

379
N81
No, 5087

THE CONSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION OF A SCORE CARD
FOR EVALUATING THE FIELD WORK EXPERIENCE
IN RECREATION

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

John Avery Conner, Jr., B.S.

Denton, Texas

December, 1975

Conner, John A. Jr., The Construction and Evaluation of a Score Card For Evaluating the Field Work Experience in Recreation. Master of Science (Recreation), December, 1975, 69 pp., 3 tables, bibliography, 20 titles.

The problem of this investigation was the construction and evaluation of a score card for evaluating the field work experience in recreation. The instrument was constructed after studying nationally adopted accreditation standards, criteria, guidelines and evaluations of professional preparation programs.

This investigation concludes that of twenty-five items which made up the original instrument, twenty-four remained after two evaluations by a panel of experts. A method was developed to score the instrument according to maximum score and percentage compliance score for each section of the instrument.

It is the recommendation of this investigation that the score card be field tested and become part of a total score card for evaluating the professional preparation program in recreation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
III. PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY.	13
IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY.	18
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	25
APPENDIX A	27
APPENDIX B	41
APPENDIX C	54
BIBLIOGRAPHY	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. First Rating of Items By Panel of Experts	19
II. Second Rating of Items By Panel of Experts	23
III. Score Analysis of the Score Card For Evaluation of the Field Work Experience in Recreation	24

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The professional preparation program of any profession, including recreation, affects the very nature of that profession's growth and influence in society. A college cannot completely teach an individual to become a professional in the area of recreation. A college can furnish an individual with selected experiences that through past use have been shown more profitable than others. A college can point the way and give the individual tools with which to work in later years.

Considerable progress has been made in the development of formal education for recreation leaders in recent years. There were only five major colleges or universities offering the undergraduate degree in recreation education in 1937, whereas in 1951 this number had grown to approximately forty institutions (1). Seventy-two schools of higher learning in North America were conducting degree programs to meet all areas of recreation specialization in industrial, municipal, and therapeutic recreation by 1965 (4). The number of institutions reporting an undergraduate curriculum in recreation totaled one hundred three in 1967 (1). Today, the number

of undergraduate institutions offering professional preparation programs in recreation and/or park administration has grown to one hundred and sixty-seven (3).

Until the mid-nineteen sixties few of the educational institutions showed any great concern regarding the establishment of high program standards for the preparation of recreation personnel. Generally, valuable basic information and preparation in the skills areas of recreation were provided by these programs but little consideration was given to the overall programs of study (4). In 1937, a national conference on proposed programs in recreation was held at the University of Minnesota. The aim of this conference was to increase communication and understanding between educational institutions and professional organizations in recreation (1). These aims were further discussed at several national conferences and at many National Recreation Congress sessions. All of these conferences centered upon the many problems facing American colleges and universities establishing programs of professional preparation in recreation. Resulting accomplishments included the shaping of basic principles for curriculum development and definition of areas of study that are essential for quality in the professional preparation program (1).

The field work experience of a professional preparation program in recreation is the opportunity to relate theory to

practical application. Since the field work experience is usually the culmination of the professional preparation program in recreation, evaluation of this experience is critical to the success of the program. A score card for use in evaluation of the field work experience of undergraduate professional preparation programs in recreation does not exist and therefore such an instrument should be developed.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was the construction and evaluation of a score card for evaluating the field work experience in recreation.

Purposes of the Study

1. A score card for evaluating the field work experience of the undergraduate professional preparation program in recreation was constructed.
2. A panel of experts evaluated the score card.
3. Instructions to accompany the score card were developed.

Definition of Terms

Field Work Experience. The field work experience is an organized and supervised opportunity to relate theory to practical application.

Score Card. The score card is a printed form which provides specific weighted items and allows partial scores

to be awarded for partial compliance with the item or standards within the evaluative instrument.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, Jackson M., Annual Survey of Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculums in Recreation and Park Administration, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1967.
2. Butler, George D., Introduction to Community Recreation, 4th Edition, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967.
3. Directory of Professional Preparation Institutions, Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, (September, 1974), National Education Association Publication, Washington, D.C.
4. Fitzgerald, Gerald B., Leadership in Recreation, New York, Barnes & Company, 1951.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of the literature pertaining to evaluation of the field work experience in recreation revealed that one evaluation instrument is available as a portion of an overall evaluation of the professional preparation program in recreation. Related studies and publications were also reviewed to supply information concerning the development of this evaluation.

The First National Conference on the College Training of Recreation Leaders was held at the University of Minnesota in 1937 (5). The intent of the conference was to bring together the differing viewpoints toward professional preparation programs in recreation. The Conference was fundamental in first trying to focus on professional preparation. A second National Conference on College Training of Recreation Leaders was held at the University of North Carolina in 1939, and it served to crystalize the thinking of professionals in this area (9). Third and fourth conferences were held at New York University in 1941 and 1948 (1).

