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The problem of this study is to analyze the effectiveness of the cooperative agreement section of Senate Bill 8 and its impact on the student teaching program in Texas. The purposes of the study are (1) to analyze the data available from the Texas Education Agency concerning the cooperatively developed in-service improvement program for supervising teachers, (2) to survey the public school personnel charged with the responsibility of developing and implementing section three of Senate Bill 8 in order to determine the effectiveness of this bill, and (3) to interview college personnel who are involved in developing and implementing section three of Senate Bill 8.

The review of literature and supplemental data are presented in the following sequence: (1) the historical background leading to the passage and enactment of Senate Bill 8; (2) related state, regional, and national programs; (3) current views of college professors, public school personnel, and Texas Education Agency personnel on Senate Bill 8; and (4) data from selected cooperative agreements for student teaching centers and related materials.
The following procedures were used to obtain appropriate data in (1) identification of the school districts which trained forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71, (2) construction of the initial survey questionnaire, (3) selection of a jury panel, (4) validation of the initial questionnaire, (5) construction of the final questionnaire, (6) administration of the final questionnaire.

The development and findings of this study are presented in five chapters. Chapter I presents an introduction and the procedure followed in completing the study. Chapter II is a review of literature and supplemental data. Chapter III contains the collection of data, and Chapter IV contains a presentation of findings. The summary, findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are inferred:

1. The implementation of Senate Bill 8 by local school districts has resulted in added clerical and administrative personnel.

2. The curriculum and instructional supervisory personnel of many school districts are being utilized to implement the in-service program for supervising teachers.

3. The student-teacher center concept appears to have been implemented only moderately in local school districts.
4. There appears to be too little time planned for in-service of supervising teachers.

5. The college supervisors appear to need more involvement in selecting and identifying supervising teachers.

6. It has been indicated that a need exists for state, regional, and local conferences on the in-service improvement programs.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made:

1. The curriculum and instructional supervisory personnel of the public school districts should be utilized and involved in implementing the in-service program and student-teacher centers.

2. Consideration should be given to eliminating public school districts who have only a few student teachers each year, unless these districts can be involved meaningfully in a consolidated in-service program.

3. Much future attention should be devoted to improving the competency of supervising teachers.

4. The student-teacher center concept can be implemented satisfactorily only if the public schools, colleges, and universities, and the Texas Education Agency cooperatively commit the resources and manpower necessary.

5. The public schools and college personnel should cooperate in developing adequate criteria for selecting and identifying supervising teachers.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A great amount of time, effort, and money has been spent in Texas in the past year to improve student teaching programs through the implementation of Senate Bill 8, passed by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature. This bill provides $200 extra per school year for supervising teachers and an additional $50 per supervising teacher, usable to assist in meeting the cost incurred in providing facilities for student teaching. According to the bill, the public school district and university shall jointly determine the criteria for selection of supervising teachers and the role of the supervising teacher in the public school. The law also provides for the public school district and university to establish joint responsibility in developing a student-teacher center. A primary purpose of the student teaching center is to provide for the implementation of a continuing in-service improvement program for supervising teachers (6, 7).

This law has helped create a new and challenging approach to teacher education in Texas. McFarland states, "A year's experience under the new law has uncovered frustrations and problems for some, but it has proven that all segments of the teaching profession can cooperate through the
student teaching center for improvement of the profession" (5, p. 38).

The main purpose of the in-service program for supervising teachers is to provide the kind of experiences conducive to professional growth. The public school has a specific role in the guidance of student teachers, and it must fulfill specific functions in the execution of that role. The in-service program worked out cooperatively between the university and the public schools is designed to equip the supervising teacher with the skills necessary for this position.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the cooperative agreement section of Senate Bill 8 and its impact on the student teaching program in Texas.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were as follows:

1. to analyze the data available from the Texas Education Agency concerning the cooperatively developed in-service improvement program for supervising teachers,

2. to survey the public school personnel charged with the responsibility of developing and implementing section three of Senate Bill 8 in order to determine the effectiveness of this bill,
3. to interview college personnel who are involved in developing and implementing section three of Senate Bill 8.

Questions for Which Answers Will Be Sought

In order to carry out the purposes of the study, questions such as the following were considered:

I. Has the application of the law resulted in increased cost, maintenance, and service by local school districts?

II. Has it improved the competency of the supervising teacher by defining his role?

III. Has it resulted in improving the overall student teaching program?

IV. Has it facilitated better understanding between the public school supervising teacher and the college coordinator of student teachers?

V. Has it helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher?

VI. Has it improved communication between the college coordinator and the public school supervising teacher?

VII. Has the Texas Education Agency provided adequate leadership in developing and implementing the new student teacher program?

Background and Significance of the Study

Senate Bill 8, passed by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature, went into effect September 1, 1970. It is widely accepted that the underlying purpose of this bill was to
improve and upgrade the student teacher or internship program for prospective teachers in Texas. For many years the colleges, public school personnel, and others have been advocating enactment of legislation that provides the machinery for money and resources to make a united effort to develop a comprehensive state-wide approach toward this goal (5, pp. 39-40).

The student-teacher center concept is not new in Texas. The twenty education service centers in Texas were created as educational cooperatives. Senate Bill 8 reflects another cooperative effort to improve educational processes. Ford states,

In June, 1970, moreover, four Teacher Centers were activated in Texas under auspices of the Texas Performance-Based Teacher TTT Project—University of Texas at El Paso, West Texas State University, Texas Christian University-Bishop College, and University of Houston. At the same time, one was also being developed in Dallas under the sponsorship of a Training Complex Grant from the U.S. Office to South-eastern Oklahoma State College (3, p. 2).

The Texas Education Renewal Center (T.E.R.C.) and Texas Information Service (T.I.S.P.) were funded by the U.S. Office of Education in July, 1971. The goal of both of these projects is to help develop a model state-wide coordination unit linked into a network of teacher centers, which in turn are linked to a network of education service centers, institutions of higher education, and elementary and secondary schools (3, p. 3; 4).
Other states have developed in-service educational programs for supervising teachers similar to our plan in Texas. Florida, Georgia, and Maryland have plans that implement the student-teacher center concept (1, pp. 75-77). In Maryland the unified approach to teacher education states,

The Teacher Education Center concept is a unifying approach to the study of teaching and supervision. In contrast to programs that deal with pre-service only or student teaching only, this program is designed to meet the needs and interests of experienced professionals as well as undergraduate students in such a way that each becomes a student of teaching according to his own particular stage of professional development. Physically, a Teacher Education Center is a cluster of two or three geographically contiguous elementary schools, or one or two junior high schools (or middle schools), and a senior high school. Organizationally, it is a partnership between a school system and one or more preparing institutions, with the possible inclusion of the professional associations and the state department of education (8, p. 1).

A review of the literature, personal interviews, and telephone interviews have revealed that no other studies of this aspect of Senate Bill 8 have been completed or initiated.

Senate Bill 8 is a vital link in the development and meshing of the other related state and national programs being developed around the teacher center concept. Through the continuing in-service improvement program for supervising teachers, the new program is expected to provide a systematic means of upgrading this aspect of the student-teacher program. This study has helped determine what is being done in Texas to implement this program, and possible suggestions of
alterations and changes are given that may be necessary for further implementation of this new program and the student-teacher center concept (8).

The T.S.T.A. Legislative Committee, under the leadership of John McFarland, Chairman, endorsed and was instrumental in helping Senate Bill 8 pass the Sixty-First Legislature. Texas is now in the second year of implementing this bill, and the issues that have been raised in this proposal are critical to the public schools, colleges, and universities. If we are going to spend the time, effort, and money to implement this program, we need to evaluate this project further.

Definition of Terms

1. **Supervising teacher**: this person is the public school teacher assigned to work with a student teacher.

2. **College coordinator**: college teacher assigned to work with the student teacher.

3. **Student teaching centers**: this is the in-service improvement program, section three of Senate Bill 8, that defines the cooperative relationship between the college or university and the public school which serves the student teaching program.

Limitations

The scope of this study was limited to section three of Senate Bill 8. The study was limited to school districts
which trained forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71. It was felt that the school districts which trained forty or more student teachers would have administrative concentration to provide the expertise necessary for this program.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the public schools which participated in this program during the first year of Senate Bill 8 would have sufficient experience to provide an objective judgment as to the results and the present progress.

It was assumed that school districts that had forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71 had administrative personnel knowledgeable with regard to the application of Senate Bill 8.

Procedure for Collection of Data

Interviews and statements of six college professors, six public school personnel, and two Texas Education Agency personnel served as a basis for the study. These people were selected for interviews because of their direct roles in administering or supervising Senate Bill 8. Selected college and public school cooperative agreements for student teaching centers were analyzed. These agreements were selected to include both large, middle, and smaller sized cooperating school districts. The literature dealing with
the passage of Senate Bill 8 and other related state and national programs was reviewed.

A list of seventy-nine school districts which had forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71 was provided by the Texas Education Agency. The survey instrument was mailed to the school administrator responsible for implementation of Senate Bill 8 in those districts.

The Survey Instrument

A questionnaire was designed and submitted to a jury of six for analysis. This jury consisted of three college professors, two public school administrators, and one person from the Texas Education Agency, all of whom were experienced and involved in the implementation of Senate Bill 8. The knowledge and insight of this group were utilized in determining the final content and in clarifying the working and interpretation of the questionnaire. It was felt that this procedure would lend reliability to the study.

Procedure for Analysis of Data

The data for the survey instrument were compiled, reported, and tabulated. The percentages of answers were reported for each question by categories.

Conclusions and recommendations were drawn from data collected from the survey instrument, a study of Texas Education Agency records, a review of literature, and interviews with people involved in the passage and implementation of Senate Bill 8.


6. Texas, Sixty-First Legislature, Senate Bill 8, codified as Article 2891d, Vernon's Civil Statutes.


The review of the literature and supplemental data was undertaken to provide a basic understanding of the problem prior to the development of the instrument for surveying the impact of the in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8. The material reviewed included books, articles, Texas Education Agency records, and interviews and statements of college professors, public school personnel and Texas Education Agency personnel who have direct roles in administering or supervising Senate Bill 8.

The review is presented in the following sequence: (1) the historical background leading to the passage and enactment of Senate Bill 8, (2) related state, regional, and national programs, (3) current views of college professors, public school personnel and Texas Education Agency personnel on Senate Bill 8, and (4) data from selected cooperative agreements for student teaching centers and related materials.

The Historical Background Leading to the Passage and Enactment of Senate Bill 8

The years preceding final passage of Senate Bill 8 were years of study and gathering of data. Cunningham states
that a group of public school administrators made a written request to the State Commission of Education in 1957 for a study of professional laboratory experience in public schools (5, p. 43). Concerning this request, Moore reports,

In 1958 the request was presented to the State Board of Examiners for Teacher Education, an advisory group to the Commissioner of Education. Their call for a pilot study was answered by West Texas State University when they proposed the Texas Student Teacher Center Project. The Texas Association for Student Teaching was asked to develop criteria for the selection of laboratory centers for teacher education. This was accomplished in the 1958 meeting held in Abilene, Texas. During the next year, T.A.S.T. sponsored twelve area conferences across the state concentrating on describing the roles of the colleges and public schools in providing laboratory experiences in teacher education. The ideas derived from the area conferences were then incorporated in the Texas Student Teacher Center Project, which was administered by West Texas State University and funded by the six project schools and the Fund for the Advancement of Education, a part of the Ford Foundation (22, pp. 73-74).

Smith stated that the Texas Student Teacher Center Project 1959-61 provided the content for the present Senate Bill 8 (31). This project developed role statements for the supervising teacher, college coordinator, cooperating school, college, and student-teacher centers. The following are administrative provisions and facilities that the Student Teacher Center Project suggested should be considered in characterizing the approved Student Teacher Center:

1. The Board of Education should approve the student teacher program and the general policies concerning the time and money to be allotted for the student teacher program.
There should be written agreements drawn up between the college and public school for cooperative responsibility in establishing Student Teacher Centers in line with state regulations.

2. Time should be provided for the task involved in the guidance of student teaching in the cooperating teacher's schedule and load by making provisions such as: an off-period, relief from other school duties, and special clerical help.

3. Definite plans for in-service growth should be made cooperatively between the school system and the college which include a knowledge and understanding of the role to be played by student teachers and members of the staffs of the college and public school in the student teacher program. This need not be offered for college credit. Basic suggestions, which are developed, might be included in a manual to be issued jointly by the college and public school.

4. Administrative policies should provide for community acceptance of the student teaching program. This could be implemented by the approval of the Board of Education and by explaining the student teaching program to the staff and parents. The student should be accepted as a faculty member.

5. Schools should be approved as Student Teacher Centers on the basis of an accredited school program.

6. Adequate supplies and equipment should be made available to student teachers assigned to a Student Teacher Center. The Texas Education Agency should take this into consideration in allocating textbooks and teacher's manuals.

7. Student Teacher Center should maintain an up-to-date professional library and curriculum laboratory for the total faculty and student teachers. This might be based on cooperative agreement between the college and Student Teacher Center.

8. The Student Teacher Center should include in its budget money to provide facilities for student-teaching experiences in Teacher Education.

9. The state should finance a program of student teaching experiences in approved Student Teacher Centers as a part of the teacher education program.

10. The Texas Education Agency should take the lead in the setting up of standards for
validating Student Teacher Centers which will be entitled to participate in state funds for furnishing these experiences (32, p. 27).

In 1965 and 1967 the Texas State Teachers Association sponsored student teaching legislation similar to Senate Bill 8, passed in 1969 by the Sixty-First Legislature. The legislation proposed in 1965 and 1967 provided for a cooperative relationship between the public school, college or university, and the Texas Education Agency. The original legislation also provided compensation for the school district and public school supervising teacher on a one-to-one ratio (35).

The original legislation submitted to the legislature in 1965 was instigated primarily through the initiative and efforts of the rank and file of the Texas State Teachers Association. The professional teachers association supported this legislation because they felt the public schools should have a more significant role in the student teaching program. It was felt that a closer relationship between the college or university and the public schools in the student teaching program needed to be developed in legal terms. Throughout the state there was no coordination or uniformity in how the relationship between the public schools and colleges or universities was to be performed. The relationship was very loosely knit and lacked coordination. Some colleges did pay stipends, free tuition, and other rewards to the public school cooperating teacher, but this was not uniform throughout the state (35).
Sturgeon stated that he felt the legislation failed to pass in 1965 and 1967 primarily because of a lack of funds. The legislature was hard pressed to provide funds for other legislation considered of higher priority than the student teaching proposal (35).

McFarland pointed out that he felt one of the major reasons for the lack of enactment of the legislation in 1965 and 1967 was opposition by college and university professors. Some colleges and universities have, in the past, looked on student teaching as being their problem. Some college and university professors felt they should instruct the public schools in cooperating with them in the student teaching program. The idea was that there be a team approach, with the university fulfilling the primary role. The team approach, with the public schools, colleges or universities, and Texas Education Agency being equal partners, met with resistance by some college and university professors. In 1965 and 1967 some college and university professors testified in the legislative hearing against the legislation and indicated to their legislators that the proposed student teaching legislation could possibly interfere with the prerogatives of the college (18).

The legislators indicated to McFarland that they had feedback from the university professors cautioning that perhaps the student teacher bill was moving too fast and that it would probably be better to have a different kind of bill
than the one proposed or to leave the student teaching pro-
gram the same. In meetings attended by McFarland there was
a feeling on the part of some professors of a reluctance to
give up authority and leeway to operate the student teaching
program. In other words, they felt that the university pro-
fessors knew best about the student teaching program. Stu-
dent teaching is a part of the teacher education program,
and the university professors are the experts on teacher edu-
cation. The university offers courses and college credit
and must meet accreditation standards set by certain accredit-
ing agencies. This matter of granting university credit and
accreditation by the agencies resulted in some university
professors thinking that they should have the final word (18).

The two main contributing factors which caused the
student teaching legislation to fail to be enacted by the
Fifty-Ninth and Sixtieth Legislatures was lack of funds
available and opposition to this legislation by some college
and university professors (18, 35).

The student teaching legislation, known as Senate Bill 8,
was passed by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature and went
into effect September 1, 1970. In the House this legisla-
tion was House Bill 73, and the sponsor was Representative
Vernon Stewart of Wichita Falls. Representative Stewart was
interested in this legislation because of the interest of
his constituents who were associated with Midwestern Univer-
sity and his interest in improving the student teaching pro-
gram (35).
In the Senate, Senator Jack Hightower sponsored Senate Bill 8, and he also was committed to the passage of this legislation. Both of these legislators were selected by the legislative committee of the Texas State Teachers Association to sponsor this legislation because of their past legislative records of supporting education legislation in the Texas Legislature. Senator Aiken of Paris, Texas, who has been associated with educational legislation for many years, worked closely with Senator Hightower and Representative Stewart in guiding this legislation through the Sixty-First Legislature (35).

The final drafting of Senate Bill 8 was accomplished by the professional staff of the Texas State Teachers Association, under the direction of L. P. Sturgeon. Also, Emmitt Smith of West Texas State University made significant contributions to the writing of this bill. Senator Hightower and Representative Stewart were consulted by representatives of the Texas State Teachers Association to find out how many student teachers the public school cooperating teachers were assigned each school year. The study revealed that for each 100 student teachers, 70 cooperative teachers were utilized. An amendment was offered to the effect that public supervising teachers would be paid on a 70 percent basis. According to Sturgeon, Senate Bill 8 did not go into effect until the fall of 1970 because of two reasons: (1) necessary funds would not be available until the fall of 1970, and (2) the
legislators felt that the partners of Senate Bill 8 needed the school year of 1969-70 to work out agreements that were required by section three of the bill. Also, this year would give the Texas Education Agency, as the governing agency designated by Senate Bill 8, time to develop state-wide policies to implement the legislation (35).

The primary forces supporting the passage of Senate Bill 8 were local, district, and state divisions of the Texas State Teachers Association. The Texas State Teachers Association staff mailed questionnaires to the legislators, and an 80 percent commitment was received for the passage of the student teaching legislation before the legislature was convened. Hearing on this legislation were scheduled during the Sixty-First Legislature. Public school, college and university, Texas State Teachers Association, and Texas Education Agency personnel were asked to testify in favor of the legislation (35). According to McFarland, those college and university people who were opposed to the student teaching legislation in the Fifty-Ninth and Sixtieth Legislatures did not testify against the legislation in the Sixty-First Legislature (18). Sturgeon stated that the intent of the legislature in the passage of this bill was to improve the quality of the student teaching program in Texas. The bill set up legal sanction for the role of the supervising teacher and forced closer communication between public schools and colleges or universities (35). The sponsors of
this bill wanted to bring about greater teamwork, cooperation, and coordination among the parties. The intent was that the public schools and colleges or universities be equal partners. Section three of Senate Bill 8 requires approved public school districts serving as Student Teaching Centers and the college or university using its facilities jointly to approve or select the supervising teachers. Section three also requires these parties to adopt an agreed continuing in-service improvement program for the supervising teachers. The bill requires the Texas Education Agency to develop policies for implementing the new student teaching legislation (36). The interim policy for the implementation of Senate Bill 8 for the 1970-71 and 1971-72 school years includes the following:

1. The position of State Coordinator for Professional Laboratory and Field Experiences was established in the Division of Teacher Education and Certification, Texas Education Agency.

2. Each college or university must have worked cooperatively with the public schools and placed on file with the State Coordinator no later than September 1, 1970, a plan for continuing in-service program for supervising teachers.

3. On or before April 1, 1971, each college or university must have submitted a list of student teachers, both for fall and spring semesters, and the public schools must
have submitted an application for funds provided in Senate Bill 8, listing the student teachers, the assigning college or university, and the supervising teachers, to the Texas Education Agency.

4. Special attention is to be given to unique skills and varied ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds in assigning personnel (37).

A summary of the significant aspects of the bill includes

1. Joint responsibility among colleges and universities and public schools for student teaching experiences.

2. Cooperative efforts by state department, colleges and universities, and public schools in establishing standards for approval of public school districts to serve as student-teacher centers.

3. Joint approval of the supervising teachers to serve in the program by the public school and the college or university.

4. Recognition of the need for and cooperative adoption of an agreed upon continuing in-service improvement program for supervising teachers.

5. Payment to the district of $200 for each supervising teacher as an additional increment.

6. Payment to the district of $50 per each supervising teacher to meet costs incurred in providing facilities for student teaching.

7. Channeling of the $250 per supervising teacher into the Minimum Foundation Program Fund.

8. Provision that the total number of supervising teachers to receive the increment shall never exceed 70 percent of the total number of student teachers enrolled in the student teaching program (1, p. 27).

With the passage of Senate Bill 8, the student teaching program in Texas was given new and unique directions to
follow. According to Smith, no other state has a plan as comprehensive in scope and depth as Senate Bill 8 (31). Smith further stated that Senate Bill 8 was not an outgrowth of other state programs but was born in Texas (31).

Related State, Regional, and National Programs

As of this time no other state legislature has enacted legislation that encompasses a state-wide plan as comprehensive as Senate Bill 8; however, other states have started programs in cooperative student teaching arrangements (31).

The literature and related information concerning legislation similar to Senate Bill 8 are not extensive at this time (27). However, the programs that are described in this section are intended to provide a review of selected programs concerning the administration and application of the Texas Cooperative Student Teaching Program.

Maryland has spearheaded the development of teacher education centers. Hess states,

In 1966, the University of Maryland, in collaboration with the Montgomery County Public Schools and with the Maryland State Department of Education, established an exemplary student teaching center at Kemp Mill Elementary School in Silver Spring. Since that time, 44 schools in 6 school systems throughout Maryland and Washington, D.C., together with 5 colleges and universities, have collaborated with the Maryland State Department in the establishment of additional teacher education centers (11, p. 301).

The overall objective of the center is to develop a coordinated program of pre-service and in-service experiences
for undergraduate students and experienced personnel. The program emphasizes the need for all educators to become students of teaching at all levels of professional development.

Five specific objectives of the center are

1. to provide wide and varied direct experiences for the student teacher
2. to develop a program of both pre-service and in-service education for teachers
3. to develop the role of the education center, coordinator, representative of the state, the college, and the school system
4. to clarify the roles of all other center personnel
5. to explore state department involvement in the education center (11, p. 301).

The student teaching centers in Maryland are currently conducting research to identify the system through which the student teacher may most effectively develop his own style of teaching rather than just imitating the cooperating teacher (11, p. 301).

West Virginia has also begun a state-wide program of teacher education centers. The 1971 West Virginia Legislature approved a budget of $100,000 for the establishment of a state-wide program of teacher education centers which would include all teacher preparation institutions in the state of West Virginia. Six centers and selected institutions to be included in each center were proposed. A coordinator was employed to work with the director of each center and a tutorial coordinator held a second-level position in charge of community and public school experiences (19, p. 1).
The Kanawha County Multi Institutional Teacher Educational Center is an example of cooperative effort between the public schools and the college and university community in West Virginia. Outstanding features of the center include the following:

Center student teachers participate in the opening school week experience, regardless of their college starting calendar. This is accomplished by advanced placement of student teachers by the Coordinator of the Center.

