Freshman Year</u>	<u>Sophomore Year</u>	<u>Junior Year</u>	<u>Senior Year</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student Teaching	0%	.4%	7%	97%
Classroom Observation	16%	58%	74%	31%
Tutoring	15%	46%	61%	22%
Teacher-aide experience	12%	48%	57%	15%
Community experiences (social work, clubs, etc.)	23%	42%	41%	21%
Interviews	4%	25%	44%	26%
Other	2%	2%	5%	3%

This table documents what was anticipated from a review of teacher education literature—a movement toward field-based programs. Many more students are spending a great deal of time in the "field", broadly defined as the community and the school. Student teaching remains almost wholly in the senior year (97%), but the high number checking classroom observation in junior year, 74%, and sophomore year, 58%, is noteworthy, along with fairly high percentages for teacher-aide experiences in the junior year (57%) and sophomore year (48%). Since the table indicates when most students participate in these field experiences, there is no way of discerning the numbers of percentages of students involved, nor the length of time spent at each activity. Many of the respondents noted that some activities they checked were voluntary, but, clearly, more varied kinds of experiences are being offered to students in teacher education.

There are some notable variations. More New England institutions have tutoring in the sophomore year (64%) and student teaching in the junior year (19%). More Middle Atlantic institutions offer community experience in the sophomore (56%) and junior years (55%). Generally, institutions in the East and West South Central States have consistently lower rates of participation in field experiences. Smaller institutions are generally offering more field experiences earlier in the college program, for example, a teacher-aide—61% in the freshman year. Black institutions offer more community experiences in all 4 years.

Many institutions offer or plan to offer certain specialized programs in teacher education. (See Table 16.) Seventy-six percent of the institutions responded in the area of early childhood education, so it can be assumed that this area is frequently discrete from elementary education. (It is not clear whether the early childhood program includes pre-school or nursery education, since the area defined means different ranges for different institutions.) The program with the next highest percent, 66%, (combining "currently offered" and "planning to offer") is learning disabilities, a fairly new field where recent research has provided opportunities to improve the skills of children with dyslexia or other learning difficulties. Some institutions included learning disabilities with education of the disadvantaged, or added education for the handicapped under "other". (A problem of definition occurs with the words disadvantaged, handicapped and retarded.) Some respondents noted that students could specialize in these fields, but they were not actually considered programs within the department of education.

Open classroom programs had the next highest response, 51%, another area where new ideas have generated new teacher programs. Urban education has a fairly high percentage, 40%, which is particularly significant in that it indicates that many institutions outside of urban areas are designing special programs for urban needs. Bilingual education, with 24%, received the lowest response on this list of programs.

<u>Table 16</u>						
<u>Specialized Programs Offered by Respondents</u>						
<u>Program</u>	<u>Currently Offered</u>		<u>Planning to Offer</u>		<u>N.A.</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Open Classroom	292	41%	74	10%	353	49%
Urban Education	247	34%	44	6%	428	60%
Bilingual Education	97	14%	74	10%	548	76%
Learning Disabilities	348	48%	126	18%	245	34%
Education of the Disadvantaged	271	38%	42	6%	406	57%
Early Childhood	445	62%	98	14%	176	25%
Other programs with special needs	125	17%	24	3%	569	79%

More New England and Middle Atlantic schools have all the programs listed, and fewer East and West South Central schools have open classroom or urban education programs. Fifty-two percent of the New England schools have urban education as opposed to 17% in the East South Central States. Bilingual education is most heavily represented in the Mountain Pacific States with 35%, as is learning disabilities with 61% in the Mountain Pacific States, but only 26% (currently) in the South Atlantic States. Early childhood programs are least favored by the North Central schools

with 49%, and most favored by the South Atlantic States with 76%. The smallest institutions consistently offer fewer of these programs, e.g., early childhood - 47%, learning disabilities - 33%, while the largest institutions offer more programs, urban education - 56%, education of the disadvantaged - 62%, early childhood - 83%. Fewer black institutions offer open classroom programs (19%) or learning disabilities (29%).

