To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Robert H. Coleman, entitled "A Comprehensive Survey of the Contemporary Student Teaching Program in the Colleges and Universities in Tennessee." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Curriculum and Instruction.

John R. Ray, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

A COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY OF THE CONTEMPORARY STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS IN THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN TENNESSEE

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Robert H. Coleman

August 1974

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"A man has made at least a start on discovering the meaning of human life when he plants shade trees under which he knows full well he will never sit"

Elton Trueblood

The writer would like to dedicate the words of Elton Trueblood to his doctoral committee of Drs. John R. Ray, Chairman, W. Carl Murphy, Charles A. Chance, Larry W. Hughes, and John M. Peters for their time, energy, and support throughout his educational experiences.

The writer is also most grateful to Drs. Earl Ramer and E. S. Christenbury, who first took time for guidance and direction, and to the many fine professors for their contributions on his behalf.

To Bill and Jo Burriss --- "friends."

To a host of friends that never lost faith in me go a special word of appreciation.

Finally, without the love and understanding of the writer's family this experience would not have been possible. To my wife, Helen, my son Bruce, and to my mother, all of whom made this entire undertaking pleasurable and worthwhile.

1159362

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to: (1) analyze existing practices in student teaching programs offered by colleges and universities in Tennessee; (2) identify characteristics of student teaching programs; (3) identify communication links among representatives of State Department personnel, colleges and universities, and related professional associations involved in student teaching programs; and (4) identify intra-state cooperative efforts among institutions to improve significant aspects of the administration of student teaching programs. Finally, the study also sought to answer questions about Tennessee student teacher programs: (1) General Background of the Institution; (2) Administration of the Student Teaching Programs; (3) The College Supervisor; (4) The Student Teachers Themselves; and (5) Cooperating School Districts and Cooperating Teachers.

Data for the study were obtained from the 35 institutions in Tennessee who have student teaching programs approved by the State Board of Education. All institutions responded to the descriptive questionnaire for a 100 percent return. The survey instrument was sent to those individuals who were involved directly with the administration of student teaching programs in their respective institutions, i.e., director/coordinator of student teaching.

Because there was no study available which dealt with a comprehensive analysis of the total student program in Tennessee and an absence of pertinent data available to all colleges and universities the study could be used by: (1) State Department of Education personnel

involved in student teaching as they work in the improvement of student teaching practices in teacher education in Tennessee; (2) personnel involved in individual institutions, regardless of their structure, which are engaged in preparing student teachers can appraise their own programs and evaluate where needed; (3) other personnel involved in this important phase of teacher education, such as directors of student teachers, superintendents, principals, and subject matter specialists at all levels of learning.

This study was designed to collect rather comprehensive descriptive information on student teaching in the State of Tennessee. Some of the major conclusions of the study are as follows:

1. There is a great diversity among the institutions and programs in the State.
2. Excellence in a student teaching program can be determined only in relationship to the total teacher education program and to the particular set of circumstances that exist at each institution.
3. There are many basic and significant differences between the student teaching programs found in public institutions and those found in private institutions and also between institutions that have received NCATE accreditation and those who have not been accredited.
4. Finally, since this is a descriptive study, the most valid conclusions that will be drawn from it are those made by each individual as he analyzes for himself the descriptive data generated by the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the problem	3
	Statement of purpose	3
	Importance of the Study	6
	Scope and Limitations of the Study	7
	Definitions	7
	Procedures and Sources of Data	9
	Organization of the Study	10
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE	11
	Criteria for Student Teachers	13
	Characteristics of Cooperating Teachers	17
	Participation in Community Activities	18
	The Role Elements in College Supervision	21
	The Role of Professional Associations	28
	Compensation to the Supervising Teacher	32
III.	EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS IN TENNESSEE	37
	Introduction	37
	Development of the Questionnaire	37
	The Participating Institutions	38
	Analysis and Evaluation of Student Teaching Programs	39
	General background of the institutions	39
	Administration of the student teaching programs	44
	The college supervisor	75

CHAPTER PAGE

The student teachers themselves 86

Cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers 111

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 130

Summary 130

Conclusions concerning the general background of the institution 132

Administration of the student teaching programs . . 132

The student teachers themselves 132

Cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers 133

Conclusions 134

Recommendations 136

BIBLIOGRAPHY 139

APPENDICES 142

APPENDIX A 143

APPENDIX B 144

APPENDIX C 146

APPENDIX D 148

APPENDIX E 167

VITA 174

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Teacher Education Institutions Participating in the Study Categorized by Type of Control	40
2.	Enrollment Category of Institutions	41
3.	Full-time Undergraduate Enrollment	42
4.	Percent of Full-time Undergraduate Students Preparing to be Teachers	43
5.	Undergraduate Programs Accredited by One of the Regional Associations or by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)	45
6.	Title of the Person Who is Directly in Charge of Total Student Teaching Program	46
7.	Years of Experience as the Administrator of Student Teacher Program	48
8.	Years in Charge of Student Teaching Program and Percent of Time Devoted to Administering the Student Teaching Program	49
9.	Elementary Student Teaching: Where Done, Full or Part-Time, and Number of Credits	52
10.	Length of Elementary Student Teaching Assignment	54
11.	Secondary Student Teaching: Where Done, Full or Part Time, and Number of Credits	56
12.	Length of Secondary Student Teaching Assignment	58
13.	Type of Schools Where Student Teachers are Placed	59

TABLE PAGE

14. Admission Requirements for Student Teaching 61

15. Applicants Denied Admission to Student Teaching 63

16. Summer Student Teaching 65

17. Student Teaching Budget 68

18. Student Teaching Programs Using Innovative Techniques and Research 70

19. Use of Campus Laboratory School in Professional Laboratory Experiences 72

20. Internship Programs 74

21. Number of College Supervisors Involved in Full and Part Time Supervision of Student Teachers 76

22. Type of College Supervisor and Degree Status 78

23. Average Number of Student Teachers Assigned to Each Full-time College Supervisor at Any One Time 81

24. Frequency of Supervisor Visits to Each Student Teacher . . 82

25. Recommended Ratio of Full-time College Supervisors to Student Teachers 84

26. Characteristics Sought in College Supervisors 85

27. Type of Grade Used for Student Teaching 87

28. Rank Importance of Student Teacher Evaluators That Actually Participate in Evaluation 88

29. Do Student Teachers Have Classroom Observation Experiences Prior to Student Teaching and Approximate Percent of Time Spent in Each Area? 92

TABLE PAGE

30. Percent of Students Who Fail Their First Student Teacher Assignment 94

31. Alternatives Available to Student Teachers Who Fail First Assignment 95

32. Approximate Percent of Student Teachers that Fail Student Teaching and are Eliminated from Teacher Education . . . 96

33. Major Causes of Student Teacher Failure 98

34. Institutions Utilizing the Student Teacher Concept, The Number of Elementary, Secondary, and Total Number of Centers 100

35. Use of Video Tape Equipment and Tape Recorders with Student Teachers 102

36. Use of Micro Teaching and Simulation Techniques Prior to or During Student Teaching 104

37. Use of the Flander's Interaction Analysis Technique and Taba's Teaching Strategies Material During Student Teaching 107

38. Use of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Material and Sensitivity Training with Student Teachers 109

39. Use of small Group Seminars with Student Teachers 112

40. Approximate Miles from Campus That Student Teachers Are Placed 113

41. Techniques Used to Help Train Cooperating Teachers 115

42. Characteristics Sought in a Cooperating Teacher 118

TABLE PAGE

43. Conditions that Exemplify the Competencies for Helping a Student Teacher 121

44. Policies that Describe Financial Remuneration and Benefits to Cooperating Teachers and/or Cooperating School Systems 122

45. Graduate Course in the Supervision of Student Teaching . . 124

46. Institutions that Provide Transportation or Reimburse if Transportation Not Provided 127

47. Membership in Professional Organizations 128

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Leonard O. Andrews has stated:

> With the exception of the few teacher education programs that offer undergraduate internships, student teaching is the most extensive, the most frequently offered, and is considered by the majority of students the most important of the professional laboratory experiences.[1]

Most educators recognize--at least verbally--the importance of student teaching in the teacher education programs offered by colleges and universities. Even if educators can arrive at some agreement on the part student teaching plays, they differ widely, on how to fit the many facets of the student teachers' experience into an acceptable, high quality teacher education program. Problems stem from a lack of clarity: ill defined procedures for establishing and implementing student teaching programs and confused functions and lines of responsibility for both individuals and groups involved in student teaching.

Despite the fact that student teaching must be a cooperative endeavor, in many cases personnel in colleges and universities, public schools, professional organizations, and state departments of education, most concerned and involved, are not working closely together. Some colleges and universities develop programs, then merely notify the schools of their plans. Others turn the entire enterprise over to the public schools.

---

[1]Leonard O. Andrews, Student Teaching (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 1.

In both instances, key people involved in implementing the programs have no part in formulating them. While several state departments of education are organized to solve problems associated with student teaching, most states have no plan or structure in this area.

One of the early critics of teacher education programs, James R. Conant, contended, "the one indisputable essential element in professional education is practice teaching."[2] Conant further stated that for certification purposes the state should require from the colleges or universities evidence that the prospective teacher had successfully performed as a student teacher under the direction of college and public school personnel in a state department approved teaching situation.[3]

Hayes contends:

> A strong stand for the value of student teaching is made by teachers, public school administrators, college and university staff members, state officials, and students. The neophyte should begin to apply what he has already learned in the college classroom under the watchful eye of a well-educated, experienced, and successful teacher.[4]

The importance of the quality of supervision has never been recognized more than it is today.

In an AST research bulletin, Jo Ann White stated:

> In view of the importance of the student teaching experience, it is unfortunate that critical, evaluative research in this area is scarce. Until recently there has been comparatively little interest in research in this field. The matter is

---

[2]James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), p. 142.

[3]Ibid., p. 60.

[4]Robert B. Hayes, "Involving Teachers in Teacher Education," Professional Growth Inservice of the Supervising Teacher, Fofty-fifth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, Inc., 1966), p. 1.

> further complicated by the great diversity existing in teacher education programs in this country. Teachers are prepared in both public and private single-purpose teacher colleges, multipurpose state colleges, and in liberal arts colleges. This, coupled with the variations in student teaching situations, supervision practices, prestudent teaching professional experiences, individual differences among student teachers and supervising teachers, make it very difficult to delineate basic research problems that will contribute to the improvement of teacher education in general and student teaching in particular.[5]

Statement of the Problem

Not only is there a lack of data on the national scene concerning teacher education, there is less material available on the state level. Fragmentation of data at the state level continues to compound the issues involving teacher education. Therefore, the need for this study is well established.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the study was to analyze existing practices in student teaching programs offered by colleges and universities in Tennessee.

More specifically, the study sought to (1) identify characteristics of student teaching programs, (2) identify communication links among representatives of the State Department, colleges and universities, and related professional associations involved in student teaching programs; and (3) identify intra-state cooperative efforts among institutions to improve selected aspects of the administration of student teaching programs.

---

[5] Jo Ann White, "Changes During Student Teaching as Measured by Pre-tests and Post-tests," Research on Student Teaching, AST Research Bulletin No. 5 (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1970), pp. 16-21.

Selected demographic data was obtained through a general program questionnaire. Areas of special concern are indicated below:

1. General Background of the Institutions. The data will show the number of teacher education institutions that participated in the study and also indicate whether they are public or private, regional or NCATE accredited. Additionally, here data will identify those schools having elementary, secondary programs, or both elementary and secondary programs.
2. Administration of the Student Teaching Programs. This section will deal with the person in charge of the student teacher program and his role as its director and the number of years this person has been in that position; the amount of time the person who administers the student teaching program actually spends in this task (as opposed to supervising student teachers, teaching classes, other administrative duties, etc.). Data will be provided to show the extent to which student teaching is done on or off campus; the extent to which student teaching is done on a full-time or part-time basis, and the number of hours credit given; and the length of the student teacher assignment.
3. The College Supervisor. This portion of the study will show the relationship of the college supervisor to the program he coordinates. This portion of the study will indicate whether the supervisor is full-time or part-time,

show the degree status of the college supervisor, and show if the responding institutions utilize general college supervisors or those from the academic areas or both. The frequency of college supervisors' visits to each student teacher and the number of student teachers assigned will also be shown.

4. The Student Teachers Themselves. This section will provide projections of student teacher enrollments by institution, grades used for evaluation, the number of student teachers who actually fail their first assignment, and provide data on the major causes of student teacher failure. Respondents were asked to show the average percent of time that student teachers spend in observation, participation, and actual teaching.

5. Cooperating School Districts and Cooperating Teachers. This part of the questionnaire dealt with the cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers.

Data will be presented to show the percent of institutions that have written contracts with cooperating schools and the total number of coopearting teachers utilized during the 1972-73 school year. Additional data will deal with the methods that are used to train cooperating teachers, major characteristics sought in cooperating teachers, and the payment to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers for working with student teachers.

I. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Educational changes and improvements may come about as the result of research. Several studies have been conducted on student teaching programs on a national scale. Student teaching programs in other states and some studies evaluating certain phases of student teaching programs in Tennessee were found, but no study was available which dealt with a comprehensive analysis of the total student teaching program in Tennessee.

Because of the absence of pertinent data available to all colleges and universities in Tennessee, the entire teacher education program in the state may be less effective in their services to students in one of the most important phases of training for their chosen vocation--student teaching.

The results of the study could be used by:

1. State Department of Education personnel involved in student teaching as they work in the improvement of student teaching practices in teacher education in Tennessee.
2. Personnel involved in individual institutions, regardless of their structure, which are engaged in preparing student teachers can appraise their own programs and evaluate where needed.
3. Other personnel involved in this important phase of teacher education, such as directors of student teachers, superintendents, principals, and subject matter specialists at all levels of learning.

II. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to the 35 colleges and universities in Tennessee that have teacher education programs approved by the State Board of Education in 1974.

The survey instrument was sent to those individuals who were involved directly with the administration of student teaching programs in their respective institutions, i.e., director and/or coordinator of student teaching.

III. DEFINITIONS

The following definitions apply for all future references to the terms below unless otherwise qualified in text or a footnote.

Professional Laboratory Experiences. All of those contacts with children, youth, and adults which are provided through observation, participation, and teaching, and which make a direct contribution to the understanding of learners and their guidance in individual and group teaching-learning processes.[7]

Student Teaching. Observation, participation, and actual teaching done by a student preparing for teaching under the direction of a supervising teacher or general supervisor; part of the preservice program offered by a teacher education institution.[8]

---

[7]Carter V. Good (ed.), Dictionary of Education (2nd ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959).

[8]Ibid.

Student Teacher. A college student who is acquiring practical teaching experiences and skill under the guidance of a supervising teacher or other qualified person.[9]

Director of Student Teaching. The supervisory or administrative head of teacher-education work done in campus demonstration or laboratory schools or in off-campus affiliated schools.[10]

Cooperating Teacher or Supervising Teacher. An experienced teacher employed in the local school system to work with high school students and to supervise college students during their student-teaching experience.[11]

College or University Coordinator or Supervisor of Student Teachers. The college representative who is responsible for supervising a student teacher or a group of student teachers.[12]

Cooperating School. An elementary or secondary school which is not controlled or supported by the college, but does provide for professional laboratory experiences in a teacher education program.[13]

Campus Laboratory School. An elementary or secondary school which is controlled and supported (all or in part) by the college or university as an integral part of the teacher education program.[14]

NCATE. National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.[15]

ATE. Association of Teacher Education (formerly AST--Association of Student Teaching).[16]

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid.

TEPS. Teacher Education and Professional Standards.[17]

IV. PROCEDURES AND SOURCES OF DATA

The first step in the procedure was a review of related research. Several studies were available which were related to this study, but no research available which dealt with the collection of data to present a clear and comprehensive picture of contemporary student teaching programs in Tennessee.

A letter was directed to the State Department of Education requesting the official list of approved teacher education institutions in Tennessee. All those institutions were contacted requesting the name and title of the director of the student teaching program and the name of his institution. (See Appendices A, B, and C.)

A questionnaire was developed based on (1) James A. Johnson's[18] questionnaire, (2) a review of related research, (3) conferences with individuals involved in student teaching programs, and (4) other professional educators. Questionnaires were mailed to the directors of student teaching programs in Tennessee. (See Appendix D.)

Interviews with representatives of colleges and universities and related professional associations were conducted to ascertain communication links and cooperative efforts among institutions in the admini-administration of student teaching programs.

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] James A. Johnson, A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs, A Multi-state Teacher Education Project (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 1968).

All information received through the questionnaire and interviews was analyzed in a descriptive manner with tabular material presented in terms of frequency and precentage.

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study consists of five chapters.

Chapter I includes an introduction, purpose of the study, importance of the study, scope and limitations of the study, definitions of terms, procedures and sources of data, and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related research and literature. Chapter 3 consists of the evaluation of student teaching programs. Chapter 4 presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

There is a limited amount of research available which relates directly to this study dealing with descriptive data about existing student teaching programs in Tennessee. In some of the other states, individuals or organizations have reported studies in the evaluation of the programs of individual institutions or state institutions only. No study was found in which all the teacher education institutions in a state were involved in a comprehensive comparison or analysis of teacher education activities.

Only two studies appeared to relate closely to this study--one by Samuel Barkat[1] in 1963 and one by James A. Johnson in 1968.[2] Although the Barkat study involved the colleges and universities in Tennessee, it dealt mainly with the development of criteria for student teacher evaluation. Johnson's study was designed to collect descriptive data from all colleges and universities on existing student teaching programs in the United States. With the help of seven consultants, a rather lengthy questionnaire was developed, revised, pretested, and finalized. The questionnaire was then sent to each teacher preparing

---

[1]Samuel Barkat, "Development of Criteria and Their Employment for Evaluation of Student Teaching Programs Offered by the Colleges and Universities in Tennessee" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1963), p. 80.

[2]James A. Johnson, A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs, A Multi-state Teacher Education Project (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 1968), pp. 3-9.

institution in the United States. There was an estimated 1,110 institutions with teacher training programs from which 847 responded with 76 percent returns.

Information about the student teaching programs of these 847 institutions was tallied and analyzed by electronic data processing equipment for each state and also for the entire country.

Major findings of this study consisted of much descriptive information about student teaching practices in the United States. Some items on the questionnaire, however, were designed to solicit opinions and recommendations of people in charge of student teaching programs concerning ways to improve student teaching in this country.

Some of the major conclusions of the Johnson study were:

1. There was great diversity among the student teaching programs in this country.

2. Excellence in a student teaching program could be determined only in relationship to the total program and to the particular set of circumstances that existed at each institution.

3. Those in charge of student teaching programs recommended that college supervisors should have a lighter load than they did.

4. The majority of institutions still gave the traditional letter grades (A, B, C, etc.) for student teaching.

5. Three-fourths of the institutions provided opportunities for student teaching in disadvantaged areas.

6. Many institutions never failed a student teacher and even at those institutions that did, a small percentage of students were actually screened out of teacher education as a result of failing student teaching.

7. Those in charge of student teaching programs believed that the most important characteristics

for a supervisor to possess were, in order, good human relations skills, knowledge of teaching methodology, a commitment to supervision, and subject matter competency.

8. Since this survey was largely a descriptive study, the most valid conclusions that could be drawn from it were those made by each individual as he analayzed for himself the data generated by the study.[3]

The Barkat study was limited to the evaluation of the student teaching programs and practices of all the institutions of higher education in Tennessee and involved in the education of secondary teachers. Barkat further defined his problem with three subproblems as follows:

1. To develop information through a questionnaire about existing practices in student teaching programs for secondary teachers offered by the teacher education institutions in Tennessee.

2. To develop a set of criteria for high quality student teacher programs for secondary teachers with the assistance of a jury made up of competent national leaders in this particular field.

3. To evaluate the programs of student teaching for secondary teachers administered by the teacher education institutions in Tennessee employing the criteria developed from the leading professional journals, accrediting associations with the assistance of the above mentioned jury of national leaders in the field of student teaching.[4]

I. CRITERIA FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

The Barkat survey revealed much information relevant to the present study; the section dealing specifically with the teacher training

---

[3] Ibid., pp. 88-90.

[4] Barkat, op. cit., pp. 83-88.

institutions in Tennessee was especially pertinent. Barkat found that of the 35 institutions offering student teaching experiences, five felt their programs were not adequate at the time of the survey to participate in the study, and only one institution was not willing to respond. The remaining 29 institutions were mailed the questionnaire and 26, or 87.7 percent of them responded and returned the questionnaire. The Barkat questionnaire listed 22 items that set forth the criteria to be evaluated and are as follows:

1. Student teaching should be performed on a full-time basis. A period of at least nine weeks should be required for this purpose.

2. a. The student teaching period should come in the last quarter/semester of the junior year, or, preferably, in the senior year.

   b. Methods courses, courses in child growth and development and educational psychology should be offered before student teaching.

3. A full-time student teacher should be given credit for as many hours as is considered a full-time load for an average student taking work at the college.

4. If housing and other facilities are favorable, student teachers should certainly be urged to live in the community where the cooperating school is located.

5. During the student teaching period, student teachers should not be allowed to take classes on the campus. Only under unavoidable circumstances a few exceptions should be made.

6. A student teacher should be encouraged to take part in community activities, but these activities should be very carefully selected in order to be a contribution to his total experience of student teaching.

7. If at all possible, a student teacher should not be assigned for his student teaching experience to the school from which he graduated.

8. It is better that one student teacher be assigned to a supervising teacher and in any case not more than two.

9. Student teachers should be familiar with attendance records, grade books, cumulative records, reports to parents, anecdotal records, and so on. A student teacher should be encouraged to write an analysis of his experiences and his strong and weak points.