IBM Data Processing Cards are being provided by the State Department of Education. They will identify the supervising teachers in the county who are carefully selected and recommended by the superintendent, principal, and supervisors. The cards will be maintained through perpetual revision.

Student teachers from six different institutions of higher learning have the opportunity to meet with one another and to share ideas and problems through combined seminars.

Special in-service programs are planned jointly by the county, the state department and the colleges.

Kanawha County's sixty coordinators and supervisors visit and offer assistance to the student teachers by acquainting them with new materials and techniques in their field.

Student teachers are provided an opportunity, through Center in-service programs, to observe and participate in the professional organizations, the reading clinic of Kanawha County, the psychological services, counseling and guidance clinic, and the health services of the county.

Student teachers, supervising teachers, principals, county and college personnel, and other guests were invited to a special luncheon sponsored by the Center in token of appreciation for their participation and cooperation with the Kanawha County Center for student teaching.

Student teachers have the opportunity and are encouraged to observe other student teachers and supervising teachers in their assigned schools as well as in other county schools. Many student teachers are having experiences with team teaching, large group instruction, guest programs, seminars, non-graded classes and modular scheduling.
Building principals, because of their increased interest and participation in the Center, are assuming a more active role in orientating the student teacher to administrative procedures concerning the operation of a school. Many are also providing group meetings of all student teachers in their building.

Monthly all-day meetings of the advisory committee, consisting of representatives of the county, the state department, and the colleges have brought new dimensions of understanding and cooperation to the student teaching program.

Special in-service meetings are planned for the supervising teachers. Two sections of the graduate course, "Supervision of Student Teachers" are being offered this semester to sixty Kanawha County teachers.

Through the M-Step Pilot Program, over $3,000 of films, film strips, and professional books pertaining to student teaching were placed in the Kanawha County central library. In addition to these, many individual Kanawha County school libraries received teacher education books.

A common evaluation form is being developed by all cooperating institutions. They are jointly preparing the evaluation which will be designed in behavioral terms. The college directors of student teaching will meet with the supervising teachers for orientation of behavioral evaluation techniques (20, pp. 4-5).

The Kanawha County Student Teaching Center was established for the purpose of coordinating a program of student teaching within the elementary and secondary schools of Kanawha County, West Virginia. Maddox states that the primary functions of the center shall be as follows:

1. Serve as a center for the assignment of all student teachers placed within the Kanawha County Public schools.
2. Identify and enlist for the assignment of all student teachers in the above mentioned schools.
3. Promote the professional growth of supervising teachers by providing educational programs designed to acquaint them with the role and responsibility of a supervising
teacher and to improve their skills as a supervisor of student teaching.

4. Enlist the services of school principals and county central office personnel in providing auxiliary learning experiences for student teachers as well as counseling on matters of the appraisal of student teachers.

5. Involve the personnel from all institutions of higher education who are participants in the Center in a general program of improvement of Student Teaching.

6. Stimulate experimental programs in student teaching, emphasizing novel arrangements for student teaching and research by the major graduate institutions in West Virginia.

7. Sponsor general in-service programs appropriate for all student teachers, emphasizing especially programs which can be conducted in large groups in order to maximize efficiency.

8. Serve as a clearing house and resource center for information about new trends and promising prospects for new arrangements in student teaching (20, pp. 5-6).

The in-service training for cooperating teachers was held in the individual public schools and each group had an input on the topic. The cooperating institutions—West Virginia State College, West Virginia Institute of Technology, Concord College, Marshall University, Morris Harvey College, West Virginia University, and Hampton Institute—provided support and consultants for in-service programs.

The cooperating teachers were recommended by institutional representatives and Kanawha County Superintendent of Schools.

Three levels of certification as cooperating teachers were used: Teacher Education Associate (held a professional certificate and master's degree, had graduate work in supervision of student teachers, five years of teaching experience, and had successfully supervised at least two student teachers; paid $150 per year); Class A (minimum of twelve hours of graduate level work in supervision and four years teaching experience;
paid $75 per year); and Class B (two or more years of teaching experience; paid $50 per year) (22, p. 12).

The state-wide teacher education centers of West Virginia show several similarities to Texas' cooperative student teaching program. Both plans utilize the student-teacher concept with a cooperative approach on selecting the supervising or cooperative teacher and developing the in-service program for these supervisors. In Texas and West Virginia the public school and college or university are developing a partnership arrangement in planning and executing the goals and objectives of the student-teacher centers.

The Multi-State Teacher Education Project (M-Step) was an interstate effort in cooperative teacher education. This project was approved by the United States Commissioner of Education in 1966. The leading roles to be taken by the individual states were as follow:

**Florida:** providing assistance to teacher education institutions and organizations by means of coordinated programs of research, institutional interaction and communication.

**Maryland:** establishing a center for laboratory experiences, through cooperative action by a local education agency, the University of Maryland, and the State Department of Education.

**Michigan:** improving laboratory experiences through the development of regional professional organizations throughout the state, coordinated by the State Department of Education.

**South Carolina:** improving in-service and pre-service teacher education through television and the use of videotapes and processes.

**Utah:** improving laboratory experiences through the use of television and video processes, experimentation with teaching teams, and developing teacher education centers by local schools and the state universities.
Washington: developing improved teacher education programs through school-college cooperation with stress on merging pre-service and in-service training.

West Virginia: developing a model center for the improvement of laboratory experiences (4, p. 335).

M-Step was seven different state projects that called for a compact in which all seven states participated (4, p. 45). The project coordinating board was made up of a director from each state department of education and the overall project director and associate director. Smith provides the following description of M-Step:

1. It is state department initiated and oriented.
2. It is widely representative by geographic location as well as state organizational type.
3. It emphasizes the encouragement of innovative exemplary programs at the state level and dissemination and utilization of information at the multi-state level.
4. It makes use of interstate planning utilizing the best professional minds in the multi-state area.
5. It includes exchange of professional personnel to meet specific needs (30, p. 35).

Another program that encompasses the student teaching program and in-service program for supervising teachers is the Portal Schools concept. Dodl and Armstrong point out that the Portal School is a name given to a unique type of individual school unit within a school system (7, p. 1).

The Portal Schools states the strategy of this concept:

The Portal School strategy is designed to bridge the gap between pre- and in-service education and to introduce new curricula into schools, by concentrating resources and sharing responsibilities among universities, public school systems,
and the community. A Portal School is a public school facilitating change, depending on each school's needs and resources (17, p. 2).

The Portal School provides the environment for training new personnel and a field context for assessing teaching competencies.

Teacher training should be coordinated among the college of education, the public school system, the community, and the teachers’ bargaining agent. This means a stable student-teacher population is in that school and will be better prepared first-year teachers for that area. Schools can see prospective new teachers operating in classrooms, and recruitment will therefore be based on actual performance in the field. Because the teachers' bargaining agent and the community are involved in planning and development of curricula and teacher training methods, their voice in teacher education can be greatly increased (17, p. 2).

The Portal School is a place where the student-teacher and supervising teacher function in a school environment planned to offer an internship that integrates all parties into the total instructional program of the school. Lutousky provides the following description:

Existing university and school system programs for pre- and in-service training and curriculum development can be concentrated in Portal Schools. With enough programs per building, the university may be able to justify financing a full-time professor per school to assist in the development and coordination of Portal School programs. These programs would provide more professional staff in a school resulting in more programs for pupils. This staff is available for a variety of consultative, testing, workshop, staff and program development, and material construction purposes at no additional cost to the school (17, pp. 5-6).
Portal Schools are being implemented in Florida, in Georgia, and elsewhere throughout the country. Alternative strategies exist for taking the steps necessary to establish and operate such collaborative ventures in teacher education. New strategies must emerge if the many subsystems within the total education system are to be changed in ways to fully maximize the potential of Portal Schools (7, p. 28).

In the summer of 1959, the Central Michigan University and several school districts received a grant from the Ford Foundation to develop a cooperative program for preparing prospective teachers. This early cooperative program received the first of the Distinguished Achievement Awards for Excellence in Teacher Education granted by the American Association for Colleges for Teacher Education.

Moore gave the following description of this program:

Students in the program took five years to earn the bachelor's degree and teacher certification. The first two years were spent in a typical liberal arts curriculum. When they reached the junior year, one semester was spent on the campus taking courses in their major and minor fields and in professional subjects. For the other half of the year, the teacher education student was a salaried staff member of the school, living in the district where he worked. The placement opportunities ranged from traditional, conservative schools to some involving team teaching, ungraded classes and closed-circuit television. During the first semester away from the campus, the interns were called teacher assistants and their pay was approximately half that of a beginning teacher. Their duties were similar to those of a teacher aide. During the fourth year, students in the program were known as teacher externs and they earned about sixty-five per cent of what a
beginning teacher received. Their duties included planning lessons or units, giving small group instruction, coaching a team, or directing a play. During their third and last phase of training, interns were called teacher associates and they earned about eighty per cent of a beginning teacher's salary. They performed all the functions of a regular teacher under supervision and with a reduced load.

The university employed three full-time and two part-time coordinators who kept in close touch with the students and partnership schools (22, pp. 42-43).

In an evaluation by students and faculty, the following advantages of the five-year program over the traditional four-year experience were revealed:

... early exposure to children; chance to earn as they learned; chance to try both secondary and elementary levels; having experience in schools with differing philosophies; campus studies meant more after being in schools; having experience of being interviewed for employment as a prospective teacher; and upgrading of school faculty because of the student teacher's presence. Local school boards showed their approval by continuing as partners even though it cost them more money, and they frequently employed graduates of the program (23, p. 12).

This project developed by a state distant from Texas is a cooperative venture, and therefore is relevant to the cooperative agreement of student teaching centers being implemented under Senate Bill 8.

The Texas Performance-Based Trainers of Teacher Trainers Project (TTT) is an example of cooperative practices in teacher education in Texas. Moore states,

The TTT program paid particular attention to the needs of the schools and their pupils through the creation of viable programs for
training prospective and experienced trainers of teacher trainers. Institutional change was a desired product of concentration on change agents who had the desire and power to bring into effect needed reforms in teacher education. Another top priority of TTT was the contribution and participation of the local community (22, p. 65).

The TTT was funded under the Education Professional Development Act (EPDA) enacted in 1967. In 1968, the Texas Education Agency established six EPDA Consortia in an attempt to coordinate teacher education throughout the state. This effort fell short of the need to create a new entity in the development of teacher education programs, so a new group was born in September, 1970--the Texas TTT Project. The seven components of this project were state, national, and five operational components based in Houston, Dallas, Canyon, and El Paso (38).

The director of the state component was the Texas Education Agency's Assistant Commissioner for Teacher Education and Instructional Services. The national component of the Texas Performance-Based TTT Project was conducted under the auspices of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. The five operational units each developed a plan that would employ the Provas Evaluation System, a federally sponsored evaluation system, for performance assessment (12, p. 6).

The TTT Project in Texas evolved into the Texas Teacher Center Project. The Texas Teacher Center Project was formed
with two key objectives in view: to make performance in the public school classroom the point of focus for all teacher education and to change the setting for teacher education to the educational cooperative, the teacher center. The Texas Teacher Center Project represents a unified approach to pre-service and in-service education. This project's funding from federal sources will continue through 1972. However, it appears other sources of funds will be needed for this project past the spring of 1972 (9).

The National Educational Renewal Center (NERC), Texas Educational Renewal Center (TERC), and Local Educational Renewal Center (LERC) are three components of a new program financed by the United States Office of Education in July, 1971. These programs are not intended to take the place of Texas Teacher Center Project; these projects will need, in a limited way, to continue some of the goals and objectives of the Texas Teacher Center Project. In Texas these programs will be linked to national information services through the Texas Information Service Project (TISP). This new program will make the public schools the fiscal agent, and this action will become self-energizing, with need assessment at the local level forming the basis for setting state priorities and national levels for research and action. The LERC will be related to social and economical deprived student needs. In the fall of 1972 it appears that Texas will have two and not more than four LERC units. Large metropolitan areas such
as Dallas, San Antonio, Houston, Fort Worth, Austin, El Paso, and various regional consortia will be prime candidates for the first LERC units (9).

The programs described in this section were included to provide a review of what selected educators are doing to develop cooperative ventures in student teaching. The latter part of this section gives a brief review of the other Texas educational progress that may have direct or indirect influence on the Texas Cooperative Student Program.

Current Views of Selected College Professors, Public School Personnel, and Texas Education Agency Personnel on Senate Bill 8

In an attempt to provide relevant background, the current views of Texas educators were solicited through personal interviews. These are views of individuals from the Texas Education Agency, college or university, and public school communities who had an active part in implementing Senate Bill 8.

Harlan Ford, Assistant Commissioner, Texas Education Agency, views the last two years of implementation of Senate Bill 8 in the following manner:

The last two years have been years of development and transition for Senate Bill 8. Experience should have been gained in the last two years to develop rather specific guidelines concerning the student-teacher centers. The colleges and universities are being able to judge and determine now the nearest centers it can financially—and other ways—work with more effectively and efficiently. Colleges are not
required to eliminate public schools where small numbers of student teachers are placed, but the college may find this necessary.

Anytime you begin a new program, you don't suddenly push a button and declare that of this date we are starting thus and so. The hope is that these two years have provided a developmental logic to what is involved and perhaps suggested strategies for that involvement. Some things have been good and some less than good. Sift those things out and begin to make the good still better to provide some substitution for those things that didn't work, and there will be that continuous ongoing process. Some things can be implemented now, and some things cannot. Those things that can, by all means do so; those things that can't be implemented but you see a need for, set to work on them, find a strategy and move into them just as quickly as you can.

So far as my personally being satisfied with implementation of Senate Bill 8, I am not satisfied with any component of education today. The kind of efforts to specifically implement Senate Bill 8 the past two years are probably equal to or better than what we might have hoped for. The spirit of trying to move into the program has been good. There are all kinds of degrees of effectiveness in each of the separate student-teacher center sites. One may do an outstanding job, one a mediocre, and another a perfunctory kind of thing. This is true any time you begin a new program.

The biggest difficulty is the age-old question: Is there really a viable model for cooperative planning and cooperative development? Work has been done toward this goal, but when you really come right down to it, the institution of higher education has a proprietary concern, and the local school district has a priority concern. Trying to get both institutions to share in common purposes and to share in the decision making process of the support systems for it is very difficult to accomplish. This is a completely different kind of thing. Overall, the Texas Education Agency believes the results of the implementation of Senate Bill 8 so far have been reasonable (8).
Tom Walker, Director of Teacher Education for the Texas Education Agency, commented on the role of the Texas Education Agency in the future and the progress of Senate Bill 8. His views follow:

Leadership will be the primary thrust. Historically, in recent times citizens of the state also expect the Texas Education Agency to play an evaluative role in the educational programs it is accountable for. In the future the agency specifically will require an evaluative procedure to be built within the framework of the contractual agreement.

The local teams that go out and evaluate the colleges and universities' teacher education programs and are coordinated by the Texas Education Agency, in a sense, will look at Senate Bill 8.

In the future years I expect to see the concept and ideas of the past expanded upon. One key idea in the agreement is sharing of responsibilities by institutions of higher learning and public schools accepting the responsibility of the partnership. If the preparation of student teachers is accepted as the joint responsibility of institutions of higher learning, local schools, and other professional organizations, then a means will develop where all parties can sit down and develop a program by which all can have an input. This type of arrangement will give a program that can give to the student preparing for the teaching role the kind of preparation that is needed.

The development of the student teaching center concept is spotlighting the fact that the preparation of the professional is not just the responsibility of institutions of higher learning, not just the responsibility of public schools, not just the responsibility of professional organizations, but that all these, plus others, have a contribution to make. Therefore, all of these parties should have a part in what the preparation for teaching will be. The professional organizations have not been represented in the structure of this concept in the past, and they need to be included in the future (41).
Tom Ryan, Chief Consultant, Division of Teacher Education, gave these additional observations and comments:

I believe a good beginning has evolved but much work lies ahead. I have evidence that the colleges and public schools have done much more than in the past in reaching these agreements for student teaching programs.

In the future, the role of the Texas Education Agency in implementing Senate Bill 8 will be a continuing effort to improve year to year. I hope to do this with a minimum of regulations in encouraging improvements. I also hope to encourage good programs and development of these programs (27).

The public schools and colleges and universities are concerned about the role the Texas Education Agency will have in implementing Senate Bill 8. In relation to this, Smith stated,

I am pleased with the role the Texas Education Agency has played. They have been very helpful in initiating this new program. They have continued to emphasize that this is an interim planning time. The memos that come from the Texas Education Agency help us know where we are at a given time in this program, and they realize that we are still in the planning stages (31).

McFarland's views on this were

Senate Bill 8 required the Texas Education Agency to set up guidelines, and they have done this well. The Agency allows agreements to differ from place to place. The Agency has not forced requirements but has allowed for local flexibility that assumes local responsibilities (18).

Another view held by a public school administrator was

The Texas Education Agency leadership and guidelines have been a little fuzzy at times, but this may be true with any new program. The
Agency needs to develop guidelines that are more refined but still flexible enough for creative development (16).

The following comments represent a school administrator's viewpoint of the role played by the Texas Education Agency:

I have had difficulty receiving cooperation with the Agency. I am not satisfied with the renewal concept by the Texas Education Agency and the way the Agency is handling this. I do not agree with the Agency on their concept of the renewal center or teacher center. On the implementation, I have gone through several series of guidelines, and I do not have time to rewrite numerous guidelines that come down. I also do not like the ways funds are supposedly allocated. When I apply, a much larger amount is promised than eventually materializes. I would not bother to put the time and effort of many high paying people into this if I had known the final financial commitment. This has been very frustrating (14).

Locke believed that the Texas Education Agency could help in developing and encouraging the following:

It appears that conferences and other means of disseminating information are needed to aid the local parties in implementing Senate Bill 8. State, regional, and area conferences need to be established to share ideas on this new program. Local conferences need to be held much more than state or regional conferences (16).

Walker supported this view by stating,

The local student-teacher centers need to have local conferences on developing policies, needs, and developments. Annual conferences on teacher education can provide another statewide means of sharing.

In these conferences both on the state, regional, and local level, different levels of involvement can sit down, tear through the problem, look for solutions, try to find approaches to the solution, and come up with ideas and recommendations. This give and take can continue on a local level. These problems can only
be solved by total professional involvement. Workable ways to solve the problems faced in preparing the teachers that our children need must be found (41).

Another suggested way of disseminating information and improving the procedures dictated by Senate Bill 8 was discussed by Ford.

A technical assistance support team from the Agency who would be identified to work exclusively with regional and area institutional programs and problems is needed. This in effect would be a roving team, not regulating in any way, but developing leadership and technical assistance to give the kind of help they are looking for. The Agency is trying to develop this plan. This team could go into the field to give any help they could provide for local public schools, universities, and others. This team would have access to programs around the state and could share ideas from place to place. Now it is very informal and unsystematic. The Agency is trying to systematize a better information system for local people.

If the program under Senate Bill 8 is to be maximized, the larger participating school districts will probably identify a student-teacher coordinator. This will be the liaison and person who will help develop a highly functional design for the school district. This coordinator will have a day-to-day involvement if those involved really want to try to improve the quality of the educational program, the quality of the staff, and staff development. This will necessitate a careful and close tracking system (8).

The enactment of Senate Bill 8 has caused the public schools and universities to cooperate and communicate to a much greater degree than in the past. The relationship already had good human relations, but Senate Bill 8 emphasized that teacher education is the joint responsibility of these two parties. The public school teacher is beginning
to accept that it is her responsibility to help design this program of teacher education (31). Tom Ryan, in relating to this dimension, stated,

Senate Bill 8 forced the public schools and colleges to sit down together, and most of these parties did not before Senate Bill 8. Before Senate Bill 8, the colleges sent names of student-teachers to the public schools, and the public schools placed these student-teachers in the schools. This was usually the extent of the relationship (27).

In agreement with Ryan's viewpoint, Ford stated,

There are not any evaluative data to measure the improved communications between the college and public schools that resulted in Senate Bill 8, but the informal feedback from the public schools and colleges indicate much improvement. There is at least now a talking relationship. Also, there is a certain psychology that anytime you affix your name to a formalized contractual agreement, the level of expectation and the level of results are enhanced (8).

Austin gave a different opinion concerning the relationship that now exists between the public schools and colleges or universities. Austin stated,

The new law has been passed but not implemented. The things covered in Senate Bill 8 that should have gotten under way have not. The operation is basically the same as before Senate Bill 8. More teeth need to be put into the implementation of this new law (2).

The public schools, colleges, and universities are, in several locations, developing a meaningful relationship. Kieschnick commented on this.
The colleges have cooperated to such an extent this year that they are giving seminars for each other. In other words, a group of East Texas State University student teachers and supervising teachers might attend a workshop conducted by the North Texas State University college coordinator. When the needs of the student teachers and supervising teachers are ascertained, different college coordinators with expertise in the needed areas may be used. This is called "cross-fertilization" (13).

However, some problems of cooperation between the college or university and public schools do exist. In relation to this, Kirby stated,

Some college people are not used to operating in a setting that involves the public schools having a voice in the decision process. Some of the college people do not see a need for this relationship. The real problem with the colleges seems to be at the secondary level. Some of the secondary college coordinators are not part of the college of education, but these coordinators service the student teaching program. This makes the administration of Senate Bill 8 difficult because these people seem to lack a concern for the problems in the public schools (14).

The views of the selected college professors, public school personnel, and Texas Education Agency personnel on the cooperatively developed in-service agreement section of Senate Bill 8 were varied.

McFarland's views on this topic were

The present bill calls for student teaching centers to be established throughout the state. I find some school districts without many highly professionally educated people setting up these centers. In some cases the control is in the hands of the school district, some in the hands of professional teachers association. The officers of the professional teachers association could conceivably be people without a graduate degree of any kind
or without a permanent certificate. These people may want to dictate to the college. If the professional teachers association gets the dominant role, then the college people could have diametric views on the student teaching program. A partnership that included the service center, professional teachers association, public schools, and universities could out-vote the university people and dictate to them certain things. These things may be in direct conflict with the accreditation agency's guidelines and may not be acceptable to the president or graduate dean of the university (18).

Another problem relating to the in-service agreement was cited by Ryan:

The most frequent problem with the in-service is the meaningful involvement of the small school districts in an in-service agreement. If Senate Bill 8 is implemented as the guidelines call for, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to include small school districts that only have a few student teachers each year. To do an effective job of implementing this new program, the districts in which the facilities, teachers, and resources can be devoted to develop a core of competent supervising teachers that know how to supervise student teachers must be identified (27).

Because of the in-service agreement and the staff development required in this agreement, some public school teachers are reluctant to participate. In regard to this, Austin observed,

Many teachers have refused to sign an agreement to have student teachers because the contract called for in-service training, and these teachers did not want to attend these extra meetings. These teachers have had student teachers before, and they do not see why they now need in-service on supervising student teachers. The $200 payment has not made that much difference to the teachers (2).
Another problem concerning the in-service was that the attitudes of some college coordinators implied that they felt the $50 additional payment to the public school district should go to the college coordinator for conducting in-service programs. Also, it has been difficult to get the college coordinator to use the classroom as a laboratory for the needs assessment development of the student teaching program. The college coordinator should develop the in-service around the classroom needs (16).