A series of questions on program emphases, teaching centers and experimental programs provides a great deal of information on new directions in teacher education. (See Table 17.) The high percentage of programs emphasizing field experiences (78%) has already been discussed, (p. 24). The large number of institutions with teaching centers (some call them teaching labs or personnel development centers)—438, 61%, indicates increasing development in this area. The majority of those responding to this question, 350, said their centers were off campus, with 161 indicating theirs were on campus. (Some institutions may have centers both on and off campus since the number was higher than 438.) These centers are often a fundamental part of competency-based (or performance-based) programs and the extremely high number of institutions, 517 (72%), planning performance-based programs testifies to changing patterns in teacher education. By way of comparison, only 27% of the respondents indicated that they have experimental programs, and only 17% indicated they were planning experimental programs other than performance-based. Seventy-four percent of the respondents said that they have in-service workshops, which is an encouraging step towards involvement and cooperation between the school districts and the local institutions.

<p align="center"><u>Table 17</u></p> <p align="center"><u>Directions and Emphases in Teacher Education</u></p> <p align="center">(N=719)</p>						
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>NA</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Programs with emphasis on multiple field experiences	557	78%	115	16%	47	7%
A center where students participate in and observe and/or are evaluated	438	61%	199	28%	82	11%
In-service workshops for teachers	530	74%	115	16%	74	10%
An experimental undergraduate program running parallel to your major programs	211	29%	478	67%	30	4%
A performance-based program (planning)	517	72%	138	19%	64	9%
Another kind of experimental program(s) planning	120	17%	344	48%	255	36%

Some interesting patterns emerged in the cross-tabulations by the criterion of size. Large institutions emphasize field experiences more (93%), and in-service training (92%). In fact, for all of the items on Table 17, except performance-based programs, the percentage of involvement increases with the size of the school. For example, multiple field experiences: small institutions - 67%, medium institutions - 75%, medium-large institutions - 86%, and large institutions - 93%. An exception for performance-based programs is in the medium-large institutions where 86% said they have or are planning performance-based programs.

Many respondents in states under PBTE mandate made note of this or commented that their programs were in transition at this time. Some noted that they were concentrating on evaluating and improving their present experimental programs before coming to a decision about them.

Admission Requirements into Teacher Education

Each institution was asked what admission measures they used to screen students entering their teacher education programs. The results are shown below.

Table 18

Admission Requirements into Teacher Education (N=719)

<u>Measure</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>Desirable</u>	<u>Not Required or No Answer</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Aptitude measures	18%	15%	68%
Achievement tests	18%	11%	70%
Minimum GPA	87%	2%	11%
Attitude & interest measures	19%	19%	62%
Recommendations	72%	5%	23%
Personality Tests	10%	16%	75%
Interviews	54%	13%	33%
Other	19%	1%	80%

The table shows that a large majority of institutions require a minimum grade point average and recommendations for entry into their training programs, 87% and 72% respectively. About one-half of the respondents require interviews. All of the other measures listed are required by less than 20% of the respondents. In addition, less than 20% of the respondents checked any one single measure as "desirable", the highest in this category being attitude and interest measures with 19%. In the "other" category, requirements such as physical examinations, speech examinations or written English examinations were listed. In addition, some respondents

noted that they are reexamining their admission procedures in an attempt to strengthen them.

New England institutions show a lower percent (68%) requiring a minimum GPA; Middle Atlantic schools show fewer (61%) requiring recommendations. Black institutions have lower than average figures for minimum GPA (74%) and recommendations (61%). By the criterion of size there are two notable differences; more of the smallest schools require recommendations (85%) and fewer of the largest schools (47%). Actually with recommendations, the percentages are in inverse proportion to each size category (84%, 76%, 64%, 47%), disclosing how size affects a school's policies. Similarly, with interviews, the smallest schools require them more frequently, 68%, with a decreasing percent to the largest:

less than 1,000	1,000-5,099	5,100-10,999	11,000+
68%	55%	45%	41%

Regarding the same issue of institutional admission policies, the survey asked what persons were most involved in the selection process into teacher-training. The responses show that 85% of the institutions rely on their education faculty for the selection process, with others far less involved.

Table 19

Who are most involved in the Selection Process?

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Student personnel services	176	25%
Education faculty	614	85%
Faculty other than education faculty	360	50%
Faculty Advisor	293	41%
College Administration	129	18%
Other	118	16%

Again, the size of the institution affects the processes. Large institutions have a greater proportion (40%) of student personnel services involved in selection, and a smaller proportion of faculty other than those in education (24%), while small institutions have considerably more general faculty involved (67%) in this process.