10. Arrangements should be made for a student teacher seminar at least one to three times a week for sharing experiences and problems.

11. The teaching schedule for all supervising teachers should be assigned so as to permit at least three hours each week, during the scheduled day, for group and individual conferences with student teachers and with college supervisory personnel.

12. Where the junior high school is located in close proximity to the senior high school, institutional experiences should be encouraged on both levels.

13. A student teacher should spend most of each school day with the supervising teacher inside or outside the classroom.

14. a. The cooperating school should be of such distance from the college campus that a student teacher would live in the community, yet not so far away that the supervisory personnel have to spend too much time in travel.

    b. A cooperating school should have relatively varied curricular offerings, good professional library, a wide selection of instructional materials, suitable facilities for seminar meetings and sufficient local resources to provide students with high quality experience in the community.

    c. A cooperating school should possess both educational outlooks and procedures which are generally in harmony with those of the college.

    d. The local board of education, administrators, and the school staff should be in sympathy with the aims and objectives of the programs.

15. There should be some formal written agreement between the college and the cooperating school in which the general responsibilities of each are specified.

16. a. A supervising teacher should have at least a Bachelor's degree, and preferably, a Master's degree, including specific preparation for supervisory purposes.

    b. A supervising teacher should have at least three years of successful teaching experience.

    c. Besides professional preparation and experience, a supervising teacher should be willing and eager to work with student teachers.

17. Supervising teachers should be compensated for their services.

18. a. Subject matter specialists from the college should be willing to help and assist the supervising teachers.

    b. Conferences and seminars should be arranged when supervising teachers can get together and share their experiences and problems.

19. a. A college supervisor should have a high degree of leadership ability. He should know what is involved in good teaching and should be able to help others analyze teaching-learning situations.

    b. His preparation should be equal or superior to that of regular members of the college staff.

20. Unless the cooperating school is located within walking distance of the college, the college supervisor should be reimbursed for meals and lodging while away from home.

21. There should be a sufficient number of faculty members assigned to the supervision of student teaching so that each will be responsible for 20 to 25 student teachers. This should constitute his full college assignment for the quarter/semester.

22. A director of student teaching is needed to handle all details involved in keeping the student teaching program moving with maximum efficiency. He should

be in charge of the overall student teaching program of the institution.[5]

In the summary, Barkat concluded that a majority of the institutions in Tennessee failed to meet most of the criteria set by the jury of 14 nationally known leaders in the field of edcuation.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS

Another section of the Johnson study dealt with major characteristics sought in cooperating teachers and revealed much information relevant to the present study. The following characteristics were listed in order of importance:

1. Willingness to work with a student teacher;
2. Human relations skills;
3. Knowledge of teaching methodology;
4. Possession of a Bachelor's degree;
5. Subject matter competency;
6. Possession of a Master's degree; and
7. Possession of a certificate for this type of work.

The respondents were asked to state methods used to train cooperating teachers. The following methods were listed:

1. Colleges and universities conducted small seminars with cooperating teachers;
2. Conducted workshops for cooperating teachers;
3. Conducted large conferences on student teaching;
4. Offered a formal course in the supervision of student teaching;

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 143-52.

5. Mailed out newsletters to cooperating teachers;
6. Sent cooperating teachers to state conferences dealing with student teaching; and
7. Sent cooperating teachers to national conferences dealing with student teaching.

Other techniques used to train cooperating teachers were listed by the respondents. The most frequently mentioned were:

1. An NDEA institute on campus for cooperating teachers;
2. All training done through clinical professors;
3. Association for student teaching materials sent to cooperating teachers; and
4. Paid membership in ATE for cooperating teachers.[6]

There is a direct relationship between the Johnson study and the present one. Many of the same questions developed in Johnson's study will be a part of this study.

III. PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Geneva Rice Clark made a study about the role of the student teachers in community activities in Tennessee. One of the conclusions of her study, which is stated below, indicated the need of full-time student teaching programs:

> The student teachers who did full-time student teaching participated more in community activities than did those students who did part-time student teaching. This indicates that more schools should endeavor and provide full-time student teaching if they prefer to have their student

---

[6] Johnson, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

> teachers participate in community activities as a part of the student teaching experience.[7]

In this study by Clark, 480 student teachers and 20 directors were surveyed by a questionnaire. The directors were asked to give information about the purposes, methods of evaluation, and requirements in community activities. The student teachers' questionnaires were concerned with the types of community activities and the number of such experiences in which they participated. Clark reported the following results in her study:

1. Directors and student teachers indicated that the extent of participation in community activities during the student teaching experiences was limited due to the lack of time, lack of interest, lack of transporation to and from student teaching centers, lack of encouragement on the part of the teaching personnel, and the lack of sufficient community agencies to accommodate all students.

2. The purposes of community activities during the student teaching experiences were, according to the directors, twofold: first, that the student teacher realize and understand the role of career teacher; second, to gain an insight into the relationship of the community and the school.

3. The directors' responses indicated that the evaluative methods for community activities lack uniformity and needed improvement.

4. The directors implied that they encouraged community activities but did not require them.

5. A study of the student teacher questionnaire revealed that social, cultural, and recreational activities were experienced by more students than any other group of activities.

6. Religious activities were participated in more times during a quarter or semester than any other activity. Parent contact opportunities were participated in

---

[7]Geneva Rice Clark, "The Use of Community Activities in Student Teaching Programs in Tennessee" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1960), p. 46.

less than any other type of community activity during the quarter or semester.

7. The student teachers who did full-time student teaching participated more in community activities than did these students who did part-time student teaching. This indicates that more schools should endeavor and provide full-time student teaching if they prefer to have their student teachers participate in community activities as a part of the student teaching experience.[8]

Her purpose in making this study was to determine the extent, nature, and purpose of the participation of student teachers in community activities during the student teaching experiences provided by the teacher education institutions in Tennessee and will closely relate to the present study by providing data on student teachers themselves.

Hermanowicz found through interview and survey studies of college students and inservice teachers in 1966 that student teaching is the most strongly approved portion of teacher preparation.[9] Most writers have been kind to the area of student teaching. There has been some criticism of its operation. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education stated in 1960 that student teaching is " . . . entangled in a mass of confusion, unmade decisions, and experiences . . . without a comprehensive definition and clear-cut statement of goals and purposes."[10]

---

[8] Ibid., pp. 47-48.

[9] Henry J. Hermanowicz, "The Pluralistic World of Beginning Teachers: A Summary of Interview Studies," The Real World of the Beginning Teacher (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966), pp. 15-25.

[10] Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed., pp. 1376-77.

While there is room for improvement in student teaching, it seems to be firmly entrenched as the major facet of a teacher education program. What needs to be done now is to examine its elements carefully. At the present time some 90 percent of student teaching experiences are now off-campus in nonlaboratory schools, far from the shadow of the college of education.[11] Times have changed since the university laboratory school serviced most of the practice teaching students. "It would follow, then, as we plan change in our teacher education programs, we should use the student teaching experience as a point of departure."[12]

IV. THE ROLE ELEMENTS IN COLLEGE SUPERVISION

One of the most prolific publishers of material dealing with supervisors of student teaching is the Association of Student Teaching, now called the Association of Teacher Educators, a broader, more inclusive title. Its yearbooks are all devoted to some aspects of teacher education, most often with a focus on field experiences and their supervision.[13]

In a position paper published in 1968, the AST listed what it thought the responsibilities of a college supervisor were:

---

[11] L. O. Andrews, Student Teaching (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 49.

[12] James L. Fischer, The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiating Teacher Roles (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969), p. 67.

[13] The Association for Student Teaching, The College Supervisor: Conflict and Challenge, Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., Inc., 1964).

While their responsibilities vary from institution to institution, college supervisors generally hold or share responsibilities in certain ways:

1. Assisting the director of student teaching in which they will do their student teaching;

2. Orienting student teachers to the school environment in which they will do their student teaching;

3. Establishing and maintaining good relationships between colleges and cooperating schools;

4. Acquainting cooperating school personnel with the philosophy, objectives, organization, and content of the teacher education program;

5. Learning the philosophy, objectives, organization, and content of the cooperating school program;

6. Helping supervising teachers and other members of the supervisory team to understand and hence improve their performance in their supervisory role in the teacher education program;

7. Working with college and cooperating school personnel in planning an appropriate program of experience for student teachers;

8. Observing and conferring with student teachers in order to help them improve their instructional practices through clinical experiences in which the teacher-learning situation and related planning and evaluation activities are examined;

9. Consulting with supervising teachers and other professionals in order to analyze the performance of student teachers and plan experiences that will lead to their greater understanding and, therefore, to the improvement of their teaching;

10. Counseling with student teachers concerning problems of adjustment to their teaching role;

11. Conducting seminars or teaching courses designated to supplement and complement student teaching experiences;

12. Consulting with cooperating school personnel on curricula, instructional, and organizational matters when requested; and

13. Analyzing and refining their own professional skills.[14]

In order for the college supervisor to carry out these responsibilities, the AST listed the following conditions thought to be necessary for college supervisors to function effectively:

1. The academic community must be committed to participation in the teacher education program.

2. Student teaching must be an integral part of the teacher education program.

3. Student teaching must be a partnership program.

4. The roles of personnel involved in student teaching must remain flexible, although clearly defined.

5. Colleges should assign as college supervisors members of the faculty who are on regular appointment.

6. Institutional philosophy and politics guiding the promotion, work load, and rank of qualified college supervisors should be consistent with those for other faculty.

7. The role of the college supervisor in the field should be integrated with his academic role on campus.

8. The work of college supervisors must be effectively coordinated by a designated person with vision and an understanding of teacher education.

9. The role of the college supervisor should be so defined that he is an agent for interpreting to others the responsibility which the total profession of education has for improving the education of teachers.

10. State boards of education should support student teaching programs financially to the extent that recommendations related to the selection and function of the college supervisor may be realized.[15]

---

[14]The Association for Student Teaching, Position Paper, The College Supervisor (Washington, D. C.: Association for Student Teaching, 1968), pp. 5-6.

[15]Ibid., pp. 8-10.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has also gone on record with regard to the "shoulds" and "oughts" of teacher education. In a brief pamphlet, the AACTE referred to the role of the supervisor of student teachers, as well as the support personnel. In the final analysis, success or failure of professional programs will depend upon how well the job gets done by those responsible. Above all, the quality of teacher education programs offered, and the degree to which such quality is maintained, depend primarily upon the faculty.[16]

The Deans and Directors of Michigan Teacher Education Institutions approved a set of guidelines for teacher education programs with the intent of improving the partnership aspect of the schools and colleges. One facet of the plan encourages the use of clustering student teachers in selected buildings and providing a more efficient setting for the college supervisor.

> Students should spend full-time in student teaching and be assigned to school buildings in clusters with one university faculty member responsible for guiding the experiences of the students in no more than two buildings. These buildings should be in as close proximity as possible and the total number of students assigned per faculty member should not exceed twenty.
>
> Scheduling clusters of students in this way will permit assigning a college faculty member to work with them full-time.[17]

---

[16] American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Recommended Standards for Teacher Education (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969).

[17] Deans and Directors of Michigan Teacher Institutions, Position Paper, Student Teaching Programs (January 11, 1968), p. 2.

The Deans and Directors have also been cognizant of some of the college supervisors' problems and anticipate some improvements in the overall situation:

> One is that the proposed program allows for the university faculty member's time to be used more efficiently and effectively. He no longer must spend many hours in his automobile traveling from school to school, but instead can spend his time where he can be most useful, with the students in his charge.
>
> The element of greatly increased time available to his students makes it possible for him to become a much more effective instructor. Now he can work closely with his students on the unique problems of each. Under the traditional system which makes possible only a very limited contact with each student teacher, the university representative really has little chance to affect the behavior of the student in a very meaningful way.[18]

For all the verbige on the college supervisor, there is still the fact that his most serious concern is the lack of a definite description of his job. Andrews feels that ". . . confusion over the role of the college supervisor of student teaching is scarcely less than over the work of the cooperating teacher."[19]

One reason for the confusion is the time factor which is linked to financial considerations. Silberman found:

> Supervisors rarely have time to observe their students more than a few times; to reduce their loads to the point where they could observe student teachers more frequently would cost more than schools of education are willing or able to spend. For supervision is inherently expensive--a supervisor can observe only one student at a time and teacher education is done cheaply in the United States.[20]

---

[18] Ibid., p. 6.

[19] Andrews, op. cit., p. 63.

[20] Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 452-53.

Goodlad notes that with regard to supervision of student teaching, senior professors rarely want to fool with it; junior professors too often regard it as a necessary evil to be endured only until promotion releases them from it.[21] Stoller concluded that neither the method of supervision nor the particular supervisor had as differential an impact on the student teacher as does the combination of cooperating teacher and cooperating class. Even if the influence of the college supervisor could be great, the quality of college supervision is suspect.[22]

There are over 1100 colleges in the United States which offer teacher education. Almost all have student teaching as part of that education. Most of those have college supervisors who provide that link between the schools and the college. Bowers and Schofield, in a study of 264 student teachers, found:

> For the college supervisor, the areas of greatest strength seemed to be in giving suggestions regarding the improvement of instruction and motivation of pupils.[23]

The role of the college supervisor is vital in the development of high-quality student teaching programs. The philosophy and policies which guide the college supervisors' selection and function ultimately

---

[21]John I. Goodlad, "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences in the Education of Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (September, 1965), 266.

[22]Nathan Stoller, "Television for Teacher Education," Changes in Teacher Education: A Reappraisal. Report of the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association (1964), pp. 63-77.

[23]Norman D. Bowers and Alice G. Schofield, "Evaluating the Supervision of Student Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, X (December, 1959), 2-4.

determine the level of excellence of the teachers prepared and recommended by a teacher education institution and its cooperating schools.

To realize fully their potential contribution, college supervisors must work in a setting which enhances their opportunity to work as practicing scholars with their school colleagues. Schools would assume increased responsibility for the preparation of teachers, particularly in the student teaching experience. Within this context, college supervisors should become members of a cooperating supervisory team, sharing responsibilities for program development and for the quality of the teacher education experience. The college supervisor can markedly affect the operation of the team through the leadership he provides.

The centrality of his role demands that the college supervisor be carefully selected. His understanding of teacher education, his ability to provide leadership in guiding the growth of student teachers, and the quality of his preparation for the supervisory role are crucial factors in determining his potential as a college supervisor.

The college supervisor should provide consultant leadership and guidance to teacher education to develop effective individual teaching styles. He should assist the students in becoming familiar with the total responsibilities of teachers. He should also provide prospective teachers with learning opportunities in the analysis and evaluation of teaching performance, for the development of professional skill through

conceptralizing teaching, and for building a rationale for a professional role.[24]

V. THE ROLE OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

In a 1970 National Study Conference, the Association of Classroom Teachers recommended their organization seek answers to the following questions where student teaching programs are involving local public school systems, the colleges and universities, and local, state, and national organizations:

1. Does the school system provide for a student teaching program with area college or university?
2. If it does, how many different teacher preparation institutions send student teachers to the school system?
3. What is the nature of the agreement(s) between the school system and the teacher preparation institution(s)? If two or more institutions are involved, are the agreements identical or is there a wide degree of variance? Why? Are the agreements formal or informal, written or oral? Who makes these agreements?
4. What criteria are used in selecting the cooperating teacher? What should be his experience or training in supervision? To what extent is a planned program of continuing education of the cooperating teacher important? How is this program determined?

---

[24]National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, "Who's in Charge Here?" (a discussion paper on fixing responsibilities for student teaching, Washington, D. C., 1966).

5. What is the method of assigning and removing the student teacher? Is it based on written criteria? If so, who established the criteria?
6. What are the special conditions of employment of the cooperating teacher (for example, preparation time, class load, supplies, and equipment, number of student teachers, and compensation)?
7. What problems or frustrations exist for the cooperating teacher?
8. What are the qualifications of the college supervisor of student teachers? Should he have successful teaching experience in the field and at the level of the student teachers whom he is supervising?
9. Is there a plan for continued evaluation of the student teaching program with machinery to keep the program relevant or to discontinue it?[25]

The ACT felt their effectiveness would be extended if they helped develop qualifications of cooperating teachers, policies of assignment and employment of cooperating teachers and establish standards of status and responsibility of cooperating teachers as related to college supervisors of student teachers. (For example, is the cooperating teacher appropriately involved in decision making on the student teaching program? How? Is he appropriately involved in evaluating the student teacher? How? Is he accepted as a peer by university staff members?)[26]

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 8-9.

[26] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

As the professional associations tackle the problems of student teaching, they also recognize the need to negotiate with the board of education an agreement covering the qualifications and conditions of employment of cooperating teachers and including the mechanics for resolving future issues that may arise but are not spelled out in the agreement. The agreement might include policies on the selection, assignment, experience, and evaluation of the student teacher; the functions of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor of student teachers; and methods of evaluating the student teaching program or establishing an inservice education program for cooperating teachers.[27]

The state association of the ACT can aid the local association, which represents the cooperating classroom teachers by:

1. Gathering and disseminating information on student teaching;

2. Provide information on the legal status of the cooperating teacher and the student teacher;

3. Develop with the state department of education, the institutions preparing teachers, and the professional associations uniform guidelines to assist the local association in negotiating with the local school board agreements on the student teaching program;

4. Identify types of assistance that state associations are not providing to meet the needs of the local association in dealing with the student teaching program and initiate action, through resolution if necessary, to motivate state action.

5. Inform members of the association and the community about the student teaching program.[28]

---

[27]National Education Association, The Association of Classroom Teachers, A New Order in Student Teaching (Washington, D. C.: The Commission, 1970), pp. 37-38.

[28]Ibid., p. 40.

The state association of classroom teachers and the state education association are well suited to correlate the activities of local associations and to provide services beyond the realm of the local association. The state associations must:

1. Establish through action of the appropriate association legislative body a positive position on student teaching;

2. Study the problem at the state level to determine:

   a. The nature and type of student teaching program contracts in existence between local school districts and various institutions of teacher education;

   b. Relevant state laws;

   c. Local associations' actions;

3. Assume responsibility for developing suggested standards for:

   a. Agreements between colleges and school systems;

   b. Agreements between local associations and school systems;

   c. Qualifications for cooperating teachers;

   d. Qualifications for college supervisors of student teachers;

   e. Definition of roles and responsibilities of cooperating teachers, administrators, and university personnel;

4. Initiate legislation as necessary to:

   a. Legalize and finance the student teacher program;

   b. Provide liability protection for student teachers as well as cooperating teachers;

5. Gather and disperse information through research, surveys, conferences and workshops, periodicals, and special publications and releases.[29]

The cumulating question posed by the ACT is "What can the Association of Classroom Teachers and the National Education Association do?" The ACT and NEA must provide leadership and support the efforts of local and state associations. Specifically, they must:

1. Take firm positions on student teaching in their resolutions, particularly as it relates to the cooperating teacher and the local association;

2. Collect and dispense information on student teaching relating to the cooperating teacher and the local association;

3. Provide leadership in developing prototypes of state legislation, standards for qualifications of cooperating classroom teachers, and model agreements to be negotiated by local associations and local school boards;

4. Sponsor conferences on student teaching that provide opportunities for the voice of the classroom teacher to be heard loud and clear;

5. Develop a strategy for aggressive and meaningful involvement of classroom teachers in creating change in teacher education.[30]

VI. COMPENSATION TO THE SUPERVISING TEACHER

For many colleges and universities using off-campus student teaching centers, determining the most appropriate methods of rewarding supervising teachers for their services is a problem of great concern. It is evident from the recent research that many different practices for the compensation of supervising teachers are being used. The

---

[29] Ibid., p. 11.

[30] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

debatable questions involve whether a supervising teacher should be paid or not, and if he is paid, should he be paid directly or should the money be given to the school or the school system? There are some institutions and individuals who feel that the supervising teachers should not be paid cash, but instead, some other professional assistance should be offered.[31]

According to Glennon and Weeks, the types of awards made to cooperating centers and supervising teachers are:

1. Payment of money directly to the cooperating school or school district;
2. Awarding of tuition credit to the cooperating teacher;
3. Awarding of cash honorarium to the cooperating teacher;
4. Furnishing substitute teachers for the cooperating school;
5. Furnishing expense money for cooperating teachers' attendance at workshops, conferences, and conventions;
6. Housing of public school students in college-owned builings;
7. Granting to cooperating teachers the use of college facilities not offered to other teachers;
8. Supplying educational equipment, supplies, texts, and furniture;
9. Supplying occasional consultant services by college staff;
10. Awarding of a scholarship to a student of the cooperating school;

---

[31]Barkat, op. cit., p. 26.

11. Awarding a cash honorarium to the cooperating principal;

12. Awarding of credit toward the Bachelor's degree to the cooperating teacher.[32]

In Johnson's study an effort was made to ascertain the payment to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers for working with student teachers. Table 48 of Johnson's study shows that 24 percent of all respondents indicated that their institutions do not pay cooperating schools as cooperating teachers for working with their student teachers; 19 percent indicated that they make a payment to the school district (no effort was made in this study to determine what the school districts do with the money); 44 percent indicated that they make a payment directly to the cooperating teacher; and 12 percent checked the "other" category on this item. Most of these indicated that they use combinations or variations of those policies already mentioned.

Table 48 also shows that, of those institutions that do make a payment to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers, the mean amount of such payment is $58.00 for the entire country. A number of institutions reported that they pay a different amount to elementary or secondary cooperating teachers and also to public or private cooperating schools. Some respondents vary the payment according to the background of the cooperating teacher.

