SECONDARY EDUCATION RESIDENCY IN LANSING--A MODEL PROJECT DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY BY THE LANSING SCHOOL DISTRICT AND MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY TO IMPROVE THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

By

Calvin Coolidge Anderson

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1972

ABSTRACT

SECONDARY EDUCATION RESIDENCY IN LANSING--A MODEL PROJECT DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY BY THE LANSING SCHOOL DISTRICT AND MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY TO IMPROVE THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

By

Calvin Coolidge Anderson

The purpose of this study was to trace the development of a model student teaching program designed and developed cooperatively by the Lansing School District and Michigan State University College of Education. This study was limited to data from participants representing the School District and the University who had been involved in some phase of the project, either in its planning or operation.

Answers were sought to five basic questions: (1) Is it desirable for a public school and a university to establish a cooperative venture to improve that phase of teacher education that deals with student teaching? (2) Is it desirable to provide non-classroom experiences as an integral part of student teaching? (3) Is it desirable for a student teacher to work with more than one supervising teacher? (4) Do student teachers benefit from frequent contact with other student teachers? (5) What benefits accrue to the project by having a local faculty member serve as clinical consultant?

To find the answer to these questions, an opinionnaire was administered to those administrators, clinical consultants, supervising teachers, student teachers, and university coordinators from the Lansing

School District and Michigan State University who had been involved in the project.

Those who responded strongly endorsed the idea that the public school and University should participate in a cooperative venture to improve student teaching. Most believed that certain non-classroom experiences are beneficial and should be an integral part of student teaching. The evidence was mixed regarding the desirability of student teachers working with more than one supervising teacher. Strong support was given to the idea of frequent contacts between student teachers. Most of the respondents indicated that there are benefits that accrue by having a local faculty member serve as clinical consultant to the project.

Much has been said in recent years about the value of cooperation between the public school and the university. From either the data or information gathered in this study it was concluded that cooperation between the public school and the university did improve student teaching. Specific recommendations were made for further study. It was recommended that both institutions continue to search out other areas of cooperation that will yield positive benefits to all concerned with teacher education.

Dedicated

to

Evangeline, Debra, and Judy

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

One cannot begin to acknowledge and thank all of those who have aided in this endeavor. Special thanks and special appreciation is directed to:

Dr. Van Johnson for his constant supportive encouragement and his willingness to serve as committee chairman throughout this doctoral program.

Dr. George Myers for his dedication to the SERL Project and for the multitude of hours spent as advisor to this dissertation. His personal and continued involvement in SERL has been one of the ingredients that has made this study possible.

Dr. Robert L. Green for his continued deep interest and personal concern and for providing the initial incentive for the writer to become actively involved in a doctoral program.

Dr. J. Edward Green for his continued friendship and availability in time of need.

Dr. Robert J. Chamberlain and Mr. Robert E. Lott of the Lansing School District for their role in making this project to improve teacher education a reality.

To Miss Mable Fry, the first clinical consultant to the project, and to the many other persons who have been involved either in the planning or operation of this cooperative venture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd.)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd.)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd.)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd.)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd.)

LIST OF TABLE (cont'd.)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd.)

CHAPTER 1

NATURE OF THIS STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Educators have long been concerned with making teacher preparation as efficient and effective as possible. Since student teaching is considered to be one of the most important aspects in the spectrum of teacher preparation, much thought has been given to what constitutes the best pattern for this experience. In an attempt to improve teacher education, patterns such as the university laboratory school, full-day and half-day programs, and internships have been developed. Some of these programs have been good; others have raised questions as to their effectiveness.

Traditionally, the training of teachers has been conceptualized by the university. Public school educators have had minimum input into the total program development. Their role has been to follow the program as established by the university.

In many cases, conventional training methods have not been effective in providing student teachers with the kinds of experiences that adequately prepare them to meet the needs and demands that are placed on the first year teacher. In the planning of teacher education programs, Haskew, among others, has argued that we should aim to correct fundamental insufficiencies in present practice.[1] Silberman, in a

---

[1] Lawrence O. Haskew, "Planning for the Education of Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, (Summer, 1966).

recent address at a national conference on teacher education, recognized the importance of cooperation of the local school and university when he stated:

> The study of teacher education cannot start with the teacher colleges or the graduate schools, or departments of education. It must start with the elementary and secondary schools themselves with what should be taught, in what manner, and to what purpose.[2]

BACKGROUND OF THIS STUDY

In recent years it has been recognized that an effective teacher education program must require cooperation and partnership in the development and design of the total program. One of the primary reasons for establishing cooperative teaching centers at Wayne State University, according to a proposal prepared by E. Brooks Smith, was to bring the public school and university closer together in the cooperative planning and supervision of student teaching.[3]

Many educators have argued for this kind of cooperation in teacher education. A report from the National Commission for Teacher Education and Professional Standards states:

> Schools and colleges have responsibility for joint planning of student teaching, and they benefit mutually from it. The interplay of collaboration in student teaching prompts examination of present practice and stimulates experimentation in teaching. It also provides opportunities to test relationships between theory and practice, to learn from results of actual teaching learning

---

[2] Charles E. Silberman, Research and Action Imperatives in Teacher Education, a speech to the National Invitational Conference on Teacher Education, Austin, Texas, October 24, 1967.

[3] Patrick J. Johnson, "An Assessment of the Administrative Organization of a Cooperative Structure," in Partnership in Teacher Education, E. Brooks Smith, et al., eds. (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968), p. 142.

situations, and to contribute to assurances that new teachers will be well prepared.[4]

Margaret Lindsey notes that it is necessary for the school district and the college to share the responsibility in planning and conducting programs in the professional preparation of teachers. She further states that neither the school district nor the college alone can adequately provide the laboratory and experience phases of teacher education.[5]

There has been and continues to be widespread concern that programs of teacher education be cooperatively developed by all those who share the responsibilities for teacher preparation. This study seeks to describe such an attempt at cooperative development by representatives of the Lansing School District and by representatives of the Michigan State University College of Education as a model for providing meaningful professional laboratory experience at the junior high school level.

PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY

The purpose of this study is to trace the development of a model teacher education program, designed and developed cooperatively by the Lansing School District and the Michigan State University College of Education. This model is known as Secondary Education Residency in Lansing, or SERL. Further, it is the intent of this study to show how

---

[4] Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching. Who's in Charge Here--Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching, a discussion paper (Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1966).

[5] Margaret Lindsey, "Speculations on the Future of Teacher Education and Cooperative Endeavors," in Partnership in Teacher Education, E. Brooks Smith, et al., eds. (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968), pp. 287-288.

this relationship in teaching has developed a new partnership between those who use teachers and those who prepare teachers.

In addition, this study will (1) review the literature dealing with cooperative development of student teaching programs; (2) trace the development of the SERL model as a unique example of cooperation between the Lansing School District and the Michigan State University College of Education; (3) investigate the reactions of persons who have been closely involved and associated with the development and execution of this project; and (4) make recommendations relative to future modification of this project.

It is the intent of this study to answer the following questions:

1. Is it desirable for a public school and a university to establish a cooperative venture in student teaching?

2. Is it desirable to provide non-classroom experiences as an integral part of student teaching?

3. Is it desirable for a student teacher to work with more than one supervising teacher?

4. Do student teachers benefit from frequent (daily) contact with other student teachers?

5. What benefits accrue to the SERL Project by having a local faculty member serve as a clinical consultant for the student teaching experience?

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This study is limited to the Secondary Education Residency in Lansing as a model project in student teaching and as a cooperative venture between Michigan State University and the Lansing School

District. It is not the purpose to evaluate this project in statistical terms. Rather, it will describe the manner in which this program was developed, and will sample opinions of selected persons who have been involved in this project that was modeled as the SERL Project. The study does not seek to deal with the current "cluster programs" as they exist at Michigan State University and other universities.

The SERL model involves a project that was initiated in Lansing in 1966 at Dwight Rich Junior High School and has been in continuous operation since that time. Although originally developed as a junior high school program, it has now been expanded to include two senior high schools, Everett and Hill. The experience at Hill does not follow the SERL model in that it is a larger program involving more student teachers with a university consultant, rather than a local teacher serving as clinical consultant.

This study is limited to Lansing and to those principals, assistant principals, clinical consultants, supervising teachers, student teachers, and university coordinators who have participated in some phase of the project, either in its planning or in its operation. This study does not attempt to quantify all the data in order to make this an evaluative study. It uses data obtained from the use of an instrument designed specifically for this study.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Many of the terms used in this study have more than one meaning, therefore, the pertinent definitions are explained below.

Principal: The principal is the building administrator who is responsible for the educational leadership, the supervision of the

operation, and management of the school facility.[6] This term encompasses assistant principals and other persons who are assigned full-time administrative functions.

Clinical Consultant: The clinical consultant is a teacher who is employed jointly by the Lansing School District and Michigan State University. The consultant is responsible for student teacher assignments; providing instruction to student teachers on such matters as lesson planning and discipline; planning and coordinating SERL group activities; and providing leadership in counseling, evaluation, and feedback.[7]

Supervising Teacher: A full-time experienced teacher employed by the school district who is selected to work with the student teacher in the classroom. He shares the responsibility for the supervision and guidance of the student teacher's experience in the classroom and in related teacher activities.

Student Teacher: A prospective teacher who is acquiring practical teaching experience and skill under the guidance of a supervising teacher or other qualified person.[8]

University Coordinator: A member of the university staff who has the responsibility to visit, observe, assist in evaluation, and

---

[6] Enrolled House Bill No. 4195, Act No. 246, State of Michigan 75th Legislature.

[7] Donald J. Chase, A Comparative Study of the Cooperative Michigan State University--Lansing SERL Project and Conventional Programs of Student Teaching with Reference to Openness and Attitude Formation, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

[8] Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), p. 530.

conduct seminars with student teachers. He is also responsible for in-service training for both clinical consultants and supervising teachers as this relates to the supervision of student teaching activities. It is through him that feedback information is supplied to the local school system and the university to modify and improve the program.

SERL: Secondary Education Residency in Lansing is a project developed jointly by the Lansing School District and Michigan State University College of Education. This program is a joint effort to improve student teaching.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

It is necessary to make certain basic assumptions for this study. First, there are models that should be examined that would give insight into the improvement of that phase of teacher education that deals with the total laboratory experience of student teaching. It is also necessary to assume that students can benefit from those experiences not usually gained from the conventional student teaching programs. These experiences to a degree are limited to the usual activities of a traditional classroom. In traditional programs, student teachers are assigned to a single supervising teacher. The assumption is made that student teachers can profit from exposure to more than one supervising teacher. It is also assumed that student teachers can benefit from frequent contacts with each other through seminars, group discussions, field trips, etc., as experienced in the SERL Project. The last assumption made is that a clinical consultant is the best qualified person to work with student teachers at the building level because of his knowledge of the local school, its administration, students, faculty and community, and his familiarity with the university.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS STUDY

Chapter 1 is a general introduction to this study. The background, purpose, scope and limitations, and basic assumptions are stated, and the definition of terms as used in this study are defined.

Chapter 2 is devoted to the review of literature which includes a brief history of student teaching as it relates to teacher education, and a review of the literature as it relates to the justification for the involvement of public schools in teacher education.

In Chapter 3 the development of the SERL model and the survey instrument used in this study is described. This chapter also includes a presentation and interpretation of the data.

Chapter 4 includes a summary of the findings, the conclusions derived from this study, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

HISTORY OF STUDENT TEACHING

It could be said that the history of the student teaching process goes as far back in history as ancient Greece. The dialogues between Socrates and young Greeks, such as Plato, who were to become teacher-philosophers was a kind of practice teaching. Plato was one student who used this experience particularly well when he became a teacher.[9]

During the Middle Ages, clergymen were responsible for most of the formal teaching and until 1700 the church assumed the responsibility for education almost exclusively. Since education had a religious motive, and since the teaching was carried on by the clergy, teachers received religious training rather than special teacher training.[10] Other persons were included in the broadening of education. Lay teachers were included in the educational spectrum. Lay teachers taught in private institutions, acquiring their training by serving long apprenticeships with a master teacher who was part of the clergy. The apprentice was not required to study particular subjects in depth nor did he receive any kind of liberal education, although he was required to do

---

[9] Edward C. Merrill, Jr., Professional Student Teaching Programs (Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1967), p. 6.

[10] James A. Johnson, A Brief History of Student Teaching (DeKalb, Ill.: Creative Educational Materials, 1968), p. 1.

some directed reading. Rather, the prospective teacher was directly involved in teaching activities receiving "on-the-job" training.[11]

Schools that were designed specifically to train teachers were in existence in Europe by the 1400s. In these schools, future teachers taught demonstration lessons to fellow students. Armytage describes the program at one of these schools: "The curriculum in Godshouse did not include what we should now call 'method' lectures, for the simple reason that in the normal preparation for a degree each student was supposed to give, as well as listen to, a certain number of lectures."[12] This practice of requiring teacher trainees to give lessons to fellow students was not common in Europe until the latter part of the seventeenth century.[13]

Education in colonial America was based almost solely upon European practices and ideas. Religion permeated colonial education just as it did European education. Children were taught to read so that they could read the Bible. Teachers in this period also served an apprenticeship which, at the time, was the only form of teacher education.[14] Other attempts to provide teacher training in the colonies were not very successful.

In the early nineteenth century, people became more interested in developing additional and better schools and the subject of teacher

---

[11] Merrill, p. 9.

[12] W.H.G. Armytage, "William Byngham: A Medieval Protagonist of the Training of Teachers," History of Education Journal, II (Summer, 1951), p. 109.

[13] Johnson, p. 8.

[14] Ibid., pp. 31-35.

training received considerable attention. Practice teaching in the normal school was the outgrowth of this concern for improved education and model schools were used to provide a brief period of practical teaching experience.[15] A student from the normal school was placed in charge of the model school classroom for one week. The other normal school students were assigned as assistants until it was their turn to be in charge of the classroom.[16]

The first normal school in the United States was a private school opened in 1823 in Concord, Vermont, 150 years after the first normal school was opened in Europe. Sixteen years later, the first state normal school was opened in Lexington, Massachusetts. By the 1860s, the normal school was a well accepted part of teacher education. Depending upon the individual school's requirements, students were required to teach from two to twenty weeks. By 1895, according to a survey conducted by the National Education Association, only four of the country's sixty-three normal schools did not have a provision for practice teaching.[17]

The Oswego State Normal School in New York, established in 1861, has been an important influence in American education, serving as a model for several normal schools. The significant difference between Oswego and other normal schools was that each model class at Oswego had

---

[15] Asahel D. Woodruff, Student Teaching Today (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960), p. 8.

[16] Johnson, pp. 46-55.

[17] Association for Student Teaching, The Outlook in Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: The Association, 1962), p. 2.

its own regular teacher and student teachers taught under close supervision.

Toward the latter part of the nineteenth century, normal schools began formal training of secondary teachers. Previously, only elementary teachers were formally trained. At the same time, most normal schools were expanding to four-year institutions and academic studies were becoming more specialized. By 1907, according to Johnson, four normal schools in Illinois received permission to award degrees.[18]

Practice teaching in universities and private schools developed in much the same way as in normal schools, although the early training programs for high school teachers conducted by universities and private schools did not include practice teaching. Johnson speculates that this may have stemmed, in part, from the fact that the university traditionally had been a liberal arts institution and as such looked with disfavor upon the technical training of teachers.[19] Some educators believe that the lack of interest in practice teaching was the result of a feeling that the university graduate did not need practice teaching.[20]

The increasing demand for teachers that continued throughout the early 1900s brought with it a concommitant growth in university departments of education. Many of these departments of education were developed into schools or colleges of education and many established model schools. One such school, at the University of Michigan, Snarr explains, "served both as a laboratory for scientific study of secondary

---

[18] Johnson, p. 145.

[19] Ibid., p. 16.

[20] G.W.A. Luckey, The Professional Training of Secondary Teachers in the United States (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1903), p. 207.

school problems and as a school for observational work and directed teaching."[21] With the demand for more teachers, both elementary and secondary, it became necessary for private institutions to expand their teacher training programs and increase these programs from two to four years.

Until certification of teachers came into existence through state departments of education, student teaching had not been a requirement.[22] Between 1920-1940 student teaching began to be recognized as a vital and essential part of teacher preparation. By 1930, most states had begun to require supervised student teaching as an integral part of the teacher education program. Upon completion of the four-year program, teaching certificates were awarded.[23]

The practical aspects of teaching were provided for in the laboratory schools or practice schools and controlled by the normal schools or teachers colleges and were separate from the public schools.[24] However, mounting enrollments and teacher shortages made it impossible for the model schools to accomodate all of the practice teachers. This led to the use of off-campus facilities for practice teaching.[25] State governments began to pass laws which made it possible for teacher training institutions to work cooperatively with the public schools to provide

---

[21] Otto W. Snarr, The Education of Teachers in the Middle States (Moorhead, Minn.: Moorhead State Teachers College, 1946), pp. 266-267.

[22] Woodruff, p. 8.

[23] A.R. Mead, "Legal Status of Laboratory Schools and Teacher Education Laboratory Practices," Journal of Teacher Education (December, 1957), p. 356.

[24] Woodruff, p. 1.

[25] Johnson, pp. 166-167.

practice teaching experiences. Consequently, the number of normal schools using off-campus laboratory facilities steadily increased.