A question on the characteristics of the student selection process shows that a selection committee (70%) and written policies (62%) predominate. Surprisingly, 6% of the institutions have no selection policy whatever.

<u>Table 20</u>		
<u>Characteristics of Selection into Teacher Training</u>		
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Detailed written policies	447	62%
Selection committee	500	70%
Faculty senate	7	1%
Other	65	9%
No selection policy	40	6%

Graduation Requirements

There are 5 major criteria used for graduation from teacher education programs: a minimum number of hours, minimum overall GPA, minimum GPA in education sequence, minimum performance in student teaching, and supervisors' evaluations as shown in Table 21.

Table 21
Criteria Used for Graduation From
Teacher Education Programs

	<u>No.</u> <u>of Inst.</u>	<u>%</u>
Minimum number of hours	696	97%
Minimum overall GPA	658	92%
Minimum GPA in education sequence	444	62%
Minimum performance in student teaching	625	87%
Minicourse evaluations	31	4%
National Standardized Tests	89	12%
Supervisors' evaluations	517	72%
Observation Schedule analyses	115	16%
Criterion-referenced tests (locally derived)	37	5%

Some variations are seen in the cross-tabulations. By the criterion of size, the smaller schools use supervisors' evaluations more than the larger: Less than 1,000 - 78%, 1,000-5,099 - 75%, 5,100-10,999 - 66%, 11,000+ - 61%. The largest institutions also use observation schedule analyses less than average (7%). Regional differences show the schools in New England with lower percentages for three of the four major graduation criteria: minimum GPA - 76%, minimum GPA in education - 48%, supervisors' evaluations - 60%. Schools in the Mountain Pacific States have generally higher percentages than average, e.g., supervisors' evaluations, 84%.

General Information

This section comprised a composite of questions on curriculum evaluation, follow-up studies of graduates, opinions of certifications and possible services of interest to the respondents. The first question in this section focused on program evaluation, a major concern for every institution

as well as for the districts employing the teachers produced by the institution. Table 22 shows the responses.

<u>Table 22</u> <u>Criteria Used to Evaluate the</u> <u>Effectiveness of the Teacher-Training Program</u>		
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Faculty performance measures by students	567	79%
Faculty performance measures by supervisory personnel	289	40%
Student achievement measures	307	43%
Curriculum review by faculty	583	81%
Curriculum review by students	377	52%
Follow-up studies of graduates	603	84%

This table shows that three criteria are prevalent in program evaluation: faculty performance measures by students (usually accomplished through student ratings), curriculum review done by the faculty and follow-up studies of graduates. The increase of student involvement in assessing both the faculty and the curriculum (a lower percent but still significant) testifies to a generalized belief that the student protest of the 1960's led to increased student representation in institutional affairs. It is, of course, impossible to know how these reviews are used in program policymaking. Fewer black institutions (by percentage) use student ratings, 55%, while more of the larger schools do use this method (11,000-- - 87%).

The last criterion on the list, follow-up studies of graduates, has become increasingly important in many institutions, though less so for the

New England schools (62%), and for black institutions (71%). These studies also seem to be related to size, as fewer small schools (78%), than large schools (90%) do follow-ups, though the percentage does not spread too widely. Institutions were asked how they gather the information about their graduates, and the response indicates two predominant methods: surveys of graduates in teaching (79% of the 603 checking follow-up studies) and surveys of administrators' opinions in the school districts involved (77%).

Table 23

How Follow-Up Studies of Graduates Are Done
(N=603)

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Survey of inservice graduates' opinions	479	79%
Survey of administrators' opinions in hiring school districts	467	77%
Classroom observation	79	13%
Placement Office reports	298	49%
Other	47	8%

Institutions were asked with which groups, if any, the institutions would want to compare their graduating seniors. The greatest interest (79%) was shown in comparisons drawn from similar institutions. The other two choices, comparisons drawn from a national sample of teacher education graduates or from a regional sample of teacher education graduates, received approximately the same degree of interest, 57% and 59% respectively. (Three percent were not interested in comparisons.)

A question seeking opinions on certification revealed that 77% of the respondents think that graduation from a state-approved teacher education

program is the best basis upon which a state should grant teaching certificates. Forty-four percent checked graduation from an NCATE-approved institution and 19% checked "a program meeting NASDTEC Guidelines" as bases for certification. Many respondents checked more than one of these choices.