Table 49 of Johnson's study shows other benefits provided for cooperating teachers. For instance, this table shows that 46 percent of the responding institutions grant their cooperating teachers college

---

[32]Vincent J. Glennon and Edwin E. Weeks, "The Administration of Programs of Off-Campus Student Teaching," Thirtieth Yearbook, The Association of Student Teaching (Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: Assocation of Student Teaching, 1951), p. 54.

of the responding institutions grant their cooperating teachers college library privileges; 28 percent provide free consultant service from the college; 25 percent give cooperating teachers some type of free tuition for college courses (a considerable number of private institutions provide such a tuition grant rather than make a cash payment to cooperating teachers); 18 percent provide their cooperating teachers with free tickets to concerts; 13 percent list the names of their cooperating teachers with some type of college faculty status; and 13 percent listed "other" benefits that they provide. The most frequently mentioned of these, in order, are: providing a dinner for cooperating teachers; having an appreciation tea; and sending a letter of appreciation to the cooperating teacher. Other interesting benefits mentioned include: invitations to department of education programs, parking permits, use of college golf course, free tuition for adult education program, free course in the supervision of student teaching, use of college audio-visual equipment, certificate of associate in teacher education, use of campus instructional materials center, and the holding of a cocktail party.

Table 50 of Johnson's study shows the mean percent of institutions that pay building principals for the placement of student teachers in their buildings and also the mean amount of such payments. For the entire country, 7 percent of the responding institutions make such payments and the mean amount of these payments is $19.00 per student teacher.[33]

---

[33]Johnson, op. cit., p. 67.

Johnson further shows in his national study of student teaching programs that for Tennessee colleges and universities the policy concerning payment to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers and amount of such payment were:

21 schools do not pay this service;

32 schools make payment to school system;

21 schools make payment directly to the cooperating teacher;

26 schools listed payment as 'other' category;

$37.00 was average amount paid by those colleges and universities who remunerated.

Under benefits provided for cooperating teachers, Johnson shows that Tennessee colleges and universities provided:

21 schools provided library privileges;

37 schools provided consultant services;

5 schools provided some free tuition;

16 gave concert tickets;

5 listed name in college catalog;

11 gave athletic tickets;

5 offered faculty status;

11 listed benefits as 'other.'

Only five institutions in Tennessee provided payment to building principals for placement of student teachers in their buildings and the mean amount for these schools amounted to $2.00 per student teacher.[34]

---

[34] Ibid., p. 70.

CHAPTER III

EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS IN TENNESSEE

I. INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of the study was to analyze existing practices in student teaching programs offered by colleges and universities in Tennessee whose programs were approved by the State Board of Education. In this chapter data was presented from the questionnaire and interviews, analyzed and evaluated based on the area of major concern identified in Chapter I.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

After the questionnaire to be used had been developed, appropriate data were collected from the Tennessee colleges and universities with approved student teaching programs. The questionnaire included questions that would be applicable and appropriate to each participating institution. A 68 item questionnaire was submitted to the writer's advisory committee for suggested changes and improvement. A copy of the revised questionnaire is in Appendix C. The questionnaire consisted of five major sections. The first section was primarily concerned with the general background of the institution. The second section dealt with administration of the student teaching programs, and the third section was designed to secure information about the college supervisor. The fourth section was directed to the student

teachers themselves. In the fifth section the questions were concerned with the cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers.

III. THE PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

A letter was written to the Tennessee State Department of Education requesting a complete list of teacher education institutions whose programs are approved by the State Department. In response to this letter the writer received a copy of Tennessee Colleges and Universities Approved for Teacher Preparation by the State Board of Education.

A letter was sent to 35 department of education chairmen of the institutions in the State of Tennessee requesting the name, title, telephone number and type of student teaching program offered by the institution. Enclosed in the letter was a stamped, self-addressed card to encourage a prompt reply. A copy is in Appendix B.

Student teaching directors in the 35 institutions were mailed the questionnaire with a letter of explanation. Each of the 35 institutions responded to the questionnaire.

For the convenience of the study the name of the responding institution will be shown on the series of tables in a shortened form. The full title of the colleges and universities and their location within the state is in Appendix C.

III. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

The information gathered in the study is presented in a series of tables contained in this section. While these tables show data for each institution participating in the study, it should be noted that percentages do not always total 100 percent due to the failure of some respondents to answer all questions and additionally, to some round-off error.

General Background of the Institutions

The first section of the questionnaire dealt with the general background of the institution. Data in Table 1 shows the number of teacher education institutions that participated in the study, categorized by public and private status. There were 10 public and 25 private institutions.

Data in Table 2 presents the enrollment categorization of the responding institutions including undergraduate, graduate, full-time, and part-time students.

Table 3 presents data on the full-time undergraduate enrollments of the participating institutions. For instance, this table shows that for the entire state, five percent of the respondents have a full-time undergraduate enrollments of less than 500 students, while 40 percent have full-time undergraduate enrollments of between 500-999 students.

Data in Table 4 shows that, for the entire State, 31 percent of the responding institutions have up to 25 percent of their

Table 1

Teacher Education Institutions Participating in the Study Categorized by Type of Control

Institution	Public	Private	Total
Austin Peay	X		X
Belmont		X	X
Bethel		X	X
Bryan		X	X
Carson-Newman		X	X
Christian Brothers		X	X
David Lipscomb		X	X
East Tennessee State	X		X
Fisk		X	X
George Peabody		X	X
King		X	X
Knoxville		X	X
Lambuth		X	X
Lane		X	X
Lee		X	X
LeMoyne-Owen		X	X
Lincoln Memorial		X	X
Maryville		X	X
Memphis State	X		X
Middle Tennessee	X		X
Milligan		X	X
Tennessee State	X		X
Tennessee Temple		X	X
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X		X
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X		X
University of Tennessee at Martin	X		X
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X		X
Southern Missionary		X	X
Southwestern		X	X
Tennessee Tech	X		X
Tennessee Wesleyan		X	X
Trevecca Nazarene		X	X
Tusculum		X	X
Union		X	X
Vanderbilt		X	X
Frequency	10	25	35
Percent	29%	71%	100%

Table 2

Enrollment Category of Institutions*

Institution	0 - 499	500 - 999	1000 - 2999	3000 - 4999	5000 - 9999	10000 - 14999	15000 - 19999	20000 - 29999	30000 - Above
Austin Peay				X					
Belmont			X						
Bethel		X							
Bryan		X							
Carson-Newman			X						
Christian Brothers		X							
David Lipscomb			X						
East Tennessee State					X				
Fisk			X						
George Peabody			X						
King	X								
Knoxville			X						
Lambuth		X							
Lane		X							
Lee			X						
LeMoyne-Owen		X							
Lincoln Memorial		X							
Maryville		X							
Memphis State								X	
Middle Tennessee					X				
Milligan		X							
Tennessee State				X					
Tennessee Temple				X					
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga					X				
University of Tennessee at Knoxville								X	
University of Tennessee at Martin				X					
University of Tennessee at Nashville					X				
Southern Missionary			X						
Southwestern			X						
Tennessee Tech					X				
Tennessee Wesleyan		X							
Trevecca Nazarene		X							
Tusculum	X								
Union			X						
Vanderbilt					X				
Frequency	2	11	10	4	6	0	0	2	0
Percent	5%	31%	28%	11%	17%	0%	0%	5%	0%

*Includes undergraduate, graduate, full-time, and part-time students.

Table 3

Full-time Undergraduate Enrollment

Institution	0 - 499	500 - 999	1000 - 2999	3000 - 4999	5000 - 9999	10000 - 14999	15000 - 19999	20000 - 29999	30000 - Above
Austin Peay				X					
Belmont		X							
Bethel		X							
Bryan		X							
Carson-Newman			X						
Christian Brothers		X							
David Lipscomb			X						
East Tennessee State					X				
Fisk			X						
George Peabody			X						
King	X								
Knoxville			X						
Lambuth		X							
Lane		X							
Lee		X							
LeMoyne-Owen		X							
Lincoln Memorial		X							
Maryville		X							
Memphis State							X		
Middle Tennessee					X				
Milligan		X							
Tennessee State				X					
Tennessee Temple			X						
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga				X					
University of Tennessee at Knoxville								X	
University of Tennessee at Martin				X					
University of Tennessee at Nashville				X					
Southern Missionary			X						
Southwestern			X						
Tennessee Tech					X				
Tennessee Wesleyan		X							
Trevecca Nazarene		X							
Tusculum	X								
Union		X							
Vanderbilt				X					
Frequency	2	14	8	6	3	0	1	1	0
Percent	5%	40%	22%	17%	8%	0%	2%	2%	0%

Table 4

Percent of Full-time Undergraduate Students Preparing to be Teachers

	Percent Preparing to be Teachers			
Institution	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Austin Peay		X		
Belmont		X		
Bethel			X	
Bryan			X	
Carson-Newman		X		
Christian Brothers	X			
David Lipscomb		X		
East Tennessee State		X		
Fisk	X			
George Peabody				X
King		X		
Knoxville	X			
Lambuth		X		
Lane				X
Lee			X	
LeMoyne-Owen			X	
Lincoln Memorial		X		
Maryville		X		
Memphis State	X			
Middle Tennessee		X		
Milligan		X		
Tennessee State	X			
Tennessee Temple		X		
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X		
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X			
University of Tennessee at Martin	X			
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X		
Southern Missionary	X			
Southwestern	X			
Tennessee Tech		X		
Tennessee Wesleyan			X	
Trevecca Nazarene			X	
Tusculum	X			
Union	X			
Vanderbilt	X			
Frequency	12	15	6	2
Percent	31%	42%	17%	5%

undergraduates preparing to be teachers; 42 percent of the institutions have between 26 percent and 50 percent of their undergraduates preparing to be teachers; and 5 percent of the institutions have from 76 percent to 100 percent of their undergraduates preparing to be teachers.

Data in Table 5 shows the proportion of public and private schools that responded in the study; the schools that have received regional accreditation and the schools that have received NCATE accredition.

The data also show that 29 percent of the respondent group were public institutions and 71 percent were private institutions. This table also shows that 95 percent of the responding schools had received regional accreditation and that 45 percent of these schools had received NCATE accreditation.

None of the responding schools had only an elementary teacher education program, 5 percent had only a secondary teacher education program, and 95 percent had both elementary and secondary teacher education programs.

Administration of the Student Teaching Programs

Questions eight through twenty-six on the questionnaire dealt with the administrative aspects of student teaching.

Data in Table 6 deals with the title of the person in charge of the student teaching program. Data in this table shows that 45 percent of the responding institutions had a Director of Student Teaching. It also shows that at 17 percent of the schools the Head of the Department of Education administers the student teacher program. At 8 percent

Table 5

Undergraduate Programs Accredited by One of the Regional Associations or by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

Institution	Regional Accreditation		NCATE	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Austin Peay	X		X	
Belmont	X			X
Bethel	X			X
Bryan	X			X
Carson-Newman	X		X	
Christian Brothers	X			X
David Lipscomb	X		X	
East Tennessee State	X		X	
Fisk	X			X
George Peabody	X		X	
King	X			X
Knoxville	X			X
Lambuth		X		X
Lane	X			X
Lee	X			X
LeMoyne-Owen	X		X	
Lincoln Memorial	X			X
Maryville	X			X
Memphis State	X		X	
Middle Tennessee	X		X	
Milligan	X		X	
Tennessee State	X		X	
Tennessee Temple		X		X
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X		X	
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X		X	
University of Tennessee at Martin	X		X	
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X		X	
Southern Missionary	X		X	
Southwestern	X			X
Tennessee Tech	X		X	
Tennessee Wesleyan	X			X
Trevecca Nazarene	X			X
Tusculum	X			X
Union	X			X
Vanderbilt	X			X
Frequency	33	2	16	19
Percent	95%	5%	45%	55%

Table 6

Title of the Person Who is Directly in Charge of Total Student Teaching Program

Institution	Director	Coordinator	Dept. Head	Dean	Other
Austin Peay	X				
Belmont					
Bethel	X				
Bryan	X				
Carson-Newman	X				
Christian Brothers			X		
David Lipscomb		X			
East Tennessee State	X				
Fisk	X				
George Peabody	X				
King			X		
Knoxville	X				
Lambuth				X	
Lane	X				
Lee				X	
LeMoyne-Owen	X				
Lincoln Memorial			X		
Maryville			X		
Memphis State					X
Middle Tennessee	X				
Milligan	X				
Tennessee State		X			
Tennessee Temple	X				
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga					X
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X				
University of Tennessee at Martin				X	
University of Tennessee at Nashville					X
Southern Missionary	X				
Southwestern					X
Tennessee Tech		X			
Tennessee Wesleyan			X		
Trevecca Nazarene					X
Tusculum	X				
Union			X		
Vanderbilt					X
Frequency	16	3	6	3	6
Percent	45%	8%	17%	8%	17%

of the institutions the student teaching program was administered by a Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences, while at 8 percent of the institutions this task was performed by the Dean of the College of Education. At 17 percent of the institutions the person who administers the student teaching program has some "other" title. Though not mentioned frequently, some of the more unusual titles for a person administering the student teaching program included Director of Professional Laboratory Services; Coordinator of Field Services; Supervisor in Charge of Professional Laboratory Experiences; Chairman, Department of Education, Director of Teacher Education and Director, Office of Teacher Education.

Data in Table 7 shows that, at 17 percent of the responding institutions, the person administering the student teaching program was in his or her first year in that position. At 14 percent of the schools this person had been in that position for 1 - 2 years, at 17 percent of the schools for 3 - 4 years, at 37 percent of the schools for 5 - 10 years, at 8 percent of the schools for 11 - 15 years, at 2 percent of the schools for 20 years or more.

Table 8 shows the percent of time the person who administers the student teaching program actually spent in this task (as opposed to supervising student teachers, teaching classes, other administrative duties, etc.). The table shows that, for the entire State of Tennessee, at 8 percent of the institutions the person who administers the student teaching program devotes from 1 percent to 10 percent of his or her total time to administering the program; at 20 percent of the institutions from 11 percent to 25 percent; at 31 percent of the institutions from 26 percent to 50 percent; at 20 percent of the institutions from

Table 7

Years of Experience as the Administrator of Student Teacher Program

Institution	Number of Years in Position						
	0-1	1-2	3-4	5-10	11-15	16-20	20+
Austin Peay	X						
Belmont							
Bethel		X					
Bryan				X			
Carson-Newman			X				
Christian Brothers		X					
David Lipscomb				X			
East Tennessee State				X			
Fisk			X				
George Peabody				X			
King				X			
Knoxville				X			
Lambuth	X						
Lane				X			
Lee				X			
LeMoyne-Owen			X				
Lincoln Memorial	X						
Maryville				X			
Memphis State		X					
Middle Tennessee				X			
Milligan					X		
Tennessee State			X				
Tennessee Temple		X					
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X						
University of Tennessee at Knoxville				X			
University of Tennessee at Martin			X				
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X						
Southern Missionary							X
Southwestern				X			
Tennessee Tech				X			
Tennessee Wesleyan		X					
Trevecca Nazarene					X		
Tusculum			X				
Union	X						
Vanderbilt					X		
Frequency	6	5	6	13	3	0	1
Percent	17%	14%	17%	37%	8%	0%	2%

Table 8

Years in Charge of Student Teaching Program and Percent of Time Devoted to Administering the Student Teaching Program

Institution	Years in Charge of Student Teaching Program							Percent of Time Spent In Administering Student Tchr. Program					
	Less 1 yr.	1-2	3-4	5-10	11-15	16-20	20+	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-90%	91-100%
Austin Peay	X										X		
Belmont			X							X			
Bethel		X								X			
Bryan				X								X	
Carson-Newman			X							X			
Christian Brothers		X								X			
David Lipscomb				X					X				
East Tennessee State				X						X			
Fisk			X						X				
George Peabody				X						X			
King				X				X					
Knoxville				X							X		
Lambuth	X										X		
Lane				X								X	
Lee				X					X				
LeMoyne-Owen			X								X		
Lincoln Memorial	X								X				
Maryville				X					X				
Memphis State		X										X	
Middle Tennessee				X									X
Milligan					X			X					
Tennessee State			X								X		
Tennessee Temple		X								X			
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X									X			
University of Tennessee at Knoxville				X									X

Table 8 (continued)

Institution	Years in Charge of Student Teaching Program							Percent of Time Spent In Administering Student Tchr. Program					
	Less 1 yr.	1-2	3-4	5-10	11-15	16-20	20+	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-90%	91-100%
University of Tennessee at Martin			X							X			
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X							X					
Southern Missionary							X		X				
Southwestern				X					X				
Tennessee Tech				X							X		
Tennessee Wesleyan		X								X			
Trevecca Nazarene					X					X			
Tusculum			X								X		
Union	X									X			
Vanderbilt					X				X				
Frequency	6	5	7	13	3	0	1	3	8	12	7	3	2
Percent	17%	14%	18%	36%	8%	0%	2%	8%	21%	30%	20%	8%	5%

51 percent to 75 percent; at 8 percent of the institutions from 76 percent to 90 percent; and at 5 percent of the institutions from 91 percent to 100 percent.

Data in Table 9 shows the extent to which elementary student teaching is done on campus or off campus; the extent to which elementary student teaching is done on a full-time or part-time basis; and the mean number of quarter credit hours or semester credit hours awarded for elementary student teaching. This table shows that in 3 percent of the institutions, elementary student teaching is done primarily on campus while at 97 percent of the institutions, elementary student teaching is done primarily off campus.

Table 9 shows that, for the entire state, 97 percent of the respondents have predominantly full-time elementary student teaching while only four institutions, or 3 percent, have part-time elementary student teaching.

Data in Table 9 also indicates that, for those institutions on the quarter system a mean of 14.00 quarter credits are awarded for elementary student teaching. Likewise, for institutions on semester system, a mean of 6.05 semester credits are awarded for elementary student teaching.

Two institutions indicated they have student teachers both on and off campus.

Data in Table 10 indicates the length of elementary student teaching assignments. This table shows the mean length of the elementary student teaching assignment for the the State of Tennessee is 10.00 weeks. All 35 of the institutions responding in the study shows that

Table 9

Elementary Student Teaching: Where Done, Full or Part Time, and Number of Credits

Institution	Where Done		Full or Part Time		Mean Number of Credits	
	On Campus	Off Campus	Full Time	Part Time	Quarter Hours	Semester Hours
Austin Peay		X	X		15	
Belmont		X	X			8
Bethel		X	X		16	
Bryan	X		X			8
Carson-Newman		X	X			6-9
Christian Brothers		X		X		6
David Lipscomb		X	X		16	
East Tennessee State	X	X	X			16
Fisk		X	X			8
George Peabody		X	X			10
King		X	X	X		6
Knoxville		X	X			12
Lambuth		X	X			8
Lane		X	X			6
Lee		X	X			6
LeMoyne-Owen		X	X			7
Lincoln Memorial		X	X		12	
Maryville		X	X			9
Memphis State		X	X			9
Middle Tennessee		X	X			6
Milligan		X	X			8
Tennessee State		X	X			15
Tennessee Temple		X	X			6
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X	X			6
University of Tennessee at Knoxville		X	X		15	

Table 9 (continued)

Institution	Where Done		Full or Part Time		Mean Number of Credits	
	On Campus	Off Campus	Full Time	Part Time	Quarter Hours	Semester Hours
University of Tennessee at Martin		X	X		15	
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X	X		15	
Southern Missionary	X	X	X			8
Southwestern		X		X		4-6
Tennessee Tech		X	X		15	
Tennessee Wesleyan		X	X	X	6	
Trevecca Nazarene		X	X		12	
Tusculum		X	X		18	
Union		X	X			9
Vanderbilt		X	X			10
Frequency	3	34	34	4	14.00	6.05
Percent	9%	97%	97%	12%		

Table 10

Length of Elementary Student Teaching Assignment

Institution	Length in Weeks	Days Per Week	Hours Per Day	Approx. Total No. of Hours Spent in Student Teaching
Austin Peay	10	5	7	350
Belmont	8	5	7	320
Bethel	11	5	9	480
Bryan	8	5	7	140
Carson-Newman	10	5	8	400
Christian Brothers	14	5	3	210
David Lipscomb	10	5	7.5	350
East Tennessee State	10	5	7	325
Fisk	8	5	7	150
George Peabody	16	5	8	640
King	6-14	5		150
Knoxville	10	5	7	350
Lambuth	9	5	7.5	337
Lane	9	5	7	300
Lee	8	5	7	280
LeMoyne-Owen	7	5	7	210
Lincoln Memorial	9-10	5	7	200
Maryville	10	5	6	300
Memphis State	9	5	6	270
Middle Tennessee	7-5	5	7	270
Milligan	8	5	6	240
Tennessee State	10	5	6	225
Tennessee Temple	8	5	5.5	200
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	8	5	8	200
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	10	5	7	325
University of Tennessee at Martin	10	5	6	270
University of Tennessee at Nashville	10	5	7.5	370
Southern Missionary	16	5	7	240
Southwestern	12	5	2	105
Tennessee Tech	10	5	7	350
Tennessee Wesleyan	8	5	6	260
Trevecca Nazarene	10	5	6.5	125
Tusculum	10	5	7.5	240
Union	16	5	6	480
Vanderbilt	7.5	5	7.5	150
Mean	10	5	7	295

elementary student teachers devote five days per week and a mean average of seven hours per day. Additionally, for the entire state, the mean total number of clock hours spent in elementary student teaching was 295 hours. It should be noted that this figure represents the total clock hours spent in the entire student teaching assignment and not just the total hours spent in actual classroom instruction.

Data in Table 11 deals with secondary student teaching. This table shows, for instance, that 3 percent of the institutions in the state have student teachers on campus while 97 percent of the institutions have their secondary student teachers off campus. Table 11 also shows that at 96 percent of the institutions, secondary student teachers do full-time student teaching and only 3 percent of the institutions do part-time secondary student teaching.