McFarland gave a view divergent from the preceding statements. He felt that "the $50 could be used to pay the college coordinator to help develop the in-service and write handbooks" (18).

There are several types of in-service programs that need to be developed within the in-service agreements required in Senate Bill 8. The following are provisions that several educators feel should be included in developing the in-service program for supervising teachers:

1. Basically, at this point in time, the in-service should be individualized. This is especially true because of the supervising teachers that have had student teachers before. All supervising teachers should have an understanding of what experiences the student teaching should include and what competencies the student teacher should be able to practice. The in-service should include how the supervising teacher may go about helping the student teacher to obtain the competencies that will help both the student teacher and supervising teacher become better practitioners. If performance based teacher education is initiated, then the in-service will need to build around
these experiences that will help the student teacher arrive at the target behavior (2).

2. The in-service needs to be planned on a broad scope and in depth. Individual assessments of student teacher, supervising teachers, and client structure in the in-service activities need to be initiated to meet the needs indicated by a needs assessment evaluation (15).

3. A joint in-service is needed if there is a multi-college relationship, and this in-service program must not assume that all supervising teachers and student teachers are at the same level of development (15).

4. Effective in-service occurs when the supervising teachers and college people work on projects such as developing handbooks that include the cooperatively developed program (18).

5. The same diet for the in-service should not be repeated year after year. Local needs should be evaluated. The representatives to the agreement can then sit down and look at the kind of in-service preparation program that is needed in that particular setting (41). 

6. In-service should be during school hours and not after school or on Saturdays. Many in-service programs of the past have not been successful because the public school supervising teachers did not have input concerning the type of in-service.

   Our local teachers association is now surveying teachers to determine what the teachers feel needs to be included in the in-service.

   A voluntary type of in-service for supervising teachers where they could choose the topic for in-service that they feel would most benefit them is in the near future. Some of the regular school in-service programs will be counted as Senate Bill 8 required in-service. This in-service will be cafeteria or buffet type in-service that will allow the supervising teacher to pick a topic more appropriate to them. These topics selected by the teacher peer group could be led by colleges, public school teachers, and other community agencies relating to education (14).
7. The in-service agreement needs to be meshed with the total curriculum and staff development program of each participating school district. This will allow re-education of the total staff (31).

Suggestions for the expenditure of the $50 supplement to the local school district for developing the in-service program were the following:

1. Provision should be made in an audit system to determine that this money is actually used on the student teaching program by each local school district (6).

2. The money in my district has been utilized to buy teaching materials, library materials, and audio-visual aids for the student teaching centers. Also, programmed in-service materials for supervising teachers are being developed so they can improve their own competencies (16).

3. This money could be utilized to pay consultants to assist in implementing the in-service program (2).

4. The intent of Senate Bill 8 is that this $50 is to be used for materials and other needs of the in-service program. The student-teacher center should study its needs and recommend the $50 be spent on these needs.

5. Thirty-five dollars of the $50 in this district goes to the local school and their instructional budget. The other $15 goes for salaries of personnel implementing Senate Bill 8 at the central office (14).

6. The budget for the expenditure of the $50 should be itemized in the agreement that is signed by the colleges and public schools (15).

7. All of this money should be spent strictly on student teaching training (3).

8. Next year several school districts plan to use this money to hire a student
teacher center coordinator that is jointly employed by the public schools and colleges (27).

Some administrators believe Senate Bill 8 has played a significant part in defining the role of the supervising teacher. Babb believes that

The passage of this bill forced the public schools to take a close look at the role of the supervising teacher. The role of the supervising teacher is being defined and Senate Bill 8 will force those who do not identify the role of the supervising teacher out of the student teaching program. A list of the kinds of skills necessary for supervising teachers' competencies and for college coordinators is being developed (3).

Smith believes that we are in the beginning stages of developing the role of the supervising teacher. He stated,

The state is moving rapidly toward performance based teacher education. The state board of education in the near future will probably approve this as a new directive that must be implemented. The teacher who is committed to performance based instruction is the only accountable teacher. This will determine if a dollar's worth of education is being received from a dollar spent (31).

Austin presented a different view on the development of the role of the supervising teacher. He stated,

On a broad range in Texas the role of the supervising teacher is not being developed. Most school districts pass out student teachers to people who want the student teacher. There is no screening process because this gets into the political realm. If the principal or other administrator has to give reasons why certain teachers do not have student teachers, he will have problems. This is why student teachers are passed around without really considering the role of the supervisor or the competencies necessary to be a supervising teacher. Before a teacher is given a student teacher, definite commitments should be understood.
At this point in time, Senate Bill 8 has made little difference from the standpoint of what actually happened in the classroom between the supervising teacher and the student teacher. The university has been handicapped because the $50 has been diverted for other purposes than helping identify the role of the supervising teacher. Up to now the $50 simply rewards the public school for taking student teachers (2).

Commenting further on this topic, Lane stated,

The competencies and role of the supervising teacher has not changed considerably, but an awareness is present that is going to have to be implemented. The in-service has shown the futility of a professor talking to fifty supervising teachers about identifying their role (15).

In the future, the in-service programs, if properly carried out, will begin to help identify the role of the supervising teacher and the competencies necessary to carry out this role (41).

Several proposals have been given to change Senate Bill 8 and the guidelines that the Texas Education Agency has developed to implement this law. These proposals are as follows:

1. I would not change Senate Bill 8 except to increase the total amount of money. Two hundred and fifty dollars per supervising teacher for the specific job is not enough to motivate teachers to be master supervising teachers. This is true because, to become master supervising teachers, a teacher may need to go back to college. The 70 percent factor was included in the bill because the bill intended to pull in fewer people so they could do a better job and not pass around this responsibility. Those people who oppose the 70 percent factor are in opposition to the intent of the bill. The intent was to prepare a core of supervising teachers (31).
2. There have been many complaints to the legislative committee of the Texas State Teachers Association concerning the 70 percent factor. This part of the legislation should not be changed at this time because the 70 percent factor has not had enough time to operate. More experience is required, and if needed, then change this part of Senate Bill 8 (18).

3. The 70 percent factor definitely should be changed. Because of this problem, the public schools and colleges do not have the flexibility needed in assigning student teachers (16).

4. The Texas Education Agency guidelines on the use of the $50 need to be explicit, not implicit. The guidelines should mandate the kinds of activities that must take place in spending the $50 (15).

5. If Senate Bill 8 were designed today, another involvement which would include the professional organizations might be included. The local school districts do not necessarily represent the professional organizations. The public schools represent the community. If the professional organizations are involved, education will benefit from the professionals who are actively involved in the work arena. They look at what is good for the profession rather than what is good for the public school or institution of higher learning (41).

6. The 70 percent figure should be removed and paid 100 percent. The $50 should be accountable in terms of the in-service training for supervising teachers and student teachers (2).

7. Cooperative planning capabilities of the two participating institutions called for in Senate Bill 8 is not something that you can write a generic floor mat for, but it has to be based upon the personalities and resources of the public schools and institutions of higher learning in that given situation. Priority systems or criterion systems may be developed where you can work with and can automatically build a support system to fulfill what you have agreed to do. Involvement of all concerned is vital (8).
The preceding comments represent various opinions of educators from around the state. It appears that, in the future, some changes will be made in Senate Bill 8 and in the Texas Education Agency guidelines for implementation.

The teacher center concept compensatory-based teacher-education that has been proposed on a state level will have a direct bearing on Senate Bill 8. Relating to this, Walker stated,

There is a strong feeling in the state with the task force studying certification that we, on a state-wide basis, move into the teacher-center concept and compensatory based teacher-education. This program will influence the student-teacher center concept and Senate Bill 8 legislation nucleus of the teacher center where the compensatory based teacher-education program will be carried out (41).

In regard to this, Smith observed,

When the state board acts on the teacher center concept and compensatory based teacher education, the role of the supervising teacher and all other teachers will change. Under this new program, a plan will develop for each student teacher and supervising teacher. If the state board mandates this new program, new standards for approval will result (31).

Ford gave the following comments on teacher centers and performance based teacher-education programs:

Teacher centers have one basic thrust of trying to develop a design for cooperative relationships. I recognize that the preparation and accountability demands the real product effectiveness in education. This has to be jointly shared both in the design, implementation, and evaluation by all parties in education. The basic purpose of the teacher center is to develop cooperative linkage of all
appropriate education institutional bodies and education supported institutions.

We, then, introduce the student-teacher center which gives a sub-element of the teacher center. Teacher centers include both pre-service and in-service in the continuum. In the student-teacher center you talk only about the pre-service component. The student-teacher center becomes a natural laboratory for pre-service and in-service or recycling. The teacher in the field can learn much in the student-teacher center about new techniques, new designs, and other improvements.

Provas design of discrepancy is being used to evaluate the teacher center concept and compensatory based teacher education. This is a confirmatory mechanism of identifying what your object is and then to take a look and see how far on the continuum you move to the fulfillment or obtainment of this object. You recycle at that point, making new objectives and moving from that point. This model is being tested with the teacher center project and can be directly applicable to the student-teacher centers. If these plans materialize, this procedure will be the model for confirming or evaluating the student-teacher centers. The student-teacher centers will be evaluated as part of the total teacher center concept (8).

The views presented in this section show the diversity of opinion among selected administrators. The views of these different administrators represent the many challenges that lie ahead in implementing the Texas Cooperative Student Program.

Data from Selected Cooperative Agreements for Student Teaching Centers and Related Materials

During the 1970-71 and 1971-72 school years, the Texas Education Agency administered Senate Bill 8 under the interim policies that were approved by the State Board of Education
on May 4, 1970. These interim policies state that, to qualify for the funds provided in Senate Bill 8, a cooperatively developed, continuing in-service improvement program for supervising teachers must be in operation and on file with the college or university, the public school, and state co-ordinator by September 1, 1970, and September 1, 1971 (37).

The agreements are filed by colleges and universities at the Texas Education Agency with the Division of Teacher Education. There are fifty-six colleges and universities in Texas approved for teacher education. These institutions of higher education may have as few as one, or as many as thirty-six, public school districts to develop agreements for the student teaching program. Generally, a common agreement is used by the colleges and universities that have a multi-public-school relationship (27).

These cooperatively developed agreements reflect a wide and varied approach to the subject of in-service education for supervising teachers. According to Self, these agreements have been drafted by the college or university and sent to the public school administration for approval. The public schools initially depended on the college or university to prepare the first draft of the cooperative agreement and the agreement was then reviewed with the public school for final approval (29).
The following agreement is an example of the type of document received by the public school for their endorsement and approval.

LETTER OF AGREEMENT

Inasmuch as the legislature has recognized in Senate Bill 8 the mutual responsibility of public schools and of colleges to plan and administer the student teaching program, the purpose of this agreement, effective for the school year 1970-71 by and between Southwest Texas State University and the Independent School District, is to establish the conditions under which this district will serve as a student teaching center for the University and student teachers will be assigned and supervised in the district. This agreement is to operate until such time as permanent policies can be established.

Both parties agree to work within the policies and regulations stated in the Texas Education Agency's "Interim Policy for Implementation of Senate Bill 8," and according to the provisions of Senate Bill 8. Specifically each agrees to attempt to assign student teachers in a way to fit the 70% allotment; this means that nearly half of the supervising teachers must be assigned at least two student teachers for the year.

The administration of the public school agrees to approve through official board action the policies and procedures for cooperation, and to make administrative arrangements necessary to schedule and support the program.

The University agrees to screen candidates carefully for personal and academic fitness and readiness for student teaching. The public school agrees to accept those so chosen, except that it reserves the right to reject any student who does not fit the same personal standards as are required of its regular staff. The University agrees to furnish the school with appropriate information about each student.

The public school agrees in turn to select carefully competent and experienced teachers as supervising teachers, giving priority in
assignment to those best qualified. The student, the college representative, and the public school representative will agree on each student's placement.

It is recognized that the classroom teacher will at all times, in terms of legal responsibility, retain the final authority for the classroom. A student teacher will not be left in charge without a certified teacher present until he has demonstrated competence and needs to teach alone as a learning experience. The student teacher will not be used as a substitute teacher except in cases of emergency, and only then when he has established competence to handle a class alone. There will be no remuneration for such emergency service.

The public school district agrees to provide the students assigned with necessary materials for instruction, including curriculum guides, textbooks, and expendable materials. It agrees to cooperate with the University representative in planning and developing a wide variety of experiences in which the student teacher can participate.

The supervising teacher and the college supervisor will cooperate in orienting each student teacher to the public school system. Student teachers will be expected to observe all policies, rules, and regulations established for the regular staff.

The college supervisor is expected to make a minimum of four visits to each student teacher. All contacts by supervisors will be made through officially approved channels. The supervising teacher and the college supervisor will jointly determine the final evaluation of the student teacher.

For the University: Dean, School of Education

For the School District: Superintendent (or authorized representative). (33)

This agreement was received by the public school superintendents in June, 1970, from the Dean, School of Education, Southwest Texas State University. These superintendents represented school districts that had accepted student
teachers or had prospects for accepting student teachers from Southwest Texas State University. In the letter accom-
ppanying the agreement, Rogers stated,

Enclosed are three copies of a letter of agreement concerning student teachers, as worked out cooperatively by representatives of Southwest Texas State University and of the public school districts concerned.

If you approve the terms of this agreement, will you please sign all three copies, retaining the signed copy for your files and returning the other two to us, one for our files, and one for the Texas Education Agency. You may want to present this matter to your board before signing, as inferred in the third paragraph, but we would appreciate their return as early as is convenient.

At the same meeting, the required inservice program for supervising teachers was discussed. It was agreed that the initiative would be left to each district for arranging its own program, as would fit into its overall inservice plans. A minimum of one meeting at the beginning and one near the end of the semester was suggested. The University would then supplement this with its own meetings as necessary, but only with those teachers who were supervising its student teachers. In addition, the University, insofar as it is able, will furnish members of its staff as consultants to the district's program.

Although cooperation has always been satisfactory, we are looking forward to a marked improvement in student teaching as we work with you in carrying out this joint responsibility for its supervision (26).

The following is another example of the early agreements developed for the first year of implementation of Senate Bill 8:

Agreement for the Development of a Teacher Education Center for 1970-71

An agreement is herewith entered into by North Texas State University and _________
to develop one or more Teacher Education Centers within the schools operated by said school district, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Bill 8, passed by the 1969 Legislature of the State of Texas.

The following specific provisions are included in this agreement:

1. During 1970-71, the details of the Center or Centers are to be determined through cooperative effort of representatives of both the public school system and the University, with particular attention to be given to (a) the development of resources for excellent student teaching experiences, (b) the development of criteria and procedures for the selection and assignment of supervising teachers, and (c) the development of effective working relationships between the two institutions cooperating in teacher education.

2. Supervising teachers assigned during 1970-71 will be nominated by the school system on the basis of understandings shared with the University regarding the objectives of student teaching and the implications of these objectives for the supervising teacher's task. It is agreed that the University has the privilege of declining to have certain or all of its students placed with teachers whom it deems inappropriate for this service.

Whenever it has been possible, arrangements have been made to orient all interested teachers regarding the provisions of Senate Bill 8, the possibilities of partnership in a Teacher Education Center, the student teacher's objectives and needs, and the implied task of the supervising teacher. Every feasible effort has been made to provide additional technical instruction for those teachers who will host student teachers during 1970-1971 through both brief pre-service meetings and at least one additional meeting during the student's tenure in the school.

3. Efforts will be made during 1970-1971 to define special, enrichment opportunities for student teachers, and to develop procedures for providing these opportunities within the provisions of Senate Bill 8. Provisions will also be made during 1970-1971 for the cooperative determination of the use of the money made available by Senate Bill 8 for the partial defrayment of the school district's teacher education costs.
4. In those instances in which a school district cooperates with two or more colleges or universities, every effort will be made to develop Teacher Education Centers through the close coordination of all the institutions involved. In general, that institution placing more students in the schools of the school district will be expected to assume the initiative in achieving this coordination.

This agreement is made applicable to 1970-1971, and can be discontinued by either the public school district or the university. It is understood that the cooperative study of the teacher education partnership during this year will form the basis of a more detailed and comprehensive agreement for 1971-1972 and afterwards.

Signed: ___________________________  Dated______
for the Independent School District
Dated______

for North Texas State University (24).

The preceding agreements represent a general approach for the requirements of the interim policies for implementing Senate Bill 8. The following agreement represents a more detailed and specific approach for the in-service program.

PROPOSAL
for
IN-SERVICE PROGRAM IN STUDENT TEACHING
Fall, 1970

It is proposed that Texas Wesleyan College and the Independent School District conduct the following in-service program for public school cooperating teachers for the school year of 1970-71 to meet the requirements as set forth in the recently enacted public law commonly called the STUDENT TEACHING BILL and to improve the quality of the student teaching program at Texas Wesleyan College.
THE IN-SERVICE PLAN

I. There will be an initial orientation session for all cooperating teachers selected to receive student teachers for the Fall semester. This meeting will be on the college campus and will be a dinner meeting to which the cooperating teachers will be guests of the College. This meeting will be on Thursday evening preceding the Monday when student teachers are to report to the school. The meeting will be from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. At this session the information folders on student teachers will be given out and the student teacher will be introduced to cooperating teachers. They will have an opportunity to converse. The College supervisors will explain the student teaching program and discuss the evaluation instruments, grading and other requirements. A presentation will be given on using a student teacher so as to increase the effectiveness of the experience for both student teacher and the cooperating teacher. Each cooperating teacher will receive a personal evaluation to this meeting.

II. After the student teacher has been in the classroom for four weeks, a half-day in-service session for cooperating teachers will be held on the College campus. It will be conducted on the following pattern:

1:00-2:00 p.m.
Meetings in groups with each College Supervisor in a discussion centering on "I wish the College would . . . ." A chance to fire back at the College Supervisor and to discuss common problems.

2:00-2:20 p.m.
Informal coffee break (chance to set up any individual meetings with College Supervisor).

2:20-
Session involving one of the following:
A. Movie of "Marked for Failure" and "Summerhill" followed by a discussion
B. Presentation on "Interaction Analysis"
C. Presentation on "Human Relations in Supervision"
D. Critiqueing several video taped micro-teaching lessons
E. Group session doing the MASA exercise with group role feedback
F. Discussion of a short case study involving a student teacher
G. The self-fulfilling prophecy
   (The cooperating teachers will be polled to determine which activity would be preferred for the 2:20 session)

3:30

   Passing out of Evaluation sheets on the in-service session

It is recognized that this plan is for one year only and may be replaced subsequently if a plan is developed between all of the public schools and colleges in the North Texas Area.

Texas Wesleyan College For the Public School

The cooperative agreements that have been developed, implemented, and submitted to the Texas Education Agency for the school year 1970-71 and 1971-72 are a beginning, but much lies ahead in implementing the program of student teaching centers. Smith concluded:

The cooperative agreement from 1970-72 reflects an administrative level agreement to work together. The decisions made under these agreements have been mainly administrative in nature. We have not gone into what actually is the role of the supervising teacher in this emerging teacher education program. At the present it is mainly left up to individual college personnel involved that go out to the public schools. We have not raised the issue of establishing roles of university, public school, service center, and others.

Some public school people ask the college people, What do you expect of us? This is not assuming the role of partnership, and this is not what should happen in a partnership. The supervising teacher is looking to college people to tell them what to do. The supervising teacher
should know much about the teaching act and related activities and enter this relationship as a participating partner.

This has not been to any great extent any real state concentrated effort, at this point, that really gets at the roles of responsibility as well as roles of activity. A bona fide needs assessment program, properly conducted, will reveal a great number of teacher failures. They reveal needs of children that represent in some way teacher failure. Without putting fault or blame, we have not educated these children at a normal rate of growth. Education has failed and needs assessment will reveal this finding (31).

The cooperatively developed agreements should include the method for evaluating the program. Austin, in support of this, observed,

The agreement should have a built-in model to get at what the university is doing to insure that Senate Bill 8 is being implemented and also what the public school is doing to fulfill their requirement on the contractual relationships. If this evaluation does not occur, the agreement will probably become a piece of paper which neither party is doing anything to implement (2).

Lane suggested the following steps that may be included in the cooperative agreement for evaluation of the in-service program:

a. cooperatively developed needs assessments,
b. formulation of goals and objectives based on the needs assessments,
c. planning of activities dictated by the goals and objectives,
d. developing of cooperative measures to see if you are obtaining the goals and objectives that you wanted to achieve,
e. revisions and modifications (15).
Lane also listed the following guidelines for public schools and colleges in developing their relationships and roles in compliance with Senate Bill 8.

a. coming together as equal partners and as professionals with equal levels of responsibility and with equal kinds of competencies. The student-teacher center conceptual framework should provide the forum to help accomplish this goal.

b. enter this relationship with as few biases as possible and look objectively at what lies at the basis of this relationship.

c. provide flexibility to admit the weaknesses and strengths of this relationship.

d. develop a built-in model for evaluation.

e. identify cooperatively the public school building you can identify a concentration of supervising teachers to work with a concentration of student teachers to implement the student-teacher center concept.

Lane further stated that we need to allow for trial and error and the freedom to try a number of difficult approaches. Evolving from this will be a number of successful models that can be disseminated as examples or patterns of examples of what can be and has been accomplished through the student-teacher centers. This information can be broadly disseminated through education service centers and regional or area conferences (15).

One factor that has impeded the implementation of Senate Bill 8, both by public schools and colleges and universities, has been that the college personnel and public school personnel responsible for implementing this program do not have sufficient time to devote to this program. In regard to this, Austin stated,
We need to be held accountable to contract, both on the part of the college and the public schools, the personnel necessary to implement this program. The heavy loads of the professors in colleges makes it difficult to devote personnel necessary to implement the student-teacher center in the public schools. This is also true in private colleges and universities. The tasks implied in Senate Bill 8 will probably not be implemented until the administration in both the public schools and colleges or universities have delegated people with the time to do these tasks. These people want to do this responsibility, but it is a very difficult task under the present circumstances (2).

Some schools in Texas are attempting to commit the money and personnel to change the situation described by Austin in the preceding paragraph. According to Locke, the Fort Worth Independent School District this spring is implementing the student teacher centers in the elementary schools. Locke gave the following description of the program in the Fort Worth schools:

Bob Bain, a professor of elementary education from North Texas State University, spends two-thirds of his time in our student-teacher centers. Bain's salary for this time is shared by North Texas State University and the Fort Worth public schools. Bain works with a cluster of schools in the center, and he teaches some of his methods course and utilizes the student teaching center as a laboratory. Bain's role includes working with our total elementary staff development program. This involvement includes teaching extension courses, conducting workshops, and other related activities. Bain specifically is working with us in our open space concept schools, reading program, student contract project, and inductive instructional methods. Bain also works with student teachers from other colleges and universities besides North Texas State University.
Next fall we plan to implement this program we are developing with North Texas State University and include Texas Christian University and other institutions of higher learning. Next fall we also will expand this new concept to the secondary areas.