The shortage of laboratory school space was not the only condition that contributed to the trend to use off-campus facilities. Another reason was economics; sufficient funds had never been available to build and maintain enough model schools. Perhaps the most significant reason, however, was that some educators believed that experiences in actual school situations would give the student a more realistic opportunity to put into practice those theories learned in college.[26]

JUSTIFICATION FOR INVOLVING PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Today, student teaching is considered to be the most important and most dynamic phase of teacher education. It is also generally accepted that "student teaching is the one part of the professional preparation that is shared by the public schools and institutions of higher education without clear-cut lines of responsibility."[27] As has been stated, the initial reason for public school involvement in teacher preparation was to put theory into practice in a realistic setting. As Merrill has noted: "The purpose of the professional student teaching program is to provide a planned, carefully supervised learning activity

---

[26] E. Brooks Smith and Patrick J. Johnson, eds., School-College Relationships in Teacher Education: Report of a National Survey of Cooperative Ventures (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964), p. 2.

[27] Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching. A New Order in Student Teaching (Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association, 1967), p. 1.

for the student teacher which allows him not only to demonstrate but to improve his resourcefulness as a teacher in a real school setting."[28]

Colleges and universities have traditionally dominated teacher education programs. Today, however, this domination is being challenged, and rightfully so, by many who believe responsibility and control of teacher preparation should rest with both the college and the public schools. Smith and Johnson point out:

> The practicing profession, feeling their rightful responsibility as keepers of the school, has never quite accepted the university's domination over teacher education and has developed means for influencing local, state, and national groups to challenge their leadership. Thus, there has emerged a kind of cold war in many situations between the university-oriented teacher educators and the school-oriented professionals. In other instances, university representatives have gone out into the community with the hand of comradeship asking schools to help them in this great task, always making sure that they keep the upper hand.[29]

Conant suggests that the university be responsible for the academic content and the foundational study and methodology of teacher education. The state, representing the public and the profession, should be responsible for certifying practices, along with the joint participation of schools and colleges in establishing professional laboratories and proper supervision.[30]

The problem continues to persist. Although neither the university nor the school can function effectively independent of one another, there is still little cooperation between them. Only a few professionals from each institution are involved in student teaching and since there is relatively little feedback from student teacher programs, the programs

---

[28] Merrill, p. 28.

[29] Smith and Johnson, p. 61.

[30] James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963).

do not change in either the university or the school. The importance of constant interplay between the college, the state legal agency, and the local school system cannot be stressed enough. If they are to work well together, the responsibilities of each must be clearly stated. It is also important for each to support the program, make a commitment, and participate fully in the commitment.[31]

Smith believes it is no easy task to bring the universities and the schools together. He attributes the difficulty to "barriers of status and differences of outlook between the two domains. . . .In the realm of the school there is a practical focus and rightfully so; while in the realm of the university, theoretical considerations are the order of the day as educational ideas develop in thoughtful interplay with foundational disciplines."[32] Unfortunately, efforts to break through these barriers have produced only modest gains. Although all concerned parties are well meaning, the primary reason for working together has been overlooked, that is, improving education for all children.

Much has been written about the need for cooperation between colleges and schools. For example, Rogers writes:

> The administration of student teaching programs, particularly in large cities, has come to be a major undertaking and the two agencies [college and public school] are mutually dependent, one upon the other, if they are to provide an adequate preservice education for the teachers who will staff the public schools in the United States.[33]

---

[31] Merrill, p. 117.

[32] E. Brooks Smith, "Summary," Cooperative Structures in School-College Relationships for Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1965), p. 101.

[33] Helen Rogers, The Administration of Student Teaching in the Secondary Schools of Large Cities, Ed.D. dissertation (Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1951), p. 3.

Francis Keppel, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, believes the model established in medicine and agriculture can be effectively applied to the betterment of American education, and that a comparable relationship should deal with recruiting, training teachers, and developing curricula that would strengthen American education.[34]

The University of Utah's Cooperative Center for Teacher Education, recognizing the need for a cooperative working relationship between schools and colleges, suggests "that student teaching centers can constitute a natural link between the college and the schools. They furnish a point of common interest at which the academic profession, the education professor, the classroom teacher and the supervisor can meet to examine and test constructive ideas, as they watch the college trained teacher carry his acquired education into a field tryout situation."[35]

A rationale for making cooperative decisions in education is presented by George Denemark:

> Determination of who should make teacher education decisions is based on analysis of the substantive character of the decisions. The concept of cooperation in teacher education is much in need of clarification. Too often we assume the automatic virtue of extensive involvement without reference to the principle group size which asserts that the 'ideal' group is that which contains all the resources needed for the task at hand and no more. Unfortunately, we seem yet to lack the conceptual schemes by means of which the persistent decisions of teacher education and the data sources for dealing with these are identified, classified, and interrelated. Certain involvements, however, seem obvious. It is clear, for example, that decisions about the contribution of mathematical syntax to the teaching of mathematics are likely to be vacuous without the involvement of a mathematician. Similarly, a logical

---

[34] Francis Keppel, "Forward," in Team Teaching, Judson R. Shaplin and Henry Olds, eds. (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. XI.

[35] Smith and Johnson, p. 33.

way to identify what teachers do in the classroom is to ask teachers.[36]

As Smith and Johnson perceive it, the question educators are faced with is: "Who should teach teachers how to teach?" They write:

> It is very tempting to seize upon the simple solution of dividing up the theoretical and the practical tasks. Let the schools who know most about the everyday job of teaching children be completely in charge of student teaching, methodology, and of the supervision and improvement of instruction. Let the universities teach the psychology, the social foundations, the philosophy and the academic background for curriculum content.[37]

The total profession must learn to work together as equals. But first the roles each is to play, must be clearly defined. Smith and Goodlad stress that school personnel, university professors, and state department experts are equally important in their contribution to the education enterprise, but the contributions are different. They write:

> The school's rightful business is practice--examined and enlightened practice. This can be accomplished best in the field. The university's rightful job is scholarly investigation of the educational activity by building theory from experimental findings, and from study of disciplines that touch on education. This can best be done at the university where the means for intensive scholarship reside and where students of education may view educational problems from a universal and objective position. The state agency for public instruction is responsible for overseeing the total enterprise, enforcing minimum standards, and fostering cooperative leadership at local and regional levels. Professional organizations should be responsible for encouraging members to reach for maximum standards and fair practices. They should provide a forum for the discussion of issues and innovative ideas which will promote imaginative policy making.[38]

---

[36] George W. Denemark, ed., Criteria for Curriculum Decision in Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1964), p. 44.

[37] Smith and Johnson, p. 63.

[38] E. Brooks Smith and John I. Goodlad, "Promises and Pitfalls in the Trend Toward Collaboration," in Partnership in Teacher Education, E. Brooks Smith, et al., eds. (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968), p. 14.

One problem which has interfered with meaningful cooperation in the past has been the tendency for one agency to infringe upon another's responsibility, particularly when it has been linked with political expediency. But partnership is very necessary because the job of training teachers is the responsibility of the entire profession. What makes for successful cooperation between school systems and universities and between classroom teachers and college supervisors? Owen believes three factors are important: (a) mutual respect, (b) common purposes, and (c) an intent to make it work.[39]

Corrigan, discussing the meaning of partnership, notes that in various programs in teacher education the emphasis is on what resources the universities have to offer the schools. Little emphasis is given to the idea that the schools have resources which could improve the universities. The college professor has always been the "expert." College personnel must have the chance to share ideas about and participate in innovative programs in education if the university is to be relevant to the needs of students and teachers in today's schools. "If a true partnership were to emerge, the partners would jointly control and have a commitment to sharing."[40] Although the colleges have always played the role of "senior partner," assuming major responsibility for

---

[39] George H. Owen, "The View from the Other Side: The Role of the Public Schools in Student Teaching," in Partnership in Teacher Education, E. Brooks Smith, et al., eds. (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968), p. 114.

[40] Dean Corrigan, "Affiliated Schools and Research and Development Centers," in Partnership in Teacher Education, E. Brooks Smith, et al., eds. (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968), p. 75.

planning and standards in the practice of attaining professional competence, the public schools now have the opportunity and the obligation to assume leadership.[41]

Southworth suggests that agreements between universities and public schools be further expanded to include representative classroom teachers selected by teacher organizations in each regional area.[42] Supervising teachers also want to participate in teacher education as a study by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools indicates. This study revealed that 80 percent of 13,146 teachers who were directing practice teaching experiences for 25,072 student teachers welcomed the opportunity to participate in teacher preparation. They considered it to be their "professional responsibility." The remaining 20 percent, for the most part, agreed that although they accepted the added responsibility reluctantly, they considered it to be necessary.[43]

---

[41] Dorothy McCuskey, "The View Ahead in Student Teaching," Teacher Education and the Public Schools, The Fortieth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., Inc., 1969), p. 37.

[42] Horton Southworth, "Issues and Problems as Viewed by a Large Multi-Purpose State University Located in a Small City in Establishing Off-Campus Student Teaching Operations," in Partnership in Teacher Education, E. Brooks Smith, et al., eds. (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968), p. 141.

[43] H.W. Schooling, "Partnership in Teacher Preparation," NEA Journal (May, 1962), p. 61.

CHAPTER 3

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is devoted to a brief history of the SERL Project and its objectives. It will further present the findings of the first study completed on the SERL model. Discussed will be the results of an opinionnaire administered to representatives of the Lansing Public Schools and representatives of Michigan State University who participated in this project.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SERL MODEL

The SERL Project was organized during the 1965-66 school year as an attempt to improve teacher education programs. The purpose was to identify and develop methods that would better prepare student teachers to organize and manage instruction. Emphasis was initially placed on the unique learning needs of youngsters in the typical junior high school classroom, but was later expanded to include student teachers at the senior high school and elementary levels. The project is a cooperative venture by the Instructional Division of the Lansing School District and the School of Teacher Education in the Michigan State University College of Education. Both agencies believed that a special kind of student teaching program was needed that would improve the quality of teachers at the junior high school level.[44]

---

[44] Lansing School District and Michigan State University Student Teaching Office, SERL Project: A Project to Improve the Preparation of Teachers, 1967.

Dwight Rich Junior High School was selected as the location for the SERL Project because of its teaching personnel, geographic location, and physical facilities that allowed the flexibility needed for such a pilot project. The project was conducted at Dwight Rich during the spring and fall quarters of 1966 and in the winter quarter of 1967 it was operated in West Junior High School. The project was expanded in the fall of 1967 to include both Dwight Rich and West Junior High Schools, with ten student teachers at each school. Other junior high schools joined the project in this order: Walter French, fall 1969; Otto, winter 1970; and Pattengill, fall 1971. Everett High School began the project during the winter term of 1971 and Hill High School joined the project fall 1971. Averill Elementary School joined the project winter 1972.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The basic objectives of the SERL Project are to provide significant improvements in the quality of experiences of student teachers involved; observations and analyses of a variety of models of teaching under varying conditions; and other kinds of school experience in addition to classroom teaching.[45]

The SERL Project is also designed to acquaint the student teachers with the many facets of the modern educational system. This includes learning about the social and cultural environment of the surrounding community; the administration of a school; school policies, programs, and resources; city-wide resources, facilities, programs, and

---

[45] Ibid.

curricula; social agencies and law enforcement agencies that work in cooperation with the schools; innovative programs; instructional media; and professional organizations. At the end of the term the student teachers realize that the field of education is no longer the narrow vocation it was fifty years ago when a classroom teacher might become a principal or, in many instances, might fill both positions.

The teaching assignments for the SERL student teachers are made on a more flexible basis than are assignments in the typical student teaching program. Each student teacher is assigned three classes, a planning period, a lunch period, and a two-hour block of time to explore the total educational program and supportive services offered by the school district. In addition to their in-school experiences, these student teachers work with social and community agencies. They are much more likely to spend time in student homes and involved in community activities than is typical of student teachers in the conventional programs.

Because of its flexibility, the SERL student teachers are able to group and regroup as they identify problems of instruction and problems of learning; analyze these problems and begin to develop hypotheses about solving them; develop plans for organizing and managing instruction to solve the identified problems; and develop evaluation techniques to determine the success of their efforts. In the process, the student teachers examine and gain practice with different methods of organizing instruction for small groups, large groups, individualized tutoring, and team teaching.

RESULTS OF THE PROJECT

The SERL Project was not seen as a research experiment but rather as a means of trying out some ideas for improving the laboratory experience in teacher preparation. The documented findings and the subjective appraisals of the people involved have indicated the following:[46]

a) The final evaluations prepared by both the supervising teacher and the college coordinator have consistently been higher than those of comparable students in the regular program.

b) A higher proportion of project people than others have accepted teaching positions in the Lansing system.

c) The project people have gained far wider experience during student teaching than is possible in the regular program where the burden of instruction is on a single supervising teacher.

d) Students have gained valuable experience in teaching remedial classes and in observing special education classes.

e) Student teachers in the project are more likely than others to obtain some experience in their minor as well as their major fields.

f) Extensive work with instructional media has been provided.

g) The project has made possible the release of groups of supervising teachers during the school day for in-service meetings at which departmental curriculum matters are being discussed in a nonpressured setting.

h) Visitations by student teachers to the homes of the students are possible.

i) Visits to study the programs of social agencies, other schools, and other grade levels are routine.

j) Skills in working in a classroom have been as well developed as with other student teachers (each student teacher is assigned to three classes).

k) Concentration in a single building has made more efficient use of the coordinator's time and equipment. The video tape machine is used much more effectively in the project setting.

l) Student teacher reaction has been one of unqualified enthusiasm. Many students who could not be assigned to the project have reported feeling somewhat cheated.

m) University specialists have been more available to the project than to the regular student teaching program.

---

[46] Ibid.

n) Student teaching has become an individualized experience in the project. Individual assignments are shifted easily to compensate for specific strengths, weaknesses or interests as they are identified. Each student's schedule is examined and modified when this seems desirable.[47]

The first study involving the SERL Project was completed by Donald J. Chase early in 1971. He compared student teachers in the SERL Project with the student teachers in the conventional programs using openness and attitude formation as dependent variables. He found that teachers in the SERL Project:

> Showed more positive gains in both attitude and openness as a result of their exposure to the activities of the project, and in the SERL Project finished at a higher level of openness and attitude than the conventional student teachers. As a result of their group activities, in interaction with pupils, parents, and individuals from community service organizations, the SERL student teachers should be better prepared to meet their obligations as first-year teachers. The SERL participants have had great opportunities to develop techniques and to recognize and use opportunities from a wide variety of sources. The socialization, the interaction of the group, appeared to be the most significant contributing factor to the differential results of the study. The group, along with the coordinator, and the cooperation of the many individuals and agencies providing the multitudinous variety of experiences, makes the SERL Project a superior pattern for providing the student teaching experience, with reference to openness and attitude formation.[48]

This project served as a model for the "cluster programs" that have been developed at Michigan State University. It further served as the model for a position paper on student teaching programs adopted by the Deans and Directors of Michigan Teacher Education Institutions in which it is stated:

> In designing the structure of a model student teaching program, four main principles were considered paramount. They are:

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] Chase, p. 82.

1. The program of student teachers should provide great flexibility so that strengths and weaknesses of individual students will determine the specific program each will follow.
2. The student teacher should be involved in a program which is designed to provide contact with several teachers and various teaching styles.
3. The program should be structured to provide many other kinds of school experiences for the student teacher in addition to classroom teaching.
4. Effective means should be developed to bring practicing teachers and teacher preparation institutions into a true partnership in the design and implementation of teacher education programs.[49]

The SERL model differs from the conventional teacher education program in that students are assigned to buildings rather than to an individual supervising teacher. A group of eight to ten student teachers is under the direction of a local faculty member who supervises the student teachers' entire experience and coordinates the public school-university activities.

Each student teacher's schedule includes a good deal of classroom teaching experience, but not necessarily under the supervision of a single teacher. For example, a student might be teaching three classes in social studies, but under the guidance of more than one supervising teacher. The remainder of the day the student might engage in an organized program designed especially for him in which he learns about the many facets of the teacher's job outside the formal classroom setting. This includes working with small groups or individuals in remedial tutoring situations, visiting homes of students, learning about community activities, learning about the administration of a school as viewed by the principal, attendance officer, custodian, or groundskeeper,

---

[49] Leland W. Dean, "A Student Teaching Program for the 1970s," unpublished paper, School of Teacher Education, Michigan State University, January 1969, presented to the Deans and Directors of Michigan Teacher Education Institutions.

and learning about the work of social agencies that are influential in the community. It also includes becoming familiar with the special services of the school such as guidance, remedial reading, nursing, library, and audio-visual aids.

FINDINGS OF THE SERL MODEL SURVEY OF OPINIONS

The instrument developed to sample the opinions of those involved in the SERL Project, past and present, was based on the rationale outlined by those persons from the Lansing School District and Michigan State University who were responsible for the program's inception.[50] The final instrument was developed after consultation with administrators from the Lansing School District and Michigan State University professors of education who are involved in teacher education and who have been actively involved in the project.

In May 1971, 160 letters (Appendix A) and opinionnaires (Appendix B) were sent to secondary school principals, assistant principals, clinical consultants, supervising teachers, student teachers, university coordinators, and some service personnel such as counselors, librarians, and persons who had been or are now involved in the SERL Project. Of the 160 opinionnaires sent, 128 (80%) of those returned contained information that was useable in this study. Five returns were not useable.

The responses used were from twelve school administrators, principals, assistant principals, and clinical consultants, grouped together because of their small number and the similarity of their

---

[50] Lansing School District and Michigan State University Student Teaching Office, SERL Project, 1967.

responses. Other respondents included 74 supervising teachers, 18 student teachers, 5 university coordinators, and 19 others, including counselors, librarians, and other school personnel involved in the project. In addition, this last category encompasses persons who were involved in the past but who are not currently involved in the project. Opinionnaires were sent to those persons who were known to have had involvement in the project. Since no information was recorded on the opinionnaire to identify the respondents, no effort was made to follow-up those participants who did not respond.