This table further indicates the mean number of quarter credits awarded for secondary student teachers by institutions on the quarter system is 14.34. Similarily, the mean number of semester credits awarded for secondary student teaching by institutions on the semester plan is 7.20.

Data in Table 12 indicates the length of secondary student teaching assignments. The table shows the mean length of secondary student teaching assignment in Tennessee is 10.00 weeks. Table 12 shows the secondary student teachers also teach five days per week and devote 7.5 mean hours per day. Lastly, Table 12 indicates the mean total clock hours devoted to secondary student teaching was 300 hours.

Data in Table 13 shows the type of school in which student teachers are placed. For the entire state, this table shows that 68

Table 11

Secondary Student Teaching: Where Done, Full or Part Time, and Number of Credits

Institution	Where Done		Full or Part Time		Mean Number of Credits	
	On Campus	Off Campus	Full Time	Part Time	Quarter Hours	Semester Hours
Austin Peay		X	X		15	
Belmont		X	X			8
Bethel		X	X		16	
Bryan	X		X			8
Carson-Newman		X	X			6-9
Christian Brothers		X		X		6
David Lipscomb		X	X		16	
East Tennessee State	X	X	X		16	
Fisk		X	X			8
George Peabody		X	X			10
King		X	X	X		6
Knoxville		X	X			12
Lambuth		X	X			6
Lane		X	X			6
Lee		X	X			6
LeMoyne-Owen		X	X			7
Lincoln Memorial		X	X		12	
Maryville		X	X			9
Memphis State		X	X			9
Middle Tennessee		X	X			6
Milligan		X	X			8
Tennessee State		X	X		15	
Tennessee Temple		X	X			6
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X	X			6
University of Tennessee at Knoxville		X	X		15	

Table 11 (continued)

Institution	Where Done		Full or Part Time		Mean Number of Credits	
	On Campus	Off Campus	Full Time	Part Time	Quarter Hours	Semester Hours
University of Tennessee at Martin		X	X		15	
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X	X		15	
Southern Missionary	X	X	X			6
Southwestern		X		X		4-6
Tennessee Tech		X	X		15	
Tennessee Wesleyan		X	X		6	
Trevecca Nazarene		X	X		12	
Tusculum		X	X		18	
Union		X	X			9
Vanderbilt		X	X			10
Frequency	3	34	33	3	14.34	7.20
Percent	9%	97%	94%	9%		

Table 12

Length of Secondary Student Teaching Assignment

Institution	Length in Weeks	Days Per Week	Hours Per Day	Approx. Total No. of Hours Spent in Student Teaching
Austin Peay	10	5	7	350
Belmont	8	5	7	320
Bethel	11	5	9	480
Bryan	8	5	7	140
Carson-Newman	10	5	8	400
Christian Brothers	14	5	3	210
David Lipscomb	10	5	7.5	350
East Tennessee State	10	5	7	325
Fisk	8	5	7	150
George Peabody	16	5	7	544
King	6-14	5		150
Knoxville	10	5	7	350
Lambuth	9	5	7.5	262
Lane	9	5	7	300
Lee	8	5	7	280
LeMoyne-Owen	7-14	5	3.5-7	210
Lincoln Memorial	9-10	5	6	200
Maryville	10	5	6	300
Memphis State	9	5	6	270
Middle Tennessee	7.5	5	7	265
Milligan	8	5	4	160
Tennessee State	10	5	6	225
Tennessee Temple	8	5	5.5	200
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	8	5	8	200
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	10	5	7	325
University of Tennessee at Martin	10	5	6	270
University of Tennessee at Nashville	10	5	7.5	370
Southern Missionary	16	5	4.5	180
Southwestern	10	5	2	110
Tennessee Tech	10	5	7	350
Tennessee Wesleyan	8	5	6	260
Trevecca Nazarene	10	5	6.5	125
Tusculum	10	5	7.5	240
Union	16	5	6	480
Vanderbilt	7.5	5	7.5	150
Mean	10	5	7.5	300

Table 13

Type of Schools Where Student Teachers Are Placed

Institution	Public Only	Private Only	Both Public and Private	Campus Laboratory	Other
Austin Peay	X				
Belmont	X				
Bethel			X		
Bryan	X				
Carson-Newman	X				
Christian Brothers			X		
David Lipscomb	X				
East Tennessee State	X				
Fisk	X				
George Peabody	X				
King	X				
Knoxville	X				
Lambuth					X
Lane	X				
Lee	X				
LeMoyne-Owen			X		
Lincoln Memorial			X		
Maryville	X				
Memphis State			X		
Middle Tennessee	X				
Milligan	X				
Tennessee State	X				
Tennessee Temple	X				
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga			X		
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X				
University of Tennessee at Martin	X				
University of Tennessee at Nashville			X		
Southern Missionary			X		
Southwestern			X		
Tennessee Tech	X				
Tennessee Wesleyan	X				
Trevecca Nazarene	X				
Tusculum	X				
Union			X		
Vanderbilt	X				
Frequency	24	0	10	0	1
Percent	68%	0%	30%	0%	2%

percent of the responding institutions place student teachers in public schools only; no schools place student teachers in private schools only; 30 percent place student teachers in both public and private schools; no schools place student teachers in the campus laboratory school only, and 2 percent checked the "other" category on this item.

Data in Table 14 deals with the admission requirements for student teaching. Ninety-seven percent of the responding institutions include overall academic record as an admission requirement for student teaching; 77 percent include record in professional education courses; 91 percent include record in major field; 78 percent require a recommendation by advisor; 52 percent include some type of check on emotional stability; 51 percent include English proficiency; 53 percent include a check on physical fitness; 51 percent check on speech and voice; 46 percent check on personal-social-ethical fitness of the student; 31 percent check on students' hearing; 6 percent include extra-class activity; and 32 percent checked the "other" category on this item. Among the more frequently listed "other" requirements for admission to student teaching listed by various institutions were: senior standing; admission by departmental or committee recommendation; completion of handwriting course for elementary education students; academic record in minor field; and selected test results.

Data in Table 15 indicates the percent of applicants denied admission to student teaching. This table shows that, for the entire State of Tennessee, 8 percent of the institutions admit all applicants to student teaching; 34 percent deny 1 - 2 percent of the applicants; 5 percent deny 3 - 4 percent of the applicants; 17 percent deny 5 - 6

Table 14

Admission Requirements for Student Teaching

Institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Austin Peay	X		X									
Belmont	X	X	X		X	X		X				
Bethel	X	X	X					X				
Bryan	X	X	X					X	X			
Carson-Newman	X	X	X					X				
Christian Brothers	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	
David Lipscomb	X	X	X				X	X	X	X		
East Tennessee State	X	X	X									
Fisk	X											
George Peabody	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
King	X		X					X				
Knoxville	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Lambuth	X		X		X		X	X		X		
Lane	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
Lee	X	X	X	X			X	X		X		
LeMoyne-Owen	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Lincoln Memorial	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		
Maryville	X	X	X					X				
Memphis State	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Middle Tennessee	X				X	X	X		X	X		
Milligan	X	X	X				X	X	X			
Tennessee State			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Tennessee Temple	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X	X	X		X	X		X				

Table 14 (continued)

Institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
University of Tennessee at Martin	X	X	X				X	X	X	X		
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Southern Missionary	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		
Southwestern	X	X	X					X				
Tennessee Tech	X	X	X	X				X				
Tennessee Wesleyan	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X			
Trevecca Nazarene	X	X	X	X	X			X		X		
Tusculum	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X			
Union	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		
Vanderbilt	X		X	X								
Totals	34	29	32	18	18	11	20	31	19	16	2	0

*1 - Overall academic record
2 - Record in proffessional education courses
3 - Record in major field
4 - English proficiency
5 - Speech and voice
6 - Hearing
7 - Physical fitness
8 - Recommendation by advisor
9 - Emotional stability
10 - Personal--social--ethical fitness
11 - Extra class activities
12 - Other, please state

Table 15

Applicants Denied Admission to Student Teaching

Institution	None	0-1%	1-2%	3-4%	5-6%	7-8%	9-10%	10% +
Austin Peay			X					
Belmont			X					
Bethel	X							
Bryan		X						
Carson-Newman			X					
Christian Brothers			X					
David Lipscomb			X					
East Tennessee State								X
Fisk		X						
George Peabody			X					
King					X			
Knoxville				X				
Lambuth	X							
Lane			X					
Lee					X			
LeMoyne-Owen		X						
Lincoln Memorial	X							
Maryville			X					
Memphis State								X
Middle Tennessee							X	
Milligan						X		
Tennessee State			X					
Tennessee Temple					X			
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga				X				
University of Tennessee at Knoxville					X			
University of Tennessee at Martin					X			
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X						
Southern Missionary			X					
Southwestern			X					
Tennessee Tech						X		
Tennessee Wesleyan		X						
Trevecca Nazarene					X			
Tusculum		X						
Union		X						
Vanderbilt			X					
Frequency	3	7	12	2	6	2	1	2
Percent	8%	20%	34%	5%	17%	5%	2%	5%

percent of the applicants; 5 percent deny 7 - 8 percent of the applicants; 2 percent deny 9 - 10 percent of the applicants; and 5 percent deny more than 10 percent of the applicants to student teaching.

Table 16 presents data on the summer student teaching programs. Data from this table shows 42 percent of the responding institutions do not conduct summer student teaching programs; 8 percent of the institutions conduct summer student teaching for their regular undergraduates only; 14 percent conduct summer student teaching programs for both regular and undergraduates and experienced teachers.

Additional data in this table indicates those institutions that conducted other types of summer student teaching programs. Thirty-four percent of those responding institutions showed no summer student teaching; 14 percent had campus laboratory school only; 34 percent had student teaching in surrounding school systems only; and 11 percent in both campus laboratory and surrounding school systems.

Item number 17 on the questionnaire read, "To the best of your knowledge, has your student teaching program or have any of your student teachers ever been involved in a law suit growing out of any aspect of student teaching?" Respondents were given an opportunity to check "yes" or "no" to this question and then were directed, "If yes, please briefly state circumstances and outcome." These institutions were also asked to briefly state the circumstances and outcomes of these law suits. The comments offered by the two institutions responding were:

1. Student teacher was threatened with a law suit over a student losing a tooth. The board of education settled by paying the dental bills.

Table 16

Summer Student Teaching

Institution	Type of Summer Student Teaching Program					Appropriate Statement Concerning Student Teaching			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Austin Peay	X					X			
Belmont	X					X			
Bethel				X				X	
Bryan	X					X			
Carson-Newman	X					X			
Christian Brothers	X							X	
David Lipscomb				X			X		
East Tennessee State				X			X		
Fisk	X					X			
George Peabody	X			X					X
King	X			X				X	
Knoxville						X			
Lambuth							X		
Lane						X			
Lee		X						X	
LeMoyne-Owen				X				X	
Lincoln Memorial					X			X	
Maryville	X					X			
Memphis State			X						X
Middle Tennessee			X				X		
Milligan				X				X	
Tennessee State	X								
Tennessee Temple	X								
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X								
University of Tennessee at Knoxville			X					X	

Table 16 (continued)

Institution	Type of Summer Student Teaching Program					Appropriate Statement Concerning Student Teaching			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
University of Tennessee at Martin			X					X	
University of Tennessee at Nashville				X				X	
Southern Missionary		X							X
Southwestern				X				X	
Tennessee Tech			X				X		
Tennessee Wesleyan		X						X	
Trevecca Nazarene	X					X			
Tusculum				X					X
Union				X					
Vanderbilt	X								
Frequency	15	3	5	11	1	12	5	12	4
Percent	42%	8%	14%	31%	2%	34%	14%	34%	11%

*1 - No summer student teaching
2 - Program for regular undergraduates only
3 - Program for experienced teachers only
4 - Program for both 2 and 3
5 - Other
6 - No summer student teaching
7 - Program in campus laboratory school only
8 - Teaching in surrounding school systems only
9 - Program in both campus laboratory and surrounding school systems

2. Student given a failing grade. Suit was dropped.

Data in Table 17 deals with financial aspects of student teaching. This table shows that only 48 percent or 15 institutions had this information available. For these institutions who had this data available the mean amount of the total student teaching budget was $25,868.00. This figure, however, does not include salaries, travel, etc., for the full-time and part-time college personnel working in the student teaching program.

Data in this table further shows that 51 percent of the institutions provided information on the cost of their student teaching program per student teacher. The mean amount of the cost per student teacher was $108.00.

Also shown in the table were the 19 responding institutions, or 54 percent, that assess a special student teaching fee in addition to regular tuition charges. The mean amount of this special fee was $43.00.

Only one institution, responding to item on the questionnaire, pay the cost of student transportation during student teaching.

The information gathered in the study on the financial aspects of student teaching would be more meaningful if the data from each responding institution was viewed institutionally, rather than the state.

Data in Table 18 deals with innovations and research in student teaching. This table shows that 54 percent of the responding institutions indicated that they had what they considered to be innovations in

Table 17

Student Teaching Budget

Institution	Total Amount of Student Teacher Budget		Cost Per Student Teacher		Assessment of Special Student Teacher Fee		1*
	Have Info.	Mean Amount	Have Info.	Mean Amount	Yes	Mean Amount	Yes
Austin Peay			X	$60.00			
Belmont					X	$50.00	
Bethel	X	$15,500	X	*2	X	$20.00	
Bryan			X	$50.00	X	$50.00	
Carson-Newman	X	$ 5,500	X	$50.00	X	$50.00	
Christian Brothers	X	$ 3,000	X	$105.00	X	$45.00	
David Lipscomb							
East Tennessee State							
Fisk					X		
George Peabody							
King					X	$30.00	
Knoxville					X	$40.00	
Lambuth	X	$ 3,500	X	$45.00	X	$40.00	X
Lane	X	$ 5,000	X	$45.00	X	$45.00	
Lee	X	$ 7,000	X	$700.00	X	$50.00	
LeMoyne-Owen	X	$ 4,000+	X	$75.00	X	$35.00	
Lincoln Memorial							
Maryville					X	$30.00	
Memphis State	X	$72,866	X	$91.00			
Middle Tennessee							
Milligan							
Tennessee State							
Tennessee Temple					X	$30.00	
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga							
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X	$200,000	X	$250.00			

Table 17 (continued)

Institution	Total Amount of Student Teacher Budget		Cost Per Student Teacher		Assessment of Special Student Teacher Fee		1*
	Have Info.	Mean Amount	Have Info.	Mean Amount	Yes	Mean Amount	Yes
University of Tennessee at Martin							
University of Tennessee at Nashville							
Southern Missionary			X	$50.00			
Southwestern	X	$ 1,000	X	*3	X	$ 5.00	
Tennessee Tech	X	$49,795	X	$100.00			
Tennessee Wesleyan	X	$ 1,000	X	$40.00	X	$25.00	
Trevecca Nazarene	X	$18,000	X	$300.00	X	$45.00	
Tusculum	X	$ 900	X	$12.00			
Union	X	$ 1,000	X	$20.00	X	$90.00	
Vanderbilt					X	$50.00	
Frequency	15	$25,868	18	$108.00	19	$40.00	1
Percent	48%		51%		54%		2%

*1 - Institution pays cost of transportation for student teaching.
2 - Total budget $3,875.
3 - $5.00 per semester hour that goes to center teacher.

Table 18

Student Teaching Programs Using Innovative Techniques and Research

Institution	Innovation		Research Grants	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Austin Peay		X		X
Belmont		X	X*	
Bethel	X			X
Bryan		X		X
Carson-Newman	X			X
Christian Brothers	X			X
David Lipscomb		X		X
East Tennessee State		X		X
Fisk		X		X
George Peabody	X			X
King		X		X
Knoxville	X			X
Lambuth		X		X
Lane		X		X
Lee	X			X
LeMoyne-Owen		X		X
Lincoln Memorial	X			X
Maryville		X		X
Memphis State	X			X
Middle Tennessee				X
Milligan	X			X
Tennessee State	X			X
Tennessee Temple				X
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga			X*	
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X			X
University of Tennessee at Martin		X		X
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X			X
Southern Missionary	X			X
Southwestern		X		X
Tennessee Tech	X			X
Tennessee Wesleyan	X			X
Trevecca Nazarene	X			X
Tusculum	X			X
Union	X			X
Vanderbilt	X			X
Frequency	19	13	2	33
Percent	54%	37%	5%	95%

*Some innovations

their student teaching programs. The most frequent innovations noted were: video tape usage, team teaching, micro-teaching, and tutoring requirements. Though not mentioned frequently, some of the more unusual innovations mentioned included: modular approach in Foundations of Education courses, personal-social-ethnic experiences, preteaching assignment, contracting, cluster planning with generalist supervision, career opportunities program, and experienced teacher interns.

Two institutions indicated they had received teaching and research grants. One received a $28,000.00 grant and the other was for $1,000.00

Data in Table 19 deals with the laboratory school and its use in professional laboratory experiences. This table shows 20 percent or seven responding institutions have a campus laboratory school. This table further shows that 2 percent of the institutions that have a campus laboratory school do not use it for providing professional laboratory experiences; while 14 percent of the institutions use it for observation and participation only. Among the "other" uses of the campus laboratory school are: summer student teaching only; observation and participation by students from introductory and foundation courses; and teachers renewing teaching certificates.

Data in Table 20 shows the number and percent of institutions having internship programs. This table shows, for the entire state, a total of 12 institutions (34 percent) have some type of internship program. Nearly all of the internships are the graduate level. The MAT (Master of Arts in Teaching) was the most frequently mentioned type of internship program.

Table 19

Use of Campus Laboratory School in Professional Laboratory Experiences

Institution	Lab. School		Use in Professional Laboratory Experiences							
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Austin Peay		X		X						
Belmont		X								
Bethel		X								
Bryan		X								
Carson-Newman		X								
Christian Brothers		X								
David Lipscomb	X			X						
East Tennessee State	X				X					
Fisk		X								
George Peabody		X								
King		X								
Knoxville		X								
Lambuth		X	X							
Lane		X								
Lee		X								
LeMoyne-Owen		X								
Lincoln Memorial		X								
Maryville		X								
Memphis State	X									X
Middle Tennessee	X			X						
Milligan		X								
Tennessee State		X								
Tennessee Temple		X								
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X								
University of Tennessee at Knoxville		X								

Table 19 (continued)

Institution	Lab. School		Use in Professional Laboratory Experiences							
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
University of Tennessee at Martin		X								
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X								
Southern Missionary	X									X
Southwestern		X								
Tennessee Tech	X			X						
Tennessee Wesleyan		X								
Trevecca Nazarene		X								
Tusculum	X			X						
Union		X								
Vanderbilt		X								
Frequency	7	28	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	2
Percent	20%	80%	2%	14%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	5%

* 1 - Not used for professional laboratory experiences at all.
2 - Observation and participation only
3 - Only one student teacher a year placed in each room
4 - One student teacher placed in a room each quarter/semester
5 - Two student teachers placed in a room at the same time
6 - Three student teachers placed in a room at the same time
7 - Four student teachers placed in a room at the same time
8 - Other

Table 20

Internship Programs

Institution	Internships	
	Yes	No
Austin Peay	X	
Belmont		X
Bethel		X
Bryan		X
Carson-Newman		X
Christian Brothers		X
David Lipscomb		X
East Tennessee State	X	
Fisk		X
George Peabody	X	
King		X
Knoxville	X	
Lambuth	X	
Lane		X
Lee		X
LeMoyne-Owen	X	
Lincoln Memorial	X	
Maryville		X
Memphis State	X	
Middle Tennessee	X	
Milligan		X
Tennessee State		X
Tennessee Temple		X
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X	
University of Tennessee at Martin		X
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X
Southern Missionary		X
Southwestern		X
Tennessee Tech	X	
Tennessee Wesleyan		X
Trevecca Nazarene		X
Tusculum		X
Union		X
Vanderbilt	X	
Frequency	12	23
Percent	34%	66%

The College Supervisor

Questions 27 through 36 on the questionnaire dealt with the college supervisor. This section of the report presents the information obtained from these question.

Data in Table 21 shows the number of college supervisors in the state. This table indicates that, for all responding institutions, the number of full-time elementary college supervisors is 37 and the number of part-time elementary college supervisors is 48. The number of full-time secondary college supervisors is 56; and the number of part-time secondary college supervisors is 120. Part-time college supervisors, in this item, might be either employed only part-time by the college or, if employed full-time by the college, devote only part of their time to the supervisors of student teachers.

Data in Table 22 deals with the degree status of all college supervisors and with the type of college supervisors used in the student teaching program. This table shows 17 percent of the responding institutions, all of the college supervisors have doctoral degrees; at 48 percent of the institutions, most of the college supervisors have a doctoral degree, at 28 percent of the institutions most of the college supervisors have a master's degree plus additional graduate work.

Data in Table 22 also shows that 28 percent of the responding schools utilize general college supervisors in their student teaching program; 22 percent utilize college supervisors from the academic area; 42 percent utilize both general college supervisors and supervisors from the academic areas; and 5 percent checked the "other" category on this item. "Other" category items used were: professors and assistant professors from the Division of Education on a part-time basis.