In the in-service agreements we are developing with area colleges and universities for this fall, we plan to include the following areas to make the agreement more specific and meaningful:
   a. define more definitive roles of all parties of the teaching student centers,
   b. detail the specific in-service meetings,
   c. develop ground rules for the ways the college coordinator will work with supervising teachers,
   d. common agreements on structure and planning of in-service,
   e. develop evaluation methods (16).

The Fort Worth public schools have also developed a Handbook for Supervising Teachers which includes the identification of the role of supervising teacher, college coordinator, and others who are involved in implementing Senate Bill 8. This handbook also includes the qualifications necessary for a supervising teacher. These qualifications are the following:

I. QUALIFICATIONS FOR SUPERVISING TEACHER
   A. Scholastic Requirements
      1. Valid Texas teaching certificate
      2. Continuing professional training
         a. College courses
         b. Workshops
         c. Travel which can be evaluated as having educational worth
      3. Attendance in either a workshop or college course in student teaching
         a. Orientation prior to supervision of student teaching
         b. Continuous in-service activities throughout the year—at least two sessions during supervision of student teaching period
B. Experience
1. On continuing contract with Fort Worth Independent School District
2. Current assignment to the subject or grade level of preceding year

C. Professional Attributes
1. Evidence of professional growth
2. Willingness to assume full responsibility for training future teachers
3. Loyalty to the teaching profession, to the school system, to the assigned school, and to the principal
4. Loyalty to students evidenced by teacher's not betraying confidential information
5. Loyalty to student teacher
6. Willingness to participate in extracurricular duties

D. Personal Characteristics
1. A reputation for being professional and ethical in conduct
2. Good rapport with fellow workers and students
3. Fairness and impartiality
4. Self-control
5. Optimistic attitude
6. Sense of humor
7. Understanding
8. Friendliness
9. Good Health
10. Neat appearance
11. Skill in communicating ideas
12. Emotional maturity

E. Classroom Performance
1. Understands learning processes
2. Creates an atmosphere for learning
3. Knows strengths and weaknesses of students and plans work on the basis of that knowledge
4. Pursues innovative ideas intelligently
5. Engenders friendliness and respect from students
6. Utilizes the assistance of a "second teacher" in the classroom (10, pp. 3-4).

The following process is used for selection of supervising teachers in the Fort Worth Public Schools:
1. The Director of Teacher Education shall
develop a master list of available super-
vising teachers. The master list shall be
compiled in the following manner.
   a. The Director of Teacher Education shall
      provide each classroom teacher with a
      copy of the qualifications of a super-
vising teacher.
   b. Any teacher who meets the qualifications
      set forth may volunteer his services as
      supervising teacher.
   c. Volunteers are then recommended by the
      principal and three fellow teachers.
      The volunteer selects the three teachers
      from among those who have worked closely
      with him in his school.
2. The Director of Teacher Education shall sub-
mit the master list for further recommenda-
tion to the following:
   a. Consultants in appropriate areas of in-
      struction
   b. The Teacher Education and Professional
      Standards Committee of the Fort Worth
      Classroom Teachers Association
   c. Coordinators of teacher education insti-
      tutions supplying the student teachers.
3. The master list will be updated each spring
by following the procedure used for compil-
ing the master list.
   a. The names of teachers who no longer
      fulfill the qualifications of superv-
vising teacher will be removed from the
      master list.
   b. Names will be added by following the
      procedure for selection (10, pp. 4-5).

The last screening before a supervising teacher is
approved for the list involves the Director of Teacher Edu-
cation for the Fort Worth Public Schools and the college
coordinator (16).

The Plainview Public Schools have developed a contract
that all supervising teachers must agree to and sign before
having a student teacher assigned to them. The contract
I have read the provisions set forth under Senate Bill 8, Student Practice Teaching, State of Texas, Sixty-First Legislature. (Quoted on the reverse side of this application form.)

Under the provisions of this Act, I wish to make application to become a Cooperating Teacher during the 19__-19__ school term.

CONTRACT

Under the conditions of this contract, I understand

(1) I am making myself available for the assignment of a student teacher during the fall semester and/or the spring semester.

(2) I am to receive the sum of two-hundred dollars ($200.00) as an added increment to my annual salary for serving as a supervising teacher.

As a supervising teacher, entrusted with the training and development of a future teacher, I pledge

(1) By example, demonstration, and encouragement to display and share the highest professional ethics exemplified by the teaching profession.

(2) To acquaint the student with the school, its personnel, and its policies.

(3) To familiarize the student with various classroom routines, student records, testing programs, resource materials, parent relationships, daily class planning, special duties and assignments.

(4) With the cooperation of the building principal and local school district, to supply each student teacher with needed teaching materials including daily plan book, teacher's editions of textbooks, course outlines, scope and sequence charts, lesson resource and audio visual materials, and other aids that will assist in student teacher development.

(5) To invite the student teacher to all professional and teacher inservice meetings that I attend.

(6) To cooperate with the assisting college professor in student teacher classroom activities, experiences, and evaluations as set forth in their handbook for student teachers.

(7) To spend needed time outside of regular classroom activities, to add to the student's teaching skills, creativity, and personality development conducive to good teaching.
(8) By example, to help the student teacher realize that a prerequisite to being a good teacher is to be first of all a person of discernment, concern, and understanding (25).

The preceding contract is an example of a part of the process of identification of the supervising teacher that the college or university and the public schools may develop as a part of the cooperative agreement. Several public schools and institutions of higher learning are considering making a contract for student teachers a part of their contractual agreement (27).

The University of Texas at El Paso and Ysleta Independent School District of East El Paso also have developed jointly a handbook to implement the programs instigated by Senate Bill 8. This handbook includes a discussion of the following headings:

1. The Student Teaching Program
   A. Legislation and Policies
   B. Student Teacher Objectives
   C. Student Teaching Programs
      1. List of Programs
      2. Program Requirements
      3. Descriptions of Programs
   D. New and Projected Programs and Innovations

2. Roles and Responsibilities
   A. The Student Teacher
   B. The Supervising Teacher
   C. The University Supervisor
   D. The Principal
   E. The University Coordinator
   F. The School District Consultant
   G. Questions and Answers

3. Student Teaching Resources
   A. Bibliographies
   B. Services Available
   C. Resource Personnel
This handbook is an example of the cooperative relationship that a university and a public school district have developed jointly under their cooperatively developed agreement.

The Houston Independent School District must develop cooperative agreements with ten colleges and universities. Day described the method used by Houston to develop these agreements. She stated,

For the school year 1971-72 the representatives of the Classroom Teachers Association, Texas State Teachers Association, Principals Association, and other public school representatives met with the college and university representatives on three separate occasions. The agreements from last year were used as a basis to develop the new cooperative agreements for student teaching centers. The major changes from the previous year were

1. Separate in-service meetings for elementary and secondary supervising teachers.
2. Subject matter in-service on secondary level were conducted in separate meetings.
3. The colleges selected different subject areas and elementary grade levels to coordinate the in-service progress.
4. Some in-service meetings were to be held on the college campuses.

The colleges and universities worked together with us in developing the criteria for being a supervising teacher before we planned our in-service. The major requirement for being a supervising teacher is three years of successful teaching experience (6).

In discussing the major difficulty that the Houston Independent School District has experienced in working with
area colleges and universities, Day felt that two were of major significance.

1. The colleges do not visit the public schools nearly enough to make the student teaching centers a meaningful project.
2. I do not approve of graduate students supervising student teachers, and several area colleges make this a practice (6).

The Dallas Independent School District, in cooperation with North Texas State University, East Texas State University, Southern Methodist University, Dallas Baptist College, and Bishop College, is involved in implementing six student teaching centers. Kieschnick described the program thus:

The cooperative agreements for the student teaching centers have been developed and implemented with the cooperation of all parties involved. Our Product Design Committee, made up of public school and college representatives, meets regularly to develop and implement plans for the student teaching centers. The centers will eventually have all the staff development from a cluster of possibly twenty schools. The in-service for the supervising teachers includes the needs of the community that surrounds the student teaching center. The in-service is a combination of the needs of the group as well as the needs of the student teachers and the supervising teachers. All three of these interests have an input into the design for the in-service.

The plan signed and sent to Austin to comply with the regulations of the Texas Education Agency is general in terms to allow flexibility in implementing our plans locally. These plans cannot be too specific because we are still developing the program.

The Dallas Independent School District now pays one half the salary of two college coordinators from Senate Bill 8 funds and other federal funding sources. We now have a full-time Student Teaching Center Coordinator in each of the centers representing Dallas schools. Also, next year we plan to have a full-time college coordinator in each of our centers.
The half-time we are buying of the college coordinator's time will be used in the total instructional program and teacher training of the teacher centers and portal schools (13).

Kieschnick also had suggestions for the college coordinators. She suggested,

1. College personnel involved in the student program should go to the field and talk to the public school people, talk to some community people, talk to some people who are outside their field who feel very keenly about teacher education. This experience would be an eye-opener initiation for college people. Through this method of discovery, they would have a foundation to build upon as they discover the school's real needs.

2. Then, after the establishment of needs assessment, priorities can be developed together. Goals have to be realistic and relevant to the student teaching centers.

3. There were problems in getting all parties to the agreements together to focus upon the priorities because each person had his own special interests. Also, each person had his own bias. There is a need to establish communications, keep the communication lines open, and disagree but still have responsiveness and cooperation (13).

Stephen F. Austin State University, the Tyler Independent School District, and the Region Seven Based Teacher Education Center are jointly planning a pilot cooperative teacher education center site for the school year 1972-73. This proposal, to be signed and submitted to the Texas Education Agency, has several sections which are similar to the plans of the Fort Worth Independent Schools and the Dallas Independent Schools. The cooperative agreement for the student teaching centers includes
1. the administrative structure—an organization chart,
2. a teacher center organization chart,
3. a stipulation for the payment of the college coordinators' salaries from public school funds and university funds,
4. recommended programs for the secondary professional block program,
5. a recommended program for the elementary practitioner,
6. suggested supervising teacher in-service training,
7. a job description for the Director of the Teacher Cooperative Education Center, Tyler, Texas, and
8. a recommended budget for the teacher center (34).

Austin commented that he believes the student teaching center at Tyler will be a genuine attempt to develop cooperatively, which is what Senate Bill 8 intended (2).

On December 5-7, 1971, a student teaching conference was held at the Villa Capri Motel in Austin specifically to discuss the design for student teaching centers for implementation in the fall of 1973 (28).

The student-teacher center plan has the following suggested outline:

I. Administrative Design for Center
II. Program Design for Student Teachers
III. Roles and Responsibilities
   A. College
B. Public School

IV. Criteria for Selection of Supervising Teachers

V. In-Service Improvement Plan for Supervising Teachers

A. Student Teacher

B. Program

C. Revision (28).

This outline was given as the topic for the educators at the Student Teaching Conference to discuss and to make detailed recommendations to be disseminated to all parties involved in teacher education in Texas. This outline represents the new guidelines developed by the Texas Education Agency.

Recommendations of the conference concerning the specific conduct of the cooperative agreements to be implemented in the fall of 1972 were as follows:

Criteria for Selection of Supervising Cooperating Teachers

The selection of supervising teachers will be accomplished through the combined efforts of professional organizations, school administration and university and college personnel.

1. Performance standards will be established for the evaluation of all components of student teacher programs. (This will be accomplished by all those indicated in initial statement.)

2. The supervising teacher will exhibit the following characteristics:
   a. A desire to accept responsibility of a student teacher.
   b. Demonstrate a history of continuing professional growth.
   c. Make a commitment to long term involvement in the student teacher program.
   d. Demonstrate professional commitment by active participation in professional organizations.
e. A commitment to actively engage in the cooperatively designed in-service programs.

f. A commitment to involve the student teacher in all facets of the planning-teaching-evaluation program. (This involvement should begin early in the student teaching experience.)

g. Be fully certified in the area(s) in which he is teaching.

h. Demonstrate an openness in his relationship with students.

i. Demonstrate a history of ability to implement new and innovative processes and programs.

j. Demonstrate a professional relationship with staff members that is in keeping with a professional code of ethics.

k. Be competent in those skills required of the student teacher.

Selection of College Supervisor

The criteria for selection of college supervisors would include all those stated for selection of the supervising teacher. Additional characteristics as stated in the following:

1. Recent classroom teaching experience.

2. A commitment to continually renew classroom teaching experiences.

3. Acquire or have experience in the area(s) in which he supervises.

4. Be a specialist in the area of student teacher activity.

5. Be competent in those teaching skills required of the student teacher and the supervising teacher as well as possessing those skills unique to working in a variety of learning and supervising situations.

Supervising Teacher In-Service

PREPARATORY STATEMENT: The institutions involved (college/university, public schools, education service centers, community, students) in the Student Teacher Centers be open, honest, and cooperative in all Teacher Education endeavors—both pre-service and in-service.
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. that the in-service education program for supervising teachers be cooperatively planned by all parties involved;

2. that a cooperatively developed handbook for student teachers be made available to both student teachers and supervising teachers that outlines the program of student teaching that should be incorporated into an in-service education program;

3. that student teachers participate in the in-service education programs of the district in which they are student teaching;

4. that portions of the in-service programs for supervising teachers and the student teaching programs be meshed in a meaningful way with the total professional development program of the district;

5. that in-service education programs be made available to prospective supervising teachers;

6. that an in-service education program be made available to first year supervising teachers; (the in-service education programs for prospective, first year, and experienced supervising teachers be held concurrently and separately as the need requires);

7. that in-service education programs be "building" oriented as well as district oriented and be based on teacher involvement (structured workshops--cooperatively planned);

8. that the supervising teacher in-service education program be a continuous program throughout the year ("building" oriented) as contrasted to a block system of in-service time at the beginning of the school year;

9. that the in-service education programs following the initial orientation aspects be problem oriented--these problems to be selected by the participants involved;

10. that the competencies of student teachers, supervising teachers, and university supervisors be cooperatively identified and that the in-service education program of the Student Teacher Centers be developed as to the identified competencies;

11. that an advisory board be formulated to consist of representatives from the school district administration, professional organizations (C.T.A., T.S.T.A., etc.), the college/university, student teachers, and the community to provide input into the supervising teacher in-service education program;
12. that wherein a school district works with several school districts in the student teaching program—the in-service programs should be coordinated.

Funds

Funds generated under S.B. 8 from the $50 per supervising teacher should be expended in a manner to implement S.B. 8 in order to improve student teaching by providing financial support for the Teacher Center Plan.

Each school district placing student teachers will be required to specify one person as a coordinator of student teaching/field experiences. Up to 20% of the above funds generated under S.B. 8 may be used for administrative and/or supporting salaries and services.

At least 80% of the $50 per student teacher which is allocated to the school district shall be spent for the in-service education of supervising teachers. This expenditure can be made for consultant services, programs, college tuition, in courses dealing with professional student teacher supervision, publications, and other expenses directly related to the professional development program for supervising teachers in their work with student teachers.

The Teacher Center should include the previous year's general expenditures as well as proposed general expenditures for the following year.

The primary expenditure of S.B. 8 funds should be for cooperative in-service programs for both supervising teachers and student teachers.

Some examples of such cooperative in-service programs directly related to the development of teaching and supervisory skills might include the following:

1. Equipment, materials and facilities not normally used in the instructional program;
2. Outside consultant fees;
3. Professional library for supervising teachers (including teacher's editions for each student teacher);
4. Expense of persons (related to the student teaching program) to attend professional conferences (28).
The preceding suggested criteria for the implementation of the new guidelines for the student teaching centers are general in nature, and these suggestions still allow for flexibility in developing the specific agreements as the particular situation warrants.

In summary, the public schools and colleges and universities are facing many new challenges in working together to design and implement the cooperative agreement for student teaching centers. This section attempted to give selected agreements, related materials, and information that are being developed to implement the requirements of Senate Bill 8 and the guidelines of the Texas Education Agency concerning this legislation.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


15. Lane, James, interview with, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas, March 17, 1972.

16. Locke, Carolyn, interview with, Fort Worth Public Schools Administration Building, Fort Worth, Texas, March 16, 1972.


18. McFarland, John W., interview with, Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas, January 20, 1972.


28. ________ and Tom Walker, leaders, seminar "Student Teaching Conference," Villa Capri Motel, Austin, Texas, December 5-7, 1971.


32. , Student Teaching—A Joint Responsibility, Canyon, Texas, West Texas State University, Press, 1961, p. 27.

33. Southwest Texas State University, letter of agreement from, San Marcos, Texas, June 7, 1970.

34. Stephen F. Austin State University, "A Proposal for a Pilot Cooperative Teacher Education Site" between Stephen F. Austin University, the Tyler Independent School District, and the Region Seven Based Teacher Education Center, Nacogdoches, Texas, the University, February 28, 1972.


36. Texas, Sixty-First Legislature, Senate Bill 8, codified as Article 2891d, Vernon's Civil Statutes.


39. Texas Wesleyan College, "Proposal: In-Service Program in Student Teaching," Fort Worth, Texas, the College, Fall, 1970.


CHAPTER III

COLLECTION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of the Texas Cooperative Student Teaching Program. The following procedures were designed to obtain appropriate data in (1) identification of the school districts which trained forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71, (2) construction of the initial survey questionnaire, (3) selection of a jury panel, (4) validation of the initial questionnaire, (5) construction of the final questionnaire, and (6) administration of the final questionnaire.

Identification of the School Districts Which Trained Forty or More Student Teachers During the School Year 1970-71

In order to identify the school districts which trained forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71, an examination of the records of the Texas Education Agency, Division of Finance, was conducted. All public school districts in Texas must have on file by April 1, an application with the Division of Finance of the Texas Education Agency which lists the names of the student teachers, supervising teachers, and totals for each category (1). An examination of these applications revealed that seventy-nine...
school districts trained forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71. A list was compiled that included the names of each of these school districts (Appendix A). Long distance telephone calls were placed to the school districts of the sample that did not identify the school administrator responsible for implementing Senate Bill 8 on the applications and records filed with the Texas Education Agency.

Construction of the Initial Survey Questionnaire

A review of the literature, a review of the cooperative agreement proposals, and consultation with college supervisors, public school administrators, supervising teachers, and Texas Education Agency personnel provided a basis for the content of the initial questionnaire. Using the accumulated information, a tentative questionnaire was developed to survey the public school administrators (Appendix D).

Selection of the Jury Panel

The jury panel was selected from educators who have had experience with the application and administration of Senate Bill 8. The six members (Appendix B) selected were three college professors, two public school administrators, and one Texas Education Agency administrator.

Each prospective jury member was contacted by telephone and requested to participate in the validation procedure.
The role of each in approving or disapproving the items on the questionnaire, based on clarity and appropriateness, was explained. Each agreed to participate and return his reply in ten days.

Validation of the Initial Questionnaire

The initial questionnaire of thirty items (Appendix E), a letter of instruction (Appendix C), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were sent to the jury panel to obtain their approval for validation of the individual items. Each judge was asked to consider whether or not each item would provide appropriate information and if each item was clearly stated. A validity response was provided in the left margin of the questionnaire. Numbers "1," "2," and "3" were typed in the margin preceding each item number. The members of the jury panel were asked to respond by circling the "1" if the question and responses were clearly stated and appropriate. If the jury member was undecided on an item, he was to circle the "2." If the item was unclear or considered inappropriate to the study, the jury member was asked to circle the "3."

A space was provided at the end of the questionnaire for the jury members to submit additions or corrections. Each jury member was requested to certify the acceptance of the questionnaire as complete or with noted exceptions. It was decided that acceptance of an item by four of the six members of the jury panel would constitute validity and justify inclusion in the final questionnaire.
Validation of the Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire (Appendix G) was constructed from the responses of the jury panel. Eighteen of the thirty items received unanimous approval. Eleven items received one "undecided" rating, and one item received an "unclear or inappropriate" rating.

Using the suggestions of the panel members, the following changes were made in the initial questionnaire: (1) forty-four word changes were made; (2) four question choices were revised; (3) a space for "others" and "additional comments and remarks" was added to some questions; and (4) any additional comments concerning Senate Bill 8 were added to the last page of the questionnaire. Upon completion of the suggested changes, the revised questionnaire (Appendix G) with a letter of instruction (Appendix F) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to each member of the jury panel. Each judge was again asked to consider whether or not each item would provide appropriate information and if each item was clearly stated. The same validity response rating system used in the first mailing was repeated in this second mailing. A space was again provided at the end of the questionnaire for the jury member to submit additions or corrections. Each jury member was requested to certify the acceptance of the instrument as complete or with noted exceptions. It was decided that acceptance of an item by four of the six members of the jury panel would constitute validity and justify inclusion in the final questionnaire.
Construction of the Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire (Appendix I) was constructed from the responses of the jury panel to the second mailing of the instrument. All items were ruled valid and included in the final questionnaire with no changes. No additions or deletions were recommended.

The questions were typed on six balanced pages (Appendix I). These were printed on an offset printer, and a pastel green paper stock was selected to provide an attractive, readily identifiable questionnaire. A cover letter (Appendix H) was also typed to introduce and explain the study. This questionnaire was used to survey all administrators who had been previously identified.

Administration of the Final Questionnaire

The validated survey questionnaire was administered to the superintendent, or his designated representative, of the seventy-nine school districts in Texas which trained forty or more student teachers during the school year of 1970-71. The cover letter (Appendix H) explained the purpose of the study and requested participation; a survey instrument (Appendix I) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to each of the seventy-nine schools in the sample. The superintendent or his designated representative was asked to respond by checking one or more choices to the survey question with the exception of question 18. Question 18 required a designated number.
The questionnaires were dated and identified by the district name and county as they were mailed. As they were returned, they were checked off a working list of the schools. These procedures resulted in a return of seventy-four usable questionnaires, or 94 percent. The first response by the school administrators provided a 76 percent return, and with one telephone reminder the response increased by 18 percent for a total of 94 percent return in twenty-five days. This return exceeded the approximately 70 percent that was considered acceptable by 24 percent.

As the questionnaires were received, the responses to each of the thirty items were manually recorded on columned data sheets. After the deadline for returning the questionnaires, the number of responses for each item were totaled. Percentages for each response were computed. The percentage of each response is reported in the thirty tables included in Chapter IV.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The findings presented here are the result of the survey questionnaire, "A Survey of the Impact of Senate Bill 8 (In-Service Section Only)." The thirty items in the survey questionnaire were designed to provide data from which answers could be concluded for the seven questions in the section, "Questions for Which Answers Will Be Sought." These questions were

I. Has the application of the law resulted in increased cost, maintenance, and service by local school districts?

II. Has it improved the competency of the supervising teacher by defining his role?

III. Has it resulted in improving the overall student teaching program?

IV. Has it facilitated better understanding between the public school supervising teacher and the college coordinator of student teachers?

V. Has it helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher?

VI. Has it improved communication between the college coordinator and the public school supervising teacher?
VII. Has the Texas Education Agency provided adequate leadership in developing and implementing the new student-teacher program?