Respondents further indicated that certificates should be based on:

1) a demonstrated minimum knowledge of:

- a) subject area (83%)
- b) professional education (81%)
- c) general education (69%).

2) a demonstrated minimum performance of teaching activities as observed by:

- a) the training institution (85%)
- b) school system personnel (71%)
- c) an external agency or group (16%).

These figures represent the opinions of the persons filling out the questionnaires and are not necessarily representative of the institutions. (Generally, the Dean of Education or Chairman of the Department of Education, or an assistant, completed the form.) With that qualification, it is nevertheless clear that the state-approved program method has the most widespread approval of the institutions in this sample. It is also clear that a large majority of respondents are concerned with the cognitive areas of teacher preparation as well as a demonstrated performance of teaching activities. Generally, they prefer to do the observing of teaching themselves, or somewhat less preferably, would involve school system personnel. Many checked both categories.

Many respondents wrote in comments on this certification question. One noted that "the key problem continues to be determining performance and competency criteria based on local priorities and needs". Another said that they "believe in a shared performance evaluation including college, school district, [and] professional associations". Still another stated that "certification should be temporary upon graduation and made permanent only after adequate performance in the field".

The last question on the survey listed some possible services for the institutions. Strongest interest was shown in programs which could validate elements of the teacher education program against knowledge and/or performance judged significant in teaching—73%. Somewhat less interest was shown in standardized candidate profiles for selection into teacher education—60%, and guidance packages for students, (self-selection and orientation to teacher training and teaching)—60%.

A selection of comments made by the respondents can be found in Appendix D.

SUMMARY

In this survey of teacher education curricula we have attempted to gather baseline data for the immediate needs of both sponsoring organizations and for the general use of the educational community. While we are aware of the limitations of a survey instrument which attempts to describe the average or typical course pursued by a student training to be an elementary or secondary school teacher, we also recognize the importance and usefulness of baseline data to various groups. Indeed, the data indicate the extent to which a common curriculum in teacher education exists and indicate which areas could be pursued for further details.

The broad picture presented by the survey shows a curriculum quite similar in many ways to what teacher education was twenty years ago (according to the general perceptions of teacher educators as reported in Koerner et al.). The majority of the curricula reported are divided into psychological and social foundations, curriculum and instruction, and general education. The course hour requirements within these areas are relatively uniform; the admission and graduation criteria vary very little from institution to institution.

Yet, a closer look at the data reveal where the changes are taking place, and the nature of these changes. There is, in fact, a great deal of variation in subject requirements within professional education. Educational psychology is the only requirement under either psychological or social foundations required by three-fourths of the respondents, and introduction to psychology (or general psychology) is the only other listing required by one-half of the schools. This in itself suggests a

considerable amount of variation in professional education. Comments written in under these questions show some institutions trying to condense their requirements in these areas into one course, or offering alternatives to their students.

Other examples of change are the use of microteaching (76%), simulation (61%), videotapes of student teachers (73%) and interaction analysis (55%).* The extensive offerings of field experiences shown in Table 15 is also supported by the use of teaching centers (61%) both on and off the campus. Institutions themselves are more heavily involved in the community, not only through field experiences, but also with in-service education in which 74% of the respondents said they were engaged.

Student involvement in various forms of program evaluation testifies to a growing influence students can have on their programs; four-fifths of the institutions use student ratings of faculty, one-half use student evaluations of curriculum and more than four-fifths do follow-up studies on their graduates.

An increasing use of learning modules (52%) and the emphasis placed by the respondents on students' performance on predetermined behavioral objectives (83%) reveals the growing awareness and acceptance of the competency-based education movement. A very large number of programs have stated that they are planning performance-based programs, (72%). (Respondents in those states under a mandate to change to PBTE noted that they anticipated changes in their programs.)

*These percentages combine the categories of "moderately" and "a great deal".

It becomes clear in reading through the surveys that large institutions in particular are providing multiple paths for their students and allow a good deal of individual prescription, so much so that some found it quite frustrating to try to sum up their many program offerings into one generalized set of figures and responses. Further case studies would have to be conducted to substantiate the degree of individualization and the varied content of many of the programs. There is, nonetheless, a generalizable picture of the institutions in our sample, which provides ample data from which to pursue further studies, tells us what kind of criteria we employ in selecting and graduating students in teacher education, and what kinds of models we are using for them.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF TEACHER EDUCATION

The ultimate value of this study is dependent upon your careful answers to the questions that follow.