Table 21

Number of College Supervisors Involved in Full and Part Time Supervision of Student Teachers

Institution	Elementary		Secondary		Total
	Full Time Supervisors	Part Time Supervisors	Full Time Supervisors	Part Time Supervisors	
Austin Peay	1	4	1	3	9
Belmont	1		1		2
Bethel		2		1	3
Bryan	1		1		2
Carson-Newman	2	4			6
Christian Brothers		1		1	2
David Lipscomb		3		2-10	13
East Tennessee State	No breakdown as to elementary - secondary				14
Fisk	3		3	2	8
George Peabody	4		10	1	15
King		1		1	2
Knoxville		1		2	3
Lambuth	1		1		2
Lane	1	1	1	3	6
Lee		5		10	15
LeMoyne-Owen	1		1	4	6
Lincoln Memorial	1	2		1	4
Maryville		1		14	15
Memphis State		11		25	36
Middle Tennessee	None permanently designated as such				
Milligan		2		2	4
Tennessee State	2		1	13	16
Tennessee Temple	2		2		4
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	4	2	8	1	15
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	4		12		16

Table 21 (continued)

Institution	Elementary		Secondary		Total
	Full Time Supervisors	Part Time Supervisors	Full Time Supervisors	Part Time Supervisors	
University of Tennessee at Martin	No breakdown as to elementary - secondary				
University of Tennessee at Nashville	1		3		4
Southern Missionary	2		2	12	16
Southwestern		1		1	2
Tennessee Tech	2	3	4	2	11
Tennessee Wesleyan	1	1	1	2	5
Trevecca Nazarene		3		5	8
Tusculum	1		1		2
Union	1		2		3
Vanderbilt	1		4		5
Totals	37	48	56	120	281

Table 22

Type of College Supervisor and Degree Status

Institution	Type of Supervisor				Degree Status				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Austin Peay		X				X			
Belmont				X	X				
Bethel			X			X			
Bryan	X						X		
Carson-Newman			X			X			
Christian Brothers	X				X				
David Lipscomb			X			X			
East Tennessee State			X				X		
Fisk			X				X		
George Peabody		X					X		
King	X				X				
Knoxville				X		X			
Lambuth		X				X			
Lane		X					X		
Lee			X			X			
LeMoyne-Owen		X					X		
Lincoln Memorial	X					X			
Maryville			X			X			
Memphis State			X			X			
Middle Tennessee			X		X				
Milligan	X				X				
Tennessee State		X					X		
Tennessee Temple		X					X		
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga			X			X			
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X						X		

Table 22 (continued)

Institution	Type of Supervisor				Degree Status				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
University of Tennessee at Martin			X				X		
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X				X				
Southern Missionary			X			X			
Southwestern	X					X			
Tennessee Tech	X					X			
Tennessee Wesleyan			X				X		
Trevecca Nazarene			X			X			
Tusculum	X					X			
Union			X			X			
Vanderbilt		X				X			
Frequency	10	8	15	2	6	19	10	0	0
Percent	28%	22%	42%	5%	17%	55%	28%	0%	0%

*1 - General college supervisor
2 - College supervisors from academic areas
3 - Combination of both 1 and 2
4 - Other
5 - All have doctor's degree
6 - Most have doctor's degree
7 - Most have master's degree plus additional credits
8 - Most have master's degree as their highest degree
9 - Most have bachelor's degree as their highest degree

Item 30 deals with the use of graduate students to supervise student teachers. This item shows that a total of three, or 8 percent, of the responding institutions utilize graduate students to supervise student teachers. The three institutions using graduate students as college supervisors are universities.

Data in Table 23 shows data regarding the average number of student teachers assigned to each full-time college supervisor (or the equivalent of a full-time supervisor) at any one time. This table shows that at 2 percent of the responding institutions from one to five student teachers constitute the full-time college supervisor's load; at 20 percent of the institutions, the full-time college supervisor is assigned six to ten student teachers; at 17 percent of the institutions, from eleven to fifteen student teachers; at 22 percent of the institutions, from sixteen to twenty student teachers; at 5 percent of the institutions, from twenty to thirty student teachers; at 2 percent of the institutions, from thirty-one to thirty-five student teachers; and at 2 percent of the institutions, the full-time college supervisor is assigned over forty student teachers at a time.

The frequency of college supervisors visits to each student teacher is shown in Table 24. Data in this table shows that, for the entire state, the college supervisor visits each student teacher twice each week at 2 percent of the institutions; once each week at 34 percent of the institutions; once every two weeks at 31 percent of the institutions; once every three weeks at 14 percent of the institutions; once each month at 8 percent of the institutions; once every two months at 2 percent of the institutions.

Table 23

Average Number of Student Teachers Assigned to Each Full-time College Supervisor at Any One Time

Institution	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	40 +
Austin Peay			X						
Belmont		X							
Bethel				X					
Bryan					X				
Carson-Newman			X						
Christian Brothers			X						
David Lipscomb				X					
East Tennessee State					X				
Fisk			X						
George Peabody					X				
King									
Knoxville			X						
Lambuth						X			
Lane					X				
Lee		X							
LeMoyne-Owen									X
Lincoln Memorial			X						
Maryville				X					
Memphis State					X				
Middle Tennessee						X			
Milligan		X							
Tennessee State				X					
Tennessee Temple							X		
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga									
University of Tennessee at Knoxville				X					
University of Tennessee at Martin					X				
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X							
Southern Missionary		X							
Southwestern									
Tennessee Tech				X					
Tennessee Wesleyan				X					
Trevecca Nazarene	X								
Tusculum		X							
Union				X					
Vanderbilt		X							
Frequency	1	7	6	8	6	2	1	0	1
Percent	2%	20%	17%	22%	17%	5%	2%	0%	2%

Table 24

Frequency of Supervisor Visits to
Each Student Teacher

Institution	2/wk	1/wk	1/2wk	1/3wk	1/mo	1/2mo	1/qtr	1/sem	Never
Austin Peay						X			
Belmont				X					
Bethel			X						
Bryan				X					
Carson-Newman			X						
Christian Brothers				X					
David Lipscomb		X							
East Tennessee State		X							
Fisk		X							
George Peabody	X								
King									
Knoxville			X						
Lambuth			X						
Lane				X					
Lee			X						
LeMoyne-Owen					X				
Lincoln Memorial			X						
Maryville		X							
Memphis State		X							
Middle Tennessee		X							
Milligan		X							
Tennessee State			X						
Tennessee Temple									
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga			X						
University of Tennessee at Knoxville			X						
University of Tennessee at Martin			X						
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X							
Southern Missionary		X							
Southwestern					X				
Tennessee Tech		X							
Tennessee Wesleyan			X						
Trevecca Nazarene				X					
Tusculum		X							
Union					X				
Vanderbilt		X							
Frequency	1	12	11	5	3	1	0	0	0
Percent	2%	34%	31%	14%	8%	2%	0%	0%	0%

The respondents were asked what they felt would be the most desirable, yet practical, ratio of full-time college supervisors to student teachers. Table 25 shows the results of this question. As the table shows, for the entire state, 8 percent of the respondents recommended one college supervisor to less than 10 student teachers; 17 percent recommended one college supervisor to 10-11 student teachers; 2 percent recommended one to 12 - 13; 25 percent recommended one to 14 - 15; 2 percent recommended one to 16 - 17; 25 percent recommended one to 18 - 19; 17 percent recommended one to 20 - 25. The recommendations indicating the ratio of the college supervisor to student teachers was made by the person in charge of student teacher programs.

The responding institutions were also asked to indicate the most important characteristics they look for in a college supervisor. Data in Table 26 shows the results of that question. Each institution's director of student teaching was asked to rank, in order of importance, those characteristics most sought in college supervisors.

Item 36 on the questionnaire asked the respondents if any of the college supervisors hold joint appointments in more than one department. Thirty-four percent indicated the college supervisors were in more than one department and 60 percent showed them to be only in education department.

Several responding institutions explained that other departments shared faculty who served as full-time or part-time supervisors. The areas most frequently mentioned were: home economics, foreign language, English, art and sciences, religion and humanities.

Table 25

Recommended Ratio of Full-time College Supervisors to Student Teachers

Institution	1 to 1-9	1 to 10-11	1 to 12-13	1 to 14-15	1 to 16-17	1 to 18-19	1 to 20-25	1 to 26-30	1to 30+
Austin Peay				X					
Belmont	X								
Bethel		X							
Bryan							X		
Carson-Newman		X							
Christian Brothers		X							
David Lipscomb							X		
East Tennessee State						X			
Fisk				X					
George Peabody						X			
King				X					
Knoxville						X			
Lambuth	X								
Lane				X					
Lee				X					
LeMoyne-Owen	X								
Lincoln Memorial				X					
Maryville						X			
Memphis State							X		
Middle Tennessee				X					
Milligan				X					
Tennessee State						X			
Tennessee Temple				X					
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga			X						
University of Tennessee at Knoxville						X			
University of Tennessee at Martin							X		
University of Tennessee at Nashville						X			
Southern Missionary					X				
Southwestern						X			
Tennessee Tech						X			
Tennessee Wesleyan							X		
Trevecca Nazarene							X		
Tusculum		X							
Union		X							
Vanderbilt		X							
Frequency	3	6	1	9	1	9	6	0	0
Percent	8%	17%	2%	25%	2%	25%	17%	0%	0%

Table 26

Characteristics Sought in College Supervisors

Institution	Characteristics Sought*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Austin Peay	4	2	1	5	3	
Belmont	4	3	2	5	1	
Bethel	4	2	1	5	3	
Bryan	3	1	2	5	4	
Carson-Newman	1	1	2	4	3	
Christian Brothers	1	2	3	5	4	
David Lipscomb	4	3	1	5	2	
East Tennessee State	4	2	1	5	3	
Fisk	4	1	3	5	2	
George Peabody	4	3	1	5	2	
King		2	1		3	
Knoxville	4	3	2	5	1	
Lambuth	3	1	4	5	2	
Lane	3	1	4	5	2	
Lee	4	3	1	5	2	
LeMoyne-Owen						
Lincoln Memorial	3	2	1	5	4	
Maryville	4	2	1	5	3	
Memphis State	4	1	3	5	1	
Middle Tennessee	3	1	2	4	1	
Milligan	2	3	1	5	4	
Tennessee State	3	1	2		4	
Tennessee Temple	3	1	2	4	5	
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	2	3	1	5	4	
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	4	2	1	5	3	
University of Tennessee at Martin	4	2	3		1	
University of Tennessee at Nashville	4	1	2	5	3	
Southern Missionary	3	2	1	5	4	
Southwestern	4	2	1	5	3	
Tennessee Tech	4	3	1	5	2	
Tennessee Wesleyan	2	3	4	5	1	
Trevecca Nazarene	2	1	3	4	5	
Tusculum	4	1	2	5	3	
Union	4	2	3		1	
Vanderbilt	2	1	3			

*1 - Subject matter competency
2 - Knowledge of teaching methodology
3 - Human relations skills
4 - Possession of a doctors degree
5 - A commitment to supervision
6 - Other

The Student Teachers Themselves

Data in Table 27 deals with the type of grade used in student teaching assessment. This table shows that 62 percent of all responding institutions use a letter grade (A, B, C, etc.) for student teaching; 8 percent use Pass or Fail; and 28 percent use Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. For the entire state there were no "other" categories listed as evaluators for grade achievement. Although it was not listed in the "grade" category the narrative evaluation that accompanies the student teachers overall evaluation of his experiences was considered most significant by the cooperating teacher and college supervisor.

The responding institutions were asked to rank, according to importance, those who actually participate in the evaluation of student teachers. Data in Table 28 shows the results of that question. This table indicates that 48 percent of the respondents ranked the cooperating teacher as the most important person in the evaluation of the student teacher; 41 percent indicated the college supervisor was the most important; the director of student teachers received 5 percent of the vote and the cooperating principal was given the lowest rating of the four groups who evaluate student teachers. The table further shows that 57 percent of the respondents indicated the college supervisor was the second most important person in the evaluation process; 43 percent ranked the cooperating teacher as the second most important; only 2 percent ranked the director of student teaching as the second most important person in the evaluation of student teachers and the cooperating teacher was again unranked in this category.

Table 27

Type of Grade Used for Student Teaching

Institution	Letter Grade	Pass or Fail	Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory	Other
Austin Peay			X	
Belmont		X		
Bethel	X			
Bryan	X			
Carson-Newman	X			
Christian Brothers		X		
David Lipscomb	X			
East Tennessee State	X			
Fisk	X			
George Peabody		X		
King	X			
Knoxville	X			
Lambuth			X	
Lane	X			
Lee	X			
LeMoyne-Owen	X			
Lincoln Memorial			X	
Maryville	X			
Memphis State			X	
Middle Tennessee	X			
Milligan	X			
Tennessee State	X			
Tennessee Temple	X			
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga			X	
University of Tennessee at Knoxville			X	
University of Tennessee at Martin	X			
University of Tennessee at Nashville			X	
Southern Missionary	X			
Southwestern	X			
Tennessee Tech	X			
Tennessee Wesleyan	X			
Trevecca Nazarene	X			
Tusculum			X	
Union			X	
Vanderbilt			X	
Frequency	22	3	10	0
Percent	62%	8%	28%	0%

Table 28

Rank Importance of Student Teacher Evaluators
That Actually Participate in Evaluation

Institution	Cooperating Teacher				College Supervisor				Director Student Teaching				Cooperating Principal			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Austin Peay		X			X											
Belmont		X			X										X	
Bethel	X					X						X			X	
Bryan	X					X					X					X
Carson-Newman	X					X						X			X	
Christian Brothers			X			X			X							X
David Lipscomb		X			X											
East Tennessee State		X			X											
Fisk	X					X					X					
George Peabody	X									X						
King		X			X										X	
Knoxville			X			X			X							
Lambuth	X					X										
Lane	X					X					X					X
Lee		X			X						X					
LeMoyne-Owen	X						X			X						
Lincoln Memorial		X			X											
Maryville		X			X											
Memphis State		X			X											
Middle Tennessee	X					X						X			X	
Milligan		X				X					X					
Tennessee State	X					X						X			X	
Tennessee Temple	X					X									X	
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X			X							X			X	
University of Tennessee at Knoxville		X				X										

Table 28 (continued)

Institution	Cooperating Teacher				College Supervisor				Director Student Teaching				Cooperating Principal			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
University of Tennessee at Martin		X			X										X	
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X					X										
Southern Missionary	X					X					X					X
Southwestern		X			X										X	
Tennessee Tech		X			X											
Tennessee Wesleyan	X					X						X			X	
Trevecca Nazarene		X			X							X			X	
Tusculum	X					X									X	
Union	X					X						X			X	
Vanderbilt	X					X									X	
Frequency	17	16	2	0	14	20	1	0	2	1	6	8	0	0	15	4
Percent	48%	43%	5%	0%	41%	57%	2%	0%	5%	2%	17%	22%	0%	0%	42%	10%

Data in Table 28 would also indicate that by combining the first and second ratings the college coordinator was ranked the most important person in the evaluation of student teaching with 98 percent; 91 percent considered the cooperating teacher to be the second most important person in the evaluation of student teaching; only 7 percent concluded the director of student teachers to be important and the cooperating principal was again unranked. Several responding institutions indicated the student teachers also had a voice in his or her own evaluation. The director of student teaching in the responding institutions did the ranking for this question.

Item 41 on the questionnaire was used to determine whether student teachers choose the type of school to which they were to be assigned for student teaching. Twenty percent of the respondents indicated that their student teachers did have a hoice of schools and 74 percent showed that students did not have a choice in their student teaching assignment.

Item 42 on the questionnaire asked the responding institutions to indicate if they provided opportunities for student teaching in disadvantaged areas. Thirty-four of the institutions showed they did provide this service to such areas.

Item 43 on the questionnaire asked the responding institutions if more than one student teacher was placed in a classroom at the same time. Thirty-seven percent indicated they never did; 51 percent showed they rarely did; and 9 percent placed more than one student teacher in a room at a given time.

Data in Table 29 shows that 92 percent of the responding institutions afford some type of classroom observation experiences prior to the student teaching assignment. This table also shows the average percent of time that student teachers spend in observation, participation, and actual teaching. Only one institution did not respond to this item on the questionnaire and shows the percentages of time spent in each experience by those responding to this item.

Data in Table 30 shows the percent of students who fail their first student teaching assignment. Twenty-two percent indicated that "none" of their student teachers fail; 29 percent reported less than 1 percent (-1 percent) fail; 37 percent show that 1 percent fail; 6 percent have 2 percent failure and only one institution indicated a failure of 3 percent. The following tables show the alternatives provided for those student teachers who fail and those who are eliminated from student teaching because of failure.

Data in Table 31 shows that 5 percent of the responding institutions student teachers who fail their first student teaching assignment are automatically eliminated from the teacher education program. Forty-eight percent of the institution's students are given a second assignment. At 20 percent of the institution's students may appeal to a committee. Twenty-two percent listed "other" alternatives and were generally combinations of those previously mentioned.

Responding institutions were also asked to estimate the approximate percent of student teachers that are definitely eliminated from teacher education because they failed student teaching. Table 32 shows the results of this question. For the entire state, this table indicated

Table 29

Do Student Teachers Have Classroom Observation Experiences Prior to Student Teaching and Approximate Percent of Time Spent in Each Area?

Institution	Yes	No	Percent of Time Spent In:		
			Observation	Participation	Actual Teaching
Austin Peay	X		20	30	50
Belmont	X		10	10	80
Bethel	X		5	20	75
Bryan	X		25	25	50
Carson-Newman	X		20	20	60
Christian Brothers	X		5-10	5-10	80-90
David Lipscomb	X		20	50	30
East Tennessee State	X		20	20	60
Fisk	X		10	15	75
George Peabody	X		10	20	70
King	X		10-25	50	25-40
Knoxville	X		10	20	70
Lambuth	X		10-25	25-40	50
Lane		X	15	10	75
Lee	X		20	30	50
LeMoyne-Owen	X		10	10	80
Lincoln Memorial	X		20	20	60
Maryville	X		20	30	50
Memphis State	X		0-10	30-40	50-60
Middle Tennessee	X		5	15	80
Milligan	X		20	20	60
Tennessee State	X		5	25	70
Tennessee Temple	X		25	25	50
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X				
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X		10	30	60

Table 29 (continued)

Institution	Yes	No	Percent of Time Spent In:		
			Observation	Participation	Actual Teaching
University of Tennessee at Martin	X		10	15	75
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X	20	10-30	70-80
Southern Missionary	X		40-50		50-60
Southwestern	X		20	20	60
Tennessee Tech	X		20	20	43
Tennessee Wesleyan		X	20	20	60
Trevecca Nazarene	X		25	25	50
Tusculum	X		5	5	90
Union	X		50	25	25
Vanderbilt	X			50	50
Frequency	32	3			
Percent	91%	9%			

Table 30

Percent of Students Who Fail Their First Student Teacher Assignment

Institution	0	-1%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	6%+
Austin Peay			X						
Belmont			X						
Bethel			X						
Bryan	X								
Carson-Newman			X						
Christian Brothers				X					
David Lipscomb			X						
East Tennessee State			X						
Fisk			X						
George Peabody			X						
King	X								
Knoxville	X								
Lambuth		X							
Lane			X						
Lee		X							
LeMoyne-Owen	X								
Lincoln Memorial	X								
Maryville					X				
Memphis State			X						
Middle Tennessee		X							
Milligan		X							
Tennessee State		X							
Tennessee Temple	X								
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X							
University of Tennessee at Knoxville		X							
University of Tennessee at Martin		X							
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X								
Southern Missionary	X								
Southwestern				X					
Tennessee Tech		X							
Tennessee Wesleyan		X							
Trevecca Nazarene			X						
Tusculum			X						
Union			X						
Vanderbilt									
Frequency	8	10	13	2	1	0	0	0	0
Percent	22%	29%	37%	6%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 31

Alternatives Available to Student Teachers Who Fail First Assignment

Institution	Alternatives*			
	1	2	3	4
Austin Peay		X		
Belmont		X		
Bethel		X		
Bryan	X			
Carson-Newman			X	
Christian Brothers		X		
David Lipscomb		X		
East Tennessee State				X
Fisk			X	
George Peabody				X
King				X
Knoxville				X
Lambuth		X		
Lane		X		
Lee		X		
LeMoyne-Owen				X
Lincoln Memorial		X		
Maryville			X	
Memphis State		X		
Middle Tennessee				X
Milligan		X		
Tennessee State		X		
Tennessee Temple				
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X		
University of Tennessee at Knoxville				X
University of Tennessee at Martin			X	
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X		
Southern Missionary				X
Southwestern		X		
Tennessee Tech		X		
Tennessee Wesleyan		X		
Trevecoa Nazarene			X	
Tusculum			X	
Union			X	
Vanderbilt	X			
Frequency	2	17	7	8
Percent	5%	48%	20%	22%

*Alternatives: 1-Student eliminated from teacher education program.
2-Given second assignment after meeting requirements

Table 32

Approximate Percent of Student Teachers that Fail Student Teaching and are Eliminated from Teacher Education

Institution	None	1%	1%	2%	3%	4%
Austin Peay		X				
Belmont		X				
Bethel			X			
Bryan	X					
Carson-Newman			X			
Christian Brothers			X			
David Lipscomb		X				
East Tennessee State		X				
Fisk		X				
George Peabody		X				
King	X					
Knoxville	X					
Lambuth		X				
Lane		X				
Lee		X				
LeMoyne-Owen	X					
Lincoln Memorial	X					
Maryville				X		
Memphis State		X				
Middle Tennessee		X				
Milligan				X		
Tennessee State		X				
Tennessee Temple	X					
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X				
University of Tennessee at Knoxville		X				
University of Tennessee at Martin		X				
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X					
Southern Missionary	X					
Southwestern	X					
Tennessee Tech		X				
Tennessee Wesleyan		X				
Trevecca Nazarene		X				
Tusculum		X				
Union		X				
Vanderbilt		X				
Frequency	9	21	3	2	0	0
Percent	25%	58%	8%	5%	0%	0%

25 percent of the respondents noted that "none" of their student teachers fail; 58 percent reported less than 1 percent (-1 percent) of their student teachers are eliminated from teacher education because they failed student teaching; 8 percent indicated 1 percent; and 5 percent showed that 2 percent of their student teachers are eliminated from teacher education because of failing student teaching.