The answer to Question I regarding increased cost, maintenance, and service by local school districts will be sought from data supplied by Items 1, 2, 18, 26, 27, 28, and 29 of the questionnaire. The degree to which Senate Bill 8 has resulted in improving the competencies of the supervising teacher raised in Question II will be concluded from data from Item 3 of the questionnaire. The answer to Question III regarding the improvement of the overall student teaching program will be sought from data supplied by Items 5, 15, 16, and 17 of the questionnaire. The answer to Question IV regarding facilitating better understanding between the public school supervising teacher and the college coordinator of student teachers will be answered by data from Items 4 and 21 of the questionnaire. Question V regarding clarifying and defining the task and function of the supervising teacher will be answered by data from Items 6, 8, 9, 10, 22, 23, 24, and 25 of the questionnaire. The answer to Question VI, regarding the improvement of communication between the college coordinator and the public school supervising teacher, will be concluded from the data provided by Items 7, 11, 12, and 30 of the questionnaire. The answer to Question VII regarding the Texas Education Agency leadership in developing and implementing the new student-teacher
program will be concluded from Items 13, 14, 19, and 20 of the questionnaire.

The data from each of the thirty items in the survey questionnaire are presented in a separate table. These data are presented in percentages of the sample for each possible answer. Any additional comments concerning Senate Bill 8 are reported at the end of the questionnaire.

Summary of the Response to the Study

The data presented in the tables in this section indicate answers in percentages of the sample. Also included are the additional comments and remarks listed by the respondents to the individual survey questions.

Survey questionnaires were sent to the seventy-nine school districts in Texas which trained forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71. The school districts in the sample trained a total of 12,247 student teachers, utilizing 8,226 supervising teachers, during the school year 1970-71.

A total of seventy-four schools responded to the questionnaire for a total response of 94 percent. This is well above the approximately 70 percent that was considered acceptable to provide appropriate data from which to draw conclusions relating to the questions posed by the study. The first response by the school administrators provided a 76-percent return, and with one telephone reminder, the response
increased by 18 percent for a total of 94 percent return in twenty-five days.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to the Application of the Law Resulting in Increased Cost, Maintenance, and Service by Local School Districts (Question I)

The data presented in this section represent the views of the superintendents or their designated representatives. The data presented in Table I indicate the action taken by school districts in planning, initiating, and implementing the continuing in-service improvement for supervising teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What action was taken by your school district in planning, initiating, and implementing the continuing in-service improvement for supervising teachers? (a) school staff effort, (b) contact college personnel, (c) staff meeting, (d) other, (Na) no answer.

The highest percentage of the schools indicated "contact college personnel" as their judgment of action taken, comprising 67 percent of the total sample. It is interesting to note that 70 percent of the sample indicated two or
more responses. The answer "school staff effort" was next highest, with 54 percent, and "other" last, with a 14-percent response. Some of the "other" reactions were (1) "joint school staff and college personnel planning," (2) "central office developed outline for orientation of supervising teachers," (3) "Senate Bill 8 in-service is a part of our teacher-education center project. We will be cooperatively planning with six universities and colleges," (4) "we have committee operation under Senate Bill 8 for Region Twenty involving college and local teacher association personnel," (5) "we implemented through Education Service Center Twenty an ad hoc committee comprised of a representative of each school and college or university; this committee plans through a joint effort all in-service," (6) "college personnel planned and conducted most sessions," (7) "survey of student teachers of their views on our program; supervising teacher furnishes my office the schedule of teaching assignment of student teacher comments," (8) "appointment of a committee of representatives from public school and university staffs," (9) "survey questions were sent to superintendents, assistant superintendents, cooperating colleges, and to each public school in the school district; their recommendations were considered," (10) "some teacher group meetings with college supervisors," (11) "periodical meeting with college supervisors," (12) "meeting with designated supervising teachers for orientation."
Table II reviews the judgment of superintendents as to added clerical and administrative personnel caused by administration of Senate Bill 8.

TABLE II

ADDED PERSONNEL CAUSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION OF SENATE BILL 8 (SURVEY ITEM 2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please check the item applicable to your district caused by the administration of Senate Bill 8 (in-service section only): (a) added clerical assistance, (b) added administrative personnel, (c) none, (d) other, (na) no answer.

The highest percentage of the schools indicated "none," representing 64 percent of the total sample. Twenty percent indicated "added clerical assistance"; 14 percent indicated "added administrative personnel"; and 9 percent indicated "other." Only 7 percent indicated more than one response in added personnel needed to implement the in-service program for supervising teachers.

The "other" responses included the following: (1) "Addition contract clerical help as needed--tasks were added to existing staff members." (2) "Increased work load for Director for Instruction." (3) "Assistant Superintendent for Instruction (me) got another job as all student teaching is coordinated through my office." (4) "No additional personnel added, and added responsibility of the personnel
office." (5) During 1970-71, I conducted four in-service meetings per week from February 1971-May 1971. Consultants were used for the school year 1971-72 to conduct workshops." (6) "Some added work on existing staff." (7) "More work for existing personnel—added time and responsibility in co-ordinating in-service training."

Table III reports Survey Item 18, data relating to the number of certified persons and secretarial and clerical persons normally provided for implementation of the continuing in-service program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please designate the number of staff members normally provided for implementation of the continuing in-service program: (a) number, full-time certified person, (b) number, secretarial and clerical person, (c) others (explain), (na) no answer.

The response "full-time certified person" was indicated by 51 percent; 26 percent indicated "secretarial and clerical person"; 24 percent indicated "other"; and 11 percent did not answer. Nine respondents indicated that both "full-time certified person" and "secretarial and clerical persons" were used as needed to implement the continuing in-service
program. The responses to "number, full-time certified person" indicated one-half person listed once, three-fourths person listed twice, one person listed fifteen times, two persons listed six times, three persons listed three times, four persons listed five times, five persons listed one time, six persons listed one time. In addition, under this category, 35 persons was listed once, 37 persons listed once, and 100 persons listed once. The "secretarial and clerical person" listed three-fourths person once; one person was listed thirteen times; two persons were listed once; three persons were listed once; four persons were listed once; ten persons were listed once; and eleven persons were listed once. Thirteen percent indicated more than one response to the number of staff members normally provided for implementation of the continuing in-service program. The "other" reactions included the following: (1) "All supervisors as needed." (2) "added to regular responsibilities of staff members employed in other capacities." (3) "Staff member of curriculum division devotes time needed to carry out program." (4) "All as needed." (5) "My secretary and one are 'it.'" (6) "Existing personnel--provided by college--none at local level." (7) "In-kind services provided when needed by district and university. Many different individuals have involvement." (8) "This year 1971-72 a consultant, his/her assistant and one principal have helped us conduct each workshop." (9) "All subject matter consultants assist."
(10) "All handled through assistant superintendent--curriculum and personnel and principals." (11) "All professionals are involved one way or another." (12) "Personnel director and secretary completed handbook and plans are made by personnel office." (13) "Assistant superintendent and five principals--all on a very limited basis time-wise." (14) "Combined college and public school personnel plus consultants--members change." (15) "The nine members of a joint advisory committee now being constituted." (16) "One administrator works with this program along with other duties. All staff members are involved to a lesser degree (planning mainly)." (17) "Part-time assignment for staff members of school district and colleges. We use curriculum director and principals." (18) "To this point, university personnel have conducted the program."

The data in Table IV report responses to Survey Item 27 covering the number of colleges and universities that supply student teachers.

**TABLE IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answers in Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How many colleges and universities supply you with student teachers? (a) one, (b) two, (c) three, (d) four, (e) five or more.
The highest response indicating the number of colleges was reported for "one" university, as indicated by 28 percent. Twenty-six percent of the sample indicated "two"; 20 percent indicated "four"; and 12 percent indicated "five or more." It is interesting to note that 12 percent of the public schools responding have a multi-college relationship in carrying out the mandates of Senate Bill 8.

Data provided in Table V report the responses to Survey Item 27, which indicates the school districts that cooperate with other school districts in consolidating the in-service program for supervising teachers.

TABLE V

COOPERATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CONSOLIDATING THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS (SURVEY ITEM 27)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Do you cooperate with other school districts in consolidating your in-service program for supervising teachers? (a) yes, (b) no, (na) no answer.

Seventy-seven percent of the sample indicated "no" cooperation with other school districts in consolidating the in-service program; while 22 percent indicated cooperation with other school districts. Remarks of the respondents to this question were as follows: (1) "We are working toward
this in the future through our region service center." (2) "We hope to do so in the future." (3) "Our in-service programs are sometimes too large to involve other districts. We shall be having our September, 1972 in-service at the local university which will consolidate approximately ten school districts' supervising teachers' in-service." (4) We plan to do this in 1972-73 school year."

Table VI reports responses to Survey Item 28, which asks how many school districts the local school cooperates with in the in-service program if the respondent indicated "yes" to Survey Item 27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you answered "yes" to question 27, how many school districts do you cooperate with in this program? (a) one, (b) two, (c) three, (d) more than three, (na) no answer.

Seventy-six percent indicated "no answer" regarding cooperation with other districts; 19 percent indicated "more than three"; and 5 percent indicated "three." One remark was listed which indicated that all districts which the local university serves with student teachers have a consolidated in-service program.
Table VII presents data on the extent to which the respondents feel that a cooperatively planned program of in-service with other districts could be implemented.

**TABLE VII**

**IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSOLIDATED IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS**

(SURVEY ITEM 29)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent do you feel that a cooperatively planned program of in-service with other school districts could be implemented in your area? (a) extensively, (b) moderately, (c) little, (d) none, (na) no answer.

Concerning the extent of cooperatively planned programs of in-service with other districts that could be implemented, 37 percent indicated "moderately"; 27 percent indicated "little"; 15 percent indicated "extensively"; 15 percent indicated "none"; and 8 percent gave no answer. The remarks of the respondents to Survey Item 29 were as follows: (1) "The area is rather sparsely populated." (2) "We've had enough coordination difficulties without adding more." (3) "At present, few other schools serve as student teaching centers in this area. Representatives of several local school districts met at the local university to decide on 'in-service' plans. A decision could not be reached at the meeting." (4) "This is being done successfully at our area university."
In summary, there seems to be some evidence of hardships and problems relating to the application of Senate Bill 8 in increased cost, maintenance, and service by local school districts. Thirty-four percent of the sample indicated additional clerical assistance and administrative personnel were needed to implement the in-service program for supervising teachers. Survey Item 18 indicates a more comprehensive analysis of how many staff members are needed to implement the program. The placement of student teachers by more than one university and the problems of developing consolidated school district in-service programs are two more added dimensions to the local school district's problems of implementing Senate Bill 8.

Data from Questionnaire Related to the Improvement of the Competencies of the Supervising Teacher by Defining His Role (Question II)

The data presented in Table VIII report the opinions of local school administrators designated the responsibility of implementing Senate Bill 8.

Regarding improvement of the competencies of supervising teachers, the highest response was reported for "fairly adequate," as indicated by 49 percent. Thirty-six percent of the sample indicated "undecided"; 9 percent indicated "other"; and 6 percent indicated "very adequate."

Some of the "other" reactions were the following: (1) "I would doubt that any improvements have been effected as
TABLE VIII

IMPROVEMENT OF THE COMPETENCIES OF THE SUPERVISING TEACHER
(SURVEY ITEM 3)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Has the in-service program improved the competencies of the supervising teacher in his working with student teachers? (a) very adequate, (b) fairly adequate, (c) undecided, (d) other, (na) no answer.

yet." (2) "No noticeable change." Among the comments were the following: (1) "This area is rapidly improving, but role identification for supervising teachers needs to be emphasized." (2) "We believe these sessions are beneficial, but we have limited feedback." (3) "No evaluation has been conducted at this time." (4) "We are recognizing improvements in this program." (5) "Some college supervisors hold in-service meetings in their teacher center (school where several student teachers are assigned) for a 'sharing' of problems, solutions, and innovative ideas." (6) "Beginning with the spring semester 1972, effort has been made to orient supervising teachers as to their roles and responsibilities." (7) "Need to continue to improve in this area." (8) "I believe the combination of experience plus the in-service are improving competencies in this area." (9) "I believe competencies will be improved." (10) "Needs marked improvement on role description." (11) "Agreement as to structure
and contract has not yet been reached." (12) "Teachers resist changing their way of doing things."

In summarizing the responses of the administrators, a majority think that defining the supervising teacher's role would be helpful in improving her competencies. The comments to Survey Item 2 add information regarding the problems relating to the role identification of supervising teachers.

Data from Questionnaire Related to Upgrading the Student Teaching Program (Question III)

The data presented in Table IX report the opinions of the respondents as to the extent the in-service program has upgraded the student teaching programs.

### TABLE IX

**UPGRADING THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM (SURVEY ITEM 5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent do you think the in-service program has upgraded the student teaching program in Texas? (a) much, (b) some, (c) little, (d) none, (e) undecided, (na) no answer.

"Some" was ranked first as the extent to which the respondents thought the in-service program has upgraded the student teaching program, as evidenced by a 56-percent
response of the total sample. Twenty-five percent indicated "little"; 9 per cent, "much"; 7 percent, "undecided"; and 3 percent, "none."

Table X reports data from Survey Item 15 which seeks to identify the extent to which the student-teacher center concept has been implemented.

TABLE X

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STUDENT-TEACHER CENTER CONCEPT
(SURVEY ITEM 15)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent has the student-teacher center concept been implemented in your school district? (a) extensive, (b) moderate, (c) little, (d) none, (na) no answer.

The extent to which the student-teacher center concept has been implemented was indicated as "moderate" by 41 percent of the survey group. Twenty-four percent indicated "little" implementation; 18 percent indicated "none"; and 16 percent indicated "extensive." Additional remarks include the following: (1) "Three centers are operational and three more are in the planning stage." (2) "This is answered with the definition of student-teacher center being a school within the district." (3) "We are presently working on a model which will bring about a well-organized student-teacher center." (4) "Steps are being actively taken to accomplish
this. A meeting has been initially scheduled for this purpose." (5) "Basic organization of the center is in progress." (6) "We are opening six centers this spring, also several portal schools." (7) "I am not certain I fully understand the teacher center concept." (8) "All colleges cooperating in assigning student teachers in our district are meeting soon for writing our plans for student-teacher centers."

Data provided in Table XI report the responses to Survey Item 16. This question explores the influence which the in-service improvement section has had on the achievement of a new and improved approach to the student teaching program.

**TABLE XI**

**NEW AND IMPROVED APPROACH TO THE STUDENT-TEACHER PROGRAM (SURVEY ITEM 16)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Has Senate Bill 8 (continuing in-service improvement section) influenced a new and improved approach to the student-teacher program in your schools? (a) creation and implementation of student-teacher center concept, (b) entire school district included as center, (c) others (list), (na) no answer.

The highest percentage of the schools (53 percent of the total sample) indicated "entire school district included as center" as the answer to the item concerning a new and improved approach to the student-teacher program. Twenty-four
percent indicated "creation and implementation of student-
teacher center concept"; 14 percent indicated "others"; and 9 percent did not answer. Among the "other" reactions were the following: (1) "We did this even before Senate Bill 8." (2) "Our school system has always been a student-teacher center." (3) "Nothing has been undertaken to this time re-
garding a student-teacher center." (4) "We may be headed for a county center operation." (5) "Several school dis-
tricts work together." (6) "Only in the beginning stages." (7) "Little change as a result of Senate Bill 8 on this question."

Table XII reports data from Survey Item 17 which seeks to find out the influence of the in-service improvement pro-
gram on the upgrading and improvement of the instructional program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE XII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVEMENT OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SURVEY ITEM 17)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of the Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Has the in-service improvement program influenced the upgrading and improvement of the instructional program? (a) much, (b) some, (c) little, (d) none, (e) undecided, (na) no answer.
Fifty-two percent of the sample schools indicated "some" as the response regarding the influence of the in-service improvement program on upgrading and improving the instructional program. Thirty-six percent of the respondents indicated "little"; 4 percent indicated "none"; 4 percent indicated "much"; 3 percent indicated "undecided"; and 1 percent gave no answer. The respondents added the following remarks to Survey Item 17: (1) "The limited time the program has been in force is not sufficient to make judgment." (2) "Too soon to tell; this should make significant differences in future." (3) "Necessarily so. Anything you stress awareness programs improve." (4) "Too soon to know; the 70 percent complicates everything." (5) "Some schools have conducted videotaping and critiquing. Results have been seen." (6) "I am observing student teacher, checking to be sure the supervising teacher is fulfilling her tasks, and having conferences with both."

In summary, data shown in Table IX indicate "some" as the extent to which the in-service program has upgraded the student teaching program. Table X shows that 41 percent of the schools indicated that their efforts toward implementing the student-teacher center concept have been "moderate." Table XI indicated that 53 percent of the survey sample use the "entire school district as center." Survey Item 17 indicates that 52 percent of the respondents feel that "some"
program as a result of the in-service improvement program. Many school administrators feel some improvements have resulted in the overall student teaching program but much effort lies ahead in reaching the quality desired.

Data from Questionnaire Related to Facilitating Better Understanding Between the Public School Supervising Teacher and the College Coordinator of Student Teachers (Question IV)

The data presented here deal with the influence of Senate Bill 8 on facilitating better understanding between the public school supervising teacher and the college coordinator of student teachers.

The data in Table XIII report responses to Survey Item 4 covering the degree of understanding and communication that exists between the supervising teacher and the college supervisor.

TABLE XIII

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE SUPERVISING TEACHER AND THE COLLEGE COORDINATOR (SURVEY ITEM 4)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Has the new in-service program helped to facilitate better understanding and communication between the supervising teacher and college supervisor? (a) very adequate, (b) fairly adequate, (c) inadequate, (d) undecided, (e) other, (na) no answer.
In response to the question concerning the developed communication between the supervising teacher and the college coordinator, 59 percent of the sample indicated "fairly adequate"; 16 percent indicated "very adequate"; 12 percent indicated "undecided"; 9 percent indicated "inadequate"; 3 percent indicated "other"; and 1 percent gave no answer. The "other" responses indicated (1) "the working relationship between supervising teacher and college supervisor has always been satisfactory" and (2) "no noticeable change brought about by the cooperatively developed in-service program." Comments on this question include the following: (1) "Rapid improvements are being made." (2) "Some college supervisors do not attend district in-service workshops nor do they conduct in-service for their supervising teachers in their respective teacher centers. Some college supervisors say they do not have time to visit teachers as often as there is a need." (3) "We have been most fortunate in this area in having excellent college supervision for the two past years." (4) "We have received little feedback on this question." (5) "Steadily improving." (6) "Steady progress being made the last two years."

Another aspect of developing understanding between the supervising teacher and the college coordinator is reviewed in Table XIV. The data in this table represent the responses by public school administrators of the sample schools to Survey Item 21. This question explores the relationship
that exists between the college and the public schools relating to the continuing in-service improvement program.

**TABLE XIV**

**THE RELATIONSHIP EXISTING BETWEEN THE COLLEGE AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS (SURVEY ITEM 21)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How would you describe the relationship that exists between college and public school relating to the continuing in-service improvement program? (a) entirely cooperative, (b) fairly cooperative, (c) some disagreement, (d) much disagreement, (na) no answer.*

Concerning the existing relationship between the college and the public schools, the highest response reported was "fairly cooperative," indicated by 47 percent. Forty-five percent of the sample indicated "entirely cooperative." Only 8 percent of the respondents indicated "some disagreement." The following explanations were given to supplement the respondent's opinion to Survey Item 21: (1) "The college director for student teaching has assumed leadership in planning in-service for our student teachers and supervising teachers. Funds from our district are allocated to the college for this purpose." (2) "The college people have assumed complete leadership of the in-service." (3) "The college and staff of the student teaching program plan in-
made by principals and teachers from each school in our district." (4) "Colleges feel that they should receive some funding for their share of the load of the in-service."
(5) "Little communication between us and the colleges."
(6) "The college handles this." (7) "Insufficient cooperation in developing this program with colleges."

In summary, 59 percent indicated that the new in-service program had helped fairly adequately to facilitate better understanding and communication between the supervising teacher and the college supervisor. In terms of describing the relationship that exists between college and public school, 45 percent indicated "entirely cooperative," and 47 percent indicated "fairly cooperative." The additional explanations given to supplement Survey Item 21 give insight into the cooperative relationships that exist between the public school supervising teacher and the college coordinator.

Data from Questionnaire Related to Helping Clarify and Define the Task and Function of the Supervising Teacher (Question V)

The data reported in this section detail the views of administrators of the sample schools relating to the in-service improvement program helping clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher. Table XV reports data relating to Survey Item 6.

Concerning the clarification of the task and function of the supervising teacher, 61 percent of the sample reported
TABLE XV
DEFINING THE TASK AND FUNCTION OF THE SUPERVISING TEACHER
(SURVEY ITEM 6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what degree has this new in-service program helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher? (a) extensive, (b) moderate, (c) little, (d) none, (na) no answer.

"moderate." Twenty-two percent indicated "little"; 16 percent indicated "extensive"; and 1 percent indicated "none."
The following explanations were given to supplement the response of the administrators: (1) "The answer will probably be 'extensive' to this question after we continue the in-service program for two or three more years." (2) "More task and function definition needed on supervising teacher." (3) "Teachers seem to understand their role better now." (4) "A manual compiled by our district has helped to clarify function of all involved." (5) "An in-service program was already in effect and the new law has not affected it appreciably." (6) "Greater recognition of both teacher and the program (i.e., more than teacher helper for nine weeks)." (7) "The in-service offers time for discussion among teachers and principals as to role description and responsibilities." (8) "Has not been implemented long enough to tell." (9) "In our case the colleges and universities probably for the first
time have begun to establish definitions jointly. This has made communication much easier." (10) "Many of the universities are not clear about themselves." (11) "This in-service has improved communication." (12) "Through conferences with college supervisor, I think teacher has been made aware of his role." (13) "Written guidelines have been jointly planned with some colleges." (14) "We have gone into a two-teacher approach." (15) "The in-service has helped the supervising teachers who attend the in-service meetings and the in-service has not helped supervising teachers who work totally independently." (16) "The in-service has given supervising teachers, college and administration a chance to define each other's roles." (17) "More emphasis has been placed on behavior objectives." (18) "The university furnishes a booklet on responsibilities of the supervising teacher. We are also working to improve the program through observation and conferences."

Table XVI presents data on determining if the $50.00 payment to the school district established in Senate Bill 8 has been used to help implement the in-service improvement program.

Concerning the utilization of the $50.00 payment for the in-service program, 59 percent of the schools indicated "yes"; 37 percent indicated "no"; and 4 percent gave no answer. A few respondents added remarks. Some of these were as follows: (1) "Ten dollars per teacher of the $50.00
TABLE XVI

UTILIZATION OF THE FIFTY DOLLAR PAYMENT TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS (SURVEY ITEM 8)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Has the $50.00 payment to the school district established in Senate Bill 8 been used in your school district to help implement the in-service improvement program? (a) yes, (b) no, (na) no answer.

is used for in-service and the $10.00 is paid to the college which handles this." (2) "This money has been used to provide a manual for instructions, facilities, meeting places, issue information--bulletins and programs--when needed." (3) "We use this money to hire a coordinator of student teachers." (4) "Consultants have been obtained for 1971-72. Videotaping equipment purchased and teachers were trained in operating the equipment." (5) "We use this money to print materials."

Table XVII reports data from Survey Item 9, which includes answers of the respondents who indicated "yes" to Survey Item 8. The respondents indicated the extent to which the $50.00 payment has been helpful in implementing the in-service improvement program.