The respondents were asked to give a yes-no answer to the questions and then to list their reasons. By using this open type of answer, it was necessary to make some general categories of responses. This was done after a careful survey of all responses was made and only then was it desirable to assign categories to specific responses. The first or what seemed the major response from each person was used. By using this method some loss and some misinterpretation of responses was inherent.

SHARED RESPONSIBILITY

The first basic question presented for response was: "Should the school and college of education continue to share the responsibility in a cooperative venture in student teaching?" Tables 1 through 6 contain the responses to this question.

Tables 1 through 6

Inspection of Table 1 indicates an overwhelming endorsement of the idea of shared responsibility in student teaching by the public school and university regardless of the age of the respondent. Of the

125 useable replies, only 3 did not respond in the affirmative. One respondent in the 30-34 age bracket responded negatively. Two in the 20-24 age group responded "yes and no."

Table 2 compares by marital status responses related to the desirability of school college cooperation. Both the one "no" response and the two "yes and no" responses were made by married persons.

Table 3 compares the respondents by sex and the desirability of the school and university to continue to share this responsibility. The one "no" response came from a male, while the two "yes and no" responses were divided one each between the sexes.

Table 4 contains responses of the desirability of continued shared responsibility according to the respondents' years of experience in education. The one "no" response was from a person with four to nine years of experience, while the two "yes and no" votes came from persons with less than five years of experience in education.

In Table 5 responses are presented according to past responsibility to the SERL Project and the desirability of continuing to share the responsibility. Thus, we see that the "no" and the "yes and no" respondents were all persons who have not had prior experiences with the SERL Project.

Table 6 presents a comparison of the desirability of continuing to share the responsibility by present responsibility to the SERL Project. From this table we see that the one negative response was from a current supervisory teacher and the "yes and no" answers were from current student teachers.

An analysis of Tables 1 through 6 indicates strong support for the school and university to continue to share the responsibility for

that segment of teacher education that deals with student teaching. The person who believed this cooperation should not continue was between 30 to 35 years of age, a single male with five to nine years of experience in education and who was a supervisory teacher for the first time. Similarly, the "yes and no" respondents were student teachers, one male and one female, both of whom were married and between 20 to 24 years old.

TABLE 1

Should the School and College of Education Continue to Share the Responsibilities in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching? A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Age

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-65	Total
YES										
Frequency	25.00	31.00	13.00	17.00	14.00	4.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	122.00
Pct. of Total	20.00	24.80	10.40	13.60	11.20	3.20	7.20	4.80	2.40	97.60
NO										
Frequency	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.80
YES AND NO										
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.60
TOTAL										
Frequency	27.00	31.00	14.00	17.00	14.00	4.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	125.00
Pct. of Total	21.60	24.80	11.20	13.60	11.28	3.20	7.20	4.80	2.40	100.00

Unused - 3

TABLE 2

Should the School and College of Education Continue to Share the Responsibilities in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching? A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Marital Status

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
YES				
Frequency	105.00	17.00	2.00	124.00
Pct. of Total	82.68	13.39	1.57	97.64
NO				
Frequency	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Pct. of Total	.79	0.00	0.00	.79
YES AND NO				
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.57	0.00	0.00	1.57
TOTAL				
Frequency	108.00	17.00	2.00	127.00
Pct. of Total	85.04	13.39	1.57	100.00

Unused - 1

TABLE 3

Should the School and College of Education Continue to Share the Responsibilities in A Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching? A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Sex

	Male	Female	Total
YES			
Frequency	67.00	57.00	124.00
Pct. of Total	52.76	44.88	97.64
NO			
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00
Pct. of Total	.79	0.00	.79
YES AND NO			
Frequency	1.00	1.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.79	.79	1.57
TOTAL			
Frequency	69.00	58.00	127.00
Pct. of Total	54.33	45.67	100.00

Unused - 1

TABLE 4

Should the School and College of Education Continue to Share the Responsibilities in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching? A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Years of Experience in Education

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
YES									
Frequency	46.00	25.00	21.00	12.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	124.00
Pct. of Total	36.22	19.69	16.54	9.45	6.30	1.57	5.51	2.36	97.64
NO									
Frequency	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.79
YES AND NO									
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.57
TOTAL									
Frequency	48.00	26.00	21.00	12.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	127.00
Pct. of Total	37.80	20.47	16.54	9.45	6.30	1.57	5.51	2.36	100.00

Unused - 1

TABLE 5

Should the School and College of Education Continue to Share the Responsibilities in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching? A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	20.00	14.00	6.00	4.00	81.00	125.00
Pct. of Total	15.63	10.94	4.69	3.13	63.28	97.66
NO						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.78	.78
YES AND NO						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.56	1.56
TOTAL						
Frequency	20.00	14.00	6.00	4.00	84.00	128.00
Pct. of Total	15.63	10.94	4.69	3.13	65.63	100.00

Unused - 0

TABLE 6

Should the School and College of Education Continue to Share the Responsibilities in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching? A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	73.00	16.00	12.00	5.00	19.00	125.00
Pct. of Total	57.03	12.50	9.38	3.91	14.84	97.66
NO						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Pct. of Total	.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.78
YES AND NO						
Frequency	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.56
TOTAL						
Frequency	74.00	18.00	12.00	5.00	19.00	128.00
Pct. of Total	57.81	14.06	9.38	3.91	14.84	100.00

Unused - 0

Tables 7 through 12

Those who responded positively to the question "Should the school and college of education continue to share the responsibility in a cooperative venture in student teaching?" were asked to state the reasons why they believe this type of cooperation should continue. Tables 7 through 12 contain the analysis of the major reasons the respondents gave for continuing the cooperative venture.

An inspection of Table 7, which compared the response by age of the major reasons for continuing the cooperative venture, indicates that 44 of the 105 (42%) who gave a positive response to the idea of school-college cooperation gave the reason "to gain practical experience to put theory into practice." "To combine the resources of both institutions" was stated by 22% of the respondents. Twenty percent responded "to keep both institutions current as to changing needs thereby forming a basis for evaluation and change." Ten respondents expressed the major reason for cooperation was to give the student teacher a realistic view of the school and of the community. Other responses included such reasons as "They [the school and the university] do not have any choice but to share responsibility;" "They must cooperate;" and "Student teachers must work with experienced teachers." Included in this "other" category were those who did not respond or who gave a response that was not related to the question.

In Table 8, in which the desirability of continuing the cooperative relationship in student teaching is compared according to marital status of the respondents, it is interesting to note that the major reasons for continuing the cooperative relationship remained in the identical order as the comparison by age. There was very little difference in the responses from married or single respondents.

Table 9 compares, according to the sex of the respondents, the major reasons for continuing the cooperative relationship. Once again the major reasons were in identical order in the age comparison (Table 7) and marital comparison (Table 8) responses. An analysis of the 59 males and 47 females who responded to this question indicates very similar responses regardless of the sex of the respondent.

Table 10 compares the major reasons for continuing the cooperative arrangement by years of experience in education. Experience in education did not seem to be a factor in ranking the major reasons to continue the cooperative venture between the local school and the College of Education.

Tables 11 and 12 make a comparison of the major reason for continuing the cooperative venture by past and present responsibility. "To gain practical experience" is rated first (42% of the respondents), followed by "To combine the resources of both institutions" (24%); "To keep both institutions current in the changing needs" (20%); and "To give a realistic view of the school and community" (10%). The order and total percentage of each category are identical in both tables.

Table 8 through 12 indicate a close similarity of reasons for continuing the relationship regardless of the respondents' age, marital status, sex, years of experience in education, or past or current responsibility to the SERL Project. Of those who responded to this set of questions, 58 currently were supervisory teachers, 14 were student teachers, 12 were school administrators or clinical consultants, and 18 had no direct responsibility to the project at the time the opinionnaire was completed.

No responses were given to the request to state reasons why the University-public school cooperation should not continue.

TABLE 7

A Comparison of Responses by Age of the Major Reasons the School and College Should Continue to Share the Responsibility in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-65	Total
To gain practical experience to put theory into practice.										
Frequency	8.00	8.00	6.00	4.00	7.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	44.00
Pct. of Total	7.62	7.62	5.71	3.81	6.67	2.86	3.81	2.86	.95	41.90
To combine the resources of both institutions.										
Frequency	5.00	6.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	23.00
Pct. of Total	4.76	5.71	1.90	2.86	2.86	.95	.95	.95	.95	21.90
To keep both institutions current as to the changing needs thereby forming a basis for evaluation and change.										
Frequency	2.00	8.00	2.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	1.90	7.62	1.90	5.71	0.00	0.00	.95	.95	0.00	19.05
To give a realistic view of the school and the community.										
Frequency	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	2.86	2.86	0.00	0.00	.95	0.00	1.90	0.00	.95	9.52
Other										
Frequency	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	8.80
Pct. of Total	3.81	.95	.95	0.00	.95	0.00	.95	0.00	0.00	7.62
TOTAL										
Frequency	22.00	26.00	11.00	13.00	12.00	4.00	9.00	5.00	3.00	105.00
Pct. of Total	20.95	24.76	10.48	12.38	11.43	3.81	8.57	4.76	2.86	100.00

Unused - 23

TABLE 8

A Comparison of Responses by Marital Status of the Major Reasons the School and College Should Continue to Share the Responsibility in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
To gain practical experience to put theory into practice.				
Frequency	37.00	7.00	0.00	44.00
Pct. of Total	34.92	6.60	0.00	41.50
To combine the resources of both institutions.				
Frequency	20.00	4.00	0.00	24.00
Pct. of Total	18.87	3.77	0.00	22.64
To keep both institutions current as to the changing needs thereby forming a basis for evaluation and change.				
Frequency	18.00	2.00	0.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	16.98	1.89	0.00	18.75
To give a realistic view of the school and the community.				
Frequency	9.00	1.00	0.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	8.49	.94	0.00	1.43
Other				
Frequency	6.00	1.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	5.66	.94	.94	7.55
TOTAL				
Frequency	90.00	15.00	1.00	106.00
Pct. of Total	84.92	14.15	.94	100.00

Unused - 22

TABLE 9

A Comparison of Responses by Sex of the Major Reasons the School and College Should Continue to Share the Responsibility in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching

	Male	Female	Total
To gain practical experience to put theory into practice.			
Frequency	27.00	18.00	45.00
Pct. of Total	25.47	16.98	42.43
To combine the resources of both institutions.			
Frequency	13.00	10.00	23.10
Pct. of Total	12.26	9.43	21.70
To keep both institutions current as to the changing needs thereby forming a basis for evaluation and change.			
Frequency	11.00	9.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	10.38	8.49	18.87
To give a realistic view of the school and community.			
Frequency	5.00	5.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	4.72	4.72	9.43
Other			
Frequency	3.00	5.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	2.83	4.72	7.55
TOTAL			
Frequency	59.00	47.00	106.00
Pct. of Total	55.66	44.34	100.00

Unused - 22

TABLE 10

A Comparison of Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Major Reasons the School and College Should Continue to Share the Responsibility in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
To gain practical experience to put theory into practice.									
Frequency	11.00	12.00	7.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	45.00
Pct. of Total	10.28	11.21	6.54	4.67	3.74	.93	3.74	.93	42.06
To combine the resources of both institutions.									
Frequency	10.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	24.00
Pct. of Total	9.35	2.80	4.67	1.87	.93	.93	1.87	0.00	22.43
To keep both institutions current as to the changing needs thereby forming a basis for evaluation and change.									
Frequency	9.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	8.41	3.74	3.74	1.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	.93	18.69
To give a realistic view of the school and community.									
Frequency	5.00	1.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	4.67	.93	0.00	1.87	.93	0.00	0.00	.93	9.35
Other									
Frequency	4.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	3.74	1.87	.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	.93	0.00	7.48
TOTAL									
Frequency	39.00	22.00	17.00	11.00	6.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	107.00
Pct. of Total	36.45	20.56	15.89	10.28	5.61	1.87	6.54	2.80	100.00

Unused - 22

TABLE 11

A Comparison of Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons the School and College Should Continue to Share the Responsibility in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
To gain practical experience to put theory into practice.						
Frequency	9.00	6.00	4.00	3.00	23.00	45.00
Pct. of Total	8.41	5.61	3.74	2.80	21.50	42.06
To combine the resources of both institutions.						
Frequency	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	16.00	24.00
Pct. of Total	1.87	2.80	1.87	.93	14.95	22.43
To keep both institutions current as to the changing needs thereby forming a basis for evaluation and change.						
Frequency	5.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	4.67	.93	0.00	0.00	13.08	18.69
To give a realistic view of the school and the community.						
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	.93	.93	0.00	0.00	7.48	9.35
Other						
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	.93	.93	0.00	0.00	5.61	7.48
TOTAL						
Frequency	18.00	12.00	6.00	4.00	67.00	107.00
Pct. of Total	16.82	11.21	5.61	3.74	62.62	100.00

Unused - 21

TABLE 12

A Comparison of Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons the School and College Should Continue to Share the Responsibility in a Cooperative Venture in Student Teaching

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
To gain practicel experience to put theory into practice.						
Frequency	22.00	2.00	8.00	3.00	10.00	45.00
Pct. of Total	20.56	1.87	7.48	2.80	9.35	42.06
To combine the resources of both institutions.						
Frequency	14.00	5.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	24.00
Pct. of Total	13.08	4.67	0.00	1.87	2.80	22.43
To keep both institutions current as to the changing needs thereby forming a basis for evaluation and change.						
Frequency	11.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	10.28	2.80	2.80	0.00	2.80	18.69
To give a realistic view of the school and the community.						
Frequency	7.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	6.45	1.87	0.00	0.00	.93	9.35
Other						
Frequency	4.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	3.74	.87	.93	0.00	.93	7.48
TOTAL						
Frequency	58.00	14.00	12.00	5.00	18.00	107.00
Pct. of Total	54.21	13.08	11.21	4.67	16.82	100.00

Unused - 21

NON-CLASSROOM EXPERIENCES

Tables 13 through 18

The next question asked was "Do you feel that non-classroom experiences are desirable as an integral part of student teaching?"

An inspection of Tables 13 through 18 indicates that nearly all of the respondents, regardless of age, believe that non-classroom experiences are desirable and should be included as a part of student teaching as shown in Table 13. The same is true when responses are compared by marital status as in Table 14, sex as in Table 15, experience in education as in Table 16, and past or current responsibility to the SERL Project as in Tables 17 and 18.

TABLE 13

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Age of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-65	Total
YES										
Frequency	25.00	27.00	12.00	15.00	13.00	4.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	114.00
Pct. of Total	20.16	21.77	9.68	12.10	10.48	3.23	7.26	4.84	2.42	91.94
NO										
Frequency	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	.81	2.42	.81	1.61	.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.45
YES AND NO										
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.81	.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.61
TOTAL										
Frequency	27.00	31.00	13.00	17.00	14.00	4.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	124.00
Pct. of Total	21.77	25.00	10.48	13.71	11.29	3.23	7.26	4.84	2.42	100.00

Unused - 4

TABLE 14

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Marital Status of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
YES				
Frequency	97.00	17.00	2.00	116.00
Pct. of Total	76.98	13.49	1.59	92.06
NO				
Frequency	8.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	6.35	0.00	0.00	6.35
YES AND NO				
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.59	0.00	0.00	1.59
TOTAL				
Freq.	107.00	17.00	2.00	126.00
Pct. of Total	84.92	13.49	1.59	100.00

Unused - 2

TABLE 15

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Sex of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	Male	Female	Total
YES			
Frequency	65.00	51.00	116.00
Pct. of Total	51.59	40.48	92.06
NO			
Frequency	4.00	4.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	3.17	3.17	6.35
YES AND NO			
Frequency	0.00	2.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.59	1.59
TOTAL			
Frequency	69.00	57.00	126.00
Pct. of Total	54.76	45.24	100.00

Unused - 2

TABLE 16

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
YES									
Frequency	45.00	19.00	20.00	12.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	116.00
Pct. of Total	35.71	15.08	15.87	9.52	6.35	1.59	5.56	2.38	92.06
NO									
Frequency	2.00	5.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	1.59	3.97	.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.35
YES AND NO									
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.79	.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.59
TOTAL									
Frequency	48.00	25.00	21.00	12.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	126.00
Pct. of Total	38.10	19.84	16.67	9.52	6.35	1.59	5.56	2.38	100.00

Unused - 2

TABLE 17

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	18.00	14.00	6.00	3.00	76.00	117.00
Pct. of Total	14.17	11.02	4.72	2.36	59.84	92.13
NO						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	6.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	.79	0.00	0.00	.79	4.72	6.30
YES AND NO						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.57	1.57
TOTAL						
Frequency	19.00	14.00	6.00	4.00	84.00	127.00
Pct. of Total	14.96	11.02	4.72	3.15	66.14	100.00

Unused - 1

TABLE 18

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	66.00	16.00	12.00	5.00	18.00	117.00
Pct. of Total	51.97	12.60	9.45	3.94	14.17	92.13
NO						
Frequency	7.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	5.51	.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.30
YES AND NO						
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.79	.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.57
TOTAL						
Frequency	74.00	18.00	12.00	5.00	18.00	127.00
Pct. of Total	58.27	14.17	9.45	3.94	14.17	100.00

Unused - 1

Tables 19 through 24

Those respondents who indicated that non-classroom experiences should be an integral part of student teaching were asked to indicate the non-classroom experiences they deemed to be most desirable. Tables 19 through 24 contain these responses.