Data in Table 33 shows the major causes of student teacher failure. This table shows that 70 percent of all respondents indicated that the major cause of student teacher failure at their institution is "inability to control students." Another 69 percent of the institutions stated that "unwillingness to work" was the second most important reason for student teacher failure. "Poor knowledge of teaching methodology was listed by 25 respondents, or 70 percent, that caused failure and 60 percent of the institutions felt the "inability to get along with other teachers" was a major reason student teachers failed. Seventy-one percent declared "poor subject matter background" to be the most frequent cause of student teacher failure.

Data in Table 34 shows the percent of responses that employ the student teacher concept as well as the total number of such centers and the number of centers utilized by each of the responding institutions. The table shows that 49 percent of all respondents do place their student teachers in centers. Fourteen instituions, or 40 percent, place their student teachers in elementary centers; thirteen institutions, or 39 percent, place their student teachers in secondary centers; and two institutions indicated there was no breakdown into elementary or secondary centers. There are 121 such centers used by Tennessee institutions.

Table 33

Major Causes of Student Teacher Failure

Institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Austin Peay	2	6	5	4	3	1	Generally unsuited for tchg.
Belmont				3	2	1	Inability to manage class
Bethel	4	5	1	3	2		
Bryan	4	1	2	3	5		
Carson-Newman	3		1		2		
Christian Brothers							
David Lipscomb	3	4	5	1	2		
East Tennessee State			2			1	Unethical conduct
Fisk		1					
George Peabody	2	5	1	4	3		
King		2	1				
Knoxville	2	3	1	4	5		
Lambuth	2	1	3	5	4		
Lane			2		1		
Lee	1						
LeMoyne-Owen							
Lincoln Memorial	4	5	1	3	2		
Maryville	4	5	1	3	2		
Memphis State	3	1	5	4	2		
Middle Tennessee	3	5	1	4	2		
Milligan	1	2	3	5	4		
Tennessee State	4	3	5	2	1		
Tennessee Temple	2				3	1	Personality problems
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	1	2	3	5	4		
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	2	3	1	5	4		

Table 33 (continued)

Institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	
University of Tennessee at Martin	2	3	1	5	4		
University of Tennessee at Nashville							
Southern Missionary							
Southwestern	1	2	3		4		
Tennessee Tech	2	1	4	5	3		
Tennessee Wesleyan	5	4	3	2	1		
Trevecca Nazarene	2	3	1	4	5		
Tusculum	3	2	1	5	4		
Union	1	2	3	5	4		
Vanderbilt	1	2			3		
Frequency	25	24	25	21	26	4	
Percent	70%	69%	70%	60%	71%	11%	

*1 - Inability to control students
2 - Unwillingness to work
3 - Poor knowledge of teaching methodology
4 - Inability to get along with other teachers
5 - Poor subject matter background
6 - Other

Table 34

Institutions Utilizing the Student Teacher Concept, The Number of Elementary, Secondary, and Total Number of Centers

Institution	Yes	No	Student Teacher Center		
			Elementary	Secondary	Total
Austin Peay		X			
Belmont	X		5	5	10
Bethel	X		5	4	9
Bryan		X			
Carson-Newman	X		2	5	7
Christian Brothers		X			
David Lipscomb	X		1		1
East Tennessee State	X				9
Fisk		X	2	1	3
George Peabody	X				
King		X			
Knoxville		X			
Lambuth		X			
Lane		X			
Lee		X			
LeMoyne-Owen		X			
Lincoln Memorial	X		1	1	2
Maryville		X			
Memphis State	X		1	4	5
Middle Tennessee	X		1	1	2
Milligan	X		4	6	10
Tennessee State	X		2	1	3
Tennessee Temple		X			
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X				
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X		4	12	16
University of Tennessee at Martin	X				26
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X		1	1	2
Southern Missionary		X			
Southwestern		X			
Tennessee Tech	X		4	6	10
Tennessee Wesleyan		X			
Trevecca Nazarene		X			
Tusculum		X			
Union		X			
Vanderbilt	X		3	3	6
Frequency	17	18	14	13	16
Percent	49%	51%	40%	39%	46%

Data in Item 51 on the questionnaire represented an attempt to determine extent to which institutions are actually using some of the rather widely discussed innovations that are available for use in student teaching programs today. The following five tables show the results of this part of the questionnaire.

Data in Table 35 shows the extent to which institutions are using video taping equipment and/or tape recorders with their student teachers. Concerning the use of video-taping equipment, this table shows that 17 percent of the responding institutions in the state are not using such equipment at all; 46 percent are using it a small amount; 23 percent are using it a good deal; 11 percent extensively; and of the directors who completed the questionnaire all were aware it was being used to the degree indicated in Table 35.

Regarding the use of audio tape recorders, Table 35 shows that 6 percent of all responding institutions reported they did not use such equipment at all with student teachers; 46 percent reported using tape recorders a small amount; 37 percent indicated such equipment is used a good deal; 3 percent said such equipment is used extensively. One responding institution indicated that they did not know how extensively tape recorders are being used with their student teachers.

Data in Table 36 also deals with innovations. These data show that 23 percent of all institutions responding did not use micro teaching prior to or during student teaching; 37 percent reported using micro teaching a small amount; 24 percent a good deal; 11 percent extensively used at their institutions.

Table 35

Use of Video Tape Equipment and Tape Recorders with Student Teachers

Institution	Use of Video Tape Equipment					Use of Tape Recorders				
	Not at All	Small Amt.	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know	Not at All	Small Amt.	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know
Austin Peay		X					X			
Belmont				X			X			
Bethel		X						X		
Bryan	X						X			
Carson-Newman				X				X		
Christian Brothers	X							X		
David Lipscomb		X					X			
East Tennessee State		X					X			
Fisk		X						X		
George Peabody			X				X			
King		X					X			
Knoxville				X				X		
Lambuth	X							X		
Lane		X					X			
Lee			X					X		
LeMoyne-Owen		X						X		
Lincoln Memorial	X							X		
Maryville		X								
Memphis State		X						X		
Middle Tennessee			X					X		
Milligan			X							X
Tennessee State		X					X			
Tennessee Temple			X					X		
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga										
University of Tennessee at Knoxville				X					X	

Table 35 (continued)

Institution	Use of Video Tape Equipment					Use of Tape Recorders				
	Not at All	Small Amt.	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know	Not at All	Small Amt.	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know
University of Tennessee at Martin		X					X			
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X						X			
Southern Missionary		X					X			
Southwestern	X						X			
Tennessee Tech			X				X			
Tennessee Wesleyan			X					X		
Trevecca Nazarene		X				X				
Tusculum			X			X				
Union		X					X			
Vanderbilt		X					X			
Frequency	6	16	8	4	0	2	16	13	1	1
Percent	17%	46%	23%	12%	0%	7%	46%	37%	3%	3%

Table 36

Use of Micro Teaching and Simulation Techniques
Prior to or During Student Teaching

Institution	Micro Teaching					Simulation Techniques				
	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know
Austin Peay	X						X			
Belmont			X					X		
Bethel			X					X		
Bryan		X						X		
Carson-Newman				X				X		
Christian Brothers	X								X	
David Lipscomb		X					X			
East Tennessee State		X				X				
Fisk		X						X		
George Peabody			X				X			
King	X						X			
Knoxville		X						X		
Lambuth	X					X				
Lane		X							X	
Lee			X					X		
LeMoyne-Owen			X				X			
Lincoln Memorial	X							X		
Maryville			X				X			
Memphis State		X					X			
Middle Tennessee			X					X		
Milligan			X						X	
Tennessee State		X					X			
Tennessee Temple		X					X			
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga										
University of Tennessee at Knoxville		X					X			

Table 36 (continued)

Institution	Micro Teaching					Simulation Techniques				
	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know
University of Tennessee at Martin		X					X			
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X								X	
Southern Missionary			X					X		
Southwestern				X					X	
Tennessee Tech				X			X			
Tennessee Wesleyan		X					X			
Trevecca Nazarene	X						X			
Tusculum				X			X			
Union		X							X	
Vanderbilt	X						X			
Frequency	8	13	9	4	0	2	16	10	6	0
Percent	23%	37%	26%	12%	0%	7%	46%	29%	17%	0%

This same table shows that 6 percent of all respondents are not using simulation techniques prior to or during student teaching at all; 46 percent are using such techniques a small amount; 29 percent a good deal; and 17 percent used simulation experiences extensively at their institutions.

Data in Table 37 indicates the extent to which the Flander's interaction analysis technique and/or Taba's teaching strategies material is being used with student teachers. For instance, this table shows that 36 percent of all respondents do not use the Flander's interaction analysis technique at all; 37 percent use it a small amount; 22 percent use this instrument a good deal; while only 3 percent use this technique extensively.

Data in the table also shows that 50 percent of all respondents do not use the Taba's teaching strategies material at all during student teaching; 24 percent use this material a small amount; 6 percent a good deal; no institution reported that it were used extensively; and 7 percent indicated they did not know hos extensively this technique was used with their student teachers.

Data in Table 38 indicates that 7 percent of all respondents do not use Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives at all with their student teachers; 30 percent use this material a small amount; 37 percent a good deal; and 17 percent use it extensively with their student teachers.

In the use of sensitivity training with student teachers data in this table shows 51 percent do not use it at all; 23 percent use it a small amount; 11 percent a good deal; 6 percent extensively; and 3

Table 37

Use of the Flander's Interaction Analysis Technique and Taba's Teaching Strategies Material During Student Teaching

Institution	Flander's Interaction Analysis					Taba's Teaching Strategies				
	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know
Austin Peay		X					X			
Belmont				X			X			
Bethel		X								
Bryan	X					X				
Carson-Newman	X						X			
Christian Brothers			X			X				
David Lipscomb	X					X				
East Tennessee State		X								X
Fisk		X				X				
George Peabody		X					X			
King		X					X			
Knoxville			X			X				
Lambuth	X					X				
Lane		X								X
Lee	X					X				
LeMoyne-Owen	X					X				
Lincoln Memorial			X			X				
Maryville		X					X			
Memphis State			X				X			
Middle Tennessee			X				X			
Milligan	X					X				
Tennessee State		X					X			
Tennessee Temple										
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga										
University of Tennessee at Knoxville		X				X				

Table 37 (continued)

Institution	Flander's Interaction Analysis					Taba's Teaching Strategies				
	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know
University of Tennessee at Martin	X					X				
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X				X				
Southern Missionary		X						X		
Southwestern		X				X				
Tennessee Tech			X							X
Tennessee Wesleyan			X					X		
Trevecca Nazarene	X					X				
Tusculum	X					X				
Union	X					X				
Vanderbilt	X					X				
Frequency	12	13	7	1	0	18	9	2	0	3
Percent	34%	37%	2%	3%	0%	50%	26%	7%	0%	9%

Table 38

Use of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Material and Sensitivity Training with Student Teachers

Institution	Bloom's Taxonomy					Sensitivity Training				
	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know
Austin Peay			X			X				
Belmont		X				X				
Bethel				X		X				
Bryan				X				X		
Carson-Newman			X				X			
Christian Brothers			X					X		
David Lipscomb	X					X				
East Tennessee State					X					X
Fisk		X				X				
George Peabody		X				X				
King			X			X				
Knoxville				X					X	
Lambuth			X					X		
Lane			X				X			
Lee	X					X				
LeMoyne-Owen				X			X			
Lincoln Memorial				X			X			
Maryville			X			X				
Memphis State		X					X			
Middle Tennessee			X			X				
Milligan		X					X			
Tennessee State			X					X		
Tennessee Temple		X					X			
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga						X				
University of Tennessee at Knoxville			X			X				

Table 38 (continued)

Institution	Bloom's Taxonomy					Sensitivity Training				
	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know
University of Tennessee at Martin		X					X			
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X				X				
Southern Missionary		X				X				
Southwestern			X			X				
Tennessee Tech			X				X			
Tennessee Wesleyan				X					X	
Trevecca Nazarene	X					X				
Tusculum		X				X				
Union		X				X				
Vanderbilt		X								
Frequency	3	11	13	6	0	19	8	4	2	1
Percent	7%	30%	37%	17%	0%	53%	23%	12%	7%	3%

percent reported they did not know to what extent sensitivity training was used at their institutions.

Data in Table 39 shows the degree the responding institutions use small group seminars with students. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents indicated they used this type of activity in working with their student teachers; 23 percent used it a good deal; 7 percent a small amount; and 0 percent reported they did not use seminars at all.

Cooperating School Districts and Cooperating Teachers

Items 52 through 63 on the questionnaire dealt with cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers. This section of the study shows the information generated by these items.

Item 52 on the questionnaire shows the percent of institutions that have written contracts with cooperating schools. The data furnished by responding institutions indicate that only thirteen institutions, or 37 percent, have written contracts.

Data in Table 40 shows the mean distance student teachers are placed from campus. For the elementary student teachers at all responding institutions, the mean minimum distance was 2.5 miles, the mean average distance was 8.4 miles, and the mean maximum distance was 30.5 miles. Corresponding, for secondary student teachers, the mean minimum distance was 1.7 miles, the mean average distance was 11.3 miles, and the mean maximum distance was 50.6 miles.

Data in Table 41 deals with the methods that are used to train cooperating teachers. The table shows that 33 percent of the respondents offer a formal course in the supervision of student teaching; 51 percent conduct workshops for cooperating teachers; 20 percent hold large

Table 39

Use of Small Group Seminars with Student Teachers

Institution	Not At All	Small Amount	Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know
Austin Peay				X	
Belmont				X	
Bethel				X	
Bryan				X	
Carson-Newman				X	
Christian Brothers				X	
David Lipscomb			X		
East Tennessee State				X	
Fisk				X	
George Peabody				X	
King				X	
Knoxville				X	
Lambuth			X		
Lane			X		
Lee				X	
LeMoyne-Owen				X	
Lincoln Memorial				X	
Maryville				X	
Memphis State			X		
Middle Tennessee				X	
Milligan		X			
Tennessee State				X	
Tennessee Temple		X			
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga					
University of Tennessee at Knoxville				X	
University of Tennessee at Martin			X		
University of Tennessee at Nashville			X		
Southern Missionary				X	
Southwestern				X	
Tennessee Tech				X	
Tennessee Wesleyan				X	
Trevecca Nazarene		X			
Tusculum			X		
Union				X	
Vanderbilt			X		
Frequency	0	3	8	23	0
Percent	0%	9%	23%	68%	0%

Table 40

Approximate Miles from Campus That Student Teachers Are Placed

Institution	Elementary			Secondary		
	Minimum	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Average	Maximum
Austin Peay	1	8	35	1	15	35
Belmont	1	7	14	1	7	14
Bethel	1	12	20	1	12	20
Bryan	2	6	35	2	6	35
Carson-Newman	2	20	100	2	20	100
Christian Brothers	0	0	0	0	0	0
David Lipscomb	.5	6-8	20	.5	8-10	20
East Tennessee State	1	15	30	1	15	30
Fisk	.5	6	17	.5	6	17
George Peabody	7	0	16	4	0	15
King	1	2	10	3	7	19
Knoxville	.5	7	14	.5	7	14
Lambuth	.5	10	30	1	15	50
Lane	.5	10	15	.5	15	30
Lee	1	3	20	1	3	30
LeMoyne-Owen	1	15	30	1	15	30
Lincoln Memorial	.5	10	15	5	15	30
Maryville	.5	2	10	1	4	30
Memphis State	0	5	25	1.5	5	30
Middle Tennessee	1	15	50	1	15	50
Milligan	1.5	5	13	5	8	30
Tennessee State	0	7	15	0	10	18
Tennessee Temple	.5	0	15	.5	0	15
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	1	0	30	1	0	30
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	0	25	120	0	25	120

Table 40 (continued)

Institution	Elementary			Secondary		
	Minimum	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Average	Maximum
University of Tennessee at Martin	.5	30	120	.5	30	120
University of Tennessee at Nashville	12	12	12	15	15	15
Southern Missionary	.5	15	25	.7	65	600
Southwestern	.1	4-5	15	.1	4-5	15
Tennessee Tech	1	20	90	5	20	90
Tennessee Wesleyan	.5	1	29	.5	1	29
Trevecca Nazarene	2	10	20	5	10	20
Tusculum	.2	5	7	.2	4	40
Union	.1	1.5	35	.1	1.5	35
Vanderbilt	0	5	0	0	10	0
Mean	2.5	8.4	30.5	1.7	11.3	50.6

Table 41

Techniques Used to Help Train Cooperating Teachers

Institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Austin Peay	X	X	X	X				
Belmont		X	X	X				
Bethel	X	X	X					
Bryan		X						
Carson-Newman		X	X					
Christian Brothers		X			X			
David Lipscomb		X						X
East Tennessee State								X
Fisk			X					
George Peabody	X							
King			X					
Knoxville			X					X
Lambuth		X						
Lane					X			
Lee		X	X					X
LeMoyne-Owen								X
Lincoln Memorial		X	X					
Maryville		X	X	X				
Memphis State	X	X			X			
Middle Tennessee	X	X	X					
Milligan								
Tennessee State	X	X						
Tennessee Temple								X
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X		X	X				
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X	X						

Table 41 (continued)

Institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
University of Tennessee at Martin	X		X					X
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X	X	X					
Southern Missionary			X					
Southwestern								X
Tennessee Tech	X	X	X	X	X			
Tennessee Wesleyan	X	X	X	X				
Trevecca Nazarene		X		X				
Tusculum			X					X
Union					X			
Vanderbilt								
Frequency	12	18	18	7	5	0	0	11
Percent	33%	51%	51%	20%	15%	0%	0%	32%

*1 - Offer a formal course in the supervision of student teaching
2 - Hold workshops for cooperating teachers
3 - Conduct small seminars with cooperating teachers
4 - Hold larger conferences on student teaching
5 - Mail out student teacher newsletters to cooperating teachers
6 - Send cooperating teachers to state conferences dealing with student teaching
7 - Send cooperating teachers to national conferences
8 - Other, Student Teacher Handbook, individual conferences, banquets, etc.

conferences on student teaching; 51 percent hold small seminars with cooperating teachers; 15 percent mail out student teaching newsletters to cooperating teachers; 0 percent send cooperating teachers to state conferences dealing with student teaching; none send cooperating teachers to national conferences dealing with student teaching; while 32 percent of the respondents listed "other" techniques used to train cooperating teachers. These were: providing the cooperating teacher with a student teaching handbook; and holding individual conferences between the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

Although not checked in "other" column several institutions furnished student teacher handbooks, hold individual conferences, and provide limited campus facilities to cooperating teachers.

The major characteristics sought in cooperating teachers is shown in Table 42 . Data in this table shows that 37 percent of the respondents listed willingness to work with student teachers as the major characteristics they seek in a cooperating teacher; 17 percent listed human relation skills; 20 percent listed knowledge of teaching methodology; 6 percent listed possession of a bachelor's degree; 11 percent listed subject matter competency; none listed possession of a master's degree; none listed possession of a certificate for this type of work; none listed having taken a course in the supervision of student teaching. In the "other" category were: recommendation of the principal and successful teaching experience as an important characteristic sought in supervising teachers.

Respondents were asked: "To what extent do your cooperating teachers exemplify the competencies that you consider to be most

Table 42

Characteristics Sought in a Cooperating Teacher

Institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Austin Peay	4	2	3		6	1	5		
Belmont	2	1	4	5	7	3	6	8	
Bethel	3	2	4	8	7	1	5	6	
Bryan	1	3	4	5		2			
Carson-Newman	1	1	2			3			
Christian Brothers	1	2	4	6	3	5	7	8	
David Lipscomb	4	5	3	2	7	1	6		
East Tennessee State	6	5	4	1		3		2	
Fisk	4	1	3	5		2			
George Peabody	4	3	1	6	7	2	5	8	
King	4	3	2			1			
Knoxville	4	5	2	3		1			
Lambuth	6	3	4	8	5	1	7	2	
Lane	4	3	5	6	7	1	8	2	
Lee	5	2	1		3	4			
LeMoyne-Owen	4	5	3	6	7	1			
Lincoln Memorial	5	2	4	6	8	1	7	3	
Maryville	3	2	4	5	6	1	7		
Memphis State	4	3	1	5	7	2	6	8	
Middle Tennessee	4	1	3			2			
Milligan	4	3	1	8	5	2	7	6	
Tennessee State	2	1	3		6	4	5		
Tennessee Temple	5	2	4			2			
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	4	3	2		5	1	6		
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	5	4	3	6	8	1	7	2	

Table 42 (continued)

Institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
University of Tennessee at Martin	5	3	4	2	7	1			
University of Tennessee at Nashville	4	3	2	7	6	1	5	8	
Southern Missionary	4	3	1			2			
Southwestern			1			2			
Tennessee Tech	5	4	2	1	6	3	7	8	
Tennessee Wesleyan	3	2	4	5	6	1	7	8	
Trevecca Nazarene	2	1	4	5	6	3	7	8	
Tusculum	4	1	2	6	7	3	5	8	
Union	5	4	2	7	8	3	6		
Vanderbilt	1	2	3						
Frequency	4	7	6	2	0	13	0	0	
Percent	4%	20%	17%	6%	0%	37%	0%	0%	

*1 - Subject matter competency
2 - Knowledge of teaching methodology
3 - Human relations skill
4 - Possession of a bachelor's degree
5 - Possession of a master's degree
6 - Willingness to work with student teachers
7 - Having taken a course in Supervision of Student Teaching
8 - Possession of a certificate for this type of work
9 - Other

important for helping a student teacher?" The results of this question is shown in Table 43. Data in this table shows, 11 percent stated that they are almost completely satisfied with the competency of their cooperating teachers; 42 percent stated that they are very well satisfied; 40 percent stated that they are quite well satisfied; 5 percent indicated they are satisfied to a limited extent; and there were no respondents indicating dissatisfaction with the competency of their cooperating teachers.