Relating to the extent to which the $50.00 payment was helpful in implementing the in-service improvement program, 50 percent indicated "moderate"; 27 percent indicated "little";
TABLE XVII
EXTENT OF UTILIZATION OF THE FIFTY DOLLAR PAYMENT
(SURVEY ITEM 9)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you answered "yes" to question eight, what extent has the $50.00 payment been helpful in implementing the in-service improvement program? (a) extensive, (b) moderate, (c) little, (d) none, (na) no answer.

and 23 percent indicated "extensive." Some of the additional remarks on Survey Item 9 were as follows: (1) "We will use Senate Bill 8 funds directly for teacher training through the Teacher Education Center." (2) "We expect this to change to 'extensive' next year." (3) "How much can be done with $50.00?" (4) "We purchase materials, printing, personnel cost." (5) "All of the money is being spent directly for materials, equipment and in-service program except a small amount for extra clerical assistance that is necessary to implement the program."

Table XVIII reports data of the respondents who answered Survey Item 9. This question indicates the estimated amount of the $50.00 payment to the school district that is used to finance the in-service improvement program.

Thirty-two percent reported "$30.01 or more" for the amount of money spent on the in-service improvement program. Twenty-five percent each reported "less than $10.00" and
TABLE XVIII
AMOUNT OF MONEY USED IN THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAM
(SURVEY ITEM 10)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you answered "yes" to question eight, estimate the approximate amount of the $50.00 per supervising teacher supplementary payment to your district that is used to finance the in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8. (a) less than $10.00, (b) $10.01-$20.00, (c) $20.01-$30.00, (d) $30.01 or more, (na) no answer.

$10.01 to $20.00"; while 18 percent reported "$20.01-$30.00."

Two additional comments were (1) "This money used for administration and clerical," and (2) "Seven portable sets of videotaping equipment were purchased, eighteen in-service training sessions on the use of the equipment and six district-wide workshops were conducted during 1971-72."

Table XIX presents data from Survey Item 22 which explored the total time planned for the in-service improvement program during school year 1971-72.

Forty-nine percent of the sample indicated "two to five hours" for the total in-service planned. Thirty-four percent indicated "six to ten hours"; 7 percent, "eleven to fourteen hours"; 5 percent, "more than fourteen hours"; and 5 percent did not answer. One additional comment to Survey Item 22 was "Twenty-one hours have been planned, three workshops each semester of 3½ hours each and attendance optional."
TABLE XIX
TIME PLANNED FOR THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAM
(SURVEY ITEM 22)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is the total time planned for in-service of student teachers during school year 1971-72? (a) two to five hours, (b) six to ten hours, (c) eleven to fourteen hours, (d) more than fourteen hours, (na) no answer.

Table XX presents data collected by Survey Item 23, regarding the amount of in-service held prior to the first day of school. Forty-four percent of the sample schools indicated "two to five hours" of in-service prior to the first day of school. Thirty-five percent indicated "more than eight hours"; 14 percent gave no answer; and 7 percent indicated "six to eight hours." The following remarks were used to supplement responses: (1) "For employed personnel; only
occasionally do student teachers participate." (2) "We have no in-service before first day of school because our participation is not determined until after school starts." (3) "Some colleges meet with their supervising teachers prior to the starting of school, other colleges meet after the first week the students have been assigned buildings." (4) "The university makes all provisions for in-service."

Table XXI reports data from Survey Item 24, which queried administrators about separate orientations for beginning supervising teachers and experienced supervising teachers.

**TABLE XXI**

**SEPARATE ORIENTATION FOR BEGINNING AND EXPERIENCED SUPERVISING TEACHERS (SURVEY ITEM 24)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Do you have separate orientation for beginning supervising teachers and experienced supervising teachers? (a) yes, (b) no, (na) no answer.

Concerning separate orientation meetings for beginning and experienced supervising teachers, 65 percent of the sample schools indicated "no," and 35 percent indicated "yes." Among the remarks were the following: (1) "We plan to do this later." (2) "This is not a problem yet, but it soon will be." (3) "This is a very vital part of our in-service
initiating each semester. Then we also begin the meeting together." (4) "We will do this next year." (5) "Some colleges make provisions for separate meetings, others do not. The ten colleges cooperating in our district plan to make such provisions for 1972-73 as teachers have made the request on their survey." (6) "Conferences, staff meetings (individuals as well as groups)."

Table XXII reports data on schools that have separate orientations for elementary and secondary supervising teachers as indicated by answers to Survey Item 25.

**TABLE XXII**

**SEPARATE ORIENTATIONS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SUPERVISING TEACHERS (SURVEY ITEM 25)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Do you have separate orientations for elementary and secondary supervising teachers? (a) yes, (b) no, (na) no answer.*

Fifty-seven percent of the schools reported separate orientations, and 42 percent reported combined meetings. One percent gave no answer. Additional remarks were as follows: (1) "We did have separate meetings last year but not this year." (2) "The in-service program is conducted by the colleges and universities." (3) "We will do this in the future through our centers." (4) "Meet together for a portion and then separate into elementary and secondary."
In summary, the continuing in-service improvement program has begun to help clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher. Sixty-one percent of the sample indicated "moderate" in answer to Survey Item 6 which dealt with this question. Fifty-nine percent of the schools indicated the $50.00 payment to the school district was being used to implement the continuing in-service improvement program; and half of the sample that indicated "yes" to Survey Item 8 reported moderate success in utilization of the $50.00 for implementing the in-service. Thirty-two percent of those who answered "yes" to Survey Item 8 indicated that the schools spent $30.01 or more" in implementing the in-service for school year 1971-72. Answers to Survey Item 22 indicate that 49 percent of the sample spend "two to five hours" of total in-service for the school year 1971-72. Forty-four percent of the schools in Survey Item 23 indicate "two to five hours" of in-service before the first day of school. Sixty-five percent of the schools indicate separate orientation for beginning supervising teachers and experienced supervising teachers in answer to Survey Item 24. Fifty-seven percent of the sample indicate separate orientation meetings for elementary and secondary teachers as reported in answer to Survey Item 25.

A review of the additional comments and remarks regarding each survey question reveals the unique feelings of several school administrators regarding the extent to which
the continuing in-service has helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher. In this section an analysis of the categorizing of the supervising teacher's in-service by beginning, secondary, and elementary levels is reviewed. This section also reviews the commitment of the school districts, both in time and money, to improve the competencies of the supervising teacher.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to the Improved Communications Between the College Coordinator and the Public School Supervising Teacher (Question VI)

The data presented in this section represent the views of school administrators, as reported on the survey questionnaire. Table XXIII presents data from Survey Item 7, which explored the degree of cooperation the public schools have experienced in dealing with the colleges in implementing the in-service program.

**TABLE XXIII**

**COOPERATION EXPERIENCED IN IMPLEMENTING THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAM (SURVEY ITEM 7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What degree of cooperation have you experienced in dealing with the colleges in implementing the in-service program? (a) much, (b) some, (c) little, (d) none, (e) undecided, (na) no answer.*
Concerning the cooperation that has been experienced with the colleges, 65 percent of the sample indicated "much"; 25 percent, "some"; while 8 percent indicated "little." One percent each indicated "none" and "undecided." Explanations of the respondents include the following: (1) "We have always had the best of cooperation with the colleges." (2) "During the school year 1971-72, some colleges have provided consultants for our workshops. All colleges have volunteered to conduct workshops for 1972-73." (3) "We deal primarily with only two universities and their directors of student teaching are most cooperative." (4) "We feel the college should offer more assistance and resource personnel." (5) "We are attempting to achieve direction and definition in cooperation with the colleges." (6) "This varies among colleges. All but one university helps us very little." (7) "Recent dabbling by university personnel in public school board politics has not improved long-standing mutual suspicions." (8) "Not much communication on this. We handle our part of in-service and college handles its part." (9) "The things that have been done have been well done by the universities." (10) "We have always had more than adequate cooperation from our colleges." (11) "One in-service per semester per college supervisor is given to teacher with whom he works." (12) "The colleges have done anything we asked." (13) "The willingness to bring about changes is very evident." (14) "The college people try to cooperate,
but they are overloaded and too busy to help as much as needed."

Table XXIV presents data collected by Survey Item 11, regarding the evaluation of the cooperatively developed in-service program.

**Table XXIV**

EVALUATION OF THE COOPERATIVELY DEVELOPED IN-SERVICE PROGRAM
(SURVEY ITEM 11)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is your evaluation of the cooperatively developed in-service improvement program agreement between the college and the public schools? (a) very efficient, (b) efficient, (c) inefficient, (na) no answer.

Sixty-five percent of the sample reported "efficient" concerning the evaluation of the in-service agreements; 26 percent reported "inefficient"; 7 percent reported "very efficient"; and 2 percent gave no answer. Additional remarks included the following: (1) "I would have to say inefficient even though some efforts have been made." (2) "The college and public schools seem to need more cooperatively developed in-service programs where college supervisors are available more frequently in the public schools to work with their teachers." (3) "It has made the agreement between the district and colleges more formal than in
previous years." (4) "We are still searching; progress has been made, but we have not reached anywhere near an optimum level."

Table XXV reports data collected by Survey Item 12, regarding the extent to which the college cooperated in developing the in-service improvement program agreements.

**TABLE XXV**

**COOPERATION EXPERIENCED WITH THE COLLEGES**

(SURVEY ITEM 12)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent has the college cooperated with you in developing the in-service improvement program agreement? (a) very adequate, (b) fairly adequate, (c) inadequate, (d) undecided, (e) other, (na) no answer.

Thirty-nine percent of the sample reported "fairly adequate" regarding the extent to which the colleges had cooperated in developing the in-service program. Thirty-six reported "very adequate"; 20 percent, "inadequate"; 4 percent, "other"; and 1 percent, "undecided." The "other" included the following: (1) "They have been most cooperative to plan district-wide in-service and workshops. There seems to be a need for individual teacher center planning and participation." (2) "I am sure the colleges feel we are cooperating with them." (3) "Helping with booklets, conferences,
staff meetings, and scheduling assignments for student teachers." (4) "Some colleges help us extensively, others hardly at all."

Table XXVI presents data collected by Survey Item 30, regarding the method by which supervising teachers are selected.

TABLE XXVI

SELECTION OF SUPERVISING TEACHERS  
(SURVEY ITEM 30)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How are supervising teachers selected in your district? (a) by principals, (b) by principals and consultants or supervisors, (c) by college and principal, (d) by principal and other administrative personnel, (e) other, (na) no answer.

Concerning the method by which supervising teachers are selected, 39 percent of the schools indicated "by principal and other administrative personnel"; 32 percent, "by principal and consultants, or supervisors"; 20 percent, "other"; 19 percent, "by college and principal"; 15 percent, "by principal"; and 1 percent gave no answer. Twelve percent indicated more than one choice to Survey Item 30. The "others" included the following: (1) "By application of teachers and demand by student teacher number." (2) "The teacher consultation committee recommends criteria for the
selection of supervising teachers." (3) "Teacher makes application." (4) "Principal and teacher request." (5) "All school and college personnel are involved at various levels of selection." (6) "By principals, college representatives, and administration personnel." (7) "Principals, other administrative personnel and colleges." (8) "By Director of Instruction." (9) "Teacher requests, principal approves or disapproves, coordinator of instruction sends the names to college." (10) "Principals may recommend teachers who indicate a desire to participate. Recommendations are screened by director, consultant, and teacher training personnel." (11) "By principal, college supervisor, and personnel director." (12) "Principal, central instructional personnel and university director of field experiences." (13) "Superintendent and assistant superintendent." (14) "By colleges and coordinator of instruction." (15) "Principals, peers, classroom teacher committee, consultants, college supervisors and director of teacher education." Additional remarks were as follows: (1) "We would not select a supervising teacher who was regarded as objectionable to the university. However, this has not been a problem." (2) "This list submitted to the central office prior to closing of school. Then when the assignments are made in the fall the colleges and universities have an opportunity to request a change if they do not approve of the supervising teacher." (3) "We are drawing new guidelines on this for next year."
"We are moving toward including supervisors in the selection process."  "Teacher makes application and principal screens applications."

In summary, some 65 percent of the school administrators indicated "much" cooperation in the relations with the colleges. Sixty-five percent of the sample reported the co-operatively developed in-service improvement agreement between the college and public schools to be "efficient." Thirty-nine percent indicated the extent to which the colleges have cooperated in developing the in-service as "fairly adequate." Only 19 percent indicated the supervising teachers are selected "by college and principal." However, the "other" category of Survey Item 30 did include college coordinators.

The results of this section revealed varied opinions of the school administrators toward the improvement of communication between the college coordinator and public school supervising teacher. The results of this section also indicate that the college coordinator is not extensively involved in the identification and selection process of supervising teachers. The comments and remarks given in this section added still other dimensions to the responses of the sample.
Data from the Questionnaire Related to the Leadership Provided by the Texas Education Agency in Developing and Implementing the New Student Teaching Program (Question VII)

The data presented in this section represent the views of school administrators concerning the Texas Education Agency providing adequate leadership in developing and implementing the new student-teacher program. Table XXVII presents data from Survey Item 13 regarding the evaluation of the administration of Senate Bill 8 on the state level by the Texas Education Agency.

**TABLE XXVII**

EVALUATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF SENATE BILL 8 BY THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY (SURVEY ITEM 13)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answers in Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is your evaluation of the administration of Senate Bill 8 on the state level by the Texas Education Agency personnel? (a) very efficient, (b) efficient, (c) inefficient, (na) no answer.

Only 15 percent of the sample schools indicated "inefficient" with regard to the administration of the bill by the Texas Education Agency. Sixty-five percent indicated "efficient"; 15 percent, "very efficient"; and 5 percent gave no answer. The following remarks were given to Survey Item 13: (1) "There has been little leadership exhibited by
T.E.A." (2) "It appears that administration of this bill will be greatly improved beginning with 1972-73 school year due to expenditure guidelines." (3) "No complaints other than there is some vagueness to new guides for a student teaching center." (4) "More definition as to what is a student teacher would help; this refers to all level certification which at this time puts us in a bind to meet 70-percent requirements." (5) "There has been a lack of clear cut guidelines, but this has permitted some flexibility in each district."

Table XXVIII reports data from Survey Item 14, regarding the type of conferences that need to be initiated on a regular schedule.

TABLE XXVIII

CONFERENCES NEEDED ON A REGULAR SCHEDULE
(SURVEY ITEM 14) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(na)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Which of the following conferences do you feel needs to be initiated on a regular schedule? (You may check more than one response.) (a) regional conferences on in-service improvement program, (b) state conferences on in-service improvement program, (c) local conference on in-service improvement program, (d) other (list), (na) no answer.

With regard to conferences needed on a regular schedule, 62 percent indicated "regional conferences on in-service
improvement program"; 57 percent wanted "local conference on in-service improvement program"; 41 percent indicated "state conference on in-service improvement program"; 5 percent replied "other"; and 1 percent gave no answer. Sixty-six percent of the school administrators gave two or more responses to Survey Item 14. The "others" include the following: (1) "There is no substance to the agreement." (2) "Especially a state conference." (3) "We have the regional programs in operation in Region Twenty." (4) "Although more direction and definition are needed, it should be basically initiated and planned at the local level."

Survey Item 19, as reported in Table XXIX, was added to elicit information relating to the needed sources of leadership, cooperation, and initiative to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8.

**TABLE XXIX**

INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF SENATE BILL 8
(SURVEY ITEM 19)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What action in your opinion would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8? (You may check more than one response.) (a) more leadership, coordination and initiative by Texas Education Agency, (b) more leadership, cooperation and initiative by colleges, (c) more leadership, cooperation and initiative by public school administrators, (d) others, (na) no answer.
Fifty-seven percent of the sample indicated that "more leadership, cooperation, and initiative by colleges" would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the in-service program, while 42 percent indicated "more leadership, cooperation, and initiative by the Texas Education Agency" was needed. Forty-five percent indicated "more leadership, cooperation, and initiative by public school administrators"; 8 percent replied "others"; and 7 percent did not answer. The other responses included the following: (1) "Continue planning at all levels." (2) "It would be to the local school's advantage to formulate their own program if we can have cooperation from university people." (3) "I feel that a majority of college personnel and school administrators do not have the time available to provide the needed leadership." (4) "We attempted to get help, but we still are at a loss." (5) "Roles should be more clearly defined by Texas Education Agency."

Table XXX reports data regarding questions pertaining to the required filing of the continuing in-service improvement program with the Texas Education Agency annually.

Sixty-six percent of the school administrators indicated "efficient and effective" concerning the present procedure for developing and submitting the required agreements to the Texas Education Agency. Only 15 percent indicated "inefficient," while 7 percent reported "very efficient." Twelve percent gave no answer. The remarks accompanying
TABLE XXX

EVALUATION OF PROCEDURES FOR APPROVAL OF THE STUDENT-TEACHER CENTERS (SURVEY ITEM 20)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is your evaluation of the present procedure for developing and submitting the required agreement for continuing in-service improvement program (student-teacher center) to Texas Education Agency by September 1 of each year? (a) very efficient and effective, (b) efficient and effective, (c) inefficient, (na) no answer.

Survey Item 20 were as follows: (1) "1972-73 will be better defined at the request of Texas Education Agency." (2) "This is an academic exercise." (3) "Follow-up and evaluation is needed." (4) "This is an assumption on my part since the cooperating university handles this procedure." (5) "The procedure as established by Texas Education Agency appears satisfactory. Local implementation of that procedure needs improvement."

In summary, some 65 percent of the sample indicated the Texas Education Agency is administering Senate Bill 8 efficiently, and 41 percent indicated state conferences are needed on implementation of the in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8. Forty-two percent indicated more leadership, cooperation, and initiative by the Texas Education Agency are needed to implement this program. Sixty-six percent of the school administrators evaluated the procedures
for developing and submitting the required agreement for continuing in-service as efficient and effective.

The following additional comments concerning Senate Bill 8 were given by the school administrators: (1) "I think that Senate Bill 8 has helped the quality of student teaching in our district. The teachers are being paid for their extra work and this has helped their enthusiasm." (2) "Roles and responsibilities should be re-defined. Consideration should be given to length of in-service meetings, especially to those teachers who have done supervising before." (3) "A great move in the right direction. Now we must move out of the interim period and nail down some exact criteria for a functional operation." (4) "Senate Bill 8 needs some re-interpretation." (5) "The 70 percent formula is difficult to administer. Should be $100.00 per semester. This bill needs amending!" (6) "I wish we could pro-rate the $200 and use more teachers as supervising teachers. In my opinion, this is the number one problem." (7) "The 70 percent factor causes more problems than it solves. $140 per cooperating teacher would be easier." (8) "Eliminate the 70 percent funding restriction and just pay each teacher $100.00 per student-teacher she supervises (not to exceed $200.00 during the school year.) This would give us more flexibility in scheduling student teachers." (9) "Give each teacher who supervises student teachers a set amount of money; delete the 70 percent." (10) "The concept of Senate Bill 8
is good, but implementation is poor." (11) "The placement of 'all level' music and physical education student teachers presents a problem sometimes in connection with the 70 percent maximum teacher usage." (12) "Most teachers prefer to have only one student-teacher per year even though this would mean less pay than the two now required." (13) "A revision to change the 70 percent quota to a fixed amount per student teacher would eliminate many problems of assignment and administration." (14) "We were receiving $60.00 per student teacher prior to Senate Bill 8. Now on an average we only receive $35.00 per student teacher. Actually this has been a loss in local revenue." (15) "Has affected us very little except for 70-30 percent."

In this chapter, a summary has been presented at the end of each section which details the findings on specific questions. Additional summary is presented in Chapter V in support of the answers to specific questions.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to analyze the effectiveness of the cooperative agreement section of Senate Bill 8 and its impact on the student teaching program in Texas. The purposes of the study were (1) to analyze the data available from the Texas Education Agency concerning the cooperatively developed in-service improvement program for supervising teachers, (2) to survey the public school personnel charged with the responsibility of developing and implementing section three of Senate Bill 8 in order to determine the effectiveness of this bill, and (3) to interview college personnel who are involved in developing and implementing section three of Senate Bill 8.

The review of literature and supplemental data has been presented in the following sequence: (1) the historical background leading to the passage and enactment of Senate Bill 8; (2) related state, regional, and national programs; (3) current views of college professors, public school personnel, and Texas Education Agency personnel on Senate Bill 8; and (4) data from selected cooperative agreements for student teaching centers and related materials.
In order to identify the school districts in Texas that trained forty or more student teachers, a review of the files of the Division of Finance of the Texas Education Agency was conducted. This review revealed that seventy-nine school districts trained forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71. Long distance telephone calls were placed to the school districts in the sample that did not identify the school administrator responsible for implementing Senate Bill 8 on the application and records filed with the Texas Education Agency.

A questionnaire which contained thirty items was developed to survey the impact of Senate Bill 8 (in-service section only). This instrument was validated and mailed to the public school administrators along with a letter requesting participation in the study. This procedure resulted in a return of 94 percent in twenty-five days.

In the presentation of the findings, Chapter IV, tables were utilized to report data which accumulated from the survey questionnaire. These data were presented by the percentages of each answer.

Findings

To carry out the purpose of this study, seven questions were formulated. The questions have been answered here and reviewed in terms of the findings in Chapter IV.
I. Has the application of the law resulted in increased cost, maintenance, and service by local school districts?

There seems to be some evidence in the data of hardships and problems relating to application of Senate Bill 8 in increased cost, maintenance, and service by local school districts. Approximately one-third of the administrators indicated additional clerical assistance and administrative personnel were needed to implement the in-service program for supervising teachers. The placement of student teachers by more than one university and the problems of developing consolidated school district in-service programs are two more dimensions to the local school district's problems of implementing Senate Bill 8. Approximately three-fourths of the sample indicated that two or more universities supply student teachers, and about one-fifth indicated consolidated in-service programs for supervising teachers were being implemented.

II. Has it improved the competency of the supervising teacher by defining his role?

One-half of the administrators indicated "fairly adequate" as the extent to which the in-service program has improved the competencies of the supervising teacher in his working with student teachers. Approximately one-third indicated "undecided" on this question. A majority think improvement can be made in improving the competencies of the
supervising teacher. Only 6 percent indicated "very adequate" to this question.

III. Has it resulted in improving the overall student teaching program?

Senate Bill 8 did exert positive impact on improving the overall student teaching program. Slightly over one-half of the sample school administrators who responded indicated "some" as the extent to which the in-service program has upgraded the student teaching program. Forty-one percent of the schools indicated "moderately" in their efforts toward implementing the student-teacher concept. Fifty-three percent of the survey sample use the "entire school district as centers." The upgrading and improvement of the instructional program received 52 percent response, as indicated by "some."

IV. Has it facilitated better understanding between the public school supervising teacher and the college coordinator of student teachers?

The data support that there has been an improvement of understanding and communication between the supervising teacher and the college supervisor. Fifty-nine percent indicated "fairly adequate" and 16 percent indicated "very adequate" as the extent to which the in-service program has aided in this relationship. In terms of describing the relationship that exists between the college and public
school, approximately one-half indicated "entirely cooperative" and one-half indicated "fairly cooperative."