In an effort to save you time in completing these pages, a few guidelines may help clarify the procedure:

1. The questionnaire is divided into 5 sections: Institutional & Student Data, Program Characteristics, Admission Requirements into Teacher Education Program, Graduation Requirements & General Information.
2. All questions are specifically concerned with the predominant undergraduate curriculum, unless otherwise indicated.
3. Please put checks in the brackets provided. When numbers are requested, please give your best estimate.
4. Please take advantage of the spaces provided for "other" answers, if applicable.
5. Please return to Educational Testing Service by June 30, 1973.

All responses to your questions will be held in confidence, and individual schools will not be identified with specific answers. The final report will be mailed to all responding institutions.

If your institution has a performance-based program, and has not received the separate questionnaire for these programs, please write to Teacher Programs and Services, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08540 if you would like to be included in that survey.

Thank you for your time and interest.

PERSON RESPONDING _____ TITLE _____
MAILING ADDRESS (if different than above label).

INSTITUTIONAL AND STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1. Type of institution: ☐ Public ☐ Private
2. Total Undergraduate population - Academic year 1972-73 (full-time and part-time):

<input type="checkbox"/> Under 250	<input type="checkbox"/> 1000-2599	<input type="checkbox"/> 11,000-20,999
<input type="checkbox"/> 251-500	<input type="checkbox"/> 2600-5099	<input type="checkbox"/> Over 21,000
<input type="checkbox"/> 501-999	<input type="checkbox"/> 5100-10,999	
3. Calendar: ☐ Semester ☐ Quarter
☐ Trimester ☐ Other (specify) _____
4. Admissions policy of institution (check more than one if applicable):

<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced placement tests	<input type="checkbox"/> College Level Examination Program
<input type="checkbox"/> Aptitude tests	<input type="checkbox"/> Achievement tests
<input type="checkbox"/> Open admissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Interview
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____	
5. Percentage of undergraduate population enrolled in teacher-training:

<input type="checkbox"/> 0-25%	<input type="checkbox"/> 26-50%	<input type="checkbox"/> 51-75%	<input type="checkbox"/> Over 75%
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------
6. a) Total number of undergraduates enrolled in teacher-training _____
b) Undergraduate males _____ Undergraduate females _____
c) Approximate number of undergraduates in each of the following groups (if available):

_____ American-Indian	_____ Black or Afro-American
_____ Mexican-American	_____ Oriental or Asian-American
_____ or Chicano	
_____ Puerto-Rican or other Spanish cultures	

7. a) Number of students graduating from teacher-training program in academic year--1972-73 _____
- b) Number of students graduated from teacher-training program in previous year--1971-72 _____

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

8. When does your teacher-training program formally begin?
- ☐ Freshmen year ☐ Sophomore year ☐ Junior year ☐ Senior year
9. On the chart below, please indicate which of the following subjects you require for the General Education sequence of Elementary Education majors.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>Not Required</u>
Anthropology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Art	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Biological Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
English/Language Arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Geography	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health-Physical Education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
History	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Music	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Physical Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Philosophy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Psychology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sociology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)		
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Please indicate below the number of courses required for the General Education sequence of Secondary Education majors in the following categories. (Please give an approximate average if the numbers vary from major to major within Secondary Education.)

	<u>No. of Course Hours</u>
Humanities	_____
Social Sciences	_____
Sciences	_____
Mathematics	_____
Health & Physical Education	_____
Other (specify) _____	_____

11. How many course hours in General Education are required of your prospective teachers in teacher education.

Elementary Teaching

- ☐ 30 hours or less
☐ 31-45 hours
☐ 46-60 hours
☐ 61-75+ hours

Secondary Teaching

- ☐ 30 hours or less
☐ 31-45 hours
☐ 46-60 hours
☐ 61-75+ hours

(Approximate average if programs vary.)

12. a) In the past three years the total number of hours required in General Education has --

- ☐ Increased ☐ decreased ☐ remained the same

b) In the next three years, these figures will probably--

- ☐ increase ☐ decrease ☐ remain the same

13. How many course hours in Curriculum and Instructional Methods are required as part of the Professional Education sequence (not including student teaching)?