Data in Table 44 deals with the payment to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers for working with student teachers. The table shows that 11 percent of all respondents indicated that their institutions do not pay for this service; 43 percent indicated that they make a payment to the school system; and 60 percent indicated they made payment directly to the cooperating teacher.

Data in Table 44 also shows that only 3 of the responding institutions indicated the building principal received remuneration for the placement of student teachers in their building. Column 7 of the table shows the total amount paid by those respondents who pay for this service and the mean amount was $40.00.

Data in Table 44 also shows other benefits provided for cooperating teachers. The most frequently mentioned of these were: library service, consultative services and passes to college athletic activities and concerts.

Data in Table 45 deals with the use of a graduate course in the supervision of student teaching. Data in this table shows that 31 percent of the responding institutions reported they do offer such a course.

Table 43

Conditions that Exemplify the Competencies for Helping a Student Teacher

Institution	1	2	3	4	5
Austin Peay			X		
Belmont		X			
Bethel		X			
Bryan		X			
Carson-Newman		X			
Christian Brothers	X				
David Lipscomb			X		
East Tennessee State		X			
Fisk		X			
George Peabody			X		
King		X			
Knoxville		X			
Lambuth			X		
Lane		X			
Lee		X			
LeMoyne-Owen	X				
Lincoln Memorial		X			
Maryville			X		
Memphis State				X	
Middle Tennessee			X		
Milligan	X				
Tennessee State			X		
Tennessee Temple		X			
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga				X	
University of Tennessee at Knoxville			X		
University of Tennessee at Martin			X		
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X			
Southern Missionary			X		
Southwestern	X				
Tennessee Tech		X			
Tennessee Wesleyan			X		
Trevecca Nazarene		X			
Tusculum			X		
Union			X		
Vanderbilt			X		
Frequency	4	15	14	2	0
Percent	11%	42%	40%	5%	0%

* 1 - Almost completely
2 - Very well
4 - To a limited extent

Table 44

Policies that Describe Financial Remuneration and Benefits to Cooperating Teachers and/or Cooperating School Systems

Institution	Remuneration to Cooperating Teachers/or Systems							Other Benefits to Cooperating Teachers
	1	2	3	4	Yes 5	No 6	7	
Austin Peay		X				X	$ 60	System pays teachers--free tuition
Belmont			X			X	$ 50	
Bethel		X				X	$ 20	Library and consultative services
Bryan			X			X	$ 50	
Carson-Newman		X	X			X	$ 25	Consultative services
Christian Brothers			X			X	$ 45	
David Lipscomb			X			X	$ 50	
East Tennessee State	X					X		Letter of appreciation
Fisk			X			X	$ 50	
George Peabody			X			X	$ 50	Consultative services
King	X					X		Library and consultative services
Knoxville			X		X		$ 25	Library and consultative services
Lambuth		X				X	$ 30	Library and consultative services
Lane		X				X	$ 30	Library and consultative services
Lee			X			X	$ 30	Library and consultative services
LeMoyne-Owen			X			X	$ 50	Tuition--Library--Consultative services
Lincoln Memorial	X					X		
Maryville		X	X			X		Library privileges
Memphis State			X			X	$ 45	Library--passes to concerts and athletics
Middle Tennessee			X		X		$ 50	Name in catalog
Milligan	X					X		
Tennessee State			X			X	$ 50	
Tennessee Temple		X				X	$ 30	Invited to annual banquet
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		X	X			X	$ 35	
University of Tennessee at Knoxville		X				X	$ 25	

Table 44 (continued)

Institution	Remuneration to Cooperating Teachers/or Systems							Other Benefits to Cooperating Teachers
	1	2	3	4	Yes 5	No 6	7	
University of Tennessee at Martin		X				X	$ 25	
University of Tennessee at Nashville		X			X		$ 50	Consultative services
Southern Missionary		X	X			X	$ 30	
Southwestern			X			X	$ 30	
Tennessee Tech		X				X	$ 25	Consultative services and athletic passes
Tennessee Wesleyan		X	X			X	$ 25	Tuition--Library--Consultative services
Trevecca Nazarene			X			X	$ 50	
Tusculum		X				X	$ 25	Library--Consultative services
Union			X			X	$ 25	
Vanderbilt			X			X	$ 50	
Totals	4	15	21	0	3	32	$ 40	

*1 - No payment for this service
2 - Payment made to the school system
3 - Payment made directly to cooperating teacher
4 - Other, please explain
5 - 6 - Do building principals receive payment for the placement of student teacher in their building?
7 - Total amount paid per student teacher

Table 45

Graduate Course in the Supervision of Student Teaching

Institution	Have Such Course		Number Enrolled Per Year	Percent of Teachers Who Had Such a Course						
	Yes	No		0%	1-5%	6-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Austin Peay	X		30					X		
Belmont		X				X				
Bethel		X								X
Bryan		X			X					
Carson-Newman		X				X				
Christian Brothers		X						X		
David Lipscomb		X								
East Tennessee State		X		X						
Fisk		X								
George Peabody	X		20				X			
King		X		X						
Knoxville		X							X	
Lambuth		X							X	
Lane		X								
Lee		X			X					
LeMoyne-Owen		X								
Lincoln Memorial		X					X			
Maryville		X			X					
Memphis State	X		30		X					
Middle Tennessee	X		60						X	
Milligan		X				X				
Tennessee State	X		25						X	
Tennessee Temple		X								
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X		30		X					
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X									

Table 45 (continued)

Institution	Have Such Course		Number Enrolled Per Year	Percent of Teachers Who Had Such a Course						
	Yes	No		0%	1-5%	6-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
University of Tennessee at Martin	X		15		X					
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X		50					X		
Southern Missionary		X				X				
Southwestern		X								
Tennessee Tech	X		50				X			
Tennessee Wesleyan	X		50					X		
Trevecca Nazarene		X						X		
Tusculum		X			X					
Union		X								
Vanderbilt		X								
Frequency	11	24		2	7	5	3	9	0	1
Percent	32%	69%		5%	20%	14%	8%	25%	0%	2%

Furthermore, the table indicates tht the mean number enrolling in this course is 36 per year. This means that approximately 360 teachers enroll in such a course each year at the institutions that indicate they teach such a course.

Data in Table 45 shows that for the entire state, 5 percent of the respondents estimate that none of their cooperating teachers have taken such a course; 20 percent estimate that from 1 to 5 percent of their cooperating teachers have taken such a course; 14 percent estimate that from 6 to 10 percent of their cooperating teachers have taken such a course; 8 percent estimate from 11 to 25 percent; 25 percent from 76 to 100 percent of their cooperating teachers have taken such a course in the supervision of student teaching.

Data in Table 46 indicates there are fourteen of the responding institutions, or 40 percent, provide transportation to the college supervisor of student teachers. The table further shows that where transportation is not provided 88 percent of the institutions offer reimbursement to the college supervisor.

Data in Table 47 deals with those directors of student teaching and institutions that hold membership in the professional organizations that are directly related to teacher education. This table shows 65 percent of the respondents belong to the national ATE organization; 51 percent are active members of SERATE (South-East Region Association of Teacher Education) organization; 71 percent of the directors are active members in the state ATE organization; and 28 percent are active in TEPS at the state level.

Table 46

Institutions that Provide Transportation or Reimburse if Transportation Not Provided

Institution	Provide Transportation		Reimburse	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Austin Peay	X		X	
Belmont		X	X	
Bethel		X	X	
Bryan	X		X	
Carson-Newman		X	X	
Christian Brothers	X		X	
David Lipscomb		X	X	
East Tennessee State	X		X	
Fisk		X	X	
George Peabody		X	X	
King		X	X	
Knoxville		X		X
Lambuth		X	X	
Lane		X	X	
Lee		X	X	
LeMoyne-Owen		X		X
Lincoln Memorial		X	X	
Maryville		X	X	
Memphis State	X		X	
Middle Tennessee	X		X	
Milligan		X	X	
Tennessee State		X	X	
Tennessee Temple	X		X	
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga			X	
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X		X	
University of Tennessee at Martin	X		X	
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X		X	
Southern Missionary		X	X	
Southwestern		X	X	
Tennessee Tech	X		X	
Tennessee Wesleyan	X		X	
Trevecca Nazarene			X	
Tusculum	X		X	
Union	X		X	
Vanderbilt		X		X
Frequency	14	18	31	3
Percent	40%	51%	88%	8%

Table 47

Membership in Professional Organizations

Institution	Institutional Membership			
	ATE National	ATE Regional	ATE State	TEPS
Austin Peay	X		X	
Belmont	X	X	X	X
Bethel	X		X	
Bryan	X		X	X
Carson-Newman	X	X	X	
Christian Brothers	X	X	X	
David Lipscomb	X			
East Tennessee State	X	X	X	
Fisk	X	X	X	
George Peabody	X		X	X
King				
Knoxville				
Lambuth			X	
Lane			X	X
Lee	X	X	X	
LeMoyne-Owen	X	X	X	
Lincoln Memorial				
Maryville	X	X	X	X
Memphis State	X	X	X	
Middle Tennessee	X	X	X	
Milligan	X		X	
Tennessee State	X	X	X	
Tennessee Temple				X
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	X	X	X	X
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	X	X	X	X
University of Tennessee at Martin	X	X	X	
University of Tennessee at Nashville	X	X	X	
Southern Missionary			X	
Southwestern	X	X	X	
Tennessee Tech	X	X	X	
Tennessee Wesleyan				
Trevecca Nazarene				
Tusculum				
Union		X		X
Vanderbilt				X
Frequency	23	18	25	10
Percent	65%	51%	71%	28%

The items on the questionnaire shown as number 67 and 68 are presented the way each institution responded. Because there was so much dissimilarity between the responses given by each institution, the writer felt these items could be best analyzed by this technique. (These responses may be found in Appendix E.)

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

It was the purpose of this study to analyze existing practices in student teaching programs offered by colleges and universities in Tennessee. Data were collected through a questionnaire and interviews about the programs in the 35 colleges and universities in the state.

Existing research showed wide differences in student teaching programs, on both national and state levels, are common. The studies selected for review were the more prominent ones dealing with institutional data about existing student teaching programs in other states and more specifically in the colleges and universities in Tennessee.

The investigation involved gathering information about the existing practices in student teaching programs in the State of Tennessee. Through the use of a 68 item questionnaire and the figures to include the academic school year for 1972-1973, appropriate data were collected from the teacher education institutions in Tennessee who had student teaching programs approved by the Tennessee State Board of Education.

All 35 approved institutions participated in the questionnaire survey for a 100 percent response. The responses of student teaching directors from those institutions were assimilated and analyzed. The existing student teaching programs in the state were evaluated.

The breakdown for both elementary and secondary centers where student teaching was done, full or part-time, length of experience that includes number of weeks, days per week, and hours per day was shown. Also included in this section were the credits given for both quarter hours and semester hours and finally, the approximate total clock hours spent in student teaching.

Other items of importance to the reader was the type of school where student teachers were placed; requirements for admission to student teaching; percent of those denied admission to study teaching; type of summer school programs offered by each institution, and the number of law suits involving either institution or student teachers. Those institutions paying cost of transportation for student teaching; amount of total student teaching budget; cost of operating program per student teaching, and whether a special fee was assessed by institution upon the student in addition to regular tuition charges was shown. Those institutions who had innovative techniques in the student teaching programs; those institutions that received research grants; institutions having a campus laboratory school and criteria best describing the school. Institutions having an internship program; number of full-time and part-time college supervisors for elementary and secondary centers; type of college supervisors used; degree status of your college supervisor; number of graduate students that supervise student teachers, and the average number of student teachers assigned to each full-time college supervisor was indicated. Pattern of visits by college supervisor to each student teacher; ratio of full-time college supervisors to student teachers; the most important characteristics in a college

supervisor; and those college supervisors holding joint appointments in two departments.

Conclusions Concerning the General Background of the Institution

The first section of the questionnaire dealt with the general background of the institution. This section gives the breakdown of the institutions by public and private status. There are ten public institutions and 25 private colleges in the state who have student teaching programs approved by the Tennessee State Board of Education.

The public institutions, while fewer in number, have larger total enrollments; larger full-time undergraduate enrollments and greater percentages of full-time undergraduate students, additionally more of the public schools prepare students for teaching and more of the public institutions have received regional and NCATE accreditation.

Administration of the Student Teaching Programs

The items in this section of the questionnaire show the administrative aspects of the student teaching programs in the institutions responding to the study.

Forty-five percent of the responding institutions had a Director of Student Teaching. The director's mean years in office was 4.5 years and he used 26 - 50 percent of his time administering the student teaching program.

The Student Teachers Themselves

Items 37 through 51 dealt with the student teachers themselves.

Included in this section of the survey were items that dealt with the grade used for student teaching; those who actually participated in the evaluation of student teaching; whether student teachers can choose the type of school to which they would be assigned; schools that provided an opportunity to teach in disadvantaged areas; number of student teachers placed in a classroom; those student teachers who had observation experiences prior to student teaching; percent of student teachers who failed their first student teaching assignment; those who failed and were eliminated from the teacher education program; the causes of student teacher failure; number of institutions that utilized the student teacher concept; and those institutions who utilized special features in their programs.

Cooperating School Districts and Cooperating Teachers

This section of items report the information generated by items 52 through 68. Data in Table 43 (page 121) shows the percent of institutions that had written contracts with cooperating schools; approximate distances from campus where student teachers were placed, and techniques used by responding institutions to help train cooperating teachers was shown. Those characteristics looked for in cooperating teachers and the competencies important in helping a student teacher was indicated. Policies concerning payment to cooperating teachers; amounted paid for this activity; other benefits provided for cooperating teachers; whether principals receive payment for placing student teachers; graduate course taught dealing with supervision of student teachers, and the number of teachers who have had such a course were

shown in the data. Those institutions who provide transportation for supervisory personnel and reimbursement for those who do not; those directors who are active in national, regional, and state organizations; experiences shared between institutions and directors; and finally, the cooperative efforts or programs with other institutions was included in this section of the study.

In view of the fact that the survey is largely a descriptive study, perhaps the most important conclusions that can be made from it are those that are implied in the narrative data contained in the study. Because of the vast amount of data gathered the most valid conclusions of the study will be those made by each individual as he analyzes the diversity, fragmentation, and commonality of the various student teaching programs described in the narrative.

II. CONCLUSIONS

One of the first conclusions drawn from the results of the study was that there is broad diversity among the student teaching programs and institutions in Tennessee. For example, the size of programs vary from those with fewer than 25 percent preparing to be teachers to those with 76 percent of their full-time undergraduates planning to enter the teaching profession. Other examples of this diversity are: institutions with fewer than 500 students to those exceeding 20,000 students; payments to cooperating teachers range from none to several hundred dollars per student teacher; the mean miles some student teachers are placed from the college campus varied from 2.5 miles to 30.5 miles for

elementary student teachers to 1.7 miles for secondary student teachers to a maximum of 50.6 miles; the budgets for student teaching programs ranged from a low of $1,000.00 to a high of $200,000.00. This list of diversities among institutions and programs is endless as indicated by the data presented in the study. Much of this diversity is due in part to the minimal student teaching programs some institutions have but the diversity also indicates innovations and that a constant evaluation of existing programs is taking place throughout the state.

A second conclusion to evolve from the study is the excellence of a student teaching program can be judged only in relation to the total teacher education program at that institution. The rapport that exists between the sponsoring institution and the cooperating school and/or school district will reflect good working relationship for the college coordinator and cooperating teacher. The number of student teachers assigned to the college supervisor, as indicated by the response to this item on the questionnaire, indicates that sixteen student teachers would be a heavy load if a good deal of travel was involved. On the other hand, this number might be a light load if all were placed close to the campus. Likewise, the total clock hours, days per week, and length of the teaching experience were closely related in all responding institutions. Unless screening procedures used prior to student teaching are known the percent of failures can be misleading.

One of the most important conclusions that can be drawn from the study is from the item on the questionnaire concerning law suits involving student teachers and/or institutions. Of the 35 responding

institutions there were only two indications that a law suit had been consummated. There were only twelve law suits indicated by the 847 student teacher directors in the entire nation in 1968.

With all of the state and federal monies available only two responding institutions indicated they had received any student teaching research grants.

It could also be concluded that there is a good deal of innovating being done in student teaching programs. Fifty-four percent of the institutions indicated they have what they consider to be innovations in their student teacher programs.

Another encouraging conclusion found in the study was the provision for student teachers to work with students in disadvantaged areas. Only one institution indicated they did not provide for this opportunity.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The study will be of value to State Department personnel, whose responsibility it is to develop activities for change in the area of student teaching, accrediting existing programs and encouraging other institutions to upgrade their programs; colleges and universities; and related professional association involved in student teaching programs; improve the intra-state activities among institutions and the program directors; and future researchers who would take this study and isolate the particular variables and deal with them empirically.

This study does not attempt to represent any widely accepted rationale for giving directions to the public or private institutions

involved in this survey, to those who direct the student teaching programs, or to the cooperating school districts and personnel related to the total program of student teaching. It is hoped that improved communication, better utilization of supporting personnel, and cooperating institutions will be realized.

The teacher training institution should have major responsibility for the continued development and improvement of the student teaching programs in the areas they serve. Institutions should participate in the development of workshops; courses in the supervision of student teaching, a handbook explaining the institutional objectives, policies, and procedures of their programs; and encourage increased activities jointly planned by the public school and teacher training institutions.

In order to strengthen the professional organizations there needs to be a concentrated effort to involve more institutional personnel in these groups. Not only is there a need to increase membership in professional organizations but also a need for more active participation within such groups and more specifically, at the state level. Public school personnel should be encouraged to become active members and work closely with the supporting colleges and universities for stronger student teaching programs. This improvement of the state organizations that are closely or directly related to teacher education can be realized when leadership is provided by the State Department, Tennessee Education Association, East, West, and Middle Tennessee Education Associations, all teacher training institutions and supporting school systems.

With improved professional organizations the cooperative efforts and experiences between the institutions and directors will also be creating more of an awareness of what all institutions are doing. There is a fragmentation of knowledge and understanding among those institutions involved in teacher training. More research is needed to determine what strategies are needed to encourage closer, more cooperative efforts among state departmental personnel, university and college supervisory staff, professional organizations, and the cooperating schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Recommended Standards for Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Andrews, L. O. Student Teaching. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Association for Student Teaching. The College Supervisor. A position paper. Washington, D. C.: Association for Student Teaching, 1968.

Association for Student Teaching. The College Supervisor: Conflict and Challenge. Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Inc., 1964.

Barkat, Samuel. "Development of Criteria and Their Employment for Evaluation of Student Teaching Programs Offered by the Colleges and Universities in Tennessee." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1963.

Bowers, Norman D., and Alice G. Scofield. "Evaluating the Supervision of Student Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, X (December, 1959), 2-4.

Clark, Geneva Rice. "The Use of Community Activities in Student Teaching Programs in Tennessee." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1960.

Deans and Directors of Michigan Teacher Institutions. Student Teaching Programs. A position paper. January 11, 1968, p. 2.

Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Fourth Edition, pp. 1376-77.

Fischer, James L. The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiating Teacher Roles. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Glennon, Vincent J., and Edwin E. Weeks. "The Administration of Programs of Off-Campus Student Teaching," Thirtieth Yearbook of the Association of Student Teaching. Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: Association of Student Teaching, 1951.

Goodlad, John I. "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences in the Education of Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (September, 1965), 266.

Hermanowics, Henry J. "The Pluralistic World of Beginning Teachers: A Summary of Interview Studies," The Real World of the Beginning Teacher. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966.

Johnson, James A. A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs. A Multi-state Teacher Education Project. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 1968.

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. "Who's in Charge Here?" A discussion paper. Washington, D. C.: The Commission, National Education Association, 1966.

National Education Association, Association of Classroom Teachers. A New Order in Student Teaching. Washington, D. C.: The Commission, 1970.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Stoller, Nathan. "Television for Teacher Education," Changes in Teacher Education: A Reappraisal. Report of the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1964.

White, Jo Ann. "Changes During Student Teaching as Measured by Pre-tests and Post-test," Research on Student Teaching. AST Research Bulletin No. 5. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO THE STATE DIRECTOR OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Mr.

State Director of Teacher Education
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Dear :

I am in the process of gathering data for my doctoral disseration at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. I would like to have a complete list of all the teacher training institutions in Tennessee whose programs are approved by the State Board of Edcuation.

Your prompt attention to this request will be appreciated.

Cordially yours,

Robert H. Coleman

APPENDIX B

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
Knoxville 37916
College of Education

Department of
Continuing and Higher Education
15 Henson Hall

Telephone 615-974-3071

February 12, 1974

Department of Education
Departmental Chairman

Dear Sir:

Would you please furnish the information on the enclosed card pertaining to the person who directs your student teaching program.

Your prompt attention to this request will be appreciated since it is a part of my doctoral research.

Cordially yours,

Robert H. Coleman
East Tennessee State University
on Doctoral Leave to
The University of Tennessee

RHC/mj

Enclosure

Dr.

Mr.