V. Has it helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher?

Yes, the continuing in-service improvement program has begun to help clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher. Three-fourths of the administrators indicated "moderately" and "extensively" to this question. Fifty-nine percent of the schools indicated the $50 payment to the school district was being used to implement the continuing in-service improvement program, and half of the schools that use the $50 for in-service indicated moderate success in utilizing this money for implementing the in-service. Almost one-half of the sample spent "two to five hours" of total in-service for the school year 1971-72.

VI. Has it improved communication between the college coordinator and the public school supervising teacher?

Yes, the law did result in improved communication. Sixty-five percent of the school administrators indicated "much" cooperation in the relations with the colleges. Sixty-five percent of the sample reported as "efficient" the cooperatively developed in-service improvement agreement between the college and public schools. Thirty-nine percent of the sample reported "fairly adequate" as the extent to which the colleges have cooperated in developing the in-service. Only one-fifth indicated the supervising teachers
are selected "by college and principal"; however, the "other"
category included some college coordinator participation.

VII. Has the Texas Education Agency provided adequate
leadership in developing and implementing the new student
teaching program?

Yes, well over half of the sample indicated that the
Texas Education Agency is administering Senate Bill 8 effi-
ciently, and nearly one-half indicated state conferences are
needed on implementation of the in-service improvement sec-
tion of Senate Bill 8. Forty-two percent indicated more
leadership, cooperation, and initiative by the Texas Educa-
tion Agency are needed to improve this program. A majority
of the school administrators evaluated the procedure of
developing and submitting the required agreement of continu-
ing in-service as efficient and effective.

Conclusions

Within the limitation and scope of this study, and
based on an analysis of the preceding data, the following
conclusions are inferred:

1. The most frequent initial action taken by local
school districts in planning, initiating, and implementing
the continuing in-service improvement for supervising
teachers is to contact college personnel.

2. The implementation of Senate Bill 8 by local school
districts has resulted in added clerical and administrative
personnel.
3. The curriculum and instructional supervisory personnel of many school districts are being utilized to implement the in-service program for supervising teachers.

4. The placement of student teachers by more than one university and the problems of developing consolidated school district in-service programs appear to be two added dimensions to the local school district's problems of implementing Senate Bill 8.

5. There appears to be improvement of the competencies of the supervising teachers in working with student teachers as a result of the in-service program.

6. The in-service program appears to have upgraded the student teaching program.

7. The student-teacher center concept appears to have been implemented only moderately in local school districts.

8. A majority of school districts include the entire school district as student-teacher centers.

9. The in-service improvement program seems to be upgrading and improving the instructional programs of the school districts.

10. The in-service program appears to have helped facilitate better understanding and communication between the supervising teacher and the college supervisor.

11. Because of the in-service program, it appears the new program has helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher.
12. The $50 payment to the school district is being utilized in a majority of the school districts to help implement the in-service improvement program.

13. There appears to be too little time planned for in-service of supervising teachers.

14. Separate in-service meetings for beginning supervising teachers and experienced supervising teachers appear to be needed. Also separate meetings for secondary and elementary supervising teachers seem to be indicated.

15. A majority of local school administrators appear to be satisfied with the cooperation they have experienced with the colleges in implementing the in-service program.

16. The cooperatively developed in-service improvement program agreements between the college and public schools seem to be administered fairly adequately.

17. The college supervisors appear to need more involvement in selecting and identifying supervising teachers.

18. The public school administrators seem satisfied with the administration of Senate Bill 8 on the state level by the Texas Education Agency personnel.

19. It has been indicated that a need exists for state, regional, and local conferences on the in-service improvement programs.

20. To increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8, it appears that more leadership and cooperation need to be
initiated by the Texas Education Agency, colleges, and public school administrators.

21. Most public school administrators are satisfied with the present procedure of developing and submitting the required agreement for continuing in-service improvement programs (student-teacher center) to the Texas Education Agency by September 1 of each year.

The following conclusions are inferred from the survey of the literature and supplemental data:

1. The primary forces that supported the passage of Senate Bill 8 were local, district, and state divisions of the Texas State Teachers Association.

2. It appears that the intent of the legislation was that the public schools and colleges or universities be equal partners, and that this relationship may bring about greater team work, cooperation, and coordination among the parties.

3. Adequate supplies and equipment should be made available to student teachers assigned to student-teacher centers.

4. Role statements need to be developed cooperatively for supervising teachers, college coordinators, cooperating schools, colleges, and student-teacher centers.

5. Consideration may need to be given to maintaining an up-to-date professional library and curriculum laboratory
for the total faculty and student teachers of the student-
teacher centers.

6. The Texas Education Agency may want to consider
special allocation of textbooks and teacher manuals for
student-teacher centers.

7. It appears the 70 percent factor was added as an
amendment to Senate Bill 8 to help develop a corps of ex-
perienced supervising teachers and to avoid passing student
teachers from one supervising teacher to another.

8. Consideration may need to be given to developing
state certification for supervising teachers and college
supervisors of student teachers.

9. Consideration may need to be given to coordinating
and meshing other related state, regional, and national pro-
grams that may be evolving and developing that have a direct
relationship to Senate Bill 8.

10. Research may need to be initiated to develop a
viable model for cooperative planning and cooperative develop-
ment relating to Senate Bill 8.

11. The meaningful involvement of professional organiza-
tions in the implementation of Senate Bill 8 appears to be
needed in the future.

12. The guidelines that may be developed by the Texas
Education Agency in the future should be more refined but
flexible enough for creative development.
13. Consideration may need to be given to establishing a technical assistance support team from the agency who would be identified to work with regional and area institutional programs and problems relating to the student-teacher centers.

14. The problem of meaningfully including small school districts in an in-service agreement may need to be considered.

15. The competencies and role of the supervising teacher may not have changed considerably; however, there may now be an awareness that change and improvement will be implemented in the future student-teacher centers.

16. The public schools and colleges may need to develop more specific and comprehensive requirements for being supervising teachers. This procedure might include a written contract signed by the public school supervising teacher.

17. The public schools and colleges may need to consider designating personnel with enough time to perform the tasks involved in implementing the student-teacher centers in the public schools.

The following conclusions are inferred from the survey of the literature and supplemental data concerning the development of the in-service program for supervising teachers:
1. In the future, consideration may need to be given to individualizing the in-service program.

2. Joint in-service for multi-college relationships may be considered for supervising teachers and student teachers who are at different levels of development.

3. Supervising teachers and college personnel may find that developing handbooks cooperatively will be a meaningful in-service activity.

4. In determining the in-service program, the public schools and colleges may need to evaluate local needs and then determine the kind of in-service preparation program that is needed in that particular setting.

5. The in-service program may need to be developed and implemented cooperatively with input from all levels, including the supervising teachers, college coordinators, student teachers, public school and college administrative personnel, professional organizations, educational service centers, and the community.

6. The in-service program may need to be meshed into the total staff development program of the school district and the in-service program be building as well as district oriented.

7. In-service may need to be consolidated for school districts who train only a few student teachers.

8. The in-service program may need to have provisions that include a procedure for evaluating the progress of the program.
The following conclusions are inferred from the survey of the literature and supplemental data concerning the expenditure of the $50 per supervising teacher supplement to the local school districts for development of the in-service program:

1. Provisions may need to be made for an audit system to determine that this money is actually used on the student teaching program.

2. This money may be utilized by developing a handbook for the student teaching program by the school district and college or university.

3. Specifically, consideration may be given to purchasing teaching materials, library materials, audio-visual aids, program in-service materials, and consultant fees for the student-teacher centers.

4. The expenditure of the $50 may be itemized and budgeted in the agreement that is signed by the college and public school.

5. The student-teacher centers may need to consider including money in their budget to provide facilities for student teaching experiences in teacher education.

6. The Texas Education Agency guidelines on the use of the $50 may need to be explicit and not implicit.

The following conclusions are inferred from the survey of the literature and supplemental data concerning proposed
1. Consideration may need to be given to increasing the total amount of money. Two hundred and fifty dollars per supervising teacher for the specific job may not be enough money.

2. The 70-percent factor may need to be amended to allow for more flexibility.

3. Involvement of the professional organizations may need to be included in Senate Bill 8.

Implications

The following implications have been drawn:

1. The curriculum and instructional supervisory personnel of the public school districts should be utilized and involved in implementing the in-service program and student-teacher centers.

2. Consideration needs to be given to eliminating public school districts who have only a few student teachers each year unless these districts can be involved meaningfully in a consolidated in-service program.

3. The improvement of the competencies of the supervising teachers needs much attention in the future.

4. The student-teacher center concept will not be implemented satisfactorily unless the public schools, colleges or universities, and the Texas Education Agency cooperatively commit the resources and manpower necessary.
5. The cooperatively developed in-service agreements between the public schools and colleges have in the past been mainly administrative in nature. Unless the supervising teacher and the college coordinator are involved more meaningfully in the future, this situation will remain static.

6. The public schools and college personnel have not developed adequate criteria for cooperatively selecting and identifying supervising teachers.

7. There exists a great need for state, regional, and local conferences on implementing the in-service improvement programs and student-teacher center concept.

8. All parties to Senate Bill 8 need to demonstrate more leadership and cooperation in the future implementation of this program.

9. The in-service program for supervising teachers needs to be coordinated and meshed into the total staff development program of the public schools.

10. The Texas Education Agency needs to give careful study and consideration to the coordination and meshing of other related state, regional, and national programs with Senate Bill 8.

11. Each local agreement should include an evaluation procedure. The Texas Education Agency needs to help develop a viable model for cooperative planning and development relating to Senate Bill 8. This information needs to be
disseminated to local schools and colleges for utilization in implementing the student-teacher centers.

12. The in-service improvement programs for supervising teachers need to include the following criteria:

(a) The program needs to be individualized.
(b) Separate programs need to be developed for beginning and experienced supervising teachers.
(c) Separate programs need to be developed for elementary and secondary supervising teachers.
(d) The development of a handbook for the student-teacher center is a vital element in the in-service program.
(e) A needs assessment should be a component in determining the kind of in-service preparation program that is needed in the particular setting.
(f) The in-service improvement program should include meaningful input and involvement of all parties concerned. The professional organizations have not been included in the procedures in the past, and they should be included in the future plans.

13. The $50 per supervising teacher supplement to the local school should include the following arrangements:

(a) The school districts and colleges should be held accountable for spending this money on the student teaching program.
(b) The expenditure of this money should be itemized in a budget included in the cooperatively developed agreement between the public school and the college or university.

(c) The supervising teacher and college coordinator should have a meaningful role in determining the expenditure of this money.

14. Role statements for all parties of Senate Bill 8 are essential in developing and implementing the in-service improvement program.

15. The following changes are implied in amending Senate Bill 8:

(a) The total amount of $250 for each supervising teacher needs to be increased considerably if the tasks implied are implemented.

(b) The 70 percent factor needs to be amended if the program is to be successful. This requirement resulted in the administration of the program being inflexible and cumbersome.

(c) The failure to include professional organizations in the implementation of Senate Bill 8 has isolated a meaningful segment of educators in Texas. Steps need to be taken to insure the inclusion of this very important segment of teacher education.
Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon this study of the Texas Cooperative Student-Teacher Program, the following recommendations for future research are made:

1. It is recommended that a companion study be conducted using the Director of the Student Teacher in the colleges and universities of Texas as the population.

2. It is recommended that similar studies of the student teacher centers be conducted in states that appear to be developing legislation similar to Senate Bill 8.

3. It is recommended that future investigation be conducted to determine the extent of the implication of the student-teacher center in the future.

4. It is recommended that future investigation be conducted in developing a viable model for evaluating the activities mandated under Senate Bill 8.
APPENDIX A

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SAMPLE SCHOOLS
1971-72

Name of School District and Address Administrator

A. & M. Consolidated I. S. D. Mr. Fred Hopson
College Station, Texas 77840

Abilene I. S. D. Dr. Joe Starnes
Box 981
Abilene, Texas 79604

Alamo Heights I. S. D. Dr. William Stanley
7101 Broadway
San Antonio, Texas 78209

Aldine I. S. D. Mr. Kenneth Black
14910 Aldine-Westfield Road
Houston, Texas 77039

Alpine I. S. D. Mr. Elmer Grounds
Box 419
Alpine, Texas 79830

Amarillo I. S. D. Mr. Gene Minor
910 West 8th
Amarillo, Texas 79101

Arlington I. S. D. Mr. Charles Creer
1203 Pioneer Parkway
Arlington, Texas 76013

Austin I. S. D. Mr. Paul Kirky
6100 West Guadalupe
Austin, Texas 78752

Beaumont I. S. D. Miss Mary K. Baxter
Box 672
Beaumont, Texas 77704

Birdville I. S. D. Mr. Jack Binion
612 East Belknap Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76117
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brownwood I. S. D.</td>
<td>P. O. Box 730 Brownwood, Texas 76801</td>
<td>Mr. Travis Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan I. S. D.</td>
<td>2200 Villa Maria Road Bryan, Texas 77801</td>
<td>Dr. Cecil Nabors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon I. S. D.</td>
<td>Box 899 Canyon, Texas 79015</td>
<td>Mr. Jerry Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton-Farmers Branch I. S. D.</td>
<td>1711 1/2 Walnut Street Carrollton, Texas 75006</td>
<td>Mr. Kenneth Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Creek I. S. D.</td>
<td>Box 799 League City, Texas 77573</td>
<td>Mr. Andrew Papa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comal I. S. D.</td>
<td>1421 Highway 81 East New Braunfels, Texas 78130</td>
<td>Mr. Jim Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce I. S. D.</td>
<td>Box 1251 Commerce, Texas 75428</td>
<td>Mr. Norris Tanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conroe I. S. D.</td>
<td>Box 449 Conroe, Texas 77301</td>
<td>Mr. J. L. McCullough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi I. S. D.</td>
<td>Box 110 Corpus Christi, Texas 78403</td>
<td>Mr. Gene Bryant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Fairbanks I. S. D.</td>
<td>Box 40040 Houston, Texas 77040</td>
<td>Dr. Joe W. Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas I. S. D.</td>
<td>3700 Ross Avenue Dallas, Texas 75204</td>
<td>Mrs. Joy Babb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park I. S. D.</td>
<td>203 Ivy Deer Park, Texas 77536</td>
<td>Mr. James Risinger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Del Valle I. S. D.  
Del Valle, Texas 78617  
Mr. Edward Neal

Denton I. S. D.  
1205 University Drive West  
Denton, Texas 76201  
Mr. Bob Christian

Ector County I. S. D.  
Box 3912  
Odessa, Texas 79760  
Mr. F. D. Manny

Edinburg I. S. D.  
Edinburg, Texas 78539  
Mr. Winston Lassiter

El Paso I. S. D.  
Box 1710  
El Paso, Texas 79999  
Mr. K. Allen Johnson

Fort Worth I. S. D.  
3210 West Lancaster  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107  
Dr. Carolyn Locke

Galveston I. S. D.  
Box 660  
Galveston, Texas 77550  
Mr. Bedford McKenzie

Garland I. S. D.  
Box 128  
Garland, Texas 75040  
Dr. Robert Sewell

Georgetown I. S. D.  
1201 Church  
Georgetown, Texas 78626  
Mr. Terry Graham

Grand Prairie I. S. D.  
Box 1170  
Grand Prairie, Texas 75050  
Mr. Ervin Whitt

Greenville I. S. D.  
Box 1022  
Greenville, Texas 75401  
Mr. Wesley Martin

Harlandale I. S. D.  
102 Genevieve  
San Antonio, Texas 78214  
Mr. William Marshall
Hays Consolidated I. S. D.
Box 368
Kyle, Texas 78640

Henderson I. S. D.
501 Richardson
Henderson, Texas 75652

Houston I. S. D.
3830 Richmond
Houston, Texas 77027

Huntsville I. S. D.
Box 791
Huntsville, Texas 77340

Hurst-Euless-Bedford I. S. D.
121 A and Central Drive
Bedford, Texas 76021

Irving I. S. D.
900 O'Connor
Irving, Texas 75061

Kilgore I. S. D.
Box 1541
Kilgore, Texas 75662

Kingsville I. S. D.
Box 871
Kingsville, Texas 78363

La Vega I. S. D.
Box 4277
Bellmead Branch
Waco, Texas 76705

Lewisville I. S. D.
217 Main Street
Lewisville, Texas 75067

Lockhart I. S. D.
P. O. Box 120
Lockhart, Texas 78644

Mr. William M. Johnson
Mr. E. W. Adams
Mrs. Marie Day
Mr. Oscar Thorne
Mrs. Pat May
Dr. Joe Castley
Mr. Bill Brantley
Mr. John S. Gillett
Mr. Henry Cranfill
Mr. Barry Jackson
Mr. P. E. Gumm
Longview I. S. D.  
Box 3268  
Longview, Texas 75601

Mr. Elmer Buie

Lubbock I. S. D.  
1628 19th Street  
Lubbock, Texas 79401

Mr. Gordon Donnum

Lufkin I. S. D.  
Box 1407  
Lufkin, Texas 75901

Dr. Sam Slaydon

Marshall I. S. D.  
Box 879  
Marshall, Texas 75670

Mr. Truitt Ingram

McAllen I. S. D.  
110 South 10th  
McAllen, Texas 78501

Mr. Dwain King

Mesquite I. S. D.  
405 East Davis  
Mesquite, Texas 75149

Dr. Ralph Kerr

Nacogdoches I. S. D.  
Nacogdoches, Texas 75961

Mrs. Elizabeth Scott

Nederland I. S. D.  
Box 908  
Nederland, Texas 77627

Mr. Joe Fiedler

New Braunfels I. S. D.  
Box 1061  
New Braunfels, Texas 78130

Mr. O. J. Erlund

North East I. S. D.  
10214 Sommers Drive  
San Antonio, Texas 78214

Mr. Bobby J. Price

Northeast Houston I. S. D.  
Box 23278  
Houston, Texas 77028

Mr. L. B. Lohn

North Side I. S. D.  
5900 Evers Road  
San Antonio, Texas 78238

Mr. Homer Smith
Mr. Harvey Brown

Mr. Elmor Bondy

Mr. Bill Stanford

Mr. Jack Cockrell

Dr. George Thompson

Mr. Gilbert Massey

Mr. Jim Cox

Mr. W. N. Corder

Dr. James Nevins

Mr. Nick Garza

Mr. Yancy Yarbrough

Mr. Jack Gingrich
Sherman I. S. D.
Box 1156
Sherman, Texas 75090
Mr. Beryl Mackey

Spring Branch I. S. D.
955 Campbell Road
Houston, Texas 77020
Dr. John Moses

Stephenville I. S. D.
Box 453
Stephenville, Texas 76401
Mr. Ben Gilbert

Sulphur Springs I. S. D.
Box 276
Sulphur Springs, Texas 75482
Mr. Van Durham

Temple I. S. D.
Box 788
Temple, Texas 76501
Mr. W. C. Valigura

Tyler I. S. D.
Box 237
Tyler, Texas 75701
Dr. Dorothy Scott

Waco I. S. D.
Drawer 27
Waco, Texas 76703
Mr. Tom Ware

Waller I. S. D.
Box 315
Waller, Texas 77484
Mr. Herbert Schulz

Wichita Falls I. S. D.
Box 2329
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307
Dr. Bedford Furr

Ysleta I. S. D.
8445 Valespino
El Paso, Texas 79907
Miss Abbie Wafer
APPENDIX B

SIX-MEMBER JURY FOR THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Three College Professors

1. Dr. Allen J. Herndon  
   Chairman, Department of Education  
   University of Texas at Arlington  
   Arlington, Texas 76013  
   Telephone: AC 817  273-2592

2. Dr. Joe Mitchell  
   Professor of Education  
   Texas Wesleyan College  
   Fort Worth, Texas  
   Telephone: AC 817  534-0251

3. Mr. James Lane  
   Change Agent from Lamar University for the TTT Project  
   Texas Christian University  
   Fort Worth, Texas  
   Telephone: AC 817  926-2461 (extension 416789)

Two Public School Administrators

4. Dr. Carolyn Locke  
   Director for Teacher Education  
   Fort Worth Public Schools  
   3210 West Lancaster  
   Fort Worth, Texas  
   Telephone: AC 817  236-8311
5. Mrs. Joy Babb  
*Director for Student Teachers*  
*Dallas Independent School District*  
3700 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas  

*Telephone: AC 214 824-1620*

---

6. Mr. Tom Ryan  
*Chief Consultant, Division of Certification and Accreditation*  
*Texas Education Agency*  
201 East 11th Street  
Austin, Texas 78701  

*Telephone: 512 475-2721*
December 14, 1971

Dear

Your assistance is requested in establishing the validity of a survey questionnaire to be used as a part of a doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University. The dissertation is being done under the direction of Dr. Paul Smith, Professor, Division of Educational Leadership.

The study will involve a survey of factors influencing the implementations of the continuing in-service improvement for supervising teachers (Section 3) of Senate Bill 8. A validated questionnaire will be sent to the public school administrators of the school districts in Texas which had forty or more student teachers during the school year 1970-71.