Inspection of Tables 19 through 24 indicates that 24 (22%) of the respondents listed "Those activities that present an understanding of the community as it affects the students." Other experiences listed were: Visits to community agencies that have direct contact with students, for example, social services, police, juvenile court, model cities, boy's training school, 21 (18.6% respondents); visits to other schools in the system, especially those schools with special facilities to serve students with special educational needs such as Walnut School for those students with unique physical handicaps and the Beekman School for the trainable mentally handicapped student, 18 (16%) respondents.

Fourteen respondents (12%) saw value in involvement in non-classroom school related activities. This category included participation in various clubs, supervision at sports events and dramatic productions, and chaperoning school social affairs.

Contact with the "in school" supportive facets of the educational program was seen as a desirable non-classroom experience by 11 (10%) of the respondents. These contacts included both building and central administration personnel. Frequent contacts with counselors was listed as a valuable experience. Often student teachers and supervising teachers singled out as an essential non-classroom experience their work with media during which students became familiar with the use and

operation of instructional media equipment and materials for classroom use. Eight respondents (7%) felt that visits to community resources of an educational nature were among the desirable non-classroom experiences. This category included trips to various business, industry, and cultural centers throughout the city. Supervising teachers especially expressed the benefits derived from becoming acquainted with those educational opportunities available to the student outside the formal school setting.

Several responses listed as important activities are listed in the tables under "other" such as all experiences related to students, most seminars and speakers, and all activities related to the classroom.

Tables 19 through 24 appear to be very much in agreement as to the ranking of desirable non-classroom experiences.

TABLE 19

A Comparison of Responses by Age of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-65	Total
Those activities that present an understanding of the community as it affects the student.										
Frequency	10.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	25.00
Pct. of Total	8.85	3.54	1.77	1.77	1.77	.88	1.77	0.00	1.77	22.12
Visits to the community agencies that have a direct contact with students, e.g., social service, police, juvenile court, model cities, Boy's Training School.										
Frequency	3.00	8.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	21.00
Pct. of Total	2.65	7.08	2.65	.88	2.65	0.00	.88	.88	.88	18.58
Visits to other schools within the system, especially special facilities such as school for the mentally and physically handicapped.										
Frequency	5.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	4.42	2.65	1.77	1.77	1.77	.88	1.77	.88	0.00	15.93
Involvement in supervision of school related activities, e.g., clubs, sports.										
Frequency	3.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	14.00
Pct. of Total	2.65	3.54	.88	1.77	0.00	0.00	1.77	1.77	0.00	12.39
Contacts with supportive facets of the educational program, e.g., administration, counselors, and instructional media.										
Frequency	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	.88	1.77	.88	.88	3.54	0.00	0.00	1.77	0.00	9.73
Visits to community resources of educational nature.										
Frequency	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	.88	2.65	1.77	1.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.08

TABLE 19 (continued)

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	Total
Other										
Frequency	3.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	16.00
Pct. of Total	2.65	2.65	.88	3.54	1.77	.88	1.77	0.00	0.00	14.16
TOTAL										
Frequency	26.00	27.00	12.00	14.00	13.00	3.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	113.00
Pct. of Total	23.01	23.89	10.62	12.39	11.50	2.65	7.96	5.31	2.65	100.00

Unused - 15

TABLE 20

A Comparison of Responses by Marital Status of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
Those activities that present an understanding of the community as it affects the student.				
Frequency	21.00	4.00	0.00	25.00
Pct. of Total	18.26	3.48	0.00	21.74
Visits to the community agencies that have a direct contact with students, e.g., social services, police, juvenile court, model cities, BTS.				
Frequency	16.00	5.00	0.00	21.00
Pct. of Total	13.91	4.35	0.00	18.26
Visits to other schools within the system, especially facilities such as school for the mentally and physically handicapped.				
Frequency	17.00	1.00	0.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	14.78	.87	0.00	15.65
Involvement in supervision of school related activities, e.g., clubs, sports.				
Frequency	12.00	1.00	2.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	10.43	.87	1.74	13.04
Contacts with supportive facets of the educational program, e.g., administration, counselors, and instructional media.				
Frequency	8.00	3.00	0.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	6.96	2.61	0.00	9.57
Visits to community resources of educational nature.				
Frequency	8.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	6.96	0.00	0.00	6.96
Other				
Frequency	15.00	2.00	0.00	17.00
Pct. of Total	13.04	1.74	0.00	14.78
TOTAL				
Frequency	97.00	16.00	2.00	115.00
Pct. of Total	84.35	13.91	1.74	100.00

Unused - 13

TABLE 21

A Comparison of Responses by Sex of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	Male	Female	Total
Those activities that present an understanding of the community as it affects the student.			
Frequency	13.00	12.00	25.00
Pct. of Total	11.30	10.43	21.74
Visits to the community agencies that have a direct contact with students, e.g., social service, police, juvenile court, model cities, Boy's Training School.			
Frequency	13.00	8.00	21.00
Pct. of Total	11.30	6.96	18.26
Visits to other schools within the system, especially special facilities such as school for the mentally and physically handicapped.			
Frequency	8.00	10.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	6.96	8.70	15.65
Involvement in supervision of school related activities, e.g., clubs, sports.			
Frequency	8.00	7.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	6.96	6.09	13.04
Contacts with supportive facets of the educational program, e.g., administration, counselors, and instructional media.			
Frequency	6.00	5.00	11.04
Pct. of Total	5.52	4.35	9.57
Visits to community resources of educational nature.			
Frequency	6.00	2.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	5.22	1.74	6.96
Other			
Frequency	10.00	7.00	17.00
Pct. of Total	8.70	6.09	14.78
TOTAL			
Frequency	64.00	51.00	115.00
Pct. of Total	55.65	44.35	100.00

Unused - 13

TABLE 22

A Comparison of Responses by Years of Experience in Education
of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
Those activities that present an understanding of the community as it affects the student.									
Frequency	12.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	24.00
Pct. of Total	10.43	1.74	3.48	2.61	0.00	0.00	1.74	.87	20.87
Visits to the community agencies that have a direct contact with students, e.g., social service, police, juvenile court, model cities, Boy's Training School.									
Frequency	6.00	6.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	21.00
Pct. of Total	5.22	5.22	2.61	1.74	1.74	0.00	.87	.87	18.26
Visits to other schools within the system, especially special facilities such as school for the mentally and physically handicapped.									
Frequency	7.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	6.09	2.61	2.61	1.74	2.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.65
Involvement in supervision of school related activities, e.g., clubs, sports.									
Frequency	7.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	6.00	.87	1.74	0.00	2.61	.87	0.00	.87	13.04
Contacts with supportive facets of the educational program, e.g., administration, counselors, and instructional media.									
Frequency	3.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	2.61	1.74	2.61	.87	0.00	0.00	1.74	0.00	9.57
Visits to community resources of educational nature.									
Frequency	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	3.48	1.74	1.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.96

TABLE 22 (continued)

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
Other									
Frequency	6.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	5.22	2.61	1.74	3.48	0.00	.87	1.74	0.00	15.65
TOTAL									
Frequency	45.00	19.00	19.00	12.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	115.00
Pct. of Total	39.13	16.52	16.52	10.43	6.96	1.74	6.09	2.61	100.00

Unused - 13

TABLE 23

A Comparison of Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Desirability of Non-Classroom Experiences

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Those activities that present an understanding of the community as it affects the student.						
Frequency	6.00	4.00	1.00	0.00	14.00	25.00
Pct. of Total	5.17	3.45	.86	0.00	12.07	21.55
Visits to the community agencies that have a direct contact with students, e.g., social service, police, juvenile court, model cities, Boy's Training School.						
Frequency	3.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	12.00	21.00
Pct. of Total	2.59	1.72	2.59	.86	10.34	18.10
Visits to other schools within the system, especially special facilities such as school for the mentally and physically handicapped.						
Frequency	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	1.72	.86	0.00	0.00	12.93	15.52
Involvement in supervision of school related activities, e.g., clubs, sports.						
Frequency	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	11.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	1.72	1.72	0.00	0.00	1.48	12.93
Contacts with supportive facets of the educational program, e.g., administration, counselors, and instructional media.						
Frequency	0.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	6.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.72	.86	1.72	5.17	9.48

TABLE 23 (continued)

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Visits to community resources of educational nature.						
Frequency	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.72	.86	0.00	4.31	8.69
Other						
Frequency	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	12.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	4.31	0.00	.86	0.00	10.34	15.52
TOTAL						
Frequency	18.00	13.00	6.00	3.00	76.00	116.00
Pct. of Total	15.52	11.21	5.17	2.59	65.52	100.00

Unused - 12

TABLE 24

A Comparison of Responses by Current Responsibility
to the SERL Project of the Desirability
of Non-Classroom Experiences

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Those activities that present an understanding of the community as it affects the student.						
Frequency	12.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	25.00
Pct. of Total	10.34	3.45	3.45	0.00	4.31	21.55
Visits to the community agencies that have a direct contact with students, e.g., social service, police, juvenile court, model cities, Boy's Training School.						
Frequency	7.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	21.00
Pct. of Total	6.03	2.59	3.45	1.72	4.31	18.10
Visits to other schools within the system, especially special facilities such as school for the mentally and physically handicapped.						
Frequency	11.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	9.48	2.59	1.72	0.00	1.72	15.52
Involvement in supervision of school related activities, e.g., clubs, sports.						
Frequency	11.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	9.48	.86	.86	.86	.86	12.93
Contacts with supportive facets of the educational program, e.g., administration, counselors, and instructional media.						
Frequency	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	4.31	.86	.86	.86	2.59	9.48

TABLE 24 (continued)

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Visits to community resources of educational nature.						
Frequency	6.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	5.17	.86	0.00	0.00	.86	6.03
Other						
Frequency	12.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	10.34	3.45	0.00	.86	.86	15.52
TOTAL						
Frequency	64.00	17.00	12.00	5.00	18.00	116.00
Pct. of Total	55.17	14.66	10.34	4.31	15.52	100.00

Unused - 12

STUDENT TEACHER INVOLVEMENT WITH MORE THAN ONE SUPERVISING TEACHER

Tables 25 through 30

The next basic question presented was: "Should a student teacher become involved with more than one supervising teacher?" Tables 25 through 30 contain the responses to this question.

Table 25 shows that of the 123 useable replies, 57 (46%) of the respondents endorse the idea of student teachers working with more than one supervising teacher. Fifty-one (41%) indicated that they do not believe this to be a good idea. Another 15 (12%) respondents suggested that it was and was not a good idea.

A closer examination of the data indicates that slightly over half of those in the 20-24 age group endorse the idea, 30% are negative, and 18% are unsure. The largest "no" group was in the 25-29 age group. Approximately 50% in both the 35-39, 40-44, and 50-55 age groups does not agree that it is desirable for a student teacher to become involved with more than one supervising teacher. From Table 25 we can conclude that although 47% of the population used in this study are in agreement with the SERL practice of using multiple supervising teachers, there is a considerable segment that either responded no (41%) or expressed mixed feelings (12%).

Table 26 compares the desirability of a student teacher being involved with more than one supervising teacher by marital status. Similar to Table 25, 46% of the respondents gave a favorable response, 42% a negative response, and 12% had mixed reactions. Even though most of the subjects were married, a close inspection of Table 26 should

suggest that percentage-wise, there is little difference in the response based on the respondents' marital status.

When a comparison of responses is made in Table 27 by sex, it is noted that males made up 55% of the total population and females 45%. It is further noted that the majority of the males (57%) believe it is a good idea to become involved with more than one supervising teacher, while 50% of the females responded no to this question. A higher percentage of females (18%) had mixed reactions than males (7%).

A comparison of years of experience in education and the desirability of student teachers being involved with more than one supervising teacher is shown in Table 28. An inspection indicates 13 of the 21 (62%) in the 10-14 group, all of the 20-24 group, and 5 of 7 (71%) in the 30-34 group are in favor of more than one supervising teacher. Of those not in favor are the 14 of 26 (54%) in the 5-9 group, 6 of 12 (50%) in the 15-19 group, and 6 of 8 (75%) in the 20-24 group. Years of experience in education does not seem to be the factor that determines the desirability of a student teacher working with more than one supervising teacher.

Tables 29 and 30 are concerned with the desirability of involving more than one supervising teacher with a student teacher by past and current responsibility to the SERL Project. While these tables are very similar, it is interesting to note the change in the attitudes. For example, 10 out of 19 (52%) of those who were past supervising teachers responded "yes." Twenty-six of 74 (35%) current supervising teachers responded "yes" to the same question.

The data for student teachers remain about the same--44% of the current student teachers responded "yes" as compared with 46% of the

former student teachers. The percentage for the same groups that responded "no" were 33% current student teachers and 30% former student teachers. The responses of school administrators and university consultants seem to indicate that those who are currently involved with the SERL Project feel more positive than those who were previously involved.

Tables 25-30 indicate the majority of the population surveyed is in favor of using more than one supervising teacher per student teacher. Those in favor seem to be males in the 35-55 age group, and either are or have been supervising teachers. Student teachers generally endorse the idea. Those responding "no" seem to be women. Years of experience and marital status do not seem to make a difference.

TABLE 25

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Age of the Desirability of a Student Teacher Being Involved With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-65	Total
YES										
Frequency	14.00	7.00	9.00	7.00	6.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	57.00
Pct. of Total	11.38	5.69	7.32	5.69	4.88	2.44	4.07	2.44	2.44	46.34
NO										
Frequency	8.00	19.00	2.00	9.00	7.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	51.00
Pct. of Total	6.50	15.45	1.63	7.32	5.69	.81	1.63	2.44	0.00	41.46
YES AND NO										
Frequency	5.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	4.07	2.44	2.44	.81	.81	0.00	1.63	0.00	0.00	12.20
TOTAL										
Frequency	27.00	29.00	14.00	17.00	14.00	4.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	123.00
Pct. of Total	21.95	23.58	11.38	13.82	11.38	3.25	7.32	4.88	2.44	100.00

Unused - 5

TABLE 26

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Marital Status of the Desirability of a Student Teacher Being Involved With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
YES				
Frequency	49.00	8.00	0.00	57.00
Pct. down	46.23	47.06	0.00	
Pct. of Total	39.20	6.40	0.00	45.60
NO				
Frequency	45.00	6.00	2.00	53.00
Pct. down	42.45	35.29	100.00	
Pct. of Total	36.00	4.80	1.60	42.40
YES AND NO				
Frequency	12.00	3.00	0.00	15.00
Pct. down	11.32	17.65	0.00	
Pct. of Total	9.60	2.40	0.00	12.00
TOTAL ACROSS				
Frequency	106.00	17.00	2.00	125.00
Pct. of Total	84.80	13.60	1.60	100.00

Unused - 3

TABLE 27

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Sex of the Desirability of a Student Teacher Being Involved With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	Male	Female	Total
YES			
Frequency	39.00	18.00	57.00
Pct. down	56.52	32.14	
Pct. of Total	31.20	14.00	45.60
NO			
Frequency	25.00	28.00	53.00
Pct. down	36.23	50.00	
Pct. of Total	20.00	22.40	42.40
YES AND NO			
Frequency	5.00	10.00	15.00
Pct. down	7.25	17.86	
Pct. of Total	4.00	8.00	12.00
TOTAL			
Frequency	69.00	56.00	125.00
Pct. of Total	55.20	44.80	100.00

Unused - 3

TABLE 28

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Desirability of a Student Teacher Being Involved With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
YES									
Frequency	20.00	10.00	13.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	58.00
Pct. of Total	16.00	8.00	10.40	3.20	.80	1.60	4.00	2.40	46.40
NO									
Frequency	18.00	14.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	52.00
Pct. of Total	14.40	11.20	5.60	4.80	4.80	0.00	.80	0.00	41.60
YES AND NO									
Frequency	8.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	6.40	1.60	.80	1.60	.80	0.00	.80	0.00	12.00
TOTAL									
Frequency	46.00	26.00	21.00	12.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	125.00
Pct. of Total	36.80	20.80	16.80	9.60	6.40	1.60	5.60	2.40	100.00

Unused - 3

TABLE 29

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Desirability of a Student Teacher Being Involved With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	10.00	6.00	6.00	3.00	36.00	58.00
Pct. of Total	7.94	4.76	2.38	2.38	28.57	46.03
NO						
Frequency	8.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	38.00	53.00
Pct. of Total	6.35	3.17	1.59	.79	30.16	42.06
YES AND NO						
Frequency	1.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	10.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	.79	2.38	.79	0.00	7.94	11.90
TOTAL						
Frequency	19.00	13.00	6.00	4.00	84.00	126.00
Pct. of Total	15.08	10.32	4.76	3.17	66.67	100.00

Unused - 2

TABLE 30

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Desirability of a Student Teacher Being Involved With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	26.00	8.00	10.00	5.00	9.00	58.00
Pct. of Total	20.63	6.35	7.94	3.97	7.14	46.03
NO						
Frequency	39.00	6.00	2.00	0.00	6.00	53.00
Pct. of Total	30.95	4.76	1.59	0.00	4.76	42.06
YES AND NO						
Frequency	9.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	7.14	3.17	0.00	0.00	1.59	11.90
TOTAL						
Frequency	74.00	18.00	12.00	5.00	17.00	126.00
Pct. of Total	48.73	14.29	9.52	3.97	13.49	100.00

Unused - 2

Tables 31 through 36

Respondents were asked to state their reasons for endorsing the concept of a student teacher working with more than one supervising teacher. Tables 31 through 36 contain the responses to this endorsement.