Elementary Teaching

- ☐ 10 hours or less
☐ 11-15 hours
☐ 16+ hours

Secondary Teaching

- ☐ 10 hours or less
☐ 11-15 hours
☐ 16+ hours

14. How many course hours in Field Experiences are required as part of the Professional Education sequence?

Elementary Teaching

- ☐ 3 hours
☐ 4-6 hours
☐ 7-9 hours
☐ 10-14 hours
☐ 15+ hours

Secondary Teaching

- ☐ 3 hours
☐ 4-6 hours
☐ 7-9 hours
☐ 10-14 hours
☐ 15+ hours

15. Please indicate below which of the following courses must be taken as part of the Psychological Foundations requirements in the Professional Education sequence. Then, please check if you anticipate any increase or decrease in this requirement in the next three years.

Courses	<u>Elementary</u>			<u>Secondary</u>		
	No. of Course Hours	Increase	Decrease	No. of Course Hours	Increase	Decrease
Gen./Intro. Psychology	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
Child Psychology	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
Adolescent Psychology	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
Educational Psychology	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
Human Growth and Development	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
Tests & Measurements (Evaluation)	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
Other (specify) _____	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]

16. Please indicate which of the following courses must be taken as part of the Social Foundations requirement in Professional Education. Then, please check if you anticipate any increase or decrease in this requirement in the next three years.

Subject	<u>Elementary</u>			<u>Secondary</u>		
	No. of Course Hours	Increase	Decrease	No. of Course Hours	Increase	Decrease
Intro. to Education	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
Philosophy of Education	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
History of Education	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
School in American Society	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
Foundations of Education	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]
Other (specify) _____	_____	[]	[]	_____	[]	[]

17. Please indicate below the total number of course hours in Professional Education required for your teacher-training program, (including field experiences).

Elementary Teaching

- ☐ 15 hours or less
☐ 16-25 hours
☐ 26-35 hours
☐ 36-45 hours
☐ 46-55 hours
☐ 56-65+ hours

Secondary Teacher

- ☐ 15 hours or less
☐ 16-25 hours
☐ 26-35 hours
☐ 36-45 hours
☐ 46-55 hours
☐ 56-65+ hours

18. a) In the past three years the total number of hours required in Professional Education has --
☐ Increased ☐ decreased ☐ remained the same.
- b) In the next three years, this figure will probably --
☐ increase ☐ decrease ☐ remain the same.
19. To what extent are the following used in the Professional Education sequence of courses?

Materials/Techniques	Not at all	Rarely	Mode- rately	A great deal
Computer-Assisted Instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individualized Instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interaction Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lectures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Microteaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Modules or Minicourses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seminars	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Simulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Videotapes of student teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Check here if the above vary by program with teacher education.

20. What importance does your institution place on the following criteria for the purpose of evaluating students in Professional Education courses?

Criteria	Very Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	Not Important
Participation in class discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scores on tests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grades on term papers/projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Performance on pre-determined behavioral objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ If you need to elaborate on the above, please check and write in below:

21. Which marking system is in predominant use in your teacher-training program?

- ☐ Letter/number grades
☐ Letter/number grades with limited pass/fail options
☐ Pass/Fail
☐ Self-reporting
☐ Other (specify) _____

22. Please indicate when most students participate in the following field experiences. (Check all that apply.)

Experience	Freshman Year	Sophomore Year	Junior Year	Senior Year
Student teaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Classroom observations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tutoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teacher aide experience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community experience (social work, clubs, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interviews, case studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ In addition, check here if field experiences vary according to program.

23. In which of the following do you presently offer teacher-training programs, or plan to offer them?

Programs	Currently Offered	Planning To Offer
Open classroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Urban education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bilingual education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Education of the disadvantaged	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Early childhood (pre-school)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other programs for special needs _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

24. Can a student prescribe to some degree his/her own program according to individual needs?

☐ Yes, in all teacher-education programs ☐ Yes, in some programs ☐ No

25. Do you have any of the following (presently or planned)?
- a) Programs with emphasis on multiple field experiences ☐ Yes ☐ No
- b) A center where students participate in and observe ☐ Yes ☐ No
and/or are evaluated. ☐ on campus ☐ off campus
- c) Inservice workshops for teachers ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (If you have published materials available, please enclose.)