As you react to the questionnaire, decide whether or not each of the 30 items will provide the researcher with needed information. If an item is appropriate and clear, circle the "1" in the left margin. If you are undecided, circle the "2". If the item is inappropriate or unclear, circle the "3". At the close of the questionnaire there is a place for your comments, corrections, and deletions. It is the researcher's intent that the final questionnaire be an efficient and effective instrument. Your assistance in this task is highly appreciated. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Charles Greer
Director for Personnel
Arlington Public Schools
1203 Pioneer Parkway
Arlington, Texas 76010

CG/mm
APPENDIX D

Survey Questionnaire

(Sample)

1. What action was taken by your school district in implementing the continuing in-service improvement for supervising teachers?
   a) School staff effort
   b) Contact College Personnel first
   c) Staff meeting
   d) Other (list)

2. Please check the applicable item to your district in administering Senate Bill 8 (in-service section only).
   a) added clerical assistance
   b) added administrative personnel
   c) none
   d) other (list)

3. Has the in-service program improved the competencies of the supervising teacher?
   a) very adequate
   b) fairly adequate
   c) undecided
   d) other

4. Has the new in-service improvement program helped to facilitate better understanding and communication between the supervising teacher and the college supervisor?
   a) very adequate
   b) fairly adequate
   c) inadequate
   d) undecided
   e) other

5. To what extent do you think the in-service improvement has upgraded teacher education in Texas?
   a) much
   b) some
   c) little
   d) none
6. To what degree has this new in-service program helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher?
   a) extensive
   b) moderate
   c) little
   d) none

7. To what degree of cooperation have you found in dealing with the colleges in implementing the in-service improvement program?
   a) much
   b) some
   c) little
   d) none
   e) undecided
   Remarks _______________________________________________________

8. Has the $50,00 payment to the school district established in Senate Bill 8 been used in your school district to help implement the in-service improvement program?
   a) yes
   b) no
   Remarks _______________________________________________________

9. To what extent has the $50.00 payment been helpful in implementing the in-service improvement program? This is applicable only if you answered yes to question number eight.
   a) extensive
   b) moderate
   c) little
   d) none
   Remarks _______________________________________________________

10. Estimate the approximate amount of the $50.00 per supervising teacher supplementary payment to your district that is used to finance the in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8.
    a) less than $10.00
    b) $10-$20
    c) $20-$30
    d) Other
11. What is your evaluation of the cooperatively developed in-service improvement program agreement between the college and the public schools?

a) very efficient
b) efficient
c) inefficient
Remarks

12. To what extent has the college cooperated with you in developing the in-service improvement program agreement?

a) very adequate
b) fairly adequate
c) inadequate
d) undecided
e) other

13. What is your evaluation of the administration of Senate Bill 8 on the state level by the Texas Education Agency personnel?

a) very efficient
b) efficient
c) inefficient
Remarks

14. Which of the following conferences do you feel needs to be initiated on a regular schedule?

a) Regional conference on in-service improvement program
b) State conference on in-service improvement program
c) Local conference on in-service improvement program
d) Other (list)

15. To what extent has the student teacher center concept been implemented in your school?

a) extensive
b) moderate
c) little
d) none
16. **Has Senate Bill 8 (continuing in-service improvement section) influenced a new and improved approach to the student teacher program in your schools?**

   a) Creation and implementation of student teacher center concept
   b) Entire school district included as center
   c) Others (list) ____________________________________________

17. **Has the in-service improvement program influenced the upgrading and improvement of the instructional program?**

   a) much
   b) some
   c) little
   d) none
   e) undecided

   Remarks __________________________________________________

18. **Please designate the number of staff members normally provided for implementation of the continuing in-service program.**

   a) full time certified persons___________
   b) secretarial and clerical persons________
   c) other (explain)_______________________

19. **What action in your opinion would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8?**

   (You may check more than one response.)

   a) more leadership and coordination and initiative by Texas Education Agency
   b) more leadership, cooperation and initiative by colleges
   c) more leadership, cooperation, and initiative by public school administrators
   d) others_____________________________

20. **What is your evaluation of the present procedure for developing and submitting the required agreements for continuing in-service improvement programs (student teacher center) to the T.E.A. by September 1 of each year?**

   a) very efficient and effective
   b) efficient and effective
   c) inefficient

   Remarks ____________________________________________
21. How would you describe the relationship that exists between college and public school relating to the continuing in-service improvement program?

a) entirely cooperative
b) fairly cooperative
c) some disagreement
d) much disagreement

Remarks

22. What is the total time planned for in-service of student teachers during school year 1971-72?

a) two to four hours
b) four to six hours
c) eight to ten hours
d) ten to twelve hours
e) more than twelve hours

23. How much in-service do you have prior to the first day of school?

a) two to four hours
b) four to six hours
c) six to eight hours
d) more than eight hours

24. Do you have separate orientations for beginning supervising teachers and experienced supervising teachers?

a) yes
b) no

Remarks

25. Do you have separate orientations for elementary and secondary supervising teachers?

a) yes
b) no

Remarks

26. How many colleges and universities supply you with student teachers?

a) one
b) two
c) three
d) four
e) five or more
27. Do you cooperate with other school districts in consolidating your in-service program for supervising teachers?
   a) yes
   b) no

28. If you answered yes to question 27, how many school districts do you cooperate with in this program?
   a) one
   b) two
   c) three
   d) more than three

29. To what extent do you feel that a cooperatively planned program of in-service with other school districts could be implemented in your area?
   a) extensively
   b) moderately
   c) little
   d) none

   Remarks

30. How are supervising teachers selected in your district?
   a) by Principal
   b) by Principal and consultants or supervisors
   c) by college and Principal
   d) by Principal and other administrative personnel
   e) other
APPENDIX E

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF SENATE BILL 8
(IN-SERVICE SECTION ONLY)

District Name _____________________________ County _____________________________

Instructions

Please check one or more of the choices to the survey questions. Additional space is provided for you to make additional comments and remarks.

Absolute anonymity is assured. No school will be identified by name, number or implication.

A report of the results of this study will be provided if desired.

VALIDITY RESPONSE*

1 2 3 1. What action was taken by your school district in implementing the continuing in-service improvement for supervising teachers?
   a) School staff effort
   b) Contact College Personnel first
   c) Staff meeting
   d) Other (list)

1 2 3 2. Please check the applicable item to your district in administering Senate Bill 8 (in-service section only).
   a) added clerical assistance
   b) added administrative personnel
   c) none
   d) other (list)

1 2 3 3. Has the in-service program improved the competencies of the supervising teacher?
   a) very adequate
   b) fairly adequate
   c) undecided
   d) other

Comments ________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
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4. Has the new in-service improvement program helped to facilitate better understanding and communication between the supervising teacher and the college supervisor?
   a) very adequate
   b) fairly adequate
   c) inadequate
   d) undecided
   e) other

Comments

5. To what extent do you think the in-service improvement has upgraded teacher education in Texas?
   a) much
   b) some
   c) little
   d) none
   e) undecided

Remarks

6. To what degree has this new in-service program helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher?
   a) extensive
   b) moderate
   c) little
   d) none

Please explain your answer:

7. To what degree of cooperation have you found in dealing with the colleges in implementing the in-service improvement program?
   a) much
   b) some
   c) little
   d) none
   e) undecided

Please explain your reason:
8. Has the $50.00 payment to the school district established in Senate Bill 8 been used in your school district to help implement the in-service improvement program?
   a) yes
   b) no

9. To what extent has the $50.00 payment been helpful in implementing the in-service improvement program? This is applicable only if you answered yes to question number eight.
   a) extensive
   b) moderate
   c) little
   d) none

10. Estimate the approximate amount of the $50.00 per supervising teacher supplementary payment to your district that is used to finance the in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8.
    a) less than $20.00
    b) $20.00 - $30.00
    c) $30.00 or more

11. What is your evaluation of the cooperatively developed in-service improvement program agreement between the college and the public schools?
    a) very efficient
    b) efficient
    c) inefficient

12. To what extent has the college cooperated with you in developing the in-service improvement program agreement?
    a) very adequate
    b) fairly adequate
    c) inadequate
    d) undecided
    e) other
123 13. What is your evaluation of the administration of Senate Bill 8 on the state level by the Texas Education Agency personnel?
   a) very efficient
   b) efficient
   c) inefficient
   Remarks

123 14. Which of the following conferences do you feel needs to be initiated on a regular schedule?
   a) regional conference on in-service improvement program
   b) state conference on in-service improvement program
   c) local conference on in-service improvement program
   d) other (list)

123 15. To what extent has the student teacher center concept been implemented in your school?
   a) extensive
   b) moderate
   c) little
   d) none
   Remarks

123 16. Has Senate Bill 8 (continuing in-service improvement section) influenced a new and improved approach to the student teacher program in your schools?
   a) creation and implementation of student teacher center concept
   b) entire school district included as center
   c) others (list)

123 17. Has the in-service improvement program influenced the upgrading and improvement of the instructional program?
   a) much
   b) some
   c) little
   d) none
   e) undecided
   Remarks
18. Please designate the number of staff members normally provided for implementation of the continuing in-service program.
   a) full time certified persons
   b) secretarial and clerical persons
   c) other (explain)

19. What action in your opinion would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8? (You may check more than one response.)
   a) more leadership and coordination and initiative by Texas Education Agency
   b) more leadership, cooperation and initiative by colleges
   c) more leadership, cooperation, and initiative by public school administrators
   d) others

20. What is your evaluation of the present procedure for developing and submitting the required agreements for continuing in-service improvement programs (student teacher center) to the T.E.A. by September 1 of each year?
   a) very efficient and effective
   b) efficient and effective
   c) inefficient
   Remarks

21. How would you describe the relationship that exists between college and public school relating to the continuing in-service improvement program?
   a) entirely cooperative
   b) fairly cooperative
   c) some disagreement
   d) much disagreement
   Please explain

22. What is the total time planned for in-service of student teachers during school year 1971-72?
   a) two to six hours
   b) six to ten hours
   c) ten to fourteen hours
   d) more than fourteen hours
   Remarks
23. How much in-service do you have prior to the first day of school?
   a) two to six hours
   b) six to eight hours
   c) more than eight hours
Remarks

24. Do you have separate orientations for beginning supervising teachers and experienced supervising teachers?
   a) yes
   b) no
Remarks
(If available, please enclose a copy of your in-service programs.)

25. Do you have separate orientations for elementary and secondary supervising teachers?
   a) yes
   b) no
Remarks
(If available, please enclose a copy of your in-service program.)

26. How many colleges and universities supply you with student teachers?
   a) one
   b) two
   c) three
   d) four
   e) five or more

27. Do you cooperate with other school districts in consolidating your in-service program for supervising teachers?
   a) yes
   b) no
Remarks

28. If you answered yes to question 27, how many school districts do you cooperate with in this program?
   a) one
   b) two
   c) three
   d) more than three
Remarks
29. To what extent do you feel that a cooperatively planned program of in-service with other school districts could be implemented in your area?
   _____a) extensively
   _____b) moderately
   _____c) little
   _____d) none

Remarks

30. How are supervising teachers selected in your district?
   _____a) by principal
   _____b) by principal and consultants or supervisors
   _____c) by college and principal
   _____d) by principal and other administrative personnel
   _____e) other

Would a report of the results of your evaluation project be available to this researcher?  Yes_______ No_______

Validity Study

After reading and responding to the validity of the items on the questionnaire, I find it complete with the following additions or corrections:

Signature
Date

(Use additional pages as needed)
January 7, 1972

Dear

Your assistance is again requested in establishing the validity of my survey questionnaire. I would like to thank you for your promptness and helpful suggestions on the first mailing. The suggestions have been incorporated into this second writing of the questionnaire, and I am seeking your final approval of all items prior to sending the questionnaire to the public school administrators.

At the suggestions of the jury the following changes were made:
1. Several changes in wording clarified certain questions.
2. Four questions choices were revised.
3. A space for "others", additional comments and remarks was added to some questions.
4. Additional comments concerning Senate Bill 8 were added to the last page of the questionnaire.

As you react to the questionnaire, decide whether or not each of the 30 items will provide the researcher with needed information. If an item is appropriate and clear, circle the "1" in the left margin. If you are undecided, circle the "2". If the item is inappropriate or unclear, circle the "3". At the close of the instrument there is a place for your comments, corrections, and deletions. It is the researcher's intent that the final questionnaire be an efficient and effective instrument.

Your assistance in returning the questionnaire within five days will enable me to mail the questionnaire by mid-January. Again, thank you for your time and expert help in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Charles Greer

CG/mm
Enclosures
APPENDIX G

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF SENATE BILL 8
(IN-SERVICE SECTION ONLY)

District Name
County

Instructions

Please check one or more of the choices to the survey questions. Additional space is provided for you to make additional comments and remarks.

Absolute anonymity is assured. No school will be identified by name, number or implication.

A report of the results of this study will be provided if desired.

ALIDITY RESPONSE*

2 3 1. What action was taken by your school district in planning, initiating, and implementing the continuing in-service improvement for supervising teachers?
   a) School staff effort
   b) Contact College Personnel
   c) Staff meeting
   d) Other (list)__________________________________________

2 3 2. Please check the item applicable to your district caused by the administration of Senate Bill 8 (in-service section only).
   a) added clerical assistance
   b) added administrative personnel
   c) none
   d) other (list)__________________________________________

2 3 3. Has the in-service program improved the competencies of the supervising teacher in his working with student teachers?
   a) very adequate
   b) fairly adequate
   c) undecided
   d) other ________________________________

Comments______________________________________________

2 3 4. Has the new in-service program helped to facilitate better understanding and communication between the supervising teacher and college supervisor?
   a) very adequate
   b) fairly adequate
   c) inadequate
   d) undecided
   e) other
2 3 5. To what extent do you think the in-service program has upgraded the student teaching programs in Texas?
    a) much
    b) some
    c) little
    d) none
    e) undecided

Remarks

2 3 6. To what degree has this new in-service program helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher?
    a) extensive
    b) moderate
    c) little
    d) none

Please explain your answer:

2 3 7. What degree of cooperation have you experienced in dealing with the colleges in implementing the in-service program?
    a) much
    b) some
    c) little
    d) none
    e) undecided

Please explain your reason:

2 3 8. Has the $50,00 payment to the school district established in Senate Bill 8 been used in your school district to help implement the in-service improvement program?
    a) yes
    b) no

Remarks

2 3 9. If you answered yes to question eight, what extent has the $50,00 payment been helpful in implementing the in-service improvement program?
    a) extensive
    b) moderate
    c) little
    d) none

Remarks
If you answered yes to question eight, estimate the approximate amount of the $50.00 per supervising teacher supplementary payment to your district that is used to finance the in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8.

   a) less than $10.00
   b) $10.01 - $20.00
   c) $20.01 - $30.00
   d) $30.01 or more

Comments:

What is your evaluation of the cooperatively developed in-service improvement program agreement between the college and the public schools?

   a) very efficient
   b) efficient
   c) inefficient

Remarks:

To what extent has the college cooperated with you in developing the in-service improvement program agreement?

   a) very adequate
   b) fairly adequate
   c) inadequate
   d) undecided
   e) other

What is your evaluation of the administration of Senate Bill 8 on the state level by the Texas Education Agency personnel?

   a) very efficient
   b) efficient
   c) inefficient

Remarks:

Which of the following conferences do you feel needs to be initiated on a regular schedule? (You may check more than one response.)

   a) regional conference on in-service improvement program
   b) state conference on in-service improvement program
   c) local conference on in-service improvement program
   d) other (list)
1 2 3 15. To what extent has the student teacher center concept been implemented in your school district?
   _____ a) extensive
   _____ b) moderate
   _____ c) little
   _____ d) none
Remarks

1 2 3 16. Has Senate Bill 8 (continuing in-service improvement section) influenced a new and improved approach to the student teacher program in your schools?
   _____ a) creation and implementation of student teacher center concept
   _____ b) entire school district included as center
   _____ c) others (list)

1 2 3 17. Has the in-service improvement program influenced the upgrading and improvement of the instructional program?
   _____ a) much
   _____ b) some
   _____ c) little
   _____ d) none
   _____ e) undecided
Remarks

1 2 3 18. Please designate the number of staff members normally provided for implementation of the continuing in-service program.
   _____ a) number, full time certified person
   _____ b) number, secretarial and clerical person
   _____ c) other (explain)

1 2 3 19. What action in your opinion would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8? (You may check more than one response.)
   _____ a) more leadership and coordination and initiative by Texas Education Agency
   _____ b) more leadership, cooperation and initiative by colleges
   _____ c) more leadership, cooperation, and initiative by public school administrators
   _____ d) others

23.20. What is your evaluation of the present procedure for developing and submitting the required agreements for continuing in-service improvement programs (student teacher center) to the T.E.A. by Sept. 1 of each year?
   _____a) very efficient and effective
   _____b) efficient and effective
   _____c) inefficient
Remarks

23.21. How would you describe the relationship that exists between college and public school relating to the continuing in-service improvement program?
   _____a) entirely cooperative
   _____b) fairly cooperative
   _____c) some disagreement
   _____d) much disagreement
Please explain

23.22. What is the total time planned for in-service of student teachers during school year 1971-72?
   _____a) two to five hours
   _____b) six to ten hours
   _____c) eleven to fourteen hours
   _____d) more than fourteen hours
Remarks

23.23. How much in-service do you have prior to the first day of school?
   _____a) two to five hours
   _____b) six to eight hours
   _____c) more than eight hours
Remarks

23.24. Do you have separate orientations for beginning supervising teachers and experienced supervising teachers?
   _____a) yes
   _____b) no
Remarks

(If available, please enclose a copy of your in-service programs.)

23.25. Do you have separate orientations for elementary and secondary supervising teachers?
23 26. How many colleges and universities supply you with student teachers?
   a) one
   b) two
   c) three
   d) four
   e) five or more

23 27. Do you cooperate with other school districts in consolidating your in-service program for supervising teachers?
   a) yes
   b) no

Remarks ____________________________

23 28. If you answered yes to question 27, how many school districts do you cooperate with in this program?
   a) one
   b) two
   c) three
   d) more than three

Remarks ____________________________

23 29. To what extent do you feel that a cooperatively planned program of in-service with other school districts could be implemented in your area?
   a) extensively
   b) moderately
   c) little
   d) none

Remarks ____________________________

23 30. How are supervising teachers selected in your district?
   a) by principal
   b) by principal and consultants or supervisors
   c) by college and principal
   d) by principal and other administrative personnel
   e) other __________________________

Any additional comments concerning Senate Bill 8 ____________________________
Validity Study

After reading and responding to the validity of the items on the questionnaire, I find it complete with the following additions or corrections:

Signature
Date

(Use additional pages as needed)
February 7, 1972

Dear Fellow Administrator:

Your help is requested in a study of factors influencing public school operations under the new student teacher program in Texas (Senate Bill 8). The study is being done as a part of a doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. Paul F. Smith, Division of Educational Leadership, North Texas State University. The questionnaire is being sent to all school districts which trained forty or more student teachers during school year 1970-71.

The identification requested on the questionnaire will enable me to maintain a check of the questionnaires as they are received. No school identification will be revealed by fact or implication.

If available, please enclose any handbooks or material you may have prepared concerning your student teaching program and the in-service program for your supervising teachers.

A response from each school administrator responsible for the student teaching program in his school district will be an important contribution to the study. The completion of the questionnaire should require no more than twenty minutes. Your consideration in returning the questionnaire to enable me to meet a February 23rd schedule will be most highly appreciated. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
APPENDIX I

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF SENATE BILL 8
(IN-SERVICE SECTION ONLY)

District Name

Instructions

Please check one or more of the choices to the survey questions. Additional space is provided for you to make additional comments and remarks.

Absolute anonymity is assured. No school will be identified by name, number or implication.

A report of the results of this study will be provided if desired.

1. What action was taken by your school district in planning, initiating, and implementing the continuing in-service improvement for supervising teachers?
   _____ a) School staff effort
   _____ b) Contact College Personnel
   _____ c) Staff meeting
   _____ d) Other (list)

2. Please check the item applicable to your district caused by the administration of Senate Bill 8 (in-service section only).
   _____ a) added clerical assistance
   _____ b) added administrative personnel
   _____ c) none
   _____ d) other (list)

3. Has the in-service program improved the competencies of the supervising teacher in his working with student teachers?
   _____ a) very adequate
   _____ b) fairly adequate
   _____ c) undecided
   _____ d) other
   Comments

4. Has the new in-service program helped to facilitate better understanding and communication between the supervising teacher and college supervisor?
   _____ a) very adequate
   _____ b) fairly adequate
   _____ c) inadequate
   _____ d) undecided
   _____ e) other
5. To what extent do you think the in-service program has upgraded the student teaching programs in Texas?
   a) much
   b) some
   c) little
   d) none
   e) undecided
Remarks

6. To what degree has this new in-service program helped clarify and define the task and function of the supervising teacher?
   a) extensive
   b) moderate
   c) little
   d) none
   Please explain your answer:

7. What degree of cooperation have you experienced in dealing with the colleges in implementing the in-service program?
   a) much
   b) some
   c) little
   d) none
   e) undecided
   Please explain your reason:

8. Has the $50.00 payment to the school district established in Senate Bill 8 been used in your school district to help implement the in-service improvement program?
   a) yes
   b) no
   Remarks

9. If you answered yes to question eight, what extent has the $50.00 payment been helpful in implementing the in-service improvement program?
   a) extensive
   b) moderate
   c) little
   d) none
   Remarks
10. If you answered yes to question eight, estimate the approximate amount of the $50.00 per supervising teacher supplementary payment to your district that is used to finance the in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8.
   a) less than $10.00
   b) $10.01 - $20.00
   c) $20.01 - $30.00
   d) $30.01 or more
   Comments

11. What is your evaluation of the cooperatively developed in-service improvement program agreement between the college and the public schools?
   a) very efficient
   b) efficient
   c) inefficient
   Remarks

12. To what extent has the college cooperated with you in developing the in-service improvement program agreement?
   a) very adequate
   b) fairly adequate
   c) inadequate
   d) undecided
   e) other

13. What is your evaluation of the administration of Senate Bill 8 on the state level by the Texas Education Agency personnel?
   a) very efficient
   b) efficient
   c) inefficient
   Remarks

14. Which of the following conferences do you feel needs to be initiated on a regular schedule? (You may check more than one response.)
   a) regional conference on in-service improvement program
   b) state conference on in-service improvement program
   c) local conference on in-service improvement program
   d) other (list)
15. To what extent has the student teacher center concept been implemented in your school district?
   a) extensive
   b) moderate
   c) little
   d) none

16. Has Senate Bill 8 (continuing in-service improvement section) influenced a new and improved approach to the student teacher program in your schools?
   a) creation and implementation of student teacher center concept.
   b) entire school district included as center
   c) others (list)

17. Has the in-service improvement program influenced the upgrading and improvement of the instructional program?
   a) much
   b) some
   c) little
   d) none
   e) undecided

18. Please designate the number of staff members normally provided for implementation of the continuing in-service program.
   a) number, full time certified person
   b) number, secretarial and clerical person
   c) other (explain)

19. What action in your opinion would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of in-service improvement section of Senate Bill 8? (You may check more than one response.)
   a) more leadership and coordination and initiative by Texas Education Agency
   b) more leadership, cooperation and initiative by colleges
   c) more leadership, cooperation, and initiative by public school administrators
   d) others
20. What is your evaluation of the present procedure for developing and submitting the required agreements for continuing in-service improvement programs (student teacher center) to the T.E.A. by Sept. 1 of each year?
   a) very efficient and effective
   b) efficient and effective
   c) inefficient

Remarks ____________________________________________________________

21. How would you describe the relationship that exists between college and public school relating to the continuing in-service improvement program?
   a) entirely cooperative
   b) fairly cooperative
   c) some disagreement
   d) much disagreement

Please explain _______________________________________________________

22. What is the total time planned for in-service of student teachers during school year 1971-72?
   a) two to five hours
   b) six to ten hours
   c) eleven to fourteen hours
   d) more than fourteen hours

Remarks ___________________________________________________________

23. How much in-service do you have prior to the first day of school?
   a) two to five hours
   b) six to eight hours
   c) more than eight hours

Remarks ___________________________________________________________

24. Do you have separate orientations for beginning supervising teachers and experienced supervising teachers?
   a) yes
   b) no

Remarks ___________________________________________________________

(If available, please enclose a copy of your in-service programs.)

25. Do you have separate orientations for elementary and secondary supervising teachers?
   a) yes
   b) no

Remarks ___________________________________________________________
26. How many colleges and universities supply you with student teachers?
   — a) one
   — b) two
   — c) three
   — d) four
   — e) five or more

27. Do you cooperate with other school districts in consolidating your in-service program for supervising teachers?
   — a) yes
   — b) no
   Remarks

28. If you answered yes to question 27, how many school districts do you cooperate with in this program?
   — a) one
   — b) two
   — c) three
   — d) more than three
   Remarks

29. To what extent do you feel that a cooperatively planned program of in-service with other school districts could be implemented in your area?
   — a) extensively
   — b) moderately
   — c) little
   — d) none
   Remarks

30. How are supervising teachers selected in your district?
   — a) by principal
   — b) by principal and consultants or supervisors
   — c) by college and principal
   — d) by principal and other administrative personnel
   — e) other

Any additional comments concerning Senate Bill 8
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