Table 31 indicates the reasons given for involving multiple supervising teachers by age. "To gain exposure to more than one philosophy, style of teaching, and discipline" was the major advantage given by 72% of the 20-24 age group; 80% of the 25-29 age group; 63% of the 30-34 age group; 88% of the 35-39 age group; 71% of the 40-44 age group; 67% of the 45-49 age group; 57% of the 50-54 age group; and 68% of the 55-59 and 60-65 age group.

"To gain a wide range of experiences in both major and minor teaching areas" and to "Help student teachers broaden views and to develop flexibility" were listed by a much smaller percentage of respondents. Other reasons listed, although not frequently, were "To give the student teacher an opportunity to develop his own style of teaching," "It is helpful," and "It depends upon the ability of the student teacher."

According to Table 32, 70% of the married persons and 73% of the single persons agree that the most important reason for the involvement of more than one supervising teacher is "To gain exposure to more than one philosophy, style of teaching, and approach to discipline."

Similar responses were all shown in Table 33, which makes a comparison of responses by sex; Table 34, which makes a comparison by years of experience; and Tables 35 and 36, which compare past and present responsibilities to the SERL Project.

The comparisons shown in Table 31 through 36 are all equally supportive of the reasons for involving a student teacher with more than one supervising teacher.

TABLE 31

A Comparison of Responses by Age of the Major Reasons for Student Teacher Involvement With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	Total
Gain exposure to more than one philosophy, style of teaching and approach to discipline.										
Frequency	13.00	8.00	7.00	7.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
Pct. of Total	18.57	11.43	10.00	10.00	7.14	2.86	5.71	2.86	2.86	71.43
Gain a wide range of experiences in both major and minor teaching areas.										
Frequency	3.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	4.29	2.86	1.43	0.00	0.00	1.43	0.00	1.43	1.43	12.86
Help student teachers broaden views and develop flexibility.										
Frequency	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	2.86	0.00	1.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.29
Other										
Frequency	2.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	2.86	0.00	1.43	1.43	1.43	0.00	4.29	0.00	0.00	10.00
TOTAL										
Frequency	18.00	10.00	11.00	8.00	7.00	3.00	7.00	3.00	3.00	70.00
Pct. of Total	25.71	14.29	15.71	11.43	10.00	4.29	10.00	4.29	4.29	100.00

Unused - 58

TABLE 32

A Comparison of Responses by Marital Status of the Major Reasons for Student Teacher Involvement With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	Married	Single	Total
Gain exposure to more than one philosophy, style of teaching and approach to discipline.			
Frequency	41.00	8.00	49.00
Pct. of Total	58.57	11.43	70.00
Gain a wide range of experiences in both major and minor teaching areas.			
Frequency	7.00	2.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	10.00	2.86	12.86
Help student teachers broaden views and develop flexibility.			
Frequency	3.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	4.29	0.00	4.29
Other			
Frequency	8.00	1.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	11.43	1.43	12.86
TOTAL			
Frequency	59.00	11.00	70.00
Pct. of Total	84.29	15.71	100.00

Unused - 58

TABLE 33

A Comparison of Responses by Sex of the Major Reasons for Student Teacher Involvement With With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	Male	Female	Total
Gain exposure to more than one philosophy, style of teaching and approach to discipline.			
Frequency	33.00	17.00	50.00
Pct. of Total	47.14	24.29	71.43
Gain a wide range of experiences in both major and minor teaching areas.			
Frequency	4.00	5.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	5.71	7.14	12.86
Help student teachers broaden views and develop flexibility.			
Frequency	3.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	4.29	0.00	4.29
Other			
Frequency	4.00	4.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	5.71	5.71	11.42
TOTAL			
Frequency	44.00	26.00	70.00
Pct. of Total	62.86	37.14	100.00

Unused - 58

TABLE 34

A Comparison of Responses by Years of Experience in Education
of the Major Reasons for Student Teacher Involvement
With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
Gain exposure to more than one philosophy, style of teaching and approach to discipline.									
Frequency	19.00	8.00	11.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	50.00
Pct. of Total	26.76	11.27	15.49	5.63	2.82	2.82	4.23	1.41	70.42
Gain a wide range of experiences in both major and minor teaching areas.									
Frequency	5.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	7.04	0.00	1.41	1.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.82	12.68
Help student teachers broaden views and develop flexibility.									
Frequency	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	4.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.23
Other									
Frequency	3.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL									
Frequency	27.00	11.00	14.00	6.00	2.00	2.00	6.00	3.00	71.00
Pct. of Total	38.03	15.49	19.72	8.45	2.82	2.82	8.45	4.23	100.00

Unused - 57

TABLE 35

A Comparison of Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons for Student Teacher Involvement With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Gain exposure to more than one philosophy, style of teaching and approach to discipline.						
Frequency	10.00	6.00	1.00	3.00	30.00	50.00
Pct. of Total	14.08	8.45	1.41	4.23	42.25	70.42
Gain a wide range of experiences in both major and minor teaching areas.						
Frequency	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	7.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.41	1.41	0.00	9.86	12.68
Help student teachers broaden views and develop flexibility.						
Frequency	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.41	0.00	0.00	2.82	4.23
Other						
Frequency	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	6.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.41	2.82	0.00	8.46	12.68
TOTAL						
Frequency	10.00	9.00	4.00	3.00	45.00	71.00
Pct. of Total	14.08	12.68	5.63	4.23	63.38	100.00

Unused - 57

TABLE 36

A Comparison of Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons for Student Teacher Involvement With More Than One Supervising Teacher

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Gain exposure to more than one philosophy, style of teaching and approach to discipline.						
Frequency	24.00	8.00	7.00	4.00	7.00	50.00
Pct. of Total	33.80	11.27	9.86	5.63	9.86	70.42
Gain a wide range of experiences in both major and minor teaching areas.						
Frequency	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	5.63	2.82	2.82	0.00	1.41	12.68
Help student teachers broaden views and develop flexibility.						
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	2.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.41	4.23
Other						
Frequency	4.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	5.63	2.82	1.41	1.41	1.41	12.68
TOTAL						
Frequency	34.00	12.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	71.00
Pct. of Total	47.89	16.90	14.08	7.04	14.08	100.00

Unused - 57

Tables 37 through 42

Tables 37 through 42 show the major reasons expressed by those who did not believe that student teachers should be involved with more than one supervising teacher. Approximately one half of the population used in this study took this position.

The reasons given for not using multiple supervising teachers were: (1) confusing ideas, philosophies, and methods of teaching caused adjustments for the student teacher to be difficult; (2) there is not enough time to develop a close relationship between the student teacher and the supervising teacher when they are not together most of the teaching day; (3) multiple supervising teachers are too demanding. Looking further into this last response, it appears to be very close to item one in this section. The last major reason given was that more than one supervising teacher complicates evaluation and conferences. Evaluation is complicated in that different supervising teachers see the same student teachers differently. Perhaps this points out the lack of consistent guidelines for evaluation on the part of supervising teachers. Further, it illustrates the lack of basic answers to the question "What is a good teacher?" Conferences are complicated in that teachers and student teachers who are working in multiple situations often do not share a common planning time and when they do there is a technical question of sharing.

Other reasons cited for not involving a student teacher with more than one supervising teacher were: (1) it is not a normal situation; (2) there is no opportunity to follow through; (3) only exceptional student teachers can make the adjustment; and (4) student teachers do not get the responsibility of a real teacher.

An inspection of Tables 37 through 42 seems to indicate a considerable amount of agreement in the reasons for restricting one student teacher to one supervising teacher when a comparison is made according to the respondent's status, years of experience in education, and past or current responsibilities to the SERL Project.

TABLE 37

A Comparison of Responses by Age of the Major Reasons for a Student Teacher Not to Become Involved With More Than One Supervisory Teacher

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-60	Total
Confusing ideas, philosophies and methods of teaching causing adjustment to be difficult.									
Frequency	4.00	10.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	26.00
Pct. of Total	6.15	15.38	3.08	7.69	6.15	0.00	0.00	1.54	40.00
Not enough time to develop a close relationship between student and supervisory teacher.									
Frequency	2.00	1.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	3.08	1.54	0.00	3.08	1.54	1.54	1.54	1.54	13.85
Multiple supervising teachers are too demanding.									
Frequency	3.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	4.62	1.54	3.08	0.00	3.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.31
Complicates evaluation and conferences.									
Frequency	2.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	3.08	6.15	0.00	1.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.54	12.31
Too much pressure--spreads student teacher too thin.									
Frequency	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	1.54	4.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.15
Other									
Frequency	1.00	3.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	1.54	4.62	0.00	3.08	1.54	0.00	4.62	0.00	15.38

TABLE 37 (continued)

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-60	Total
TOTAL									
Frequency	13.00	22.00	4.00	10.00	8.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	65.00
Pct. of Total	20.00	33.85	6.15	15.38	12.31	1.54	6.15	4.62	100.00

Unused - 63

TABLE 38

A Comparison of Responses by Marital Status of the Major Reasons for a Student Teacher Not to Become Involved With More Than One Supervisory Teacher

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
Confusing ideas, philosophies and methods of teaching causing adjustment to be difficult.				
Frequency	21.00	5.00	1.00	27.00
Pct. of Total	31.34	7.46	1.49	40.30
Not enough time to develop a close relationship between student and supervisory teacher.				
Frequency	8.00	0.00	1.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	11.94	0.00	1.49	13.43
Multiple supervising teachers are too demanding.				
Frequency	7.00	1.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	10.45	1.49	0.00	11.94
Complicates evaluation and conferences.				
Frequency	5.00	3.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	7.46	4.48	0.00	11.94
Too much pressure--spreads student teacher too thin.				
Frequency	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	5.97	0.00	0.00	5.97
Other				
Frequency	11.00	0.00	0.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	16.42	0.00	0.00	16.42
TOTAL				
Frequency	56.00	9.00	2.00	67.00
Pct. of Total	83.58	13.43	2.99	100.00

Unused - 61

TABLE 39

A Comparison of Responses by Sex of the Major Reasons for a Student Teacher Not to Become Involved With More Than One Supervisory Teacher

	Male	Female	Total
Confusing ideas, philosophies and methods of teaching causing adjustment to be difficult.			
Frequency	11.00	16.00	27.00
Pct. of Total	16.42	23.88	40.30
Not enough time to develop a close relationship between student and supervisory teacher.			
Frequency	3.00	6.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	4.48	8.96	13.43
Multiple supervising teachers are too demanding.			
Frequency	5.00	3.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	7.46	4.48	11.94
Complicates evaluation and conferences.			
Frequency	2.00	6.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	2.99	8.96	11.94
Too much pressure--spreads student teacher too thin.			
Frequency	2.00	2.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	2.99	2.99	5.97
Other			
Frequency	6.00	5.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	8.96	7.46	16.42
TOTAL			
Frequency	29.00	38.00	67.00
Pct. of Total	43.28	56.72	100.00

Unused - 61

TABLE 40

A Comparison of Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Major Reasons for a Student Teacher Not to Become Involved With More Than One Supervisory Teacher

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-25	25-29	30-34	Total
Confusing ideas, philosophies and methods of teaching causing adjustment to be difficult.								
Frequency	9.00	10.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	26.00
Pct. of Total	13.64	15.15	4.55	4.55	1.52	0.00	0.00	39.39
Not enough time to develop a close relationship between student and supervisory teacher.								
Frequency	3.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	4.55	0.00	3.03	3.03	3.03	0.00	0.00	13.64
Multiple supervising teachers are too demanding.								
Frequency	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	4.55	4.55	0.00	0.00	3.03	0.00	0.00	12.12
Complicates evaluation and conferences.								
Frequency	6.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	9.09	1.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.52	12.12
Too much pressure--spreads student teacher too thin.								
Frequency	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	3.03	3.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.06

TABLE 40 (continued)

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	Total
Other								
Frequency	3.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	4.55	0.00	3.03	4.55	3.03	0.00	1.52	16.67
TOTAL								
Frequency	26.00	16.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	0.00	2.00	66.00
Pct. of Total	39.39	24.24	10.61	12.12	10.61	0.00	3.03	100.00

Unused - 62

TABLE 41

A Comparison of Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons for a Student Teacher Not to Become Involved With More Than One Supervisory Teacher

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Confusing ideas, philosophies and methods of teaching causing adjustment to be difficult.						
Frequency	4.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	18.00	27.00
Pct. of Total	4.97	4.48	1.49	1.49	26.87	40.30
Not enough time to develop a close relationship between student and supervisory teacher.						
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	7.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	1.49	1.49	0.00	0.00	10.45	13.43
Multiple supervising teachers are too demanding.						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	6.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	1.49	0.00	1.49	0.00	8.96	11.94
Complicates evaluation and conferences.						
Frequency	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	1.49	5.97	0.00	0.00	4.48	11.94
Too much pressure--spreads student teacher too thin.						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.97	5.97

TABLE 41 (continued)

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Other						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	9.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	1.49	0.00	1.49	0.00	13.43	16.42
TOTAL						
Frequency	8.00	8.00	3.00	1.00	47.00	76.00
Pct. of Total	11.94	11.94	4.48	1.49	70.15	100.00

Unused - 61

TABLE 42

A Comparison of Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons for a Student Teacher Not to Become Involved With More Than One Supervisory Teacher

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Confusing ideas, philosophies and methods of teaching causing adjustment to be difficult.						
Frequency	18.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	27.00
Pct. of Total	26.87	5.97	0.00	0.00	7.46	40.30
Not enough time to develop a close relationship between student and supervisory teacher.						
Frequency	6.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	8.96	1.49	1.49	0.00	1.49	13.43
Multiple supervising teachers are too demanding.						
Frequency	5.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	7.46	1.49	1.49	0.00	1.49	11.94
Complicates evaluation and conferences.						
Frequency	4.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	5.97	2.99	0.00	0.00	2.99	11.94
Too much pressure--spreads student teacher too thin.						
Frequency	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	4.48	1.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.97

TABLE 42 (continued)

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Other						
Frequency	10.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	14.93	1.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.42
TOTAL						
Frequency	46.00	10.00	2.00	0.00	9.00	67.00
Pct. of Total	68.66	14.93	2.99	0.00	13.43	100.00

Unused - 61

BENEFITS OF FREQUENT STUDENT TEACHER CONTACTS

Tables 43 through 48

Built into the SERL Project is the mechanism that allows frequent contacts between student teachers. Afternoons are often spent in seminar groups, field trips, in-service training, and similar group professional growth programs. In order to get an evaluation of this phase of the program, respondents were asked "Do student teachers benefit from frequent contacts with other student teachers?" The responses, as shown in Tables 43 through 48, showed a very positive attitude toward this segment of the project with 89% endorsing the concept.

An inspection of Table 43 indicates that of the 5 "no" respondents, two were in the 25-29 age group, 2 were in the 35-39 age group, and 1 was in the 40-44 age group. Of the 8 who indicated "yes" and "no," 2 were in the 25-29 and the 55-59 age groups, and 1 was in each of the following age groups, 20-24, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-44. There did not seem to be any conclusive pattern to the group that rejected the concept when an age comparison was made.

When the desirability of frequent student contacts was compared by marital status as shown in Table 44, 4 of the 5 "no" responses were from married persons and 1 was from a single person. All 9 of the "yes and no" responses were from respondents who are married.

Table 45 indicates that of the 5 negative responses, 4 were from males and 1 was from a female. The "yes and no" responses were divided 6 (4.84% of the total male population) and 3 (2.42% of the total female population). The percentage of males in the total population was 53.23 as compared with 46.77 female.

When a comparison is made of the desirability of frequent student teacher contacts with other student teachers and years of experience in education, Table 46 indicates an overwhelmingly positive response. This table shows that the 5 negative responses were concentrated in the 0-9 years of experience category. Those who responded "yes and no" seem to be distributed across the experience range. While 3 were in the first group, only the 25-29 experience group did not show any negative response.

An examination of Table 47 shows that none of the past student teachers responded negatively to this question. The "no" responses were from the groups of former supervising teachers and former administrators. The "yes and no" responses did not show any student teachers, but did include all other groups.

Table 45 shows strong support among those who are currently involved in the SERL Project for the frequent contacts of student teachers with other student teachers. Of the 125 responses to this question, 111, or 88.8%, approved the idea. Again, there was a strong endorsement from all groups, especially the student teachers.

In summary of Tables 43 through 48, the evidence would indicate that those who do not approve of the frequent contact idea are between the ages of 24-44, mostly married and male, have had 0-14 years of experience in education, and are not past or current student teachers. Of those who see both advantages and disadvantages, there is not a clear difference based on age or years of experience in education.