26. Do you have an experimental undergraduate teacher education program running parallel to your major program?

☐ Yes No. of students enrolled _____ ☐ No

27. a) Are you planning a performance-based program? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- b) Are you planning another kind of experimental program? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Please describe _____
- _____

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS INTO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

28. Please indicate your institution's policies regarding the following admission measures into teacher education. (Check all that apply.)

Measure	Required	Not Required	Desirable
Aptitude measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Achievement tests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimum GPA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attitude & interest measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recommendations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personality tests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interviews	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

29. Among the following, please check those who are most involved in the selection process for admission into teacher-training:

- ☐ Student personnel services
- ☐ Education faculty
- ☐ Faculty other than education faculty
- ☐ Faculty advisor
- ☐ College administration
- ☐ Other (specify) _____

30. Which of the following are characteristic of your selection into teacher-training process? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Detailed written policies
- ☐ Selection committee
- ☐ No selection policy
- ☐ Faculty senate
- ☐ Other (specify) _____

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

31. Which of the following criteria are used for graduation from your program? (Check all that apply.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum number of hours | <input type="checkbox"/> Supervisors' evaluations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum overall GPA | <input type="checkbox"/> Observation schedule analyses |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum GPA in education sequence | <input type="checkbox"/> Criterion-referenced tests |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum performance in student teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> (locally derived) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mini-course evaluations | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> National standardized tests (specify) _____ | |

Minimum score required? ☐ Yes ☐ No

GENERAL INFORMATION

32. a) Which of the following are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the institution's teacher-training program?

- ☐ Faculty performance measures by students
- ☐ Faculty performance measures by supervisory personnel
- ☐ Student achievement measures
- ☐ Curriculum review by faculty
- ☐ Curriculum review by students
- ☐ Follow-up studies of graduates

b) If "follow-up studies of graduates" is checked above, please indicate below how you have done this.

- ☐ Survey of inservice graduates' opinions
- ☐ Survey of administrators' opinions in hiring school districts
- ☐ Classroom observations
- ☐ Placement office reports
- ☐ Other (specify) _____

33. With which of the following groups, if any, would you be interested in having data to compare your graduating seniors?

- ☐ A national sample of teacher education graduates.
- ☐ A regional sample of teacher education graduates.
- ☐ A sample drawn from institutions similar to yours.
- ☐ None of the above.

34. On what basis do you think a state should grant teaching certificates?

- Graduation from:
- ☐ a state approved teacher education program.
 - ☐ an NCATE approved institution.
 - ☐ a program meeting NASDTEC guidelines.

Demonstrated minimum knowledge of:

- ☐ subject area.
- ☐ professional education.
- ☐ general education.

Demonstrated minimum performance of:

- ☐ teaching activities as observed by training institution.
- ☐ teaching activities as observed by school system personnel.
- ☐ teaching activities as observed by external agency or group.

Comment: _____

35. If it were possible for ETS to develop the services listed below, which of the following would be of interest to you for your teacher education program.

☐ Standardized candidate profiles (achievement, attitudes, experiences, etc.) for selection into teacher education program.

☐ Guidance packages (publications, films, etc.) for students; self-selection and orientation to teacher-training and teaching.

☐ Programs validating elements of the teacher education program against knowledge and/or performance judged significant in teaching.

☐ Evaluation of student achievement on a state-wide criterion-referenced basis.

☐ Other (specify) _____

36. Please use the space below to add any comments desired, e.g., areas of concern, new directions in your training program, etc.--

THANK YOU

APPENDIX B

Table 1

Distribution of Respondents by Region

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
New England	42	6%
Middle Atlantic	84	12%
North Central	255	36%
South Atlantic	99	14%
East South Central	66	9%
West South Central	82	11%
Mountain Pacific	85	12%
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>1%</u>
Total	719	101%

Table II
Distribution of Respondents by Size

	<u>From Question #2</u>			
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
0-250	1	0%		
251-500	23	3%	157	22%
501-999	133	19%		
1,000-2,599	223	31%	337	47%
2,600-5,099	114	16%		
5,100-10,999	124	17%	124	17%
11,000-20,999	72	10%	95	13%
21,000+	23	3%		
NA	<u>6</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1%</u>
Total	719	100%	719	100%