Ms. _____

Name

_____

Title (Director - Coordinator - Other)

Phone Number _____ Ext._____

Student Teaching offered in

Secondary ☐

Elementary ☐

Both ☐

APPENDIX C

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES RESPONDING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

College/University	Location
Austin Peay State University	Clarksville
Belmont College	Nashville
Bethel College	McKenzie
William Jennings Bryan College	Dayton
Carson-Newman College	Jefferson City
Christian Brothers College	Memphis
David Lipscomb College	Nashville
East Tennessee State University	Johnson City
Fisk University	Nashville
George Peabody College	Nashville
King College	Bristol
Knoxville College	Knoxville
Lambuth College	Jackson
Lane College	Jackson
Lee College	Cleveland
Lemoyne-Owen College	Memphis
Lincoln Memorial University	Harrogate
Maryville College	Maryville
Memphis State University	Memphis
Middle Tennessee State University	Murfreesboro

College/University	Location
Milligan College	Milligan College
Tennessee State University	Nashville
Tennessee Temple College	Chattanooga
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	Chattanooga
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	Knoxville
University of Tennessee at Martin	Martin
University of Tennessee at Nashville	Nashville
Southern Missionary College	Collegedale
Southwestern College	Memphis
Tennessee Technological University	Cookeville
Tennessee Wesleyan College	Athens
Trevecca Nazarene College	Nashville
Tusculum College	Greeneville
Union University	Jackson
Vanderbilt University	Nashville

APPENDIX D

A COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY OF THE CONTEMPORARY STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS IN THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN TENNESSEE

Conducted by:

Mr. Robert H. Coleman
Assistant Professor of Education
Coordinator of Student Teachers
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
On leave for doctoral study to
The University of Tennessee

Supported by:

Doctoral Committee:
Dr. John R. Ray, Chairman
Dr. Carl W. Murphy
Dr. Charles Chance
Dr. Larry Hughes
Dr. John Peters
Dr. Bill Butefish
Dr. E. S. Christenbury

Directions for Completing This Survey Instrument:

The purpose of this instrument was to gather pertinent information about student teaching in Tennessee and to analyze existing practices in student teaching programs offered by colleges and universities in Tennessee.

We would appreciate having the person in charge of the student teaching program fill out this instrument. Please be as accurate as possible. Where you lack specific information requested, feel free to use approximations. If you feel that an item does not adequately provide for the situation at your institution, please add explanatory notes in the margin. Please answer all items.

The definition of student teaching used in this study is as follows: "A period of guided teaching when a college student assumes increasing responsibility for directing the learning of a group of learners over a period of consecutive weeks." For the purposes of the study, a distinction is made between "student teaching" and "internship" which is typically a paid graduate experience. It is not intended that the study include internships unless your institution uses the terms "student teaching" and "internship" synonmously.

PLEASE BASE YOUR RESPONSES ON THE ACADEMIC YEAR 1972-73.

Name, Title, and Address of Person Completing this Instrument:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Institution: _____

Address: _____

_____

PLEASE USE THE ENCLOSED STAMPS AND NAME TAG AND RETURN IN THIS ENVELOPE.

QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL BACKGROUND OF THE INSTITUTION

1. Is your school essentially a public or private institution?

   Public Private

2. What is the approximate total enrollment of your institution? (Please include undergraduate, graduate, full-time, and part-time students.)

0 - 499	3,000 - 4,999	15,000 - 19,999
500 - 999	5,000 - 9,999	20,000 - 29,999
1,000 - 2,999	10,000 - 14,999	30,000 & Above

3. Approximately how many full-time undergraduate students are enrolled at your institution?

0 - 499	3,000 - 4,999	15,000 - 19,999
500 - 999	5,000 - 9,999	20,000 - 29,999
1,000 - 2,999	10,000 - 14,999	30,000 & Above

4. Approximately what percent of your full-time undergraduate students are preparing to be teachers?

   0 - 25% 26 - 50% 51 - 75% 76 - 100%

5. Is your undergraduate program accredited by one of the regional accreditation associations (North Central, Middle States, New England, Northwest, Southern, Western)?

   Yes No

6. Is your undergraduate program accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)?

   Yes No

7. Please check the type of teacher education program that your institution has at this time.

   Elementary only Secondary only

   Both elementary and secondary

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

8. What is the title of the person who is directly in charge of your total student teaching program?

Director of Student Teaching

Head, Department of Education

Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences

Dean, College of Education

Other, please state title: _____

---

9. How many years have you been in charge of the student teaching program?

Less than 1 year	11 - 15 years
1 - 2 years	16 - 20 years
3 - 4 Years	
5 - 10 years	More than 20 years

10. As the person in charge of student teaching, approximately what percent of your total time is actually deveoted to administering the student teaching program (as opposed to supervising student teachers, teaching a class, other administrative duties, etc.)?

1 - 10%	11 - 25%
26 - 50%	51 - 75%
76 - 90%	91 - 100%

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

11. Please fill in the following chart to provide basic information about your student teaching program. If there are variations, please indicate the usual or predominate pattern.

	Where Done		Full ot Part Time		Length			Number of Credits		Approximate total number of clock hours spent in student teaching
	On Campus	Off Campus	Full Time	Part Time	No. of Weeks	Days Per Week	Hours Per Day	Qtr. Hours	Sem. Hrs.	
Elementary										
Secondary										

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

12. In what type of schools do you place your student teachers?

Public schools only	Both public and private schools
Private schools only	Campus laboratory school only

Other, please explain:_____

_____

_____

13. Please check those items which you include as requirements for admission to student teaching.

Overall academic record	Physical fitness
Record in professional education courses	Recommendation by adviser
Record in major field	Emotional stability
English proficiency	Person-social-ethical fitness
Speech and voice	Extra-class activity
Hearing	

Other, please state: _____

_____

_____

14. Of the students who formally apply for a student teaching assignment, approximately what percent of the applicants are denied admission to student teaching?

All applicants are admitted	5 - 6% are denied admission
Less than 1% are denied admission	7 - 8% are denied admission
1 - 2% are denied admission	9 - 10% are denied admission
3 - 4% are denied admission	More than 10% are denied admission

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

15. Please check the type of summer student teaching program that you conduct.

No summer student teaching

Summer student teaching for regular undergraduates only

Summer student teaching for experienced teachers only

Summer student teaching for both regular undergraduates and for experienced teachers

Other, please explain: _____

_____

16. Please check the most appropriate statement concerning summer student teaching at your institution.

No summer student teaching

Summer student teaching only in our campus laboratory school

Summer student teaching only in surrounding school systems

Summer student teaching both in our campus laboratory school and in surrounding school systems

17. To the best of your knowledge, has your student teaching program or have any of your student teachers ever been involved in a law suit growing out of any aspect of student teaching?

Yes No

If yes, please briefly state circumstances and outcome: _____

_____

_____

18. Does your institution pay the cost of student transportation during student teaching?

Yes No

If yes, please briefly explain: _____

_____

_____

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

19. What is the amount of your total student teaching budget?

Do not have such information Total budget $_____

Briefly explain what costs are included in this budget _____

_____

_____

20. What is the approximate cost of operating your student teaching program per student teacher?

Do not have such information

Approximate cost per student teacher $_____

Please provide any explanation you feel may be necessary? _____

_____

_____

21. Is a special student teaching fee assessed by your institution upon the student teacher other than regular tuition charges?

Yes No

If yes, how much is this fee per student teacher? $_____

22. Do you have what you consider to be any innovations in your student teaching program?

Yes No

If yes, briefly explain:_____

_____

_____

23. Have you received any research grants in your student teaching program during the past two years?

Yes No

If yes, Amount of grant $_____

Source of grant _____

_____

Title of research project _____

_____

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

24. Does your institution have a campus laboratory school?

Yes No

25. If you have a campus laboratory school, please check the statement which best describes its use in your student teaching program.

We do not use the laboratory school for student teaching, participation, or observation

We use the laboratory school for participation and observation purposes only

Only one student teacher a year is placed in each room

One student teacher is placed in a room each quarter or semester

Two student teachers are placed in each room at the same time

Three student teachers are placed in each room at the same time

Four student teachers are placed in each room at the same time

Other, please explain: _____

_____

_____

26. Does your institution operate any internship programs?

Yes No

If yes, very briefly explain the program(s): _____

_____

_____

_____

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

27. Please fill in the following chart showing the number of college supervisors that you have.

	Full-time College Supervisors	Part-time College Supervisors	TOTALS
Elementary			
Secondary			
TOTALS			

GRAND TOTAL

28. What type of college supervisors do you use in your secondary student teaching program?

General college supervisors

College supervisors from the academic areas

A combination of the above

Other, please explain: _____

29. Which statement best describes the degree status of your college supervisors in general?

All of them have a doctor's degree

Most of them have a doctor's degree

Most of them have master's degree plus considerable additional credits

Most of them have a master's degree as their highest degree

Most of them have a bachelor's degree as their highest degree

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

30. Do you employ graduate students to supervise student teachers?

Yes No

If yes, approximately what percent of your total student teaching supervision is done by graduate students rather than by regular faculty members? _____%

31. What is the average number of student teachers assigned to each full-time college supervisor (or the equivalent of a full-time college supervisor if you have part-time college supervisors) at any one time?

1 - 5	16 - 20	31 - 35
6 - 10	21 - 25	36 - 40
11 - 15	26 - 30	More than 40

32. Please check the statement which best describes the general pattern of your college supervisors' visits to each student teacher.

Twice each week	Once every two months
Once each week	Once each quarter
Once every two weeks	Once each semester
Once every three weeks	Never
Once every month	

33. Briefly describe the procedure used for equating the load of a faculty member supervising student teachers to the load of a faculty member engaged in classroom teaching. Indicate any formula you might use in determining college supervisor load.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

34. What do you believe would be the most desirable, yet practical, ratio of full-time college supervisors to student teachers?

1 to less than 10	1 to 14 - 15	1 to 20 - 25
1 to 10 - 11	1 to 16 - 17	1 to 26 - 30
1 to 12 - 13	1 to 18 - 19	1 to more than 30

35. Rank (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) the following according to the most important characteristics that you look for in a college supervisor.

_____Subject matter competency

_____Knowledge of teaching methodology

_____Human relations skills

_____Other, please explain: _____

_____Possession of a doctor's degree

_____A commitment to supervision

_____

36. Do any of your college supervisors hold joint appointments in two departments?

Yes No

If yes, please explain: _____

_____

_____

THE STUDENT TEACHERS THEMSELVES

37. How many student teachers did your institution have during the academic year 1966-67, not including the summer session?

Under 25	100 - 299	700 - 999
25 - 49	300 - 499	1000 - 2000
50 - 99	500 - 699	Over 2000

38. How many student teachers did your institution have during the 1967 summer school session?

0	26 - 50	151 - 200
1 - 10	51 - 100	201 - 300
11 - 25	101 - 150	Over 300

39. What type of grade do you use for student teaching?

Letter grade (A, B, C, etc.) Pass or Fail

Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory

Other, please explain: _____

_____

40. Please rank (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) according to importance, those who participated in the evaluation of student teachers. Rank only those who actually participate.

_____Cooperating teacher

_____College supervisor

_____Principal of cooperating school

_____Director of Student Teaching

_____Other, please state: _____

_____

41. Can your student teachers choose the type of school to which they will be assigned for student teaching?

Yes No

42. Do you provide opportunities for student teaching in disadvantaged areas?

Yes No

THE STUDENT TEACHERS THEMSELVES

43. Do you place more than one student teacher in a given classroom at the same time?

Never Rarely Quite often Always

44. Do most of your student teachers have classroom observation experiences prior to student teaching?

Yes No

45. During student teaching, on the average, approximately what percent of your student teachers' time is spent in:

observation? _____%

participation? _____%

actual teaching? _____%

46. Approximately what percent of your student teachers fail their first student teaching assignment?

None	2%	5%
Less than 1%	3%	6%
1%	4%	Over 6%

47. What alternatives are available to a student who fails his or her first student teaching assignment?

The student is eliminated from the teacher education program once and for all

He is given a second student teaching assignment after meeting certain requirements

He may appeal to a committee which determines if he may have a second student teaching assignment

Other, please explain: _____

_____

THE STUDENT TEACHERS THEMSELVES

48. Approximately what percent of your student teachers fail student teaching and are thereby eliminated from the teacher education program?

None	2%	5%
Less than 1%	3%	6%
1%	4%	Over 6%

49. Rank (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) according to importance the following causes of student teacher failure at your institution.

_____Inability to control students

_____Inability to get along with other teachers

_____Unwillingness to work

_____Poor subject matter background

_____Poor knowledge of teaching methodology

_____Other, please state: _____

_____

_____

50. Do you utilize the student teaching center concept in your student teaching program?

Yes No

If yes, how many elementary centers? _____

how many secondary centers? _____

how many total centers? _____

THE STUDENT TEACHERS THEMSELVES

51. Please indicate the extent to which you utilize the following features in your student teaching program by checking the appropriate column.	Not at all	A small amount	A good deal	Extensively	Don't know
Use of video-tape equipment with student teachers					
Use of tape recorders with student teachers					
Use of micro-teaching prior to or during student teaching . .					
Use of simulation techniques prior to or during student teaching					
Use of Flander's interaction analyse technique during student teaching					
Use of Taba's "teaching strategies" material during student teaching					
Use of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives during student teaching					
Use of sensitivity training for student teachers					
Use of small group seminars with student teachrs					

COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

52. Do you have written contracts with the schools in which you place student teachers?

Yes No

53. Please fill in the following chart showing the approximate distances from campus that you place student teachers.

	Minimum Distance	Average Distance	Maximum Distance
Elementary			
Secondary			

54. What was the approximate total number of cooperating teachers with whom you placed student teachers during the past school year (1966-67)?

Under 25	101 - 200	1,001 - 1,500
26 - 50	201 - 500	1,501 - 2,000
51 - 100	501 - 1,000	Over 2,000

55. Check any of the following techniques that you use to help train cooperating teachers.

Offering a formal course in the supervision of student teaching

Holding workshops for cooperating teachers

Conducting small seminars with cooperating teachers

Holding larger conferences on student teaching

Mailing out student teaching newsletter to cooperating teachers

Sending cooperating teachers to state conferences dealing with student teaching

Sending cooperating teachers to national conferences dealing with student teaching

Other, please state: _____

_____

COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

56. Rank (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) according to importance, those characteristics that you look for in a cooperating teacher.

_____Subject matter competency

_____Knowledge of teaching methodology

_____Human relations skill

_____Possession of a bachelor's degree

_____Possession of a master's degree

_____Willingness to work with student teachers

_____Having taken a course in Supervision of Student Teaching

_____Possession of a certificate for this type of work

_____Other, please state: _____

57. To what extent do your cooperating teachers exemplify the competencies that you consider to be most important for helping a student teacher

Almost completely

Very well

Quite well

To a limited extent

Not at all

58. Check the statement which best describes your policy concerning payment to cooperating teachers and/or cooperating school systems for working with your student teachers.

We do not pay for this service

We make a payment to the school system

We make a payment directly to the cooperating teacher

Other, please explain: _____

_____

59. What, if any, is the total amount that you pay per student teacher?

Per student teacher $_____

COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

60. Please check any of those benefits which you provide for your cooperating teachers.

Some type of college faculty status

Free tuition for college courses

Library privileges

List names in the college catalog

Free consultant service from the college

Passes to athletic events

Passes to concerts

Other, please explain: _____

_____

61. Do building principals receive payment for the placement of student teachers in their building?

Yes No

If yes, what amount per student teacher? $_____

62. Does your institution offer some type of graduate course dealing with "The Supervision of Student Teaching?"

Yes No

If yes, approximately how many students enroll in the course each year? _____

63. Approximately what percent of your cooperating teachers have had a course in the supervision of student teachers?

0%

1 - 5%

6 - 10%

11 - 25%

26 - 50%

51 - 75%

76 - 100%

COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

64. Does your institution provide transportation for supervisory personnel?

Yes No

65. Does your institution reimburse the supervisors if transportation is not provided?

Yes No

66. Are you an active member of:

ATE (national)

ATE (regional)

ATE (state

TEPS

67. How do you share experiences with other directors in student teaching? Please explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

68. How do you share in cooperative efforts or programs with other institutions? Please explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX E

RESPONSES TO ITEMS 67 AND 68

Item number 67 and 68 on the questionnaire read:

67. How do you share experiences with other directors in student teaching? Please explain:

68. How do you share in cooperative efforts or programs with other institutions? Please explain:

The comments offered by institutions are as follows:

Austin Peay State University

67. A. T. E. Conferences; Chance Meetings; phone calls or letters occasionally.

68. Same as above.

Belmont College

67. All colleges in the Metro-Nashville area belong to a Teacher Education Council with Metro and this provides opportunities for sharing.

68. Programs like TEAM (Teacher Education Alliance with Metro) and Teacher Corps offer opportunities for sharing.

Bethel College

67. National, Regional, and State Meeting. Field Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa.

68. We exchange assignments and supervisors within the State of Tennessee and we work with other states.

William Jennings Bryan College

67. No response.

68. No response.

Carson-Newman College

67. Discussions of professional meetings.

68. International program with the University of Alabama - students placed in Santo Domingo.

Christian Brothers College

67. Informally.

68. Christian Brothers and two other colleges and an art academy form a consortium. Students can take courses within this group for no extra fee.

David Lipscomb College

67. Meet regularly in Metro Council for Teacher Education - composed of public school and college personnel.

68. Through the above named Council.

East Tennessee State University

67. The Directors of Student Teaching for the Tennessee State Colleges and Universities meet informally once each quarter.

68. To some extent. We have furnished supervision for students from other institutions. E.T.S.U. and Milligan College cooperated in the Teacher Corps Program.

Fisk University

67. Monthly Council Meeting.

68. Monthly meeting of Directors of Teacher Training.

George Peabody College

67. Informally at meetings, conventions, etc.

68. We provide student teaching supervision for a few of their students who want to student teach in Nashville. Credits are transferred to parent institution.

King College

67. Very informally and sporadically.

68. None attempted.

Knoxville College

67. Very seldom does this opportunity occur. Some is done in informal conferences.

68. As above.

Lambuth College

67. Conferences

68. Conferences

Lane College

67. We share experiences through discussions at meetings such as ATE, TEPS, and other regional and state meetings.

68. Other directors in this area and I have met with the superintendent of a local school system to plan for similar programs.

Lee College

67. ATE meetings; exchange material; and attend conferences together.

68. Exchange ideas with fellow institutions and accept students from other institutions.

Lemoyne-Owen College

67. Through various contacts in meetings and with other directors in city and regional meetings.

68. As above

Lincoln Memorial University

67. Personal contacts with friends in other schools.

68. No response.

Maryville College

67. Professional meetings and informal contacts.

68. None

Memphis State University

67. Ten state supported institution directors meeting four times yearly.

68. Reciprocal agreement between above mentioned institutions. Exchange program with South Dakota State University.

Middle Tennessee State University

67. Ten state supported institution directors meeting four times yearly. Active membership in ATE (National, Regional, and State Associations).

68. As above.

Milligan College

67. None

68. Shared with E.T.S.U. in the Teacher Corps Program.

Tennessee State University

67. Members of state organized group.

68. A Teacher Education Center is staffed and funded by three cooperating institutions - T.S.U., U.T.N., M.T.S.U., and Metro-Nashville school system.

Tennessee Temple College

67. None

68. None

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

67. None

68. Quarterly meeting of state directors.

University of Tennessee at Knoxville

67. Ad Hoc group of directors of student teaching of state supported universities.

68. None

University of Tennessee at Martin

67. Quarterly three hour conference. Personal conferences.

68. Quarterly meeting with other student teacher directors from state institutions.

University of Tennessee at Nashville

67. Professional meetings. Quarterly meetings of state university directors of student teaching.

68. Supervise student teachers from other universities in which joint supervision is given from three institutions at one teacher education center.

Southern Missionary College

67. Group meetings.

68. Personal contact and professional meetings.

Southwestern College

67. Personal calls and at conferences.

68. Formal consortium with Southwestern C.B.C., and Lemoyne-Owen.

Tennessee Technological University

67. Directors meet quarterly. National and regional meetings. Informal telephone contacts.

68. Student teaching exchange was developed in quarterly meetings by directors.

Tennessee Wesleyan College

67. Informal contacts

68. SERATE and AACTE.

Trevecca Nazarene College

67. None

68. None

Tusculum College

67. Informally

68. Conferences

Union University

67. Conferences, professional meetings, and publications.

68. As above.

Vanderbilt University

67. Membership in Metro-Nashville Council on Teacher Education.

68. None

In view of the above fragmented attempts to share experiences and efforts among institutions, it is concluded that the student teaching programs are not able to benefit from the programs or activities from other institutions or from the accumulated experiences of the directors. The only consistent activity was among the directors in the public institutions who meet on an informal basis once each quarter.

VITA

Robert H. Coleman was born in Hunter, Arkansas on April 13, 1922. He attended elementary schools in Corbin, Kentucky and was graduated from Corbin High School in 1942. The following September he entered the University of Kentucky and in January, 1943 he was called to active duty in the United States Army. He served in the United States, New Guinea, Phillipine Island, and Korea for almost three years. After discharge from the service he entered Eastern Kentucky University in the spring of 1946 and in June 1949, he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in History and Physical Education. In the summer of 1949, he accepted a teaching and coaching assistantship at the same institution and began study toward a Master's degree. He received this degree in June 1950, and was employed by the Bristol, Virginia School Board in July, 1950 as a teacher and basketball coach. While in undergraduate studies he was elected president of his freshman and senior class and was elected to Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities.

He taught and coached basketball at Virginia High School from 1950 through 1962. In June of 1962, he was appointed principal of The Thomas Jefferson Elementary School where he served until his appointment to the faculty of East Tennessee State University in June, 1967. He was selected to appear in the 1968 edition of "Outstanding Personalities of the South." He is a member of Kappa Delta Pi and Phi Delta Kappa, honor societies in education.

He entered the Graduate School of the University of Tennessee in September 1973, and received the Doctor of Education degree with a major in Curriculum and Instruction in June 1974.

He is married to the former Helen Hammock of Corbin, Kentucky, and has one son, Robert Bruce.