TABLE 43

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Age of the Desirability of Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-65	Total
YES										
Frequency	26.00	26.00	12.00	14.00	12.00	3.00	9.00	4.00	3.00	109.00
Pct. of Total	21.31	21.31	9.84	11.48	9.84	2.46	7.38	3.28	2.46	89.34
NO										
Frequency	0.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.64	0.00	1.64	.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.10
YES AND NO										
Frequency	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	.82	1.64	.82	.82	.82	0.00	0.00	1.64	0.00	6.46
TOTAL										
Frequency	27.00	30.00	13.00	17.00	14.00	3.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	122.00
Pct. of Total	22.13	24.59	10.66	13.93	11.48	2.46	7.38	4.92	2.46	100.00

Unused - 6

TABLE 44

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Marital Status of the Desirability of Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
YES				
Frequency	94.00	14.00	2.00	110.00
Pct. of Total	75.81	11.29	1.61	88.71
NO				
Frequency	4.00	1.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	3.23	.81	0.00	4.03
YES AND NO				
Frequency	9.00	0.00	0.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	7.26	0.00	0.00	7.26
TOTAL				
Frequency	107.00	15.00	2.00	124.00
Pct. of Total	86.29	12.10	1.61	100.00

Unused - 4

TABLE 45

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Sex of the Desirability of Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Male	Female	Total
YES			
Frequency	56.00	54.00	110.00
Pct. of Total	45.16	43.55	88.71
NO			
Frequency	4.00	1.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	3.23	.81	4.03
YES AND NO			
Frequency	6.00	3.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	4.84	2.42	7.26
TOTAL			
Frequency	66.00	58.00	124.00
Pct. of Total	53.23	46.77	100.00

Unused - 4

TABLE 46

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Desirability of Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
YES									
Frequency	43.00	21.00	18.00	11.00	7.00	2.00	6.00	2.00	110.00
Pct. of Total	34.68	16.94	14.52	8.87	5.65	1.61	4.84	1.61	88.71
NO									
Frequency	1.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	.81	1.61	1.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.03
YES AND NO									
Frequency	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	2.42	.81	.81	.81	.81	0.00	.81	.81	7.26
TOTAL									
Frequency	47.00	24.00	21.00	12.00	8.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	124.00
Pct. of Total	37.90	19.35	16.94	9.68	6.45	1.61	5.65	2.42	100.00

Unused - 4

TABLE 47

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Desirability of Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	64.00	18.00	9.00	4.00	16.00	111.00
Pct. of Total	51.20	14.40	7.20	3.20	12.80	88.80
NO						
Frequency	3.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	2.40	0.00	1.60	0.00	0.00	4.00
YES AND NO						
Frequency	5.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	4.00	0.00	.80	.80	1.60	7.20
TOTAL						
Frequency	72.00	18.00	12.00	5.00	18.00	125.00
Pct. of Total	57.60	14.40	9.60	4.00	14.40	100.00

Unused - 3

TABLE 48

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Desirability of Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	16.00	12.00	5.00	2.00	76.00	111.00
Pct. of Total	12.80	9.60	4.00	1.60	60.80	88.80
NO						
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	1.60	0.00	0.00	.80	1.60	4.00
YES AND NO						
Frequency	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	9.00
Pct. of Total	.80	.80	.80	.80	4.00	7.20
TOTAL						
Frequency	19.00	13.00	6.00	4.00	83.00	125.00
Pct. of Total	15.20	10.40	4.80	3.20	66.40	100.00

Unused - 3

Tables 49 through 54

Those who responded positively to the question "Do student teachers benefit from frequent contact with other student teachers?" were asked to state their reasons. Tables 49 through 54 contain these responses. Cited as the major advantage by over 70% of the respondents was "To share common problems, experiences, ideas, success, failures, and techniques." More than 16% listed "positive reinforcement and moral support" as the major benefit of the close and frequent association of student teachers. Other benefits were "to give a basis for self evaluation," and "to share frustrations and discuss problems in a nonthreatening environment."

An analysis of Tables 49 through 53 indicates the major benefits do not change appreciably when comparing the variables of age, marital status, sex, experience in education, past or current responsibilities to the SERL Project.

TABLE 49

A Comparison of Responses by Age of the Major Desirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	Total
Share common problems, experiences, ideas, success, failure and techniques.										
Frequency	17.00	23.00	7.00	12.00	11.00	1.00	6.00	3.00	3.00	83.00
Pct. of Total	14.78	20.00	6.09	10.43	9.57	.87	5.22	2.61	2.61	72.17
Positive reinforcement and moral support.										
Frequency	5.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	19.00
Pct. of Total	4.35	1.74	3.48	.87	1.74	0.00	1.74	2.61	0.00	16.52
Gives basis for self evaluation.										
Frequency	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	6.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	.87	.87	0.00	0.00	.87	.87	0.00	0.00	5.22
Share frustrations and discuss problems in a nonthreatening environment.										
Frequency	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	.87	0.00	.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.74
Other										
Frequency	2.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	0.00	1.74	.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.48
TOTAL										
Frequency	26.00	27.00	14.00	15.00	13.00	2.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	115.00
Pct. of Total	22.61	23.48	12.17	13.04	11.30	1.74	7.83	5.22	2.61	100.00

Unused - 13

TABLE 50

A Comparison of Responses by Marital Status of the Major Desirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
Share common problems, experiences, ideas, success, failure, and techniques.				
Frequency	75.00	8.00	1.00	84.00
Pct. of Total	64.10	6.84	.85	71.79
Positive reinforcement and moral support.				
Frequency	15.00	4.00	1.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	12.82	3.42	.85	17.09
Gives basis for self evaluation.				
Frequency	5.00	1.00	0.00	6.00
Pct. of Total	4.27	.85	0.00	5.13
Share frustrations and discuss problems in a nonthreatening environment.				
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.71	0.00	0.00	1.71
Other				
Frequency	4.00	1.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	3.42	.85	0.00	4.27
TOTAL				
Frequency	101.00	14.00	2.00	117.00
Pct. of Total	86.32	11.97	1.71	100.00

Unused - 11

TABLE 51

A Comparison of Responses by Sex of the Major Desirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Male	Female	Total
Share common problems, experiences, ideas, success, failure and techniques.			
Frequency	48.00	36.00	84.00
Pct. of Total	41.03	30.77	71.79
Positive reinforcement and moral support.			
Frequency	10.00	10.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	8.55	8.55	17.09
Gives basis for self evaluation.			
Frequency	1.00	5.00	6.00
Pct. of Total	.85	4.27	5.13
Share frustrations and discuss problems in a nonthreatening environment.			
Frequency	1.00	1.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.85	.85	1.71
Other			
Frequency	2.00	3.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	1.71	2.57	4.27
TOTAL			
Frequency	62.00	55.00	117.00
Pct. of Total	52.99	47.01	100.00

Unused - 11

TABLE 52

A Comparison of Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Major Desirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
Share common problems, experiences, ideas, success, failure and techniques.									
Frequency	30.00	16.00	16.00	10.00	6.00	0.00	4.00	2.00	84.00
Pct. of Total	25.64	13.68	13.68	8.55	5.13	0.00	3.42	1.71	71.79
Positive reinforcement and moral support.									
Frequency	8.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	6.84	2.56	1.71	.85	.85	.85	2.56	.85	17.09
Gives basis for self evaluation.									
Frequency	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	6.00
Pct. of Total	2.56	.85	0.00	.85	0.00	.85	0.00	0.00	5.13
Share frustrations and discuss problems in a nonthreatening environment.									
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.85	0.00	.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.71
Other									
Frequency	3.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	2.56	1.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.27
TOTAL									
Frequency	45.00	22.00	19.00	12.00	7.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	117.00
Pct. of Total	38.46	18.80	16.24	10.26	5.98	1.71	5.98	2.56	100.00

Unused - 11

TABLE 53

A Comparison of Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Desirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Share common problems, experiences, ideas, success, failure and techniques.						
Frequency	13.00	8.00	5.00	2.00	57.00	85.00
Pct. of Total	11.02	6.78	4.24	1.69	48.31	72.03
Positive reinforcement and moral support.						
Frequency	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	14.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	1.69	1.69	.85	.85	11.86	16.95
Gives basis for self evaluation.						
Frequency	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	6.00
Pct. of Total	2.54	.85	0.00	0.00	1.69	5.08
Share frustrations and discuss problems in a nonthreatening environment.						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.69	1.69
Other						
Frequency	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	.85	0.00	0.00	3.39	4.24
TOTAL						
Frequency	18.00	12.00	6.00	3.00	79.00	118.00
Pct. of Total	15.25	10.17	5.08	2.54	66.95	100.00

Unused - 10

TABLE 54

A Comparison of Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Desirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Share common problems, experiences, ideas, success, failure and techniques.						
Frequency	53.00	11.00	7.00	1.00	13.00	85.00
Pct. of Total	44.92	9.32	5.93	.85	11.02	72.03
Positive reinforcement and moral support.						
Frequency	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	20.00
Pct. of Total	4.24	4.24	2.54	3.39	2.54	16.95
Gives basis for self evaluation.						
Frequency	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	6.00
Pct. of Total	2.54	.85	0.00	0.00	1.69	5.08
Share frustrations and discuss problems in a nonthreatening environment.						
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.69
Other						
Frequency	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	3.39	.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.24
TOTAL						
Frequency	67.00	18.00	10.00	5.00	18.00	118.00
Pct. of Total	56.78	15.25	8.47	4.24	15.25	100.00

Unused = 10

Tables 55 through 59

The few respondents who did believe that there were drawbacks resulting from frequent contacts between student teachers are listed in Table 55 through 59. Only 5 responses could be tabulated in a specific category. They believed that under the circumstances student teachers depended upon each other too much. Other reasons given were: "There is a tendency to stick too close together, thereby isolating themselves from the faculty;" "There is danger of too much complaining, griping, etc.;" "There is too much of an opportunity to develop resentment against demanding supervising teachers;" About 12 respondents expressed doubt of the advisability of frequent contacts between student teachers.

TABLE 55

A Comparison of Responses by Age of the Major
Undesirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts
Between Student Teachers

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	Total
They depend too much upon each other.									
Frequency	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	8.33	8.33	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	41.67
Other									
Frequency	1.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	8.33	16.67	0.00	16.67	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	58.33
TOTAL									
Frequency	1.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	12.00
Pct. of Total	8.33	25.00	8.33	25.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	16.67	100.00

Unused - 116

TABLE 56

A Comparison of Responses by Sex of the Major Undesirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Male	Female	Total
They depend too much upon each other.			
Frequency	4.00	2.00	6.00
Pct. of Total	30.77	15.38	46.15
Other			
Frequency	5.00	2.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	38.46	15.38	53.84
TOTAL			
Frequency	9.00	4.00	13.00
Pct. of Total	69.23	30.77	100.00

Unused - 115

TABLE 57

A Comparison of Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Major Undesirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
They depend too much upon each other.									
Frequency	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	6.80
Pct. of Total	7.69	7.69	7.69	0.00	7.69	0.00	7.69	7.69	46.15
Other									
Frequency	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	23.08	7.69	15.38	7.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	53.84
TOTAL									
Frequency	4.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	13.00
Pct. of Total	30.77	15.38	23.08	7.69	7.69	0.00	7.69	7.69	100.00

Unused - 115

TABLE 58

A Comparison of Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Undesirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teacners

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
They depend too much upon each other.						
Frequency	2.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	6.00
Pct. of Total	15.38	0.00	23.08	7.69	0.00	46.15
Other						
Frequency	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	38.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.38	53.84
TOTAL						
Frequency	7.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	13.00
Pct. of Total	53.85	0.00	23.08	7.69	15.38	100.00

Unused - 115

TABLE 59

A Comparison of Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Undesirable Reasons for Frequent Contacts Between Student Teachers

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
They depend too much upon each other.						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	6.00
Pct. of Total	7.69	0.00	7.69	7.69	23.08	46.15
Other						
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	7.69	7.69	0.00	7.69	31.77	53.84
TOTAL						
Frequency	2.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	7.00	13.00
Pct. of Total	15.38	7.69	7.69	15.38	53.85	100.00

Unused - 115

LOCAL FACULTY AS CLINICAL CONSULTANT

Tables 60 through 65

A unique feature of the SERL Project is the use of a local faculty member who has release time, usually one-half day, to coordinate the activities of the student teacher group. This is in contrast to the use of a university coordinator under the more conventional programs. Respondents were asked to react to the question, "Are there advantages of having a local (public school) faculty member serve as clinical consultant to student teachers?" Tables 60 through 65 indicate the "yes" and "no" responses as to the desirability of using a local clinical consultant.

An inspection of Table 60, which compares the desirability of using a local clinical consultant by the age of the respondent, indicates that most of the population responded positively. The 2 "no" responses were in the 25-29 age group. The 14 who said "yes and no" are scattered well across the total age range.

Table 61 compares the desirability of using a local clinical consultant by marital status. Of the 2 that responded "no," 1 was married and 1 was single. All 15 who responded "yes and no" were married.

A comparison of the "yes and no" responses by sex is shown in Table 62. The "no" responses were evenly divided between male and female. The 15 "yes and no" responses were divided, 11 males (19% of the total male population) and 4 females (8% of the total female population).

Table 63 compares by years of experience in education the desirability of using a local faculty member as clinical consultant. The 2 "no" responses are in the 0-9 years of experience ranges. The 15 "yes and no" responses are scattered across almost the entire experience range.

As indicated in Table 64, the comparison of the desirability of using a local clinical consultant is objected to by 2 former supervising teachers. The "yes and no" response is distributed fairly evenly when compared with past responsibility to the SERL Project. Only those who have not experienced any previous responsibility to the SERL group show in significant numbers.

Table 65 indicates that one out of 58 (1.7%) supervising teachers and 1 out of 12 (8%) of the school administrators do not believe there are advantages to using a local clinical consultant. The 15 that indicate advantages and disadvantages are found in all of the categories of current responsibility.

TABLE 60

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Age of the Desirability of Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	20-24	25-29	30-34	34-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	Total
YES										
Frequency	24.00	17.00	8.00	14.00	10.00	0.00	8.00	5.00	3.00	89.00
Pct. of Total	22.86	16.19	7.62	13.33	9.52	0.00	7.62	4.76	2.86	84.76
NO										
Frequency	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.90
YES AND NO										
Frequency	1.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	14.00
Pct. of Total	.95	1.90	2.86	.95	2.86	1.90	.95	.95	0.00	13.33
TOTAL										
Frequency	25.00	21.00	11.00	15.00	13.00	2.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	105.00
Pct. of Total	23.81	20.00	10.48	14.29	12.38	1.90	8.57	5.71	2.86	100.00

Unused - 23

TABLE 61

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Marital Status of the Desirability of Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
YES				
Frequency	76.00	12.00	2.00	90.00
Pct. of Total	71.03	11.21	1.87	84.11
NO				
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.93	.93	0.00	1.87
YES AND NO				
Frequency	15.00	0.00	0.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	14.02	0.00	0.00	14.02
TOTAL				
Frequency	92.00	13.00	2.00	107.00
Pct. of Total	85.98	12.15	1.87	100.00

Unused - 21

TABLE 62

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Sex of the Desirability of Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Male	Female	Total
YES			
Frequency	46.00	44.00	90.00
Pct. of Total	42.99	41.12	84.11
NO			
Frequency	1.00	1.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.93	.93	1.87
YES AND NO			
Frequency	11.00	4.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	10.28	3.74	14.02
TOTAL			
Frequency	58.00	49.00	107.00
Pct. of Total	54.21	45.79	100.00

Unused - 21

TABLE 63

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Desirability of Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
YES									
Frequency	38.00	14.00	13.00	10.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	3.00	90.00
Pct. of Total	35.51	13.08	12.15	9.35	5.61	0.00	5.61	2.80	84.11
NO									
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.93	.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.87
YES AND NO									
Frequency	2.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	1.87	3.74	3.74	.93	1.87	.93	.93	0.00	14.02
TOTAL									
Frequency	41.00	19.00	17.00	11.00	8.00	1.00	7.00	3.00	107.00
Pct. of Total	38.32	17.76	15.89	10.28	7.48	.93	6.54	2.80	100.00

Unused - 21

TABLE 64

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Desirability of Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	14.00	9.00	5.00	2.00	61.00	91.00
Pct. of Total	12.96	8.33	4.63	1.85	56.48	84.26
NO						
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.85
YES AND NO						
Frequency	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	10.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	.93	.93	.93	1.85	9.26	13.89
TOTAL						
Frequency	17.00	10.00	6.00	4.00	71.00	108.00
Pct. of Total	15.74	9.26	5.56	3.70	65.74	100.00

Unused - 20

TABLE 65

A Comparison of Yes-No Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Desirability of Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
YES						
Frequency	51.00	17.00	7.00	3.00	13.00	91.00
Pct. of Total	47.22	15.74	6.48	2.78	12.04	84.26
NO						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.93	0.00	.93	0.00	0.00	1.85
YES AND NO						
Frequency	6.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	5.56	.93	3.70	1.85	1.85	13.89
TOTAL						
Frequency	58.00	18.00	12.00	5.00	15.00	108.00
Pct. of Total	53.70	16.67	11.11	4.63	13.89	100.00

Unused - 20

Tables 66 through 71

Those who indicated they believed there were advantages to having a local faculty member serve as clinical consultant were asked to list the main advantage. Tables 66 through 71 contain the major advantages.

Nearly half of the respondents (49.49%) who believed a local faculty member should serve as clinical consultant listed as the major advantage that "he knows and understands the school, its resources, faculty, problems, students, and community." Other major advantages listed were: (1) "He is available to student teachers and supervising teachers for consultation," (2) "He gives unity and direction to the project," (3) "He is available to deal with problems as they arise." Other comments were "he is in close contact with all parties concerned" and "the program is so far removed from the university that local coordination is needed.

The comments remained constant throughout the variables of age, sex, marital status, experience in education, past and current responsibility to the project.