Table III
Distribution of Public/Private Institutions by Size

	less than 1,000		1,000- 5,099		5,100- 10,999		11,000+	
Public	9	6%	140	42%	100	81%	88	93%
Private	143	91%	194	58%	22	18%	6	6%
NA	5	3%	3	1%	2	2%	1	1%
Columns Total	157	(100%)	337	(100%)	124	(100%)	95	(100%)

APPENDIX C

States included in the designated regions for the cross-tabulation:

New England

Connecticut
Maine
Massachusetts
New Hampshire
Rhode Island
Vermont

Middle Atlantic

New Jersey
New York
Pennsylvania

North Central

Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Nebraska
North Dakota
Ohio
South Dakota
Wisconsin

South Atlantic

Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Maryland
North Carolina
South Carolina
Virginia
West Virginia

East South Central

Alabama
Kentucky
Mississippi
Tennessee

West South Central

Arkansas
Louisiana
Oklahoma
Texas

Mountain Pacific

Arizona
California
Colorado
Hawaii
Idaho
New Mexico
Nevada
Oregon
Utah
Washington
Wyoming

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE COMMENTS

"Our basic concern is the sophistication of a continuous undergraduate training and development program which we have implemented—continuous in the sense that the students' first contact with teacher education is an 'early' field experience, basically to study the role of the teacher...."

"We are attempting to strengthen our procedures regarding admission into teacher preparation areas. We are also concerned with the area of retention and are attempting to develop new criteria...."

"Efforts to develop a competency-based program are underway and very time-consuming. The 1973-74 academic year will include important revisions and experiments with both entrance and exit criteria and evaluation procedures, especially in the personal make-up of entrance and exit screening committees."

"I am very wary of any program that tends to make people conform to an arbitrary standard. The focus should be on optimum opportunity for growth and self-determination."

"...I would prefer a profile or some type of data reflecting the qualities and attributes of 'good' teachers as these were determined against criteria 'known to be associated with good teaching.' Perhaps against some measure of student learning instead of teacher performance...."

"Until certification is based more on the performance of teachers in a teaching/learning situation than it now is, the professional level of newly certified personnel will continue to be something less than certain...."

"It appears to me that the certification recommending function in Pennsylvania is going to pass from the colleges to the Intermediate Units and/or the organized profession. We deplore this and are fighting it but the trend seems inexorable."

"In elementary education an emphasis in Multi-Unit Individually Guided Instruction has been at in-service and pre-service levels. Also at elementary level, a successful 3 year program in micro-team teaching in teacher education has been successful. Each of these programs involves heavily, area school teachers, principals, and students...."

"We have two concerns on which we are working: (1) Non-academic factors to consider in admitting students to teacher education programs, and (2) relating performance in professional education courses to competency in the classroom."

"Excessive publicity given to the so-called 'Teacher Surplus' may prevent our building up a pyramid of quality (so long needed) from which employing superintendents could select the best...."

"Am concerned not to be locked into C.B.T.E. set of competencies for all education students—also the time, place, evaluator, level of performance, etc. etc. of competency. Judgment makes system at best very mechanical and hard to handle—at worst unworkable."

"With California not having education majors—it is more difficult to control programs before graduation. Consequently, some of your questions don't fit our situation as well; then, too, moving into the Ryan credential within one year and eliminating all other types (by Sept. 1974) means that we are in process of change."

"...the need for a more active interest in teacher education on the part of the liberal arts faculties... Liberal arts faculties have lost interest in teacher education since the curriculum revision movement of the 1960's ended."

"In addition to the move toward PBTE, there must be a move toward humanistic development through interpersonal relations activities and varieties of experiences with individuals from various 'communities,'...."

"Entirely too rigid and bureaucratic certification standards leaving the institution too little flexibility and discretionary decision-making... do something about that and a victory for humanity will be imminent."

"It seems clear to me that minimum programs for preparing teachers can no longer be tolerated. Teacher educators need to be given the freedom to prepare teachers without so much interference from competitive elements on campuses and State Departments. The concept that 'the least professional education, the better' must be abandoned for one that stresses optimum conditions for preparing top-quality candidates to enter the profession."

"We see our role as changing from predominantly pre-service to a predominantly in-service orientation; from serving students who come to us, to providing services to the entire educational community; from a credit hour system to some more flexible individualized program of providing services when and where they are needed...."