TABLE 66

A Comparison of Responses by Age of the Major Reasons for Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	Total
He knows and understands the school, its resources, faculty, problems, students, and community.										
Frequency	10.00	10.00	4.00	7.00	9.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	49.00
Pct. of Total	10.10	10.10	4.04	7.07	9.09	1.01	4.04	3.03	1.01	49.49
He is available to student teachers and supervising teachers for consultation.										
Frequency	3.00	8.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	17.00
Pct. of Total	3.03	8.08	2.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.02	2.02	0.00	17.17
He gives the project unity and direction.										
Frequency	4.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	4.04	1.01	3.03	3.03	1.01	1.01	1.01	0.00	1.01	15.15
He is available to deal with problems as they arise.										
Frequency	5.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	5.05	0.00	1.01	1.01	2.02	0.00	1.01	0.00	0.00	10.10
Other										
Frequency	2.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	2.02	0.00	1.01	2.02	0.00	0.00	1.01	1.01	1.01	8.08
TOTAL										
Frequency	24.00	19.00	11.00	13.00	12.00	2.00	9.00	6.00	3.00	99.00
Pct. of Total	24.24	19.19	11.11	13.13	12.12	2.02	9.09	6.06	3.03	100.00

Unused - 29

TABLE 67

A Comparison of Responses by Marital Status of the Major Reasons for Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
He knows and understands the school, its resources, faculty, problems, students, and community.				
Frequency	44.00	5.00	0.00	49.00
Pct. of Total	43.56	4.95	0.00	48.51
He is available to student teachers and supervising teachers for consultation.				
Frequency	16.00	1.00	1.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	15.84	.99	.99	17.82
He gives the project unity and direction.				
Frequency	11.00	3.00	1.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	10.89	2.97	.99	14.85
He is available to deal with problems as they arise.				
Frequency	9.00	2.00	0.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	8.91	1.98	0.00	10.89
Other				
Frequency	8.00	0.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	7.92	0.00	0.00	7.92
TOTAL				
Frequency	88.00	11.00	2.00	101.00
Pct. of Total	87.13	10.89	1.98	100.00

Unused - 27

TABLE 68

A Comparison of Responses by Sex of the Major Reasons for Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Male	Female	Total
He knows and understands the school, its resources, facuity, problems, students and community.			
Frequency	25.00	25.00	50.00
Pct. of Total	24.75	24.75	49.50
He is available to student teachers and supervising teachers for consultation.			
Frequency	7.00	11.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	6.93	10.89	17.82
He gives the project unity and direction.			
Frequency	10.00	5.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	9.90	4.95	14.85
He is available to deal with problems as they arise.			
Frequency	6.00	4.00	10.00
Pct. of Total	5.94	3.96	9.90
Other			
Frequency	5.00	3.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	4.95	2.97	7.92
TOTAL			
Frequency	53.00	48.00	101.00
Pct. of Total	52.48	47.52	100.00

Unused - 27

TABLE 69

A Comparison of Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Major Reasons for Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
He knows and understands the school, its resources, faculty, problems, students, and community.									
Frequency	17.00	10.00	7.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	49.00
Pct. of Total	16.83	9.90	6.93	3.96	3.96	.99	4.95	.99	48.51
He is available to student teachers and supervising teachers for consultation.									
Frequency	7.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	6.93	4.95	1.98	.99	2.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.82
He gives the project unity and direction.									
Frequency	5.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	4.95	1.98	3.96	1.98	.99	0.00	.99	0.00	14.85
He is available to deal with problems as they arise.									
Frequency	7.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	6.93	0.00	0.00	3.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.89
Other									
Frequency	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	2.97	.99	.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	.99	1.98	7.92
TOTAL									
Frequency	39.00	18.00	14.00	11.00	8.00	1.00	7.00	3.00	101.00
Pct. of Total	38.61	17.82	13.86	10.89	7.92	.99	6.93	2.97	100.00

Unused - 27

TABLE 70

A Comparison of Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons for Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
He knows and understands the school, its resources, faculty, problems, students, and community.						
Frequency	6.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	32.00	50.00
Pct. of Total	5.88	4.90	3.92	2.94	31.37	49.02
He is available to student teachers and supervising teachers for consultation.						
Frequency	3.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	13.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	2.94	1.96	0.00	0.00	12.75	17.65
He gives the project unity and direction.						
Frequency	4.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	9.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	3.92	0.00	.98	.98	8.82	14.71
He is available to deal with problems as they arise.						
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	1.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.82	10.78
Other						
Frequency	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.96	.98	0.00	4.90	7.84
TOTAL						
Frequency	15.00	9.00	6.00	4.00	68.00	102.00
Pct. of Total	14.71	8.82	5.88	3.92	66.67	100.00

TABLE 71

A Comparison of Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons for Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
He knows and understands the school, its resources, faculty, problems, students, and community.						
Frequency	23.00	8.00	7.00	4.00	8.00	50.00
Pct. of Total	22.55	7.84	6.86	3.92	7.84	49.02
He is available to student teachers and supervising teachers for consultation.						
Frequency	16.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	15.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.96	17.65
He gives the project unity and direction.						
Frequency	9.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	15.00
Pct. of Total	8.82	2.94	1.96	0.00	.98	14.71
He is available to deal with problems as they arise.						
Frequency	3.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	2.94	6.86	0.00	0.00	.98	10.78
Other						
Frequency	4.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	3.92	0.00	.98	.98	1.96	7.84
TOTAL						
Frequency	55.00	18.00	10.00	5.00	14.00	102.00
Pct. of Total	53.92	17.65	9.80	4.90	13.73	100.00

Tables 72 through 77

The major disadvantages to using a local faculty member as clinical consultant are shown in Tables 72 through 77. Of those who saw disadvantages, 4 listed the lack of time for observation and evaluation of student teachers. One reason for this could be that the clinical consultant is usually teaching during the same class periods that the student teachers are teaching.

A second major disadvantage was seen as the clinic consultant's lack of formal or specialized training in the supervision of student teachers. The possibility of his having biases that would interfere with objective evaluation was further listed. Other reasons stated were: "It takes a good teacher out of the classroom" and "it should be the job of the supervising teacher."

The disadvantages seem to remain constant when compared by age, sex, marital status, years of experience in education, past or current responsibility to the SERL Project.

TABLE 72

A Comparison of Responses by Age of the Major Reasons
for Not Having a Local Faculty Member
Serve as Clinical Consultant
to the SERL Project

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	Total
He does not have enough time for observation and evaluation of student teachers.									
Frequency	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	5.88	5.88	5.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.88	23.53
He may not have had any special training in the supervision of student teachers.									
Frequency	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	5.88	5.88	0.00	0.00	0-00	0.00	5.88	0.00	17.65
He may have biases that interfere with objective evaluation.									
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.88	5.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.76
Other									
Frequency	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	5.88	11.76	0.00	11.76	11.76	0.00	5.88	47.06
TOTAL									
Frequency	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	17.00
Pct. of Total	11.76	17.65	17.65	5.88	17.65	11.76	5.88	11.76	100.00

Unused - 111

TABLE 73

A Comparison of Responses by Marital Status of the Major Reasons for Not Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
He does not have enough time for observation and evaluation of student teachers.				
Frequency	4.00	1.00		5.00
Pct. of Total	21.05	5.26		26.32
He may not have had any special training in the supervision of student teachers.				
Frequency	3.00	0.00		3.00
Pct. of Total	15.79	0.00		15.79
He may have biases that interfere with objective evaluation.				
Frequency	3.00	0.00		3.00
Pct. of Total	15.79	0.00		15.79
Other				
Frequency	7.00	1.00		8.00
Pct. of Total	36.84	5.26		42.10
TOTAL				
Frequency	17.00	2.00		19.00
Pct. of Total	89.47	10.53		100.00

Unused - 109

TABLE 74

A Comparison of Responses by Sex of the Major Reasons for Not Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Male	Female	Total
He does not have enough time for observation and evaluation of student teachers.			
Frequency	2.00	2.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	11.11	11.11	22.22
He may not have had any special training in the supervision of student teachers.			
Frequency	2.00	1.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	11.11	5.56	16.67
He may have biases that interfere with objective evaluation.			
Frequency	2.00	1.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	11.11	5.56	16.67
Other			
Frequency	7.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	38.89	5.56	44.44
TOTAL			
Frequency	13.00	5.00	18.00
Pct. of Total	72.22	27.78	100.00

Unused - 110

TABLE 75

A Comparison of Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Major Reasons for Not Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	Total
He does not have enough time for observation and evaluation of student teachers.								
Frequency	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	10.53	10.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	26.32
He may not have had any special training in the supervision of student teachers.								
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	10.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	0.00	15.79
He may have biases that interfere with objective evaluation.								
Frequency	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	10.53	0.00	5.26	0.00	0.00	15.79
Other								
Frequency	0.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	15.79	10.53	5 6	5.26	0.00	5.26	36.84
TOTAL								
Frequency	4.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	19.00
Pct. of Total	21.05	26.32	21.05	5.26	10.53	5.26	10.53	100.00

Unused - 109

TABLE 76

A Comparison of Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons for Not Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
He does not have enough time for observation and evaluation of student teachers.						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.32	26.32
He may not have had any special training in the supervision of student teachers.						
Frequency	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	5.26	0.00	0.00	10.53	15.79
He may have biases that interfere with objective evaluation.						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	10.53	15.79
Other						
Frequency	2.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	10.53	0.00	5.26	5.26	21.05	42.10
TOTAL						
Frequency	2.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	13.00	19.00
Pct. of Total	10.53	5.26	5.26	10.53	68.42	100.00

Unused - 109

TABLE 77

A Comparison of Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Reasons for Not Having a Local Faculty Member Serve as Clinical Consultant to the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
He does not have enough time for observation and evaluation of student teachers.						
Frequency	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	21.05	5.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.32
He may not have had any special training in the supervision of student teachers.						
Frequency	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	5.26	0.00	5.26	5.26	15.79
He may have biases that interfere with objective evaluation.						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	5.26	0.00	5.26	0.00	5.26	15.79
Other						
Frequency	4.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	8.00
Pct. of Total	21.05	0.00	15.79	5.26	0.00	42.10
TOTAL						
Frequency	9.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	19.00
Pct. of Total	47.37	10.53	21.05	10.53	10.53	100.00

Unused - 109

RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN THE SERL MODEL

Tables 78 through 83

The final question asked was: "Were you to repeat the SERL experience, what changes would you like to see effected?" Responses to this question are found in Tables 78 through 83. Some persons suggested that the program should stay as it is with no change; others indicated some changes that they would like to see.

While there were some changes in the importance in the comparison by sex, the relative positions of the top eleven desired changes were fairly constant.

The order of the major recommended changes was:

1. Increase the classroom time for student teachers.
2. Limit the number of trips. Combine SERL groups for some trips.
3. Increase the student teacher-supervising teacher planning time.
4. Lengthen the time for student teaching (currently the student teaching time is approximately 10 weeks).
5. Increase the time for clinical consultants to observe student teachers.
6. Screen student teachers more carefully.
7. Improve communications between the supervising teacher and the clinical consultant.
8. Increase the student teacher's time for student consultation.
9. Improve student teacher orientation.
10. Provide more time for student teachers to observe other student teachers.
11. Provide more time for student teacher contact with other SERL groups.

Of the 41 persons who thought the classroom time for student teachers should be increased, 32 were in the 20-39 age range (Table 78); 34 were married, according to Table 79; 22 were male and 20 female, as indicated in Table 80; and 31 had less than 14 years of experience in education, as shown in Table 81. Past SERL responsibility was not a significant variable, as indicated in Table 82. Thirty-one of the 66 current supervising teachers are in favor of increasing classroom time from the information presented in Table 83.

TABLE 78

A Comparison of Responses by Age of the Major Changes Recommended in the SERL Project

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	Total
Increase classroom time for student teachers.										
Frequency	8.00	13.00	4.00	7.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	41.00
Pct. of Total	7.14	11.61	3.57	6.25	4.46	.89	.89	1.79	0.00	36.61
Limit the number of field trips--combine SERL groups for some trips.										
Frequency	3.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	2.68	1.79	2.68	.89	.89	0.00	0.00	.89	0.00	9.82
Increase student teacher-supervising teacher planning time.										
Frequency	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	1.79	1.79	1.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	.89	0.00	0.00	6.25
Lengthen time for student teaching.										
Frequency	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	.89	.89	.89	0.00	0.00	.89	0.00	.89	4.46
Increase time for the clinical consultant to observe student teachers.										
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	.89	0.00	0.00	.89	.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.57
More careful screening of student teachers.										
Frequency	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	.89	.89	0.00	.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.68
Improve communication between clinical consultant and supervising teachers.										
Frequency	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	.89	0.00	0.00	.89	0.00	2.68

TABLE 78 (continued)

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-65	Total
Increase student teacher time for student consultation.										
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	.89	0.00	.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.89	2.68
Improve student teacher orientation.										
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.89	.89	0.00	1.79
Provide more time for student teachers to observe other student teachers.										
Frequency	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.79
Provide more opportunities for student contact with other SERL groups.										
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.79
Other										
Frequency	7.00	5.00	1.00	4.00	6.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	27.00
Pct. of Total	6.25	4.46	.89	3.57	5.36	1.79	1.79	.89	.89	24.11
TOTAL										
Frequency	26.00	25.00	13.00	15.00	14.00	4.00	6.00	6.00	3.00	112.00
Pct. of Total	23.21	22.32	11.61	13.39	12.50	3.57	5.36	5.36	2.68	100.00

Unused - 16

TABLE 79

A Comparison of Responses by Marital Status of the Major Changes Recommended in the SERL Project

	Married	Single	Divorced	Total
Increase classroom time for student teachers.				
Frequency	34.00	7.00	1.00	42.00
Pct. of Total	29.57	6.09	.87	36.52
Limit the number of field trips--combine SERL groups for some trips.				
Frequency	11.00	0.00	0.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	9.57	0.00	0.00	9.57
Increase student teacher-supervisory teacher planning time.				
Frequency	6.00	1.00	0.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	5.22	.87	0.00	6.09
Lengthen time for student teaching.				
Frequency	3.00	2.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	2.61	1.74	0.00	4.35
Increase time for the clinical consultant to observe student teachers.				
Frequency	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	3.48	0.00	0.00	3.48
More careful screening of student teachers.				
Frequency	2.00	1.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	.87	0.00	2.61
Improve communication between clinical consultant and supervising teacher.				
Frequency	3.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	2.61	0.00	0.00	2.61
Increase student teacher time for student consultation.				
Frequency	2.00	1.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	.87	0.00	2.61
Improve student teacher orientation.				
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	0.00	0.00	1.74
Provide more time for student teachers to observe other student teachers.				
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	0.00	0.00	1.74

TABLE 79 (continued)

	Married d	Single	Divorced	Total
Provide more opportunities for student contact with other SERL groups.				
Frequency	2.00	1.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	.88	0.00	2.61
Other				
Frequency	27.00	2.00	1.00	30.00
Pct. of Total	23.48	1.74	.87	26.11
TOTAL				
Frequency	98.00	15.00	2.00	115.00
Pct. of Total	85.22	13.04	1.74	100.00

Unused - 13

TABLE 80

A Comparison of Responses by Sex
of the Major Changes Recommended
in the SERL Project

	Male	Female	Total
Increase classroom time for student teachers.			
Frequency	22.00	20.00	42.00
Pct. of Total	19.30	17.54	36.84
Limit the number of field trips--combine SERL groups for some trips.			
Frequency	8.00	3.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	7.02	2.63	9.65
Increase student teacher-supervising teacher planning time.			
Frequency	4.00	3.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	3.51	2.63	6.14
Lengthen time for student teaching.			
Frequency	1.00	4.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	.88	3.51	4.39
Increased time for the clinical consultant to observe student teachers.			
Frequency	2.00	2.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	1.75	1.75	3.51
More careful screening of student teachers.			
Frequency	1.00	2.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	.88	1.75	2.63
Improve communication between clinical consultant and supervising teacher.			
Frequency	3.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	2.63	0.00	2.63
Increase student teacher time for student consultation.			
Frequency	1.00	2.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	.88	1.75	2.63
Improve student teacher orientation.			
Frequency	2.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.75	0.00	1.75
Provide more time for student teachers to observe other student teachers			
Frequency	2.00	1.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	.87	2.61

TABLE 80 (continued)

	Male	Female	Total
Provide more opportunities for student contact with other SERL groups.			
Frequency	1.00	1.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.88	.88	1.76
Other			
Frequency	17.00	13.00	30.00
Pct. of Total	14.42	11.41	26.33
TOTAL			
Frequency	63.00	51.00	114.00
Pct. of Total	54.78	44.74	100.00

Unused - 14

TABLE 81

A Comparison of Responses by Years of Experience in Education of the Major Changes Recommended in the SERL Project

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
Increase classroom time for student teachers.									
Frequency	13.00	12.00	6.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	42.00
Pct. of Total	11.40	10.53	5.26	4.39	3.51	.88	.88	0.00	36.84
Limit the number of field trips--combine SERL groups for some trips.									
Frequency	5.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	4.39	1.75	2.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.88	9.65
Increase student teacher-supervising teacher planning time.									
Frequency	3.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	2.63	2.63	0.00	.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.14
Lengthen time for student teaching.									
Frequency	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	1.75	0.00	.88	0.00	.88	0.00	.88	0.00	4.39
Increase time for the clinical consultant to observe student teachers.									
Frequency	2.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	1.75	0.00	.88	.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.51
More careful screening of student teachers.									
Frequency	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.75	0.00	0.00	.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.63
Improve communication between clinical consultant and supervising teachers.									
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	.88	0.00	.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.88	2.63

TABLE 81 (continued)

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	Total
Increase student teacher time for student consultation.									
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.88	0.00	2.63
Improve student teacher orientation.									
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	.88	0.00	0.00	.88	0.00	1.75
Provide more time for student teachers to observe other student teachers.									
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.75
Provide more opportunities for student contact with other SERL groups.									
Frequency	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	2.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.63
Other									
Frequency	11.00	3.00	7.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	29.00
Pct. of Total	9.65	2.63	6.14	3.51	1.75	.88	0.00	.88	25.43
TOTAL									
Frequency	44.00	22.00	19.00	12.00	8.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	114.00
Pct. of Total	38.60	19.30	16.67	10.53	7.02	1.75	3.51	2.63	100.00

Unused - 14

TABLE 82

A Comparison of Responses by Past Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Changes Recommended in the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Increase classroom time for student teachers						
Frequency	7.00	6.00	0.00	1.00	28.00	42.00
Pct. of Total	6.09	5.22	0.00	.87	24.35	36.52
Limit the number of field trips--combine SERL groups for some trips.						
Frequency	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	8.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.74	.87	0.00	6.96	9.57
Increase student teacher-supervising teacher planning time.						
Frequency	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.35	6.09
Lengthen time for student teaching.						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	.87	0.00	.87	.87	1.74	4.35
Increase time for the clinical consultant to observe student teachers.						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	2.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	.87	0.00	.87	0.00	1.74	3.48
More careful screening of student teachers.						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.61	2.61

TABLE 82 (continued)

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Improve communication between clinical consultant and supervising teachers.						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.61	2.61
Increase student teacher time for student consultation.						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.74	2.61
Provide more opportunities for student contact with other SERL groups.						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.61	2.61
Improve student teacher orientation.						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	.87	.87	1.74
Provide more time for student teachers to observe other student teachers.						
Frequency	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	1.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.74
Other						
Frequency	6.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	17.00	30.00
Pct. of Total	5.22	2.61	2.61	.87	14.78	26.00
TOTAL						
Frequency	18.00	13.00	6.00	4.00	74.00	115.00
Pct. of Total	15.65	11.30	5.22	3.48	64.35	100.00

TABLE 83

A Comparison of Responses by Current Responsibility to the SERL Project of the Major Changes Recommended in the SERL Project

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Increase classroom time for student teachers.						
Frequency	31.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	7.00	42.00
Pct. of Total	26.96	1.74	.87	.87	6.09	36.52
Limit the number of field trips--combine SERL groups for some trips.						
Frequency	5.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	11.00
Pct. of Total	4.35	1.74	1.74	0.00	1.74	9.57
Increase student teacher-supervising teacher planning time.						
Frequency	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	7.00
Pct. of Total	4.35	0.00	.87	0.00	.87	6.09
Lengthen time for student teaching.						
Frequency	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	5.00
Pct. of Total	.87	.87	1.74	.87	0.00	4.35
Increase time for the clinical consultant to observe student teachers.						
Frequency	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
Pct. of Total	.87	1.74	.87	0.00	0.00	3.48
More careful screening of student teachers.						
Frequency	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	2.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.61

TABLE 83 (continued)

	Supervising Teachers	Student Teachers	School Administrators and Clinical Consultants	University Coordinators	None	Total
Improve communication between clinical consultant and supervising teachers.						
Frequency	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	.87	.87	.87	0.00	0.00	2.61
Increase student teacher time for student consultation.						
Frequency	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	1.74	.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.61
Improve student teacher orientation.						
Frequency	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	.87	0.00	0.00	.87	0.00	1.74
Provide more time for student teachers to observe other student teachers.						
Frequency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.74	1.74
Provide more opportunities for student contact with other SERL groups.						
Frequency	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Pct. of Total	0.00	2.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.61
Other						
Frequency	16.00	6.00	2.00	1.00	5.00	30.00
Pct. of Total	13.91	5.22	1.74	.87	4.35	26.09
TOTAL						
Frequency	66.00	18.00	10.00	4.00	17.00	115.00
Pct. of Total	57.39	15.65	8.70	3.48	14.78	100.00

CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to trace the development of a model student teaching program designed and developed cooperatively by the Lansing School District and the Michigan State University College of Education. Answers were sought to five basic questions:

(1) Is it desirable for a public school and a university to establish a cooperative venture in student teaching?

(2) Is it desirable to provide non-classroom experiences as an integral part of student teaching?

(3) Is it desirable for a student teacher to work with more than one supervising teacher?

(4) Do student teachers benefit from frequent (daily) contact with other student teachers?

(5) What benefits accrue to the SERL Project by having a local faculty member serve as clinical consultant for the student teaching experience?

Data was drawn from the results of an opinionnaire which was responded to by 12 school administrators, 74 supervising teachers, 18 student teachers, 5 university coordinators, and 19 others (counselors, librarians, and other support personnel), all of whom are or have been involved in the SERL Project. The principal findings were:

1. Schools and universities should continue to share the cooperative venture in student teaching. This was supported by 125 of the 128 respondents. Major reasons to continue this cooperative venture were: (a) to gain practical experience and to put theory into practice; (b) to combine the resources of both institutions; (c) to keep both institutions current as to the changing needs, thereby forming a base for evaluation and change; and (d) to give student teachers a realistic view of the school and community.

2. Non-classroom experiences should be an integral part of student teaching as indicated by 114 respondents. Those experiences were listed as: (a) those activities that present an understanding of the community as it affects the student; (b) visits to community agencies that have direct contact with the student; (c) visits to other schools within the system; (d) involvement in supervision of school related activities, e.g., clubs and sports; (e) contacts with supportive facets of the educational program, e.g., administration, counselors, and institutional media; and (f) visits to community resources of an educational nature.

3. The desirability of a student teacher working with more than one supervising teacher was divided 46% in favor and 41% rejecting the idea, with 12% responding favorably and unfavorably. Those who were in favor of a student teacher working with more than one supervising teacher gave the following reasons: (a) to gain exposure to more than one philosophy or style of teaching and approach to discipline; (b) to gain a wide range of experience in both major and minor teaching areas; and (c) to help student teachers broaden views and develop flexibility.

Those who oppose the involvement of more than one supervising teacher per student teacher stated the following objections: (a) it creates confusing ideas, philosophies, and methods of teaching, causing adjustment to be difficult; (b) there is not enough time to develop a close relationship between the supervising teacher and student teachers; (c) multiple supervising teachers are too demanding; (d) it complicates evaluation and conferences; and (e) it causes too much pressure and spreads the student teacher too thin.

4. Student teachers do benefit from frequent contacts with other student teachers as indicated by 89% of the respondents for the following reasons: (a) to share common problems, experiences, ideas, success, failures, and techniques; (b) for positive reinforcement and moral support; (c) to give a basis of self-evaluation; and (d) to share frustrations and discuss problems in a nonthreatening environment.

Those respondents who were negative to the idea expressed concern that student teachers depend too much upon each other when they are in frequent contact.

5. A local faculty member should be used as clinical consultant for student teachers as indicated by nearly 85% of the respondents because he (a) knows and understands the school, its resources, faculty, students, problems, and community; (b) is available to student and supervising teachers for consultation; (c) gives the project direction and unity; and (d) is available to deal with problems as they arise.

Those who reject the idea of using a local clinical consultant do so for one of the following reasons: (a) he does not have sufficient time for observation and evaluation of student teachers; (b) he may not have had any special training in the supervision of student teachers; and (c) he may have biases that interfere with objective evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS DERIVED FROM THIS STUDY

The evidence from this study leads to the conclusion that the SERL Project provides a successful illustration of a cooperative effort to improve the laboratory phase of teacher education. This project has been beneficial to the Lansing School District and to the teacher education program at Michigan State University. This joint effort has made teacher education more meaningful and has provided an opportunity for greater involvement of public school as well as university personnel. In fact, this SERL Project served as the model for the "cluster program"[51] of student teaching as it was developed at Michigan State University.

From the findings it appears that careful attention needs to be given to many of the specific details which go to make up the development of a model program, such as selection, assignment, orientation, and evaluation of students who participate in the program.

There also appears to be a need for a carefully planned, ongoing program of in-service activities for clinical consultants, supervising teachers and university personnel to make the total clinical experience maximally effective.

It further appears that priorities need to be established as they affect the non-classroom activities to be utilized during the student teaching experience. This is important in achieving full

---

[51] In a cluster program the student teachers are assigned to a building (rather than assigned to supervising teachers) in groups of 10-12. The school and the community it serves is considered a learning laboratory in which the student teacher studies the problems of teaching and gains experience in solving these problems. A local faculty member is assigned to guide this laboratory experience.

individualization of the laboratory experience. The need for specific non-classroom experiences may differ from individual to individual.

It also can be concluded that there is value in the exposure of a student teacher to more than one member of the school's faculty, for example, assignment to team teaching, differentiated staffing, and other models of instruction. The principle of individualization of experiences also applies to the selection of the specific models of teaching to which the student is assigned.

It may further be concluded that there is considerable benefit to be gained by grouping student teachers for part of their clinical experience. The benefit of this grouping depends largely upon the competence and experience of the clinical consultant. It appears that careful attention needs to be given to the activities provided during this group experience.

From the evidence in this study, the clinical consultant appears to have been a key person in the successful operation of the SERL Project. He is the central figure who can bring all essential forces together into a meaningful relationship designed to produce the maximum benefits for the individual student teacher. The clinical consultant is one of the unique elements of the SERL model that make it different from the conventional programs.

In order for such a program to be effective, a strong commitment is essential from central and building administration, teaching staff, and from university personnel involved. To the degree these mesh, the experience of student teaching becomes meaningful.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The findings of one dissertation cannot include all of the ramifications of a process as complicated as student teaching, especially when the main emphasis is built upon a joint effort between the public school and the university. This study was limited to the SERL model and those participants from the Lansing School District and Michigan State University who were involved in some phase of the project, either in its planning or operation. Recommendations for further investigation include:

1. A study of the length of time, as measured in class hours per day, and the length of time as measured in weeks, of the student teaching experience. Are these factors related to the success of first year teachers?

2. An examination of the value of non-classroom experiences for student teachers as they relate to the on-the-job effectiveness of first year teachers. What non-classroom experiences are most beneficial in preparing beginning teachers to meet their challenge?

3. An evaluation of field trips with possible consideration for combining SERL groups for selected trips, and creating the opportunity for small group and individual field trip experiences to meet individual needs.

4. An investigation of scheduling as a tool to search for ways to increase the time available to clinical consultants for observation of student teachers.

5. An investigation of scheduling, especially in high school, in an effort to increase the unstructured time available to supervising and student teachers for planning and consultation.

6. A delineation of the role of the supervising teacher as related to the SERL Project. How many consecutive terms can a supervising teacher work with student teachers and remain effective?

7. A study of the employment opportunities in teaching of those persons who have had the SERL experiences as compared with those who have had conventional student teaching experiences.

8. A comparison of the effects of using first or second year teachers as supervising teachers as contrasted with using teachers with longer service. Is there a generation gap?

9. An investigation of the possibility of one teacher supervising the activities of more than one student teacher at the same time. Should the supervising teacher-student teacher relationship continue to be on a one-to-one basis?

10. A study of the similarities of the elementary, junior high, and senior high SERL experiences. What common elements do they share? How do they differ? Are they similar enough to combine some experiences?

11. A study of the desirability of including the public school in the development of pre and post student teaching activities.

12. A feasibility study of the development of a formal in-service program, with university credit for clinical consultants and supervising teachers. Is this an opportunity to develop an ongoing cooperative program that would be of continual benefit to teacher education?

Much has been said in recent years about the value of cooperation between the public school and the university. The SERL model is an example of this type of joint endeavor. From the evidence gathered in this study, it was concluded that cooperation between the public school and the university did improve student teaching.

It is recommended that both institutions continue to search out other areas of cooperation that will yield positive benefits to all concerned with teacher education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Association for Student Teaching. The Outlook in Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: The Association, 1962.

Armytage, W.H.G. and Byngham, William. "A Medieval Protagonist of the Training of Teachers." History of Education Journal, 11. (Summer, 1951).

Chase, Donald J. A Comparative Study of the Cooperative Michigan State University--Lansing SERL Project and Conventional Programs of Student Teaching with Reference to Openness and Attitude Formation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

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

Corrigan, Dean. "Affiliated Schools and Research and Development Centers." Partnership in Teacher Education. Edited by E. Brooks Smith, Hans C. Olsen, Patrick J. Johnson, and Chandler Barbour. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

Denemark, George W., ed. Criteria for Curriculum Decisions in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1964.

Dean, Leland W. A Student Teaching Program for the 1970s. Unpublished paper, School of Teacher Education, Michigan State University. Presented to the Deans and Directors of Michigan Teacher Education Institutions, January, 1969.

Enrolled House Bill No. 4195, Act No. 246, State of Michigan, 75th Legislature, 1970.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Haskew, Lawrence O. "Planning for the Education of Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education. (Summer, 1966).

Johnson, James A. A Brief History of Student Teaching. DeKalb, Ill.: Creative Educational Materials, 1968.

Johnson, Patrick J. "An Assessment of the Administrative Organization of a Cooperative Structure." Partnership in Teacher Education. Edited by E. Brooks Smith, Hans C. Olsen, Patrick J. Johnson, and Chandler Barbour. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching. A New Order in Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association, 1967.

Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching. Who's in Charge Here--Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching. A discussion paper. Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1966.

Keppel, Francis. "Forward." Team Teaching. Edited by Judson T. Shaplin and Henry Olds. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Lansing School District and Michigan State University Teaching Office. SERL Project: A Project to Improve the Preparation of Teachers, 1967.

Lindsey, Margaret. "Speculations on the Future of Teacher Education and Cooperative Endeavors." Partnership in Teacher Education. Edited by E. Brooks Smith, Hans C. Olsen, Patrick J. Johnson, and Chandler Barbour. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

Luckey, G.W.A. The Professional Training of Secondary Teachers in the United States. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1903.

McCuskey, Dorothy. "The View Ahead in Student Teaching." Teacher Education and the Public Schools, The Fortieth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., Inc., 1969.

Mead, A.R. "Legal Status of Laboratory Schools and Teacher Educational Laboratory Practices." Journal of Teacher Education, 8. (December, 1957).

Merrill, Edward C., Jr. Professional Student Teaching Programs. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1967.

Owen, George H. "The View From the Other Side: The Role of the Public Schools in Student Teaching." Partnership in Teacher Education. Edited by E. Brooks Smith, Hans C. Olsen, Patrick J. Johnson, and Chandler Barbour. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

Rogers, Helen. The Administration of Student Teaching in the Secondary Schools of Large Cities. Ed.D. dissertation. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1959.

Schooling, H.W. "Partnership in Teacher Preparation." NEA Journal (May, 1962).

Silberman, Charles E. Research and Action Imperatives in Teacher Education. A speech to the National Invitational Conference on Teacher Education, Austin, Texas, October 24, 1967.

Smith, E. Brooks; Olsen, Hans C.; Johnson, Patrick J.; and Barbour Chandler, eds. Partnership in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

Smith, E. Brooks. "Summary." Subcommittee on School-College Relationships in Teacher Education of the Committee on Studies. Cooperative Structures in School-College Relationships for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1965.

Smith, E. Brooks and Goodlad, John I. "Promises and Pitfalls in the Trend Toward Collaboration." Partnership in Teacher Education. Edited by E. Brooks Smith, Hans C. Olsen, Patrick J. Johnson, and Chandler Barbour. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

Smith, E. Brooks and Johnson, Patrick J., eds. School-College Relationships in Teacher Education: Report of a National Survey of Cooperative Ventures. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964.

Snarr, Otto W. The Education of Teachers in the Middle States. Moorehead, Minn.: Moorehead State Teachers College, 1946.

Southworth, Horton. "Issues and Problems as Viewed by a Large Multi-Purpose State University, Located in a Small City in Establishing Off-Campus Student Teaching Operation." Partnership in Teacher Education. Edited by E. Brooks Smith, Hans C. Olsen, Patrick J. Johnson, and Chandler Barbour. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

Woodruff, Asahel D. Student Teaching Today. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960.

APPENDIX A

May 19, 1971

Dear Fellow Educator,

The training of teachers is crucial to the education of young people. Student teaching experience is an integral part of this training. Secondary Education Residency in Lansing, popularly known as SERL, is a model project developed cooperatively between Michigan State University and the Lansing School District to improve the preparation of teachers.

Because you have been associated with SERL your response to the enclosed questionnaire will be valuable in tracing the development of this unique project.

I will be grateful for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Calvin C Anderson

Calvin C. Anderson
Everett High School
3900 Stabler Street
Lansing, Michigan 48910

APPENDIX B

May, 1971

Because you have been associated with the SERL Project, it will be helpful in tracing the development of the program for you to make the responses that you deem appropriate to the following questions.

Age _____ Married _____ (yes/no) Male _____ Female _____

Years of experience in education _____

1. What is your current relationship to the SERL Project?

   Check the appropriate category.

   _____ Principal
   _____ Assistant Principal
   _____ Clinical Consultant
   _____ Supervising Teacher
   _____ Student Teacher
   _____ University Coordinator
   _____ None
   _____ Other (specify)_____

2. Have you had other responsibilities in the SERL Project? If so, please indicate.

   _____ Principal
   _____ Assistant Principal
   _____ Clinical Consultant
   _____ Supervising Teacher
   _____ Student Teacher
   _____ University Coordinator
   _____ None
   _____ Other (specify)_____

3. Should the school and college of education continue to share the responsibility in a cooperative venture in student teaching?

   Yes_____ No_____

If yes, list your reasons _____

_____

_____

_____

If no, list your reasons _____

_____

_____

_____

4. Do you feel that non-classroom experiences are desirable as an integral part of student teaching?

   Yes _____ No_____

If yes, which non-classroom experiences?_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Should a student teacher be involved with more than one supervising teacher?

   Yes _____ No_____

If yes, why? _____

_____

_____

_____

If no, why? _____

_____

_____

_____

6. Do student teachers benefit from frequent contact with other student teachers?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what are the benefits? _____

_____

_____

_____

If no, what are the drawbacks? _____

_____

_____

_____

7. Are there advantages of having a local (public school) faculty member serve as a clinical consultant?

Yes _____ No _____

List the advantages _____

_____

_____

_____

List the disadvantages _____

_____

_____

_____

8. Were you to repeat the SERL Experience, what changes would you like to see effected? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return to Calvin C. Anderson, Everett High School,
3900 Stabler Street, Lansing, Michigan 48910