Improving the quality of leadership in recreation was the theme of the National Conference on Undergraduate

Professional Preparation in Health Education, Physical Education, and Recreation Education in December, 1948, at Jackson's Mill, West Virginia (1). Focusing on leadership, the conference attempted to bring together differing viewpoints. Unification of techniques being used in the professional preparation of recreation leaders was also discussed but no action was taken by the conference.

The first attempt to prepare criteria at the national level for evaluating professional preparation in Health Education, Physical Education and Recreation Education was completed in 1952 by a committee sponsored by the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (1). The evaluation criteria for these specialized areas were developed as a supplement to the general criteria used by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1).

The committee for the Improvement of Professional Preparation in Health Education, Physical Education and Recreation Education, and the Professional Education Section of the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation met in 1955 and prepared what each considered to be the minimum essentials in the areas of faculty, facilities, and curriculum for the professional preparation of recreation personnel (1). This led to the second Washington Conference on Professional Preparation of Recreation Personnel in

November, 1956, and a third in November, 1958 and together, they ultimately resulted in the publishing of a set of evaluative standards and guides for health education, physical education and recreation education in 1959 (1).

A National Conference on Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Health Education, Physical Education, and Recreation Education convened in 1962 and produced guidelines for teacher education programs. The participants also formed the Professional Preparation Panel to implement the guidelines and give attention to improvement of existing programs (6). In 1967, the panel suggested that the 1962 conference guidelines be revised. Finally, in 1972, the conference was held in New Orleans and the outcome was the publication of Professional Preparation in Dance, Physical Education, Recreation Education, Safety Education and School Health Education (8).

Heywood (7) used the National Recreation Education Accreditation Project Standards and Evaluative Criteria to evaluate the entire professional preparation program of Florida State University. The instrument used a "yes", "no", and "no opinion" answer system. Heywood reported that the Florida State recreation program was lacking in organization, administration and research.

Bookwalter (3) developed an instrument to evaluate undergraduate physical education professional preparation programs. His instrument entitled, A Score Card For

Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education, was published in 1962. Dollgener (4) utilized the first edition of the score card in his doctoral investigation which evaluated the professional preparation programs in physical education within fifteen institutions of higher learning in the state of Indiana in 1965. The investigation revealed that certain items within the first edition of the instrument were overlapping and nondiscriminating. Consequently, Bookwalter and Dollgener developed a revised score card in which two sub-areas and a number of items were eliminated from the original Bookwalter score card.

Steir (10) developed an instrument to accompany the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education. He found that of the seventeen investigations he reviewed, all used a score card to evaluate their programs in physical education. He developed an instrument using the three-hundred eighteen items of the Bookwalter-Dollgener card by re-wording each item into a question and using a point scale check system for each of the items. He administered this instrument in four selected colleges in South Dakota, and compared his scores with those gathered by Wray (12) using the Third Edition of the Bookwalter-Dollgener card. Wray evaluated the professional preparation programs in physical education in selected public and private colleges and universities in

South Dakota and North Dakota. Steir concluded that the reconstructed score card is administrable and that the difference between the scores will not be statistically significant.

The Baccalaureate Accreditation Schedule (2) of the California Park and Recreation Society used a three part survey tool to accredit schools which met the required standards set forth by the schedule. The schedule covers standards and interpretations for accreditation in recreation and parks, organization for the preparation of the accreditation schedules, and guidelines for the preparation of the self-study report using the accreditation schedule.

Van der Smissen (11) developed an Evaluation and Self-Study of Public Recreation and Park Agencies. Her guide was developed with standards and evaluative criteria for municipal recreation agencies, and covers the entire spectrum of municipal recreation.

The Guidelines for Professional Preparation Programs for Personnel Involved in Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped (5) was developed by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The guidelines cover the implications and ramifications for personnel responsible for preparing future leaders and teachers in the field of education and recreation for the handicapped.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, "Evaluative Standards and Guide in Health Education, Physical Education and Recreation," Washington, D.C., 1959.
2. Baccalaureate Accreditation Schedule, California Council on Parks and Recreation Accreditation, Fresno, California, 1970.
3. Bookwalter, Karl W., A Score Card For Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education, Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press, 1962.
4. Dollgener, Robert J., "A Critical Appraisal of a Selected Score Card for Evaluation of Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education," Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Indiana University, 1965.
5. First National Conference on the Training of Recreation Leaders, Minneapolis, Minn., Farnham Printing and Stationary Company, 1938.
6. Guidelines for Professional Preparation Programs for Personnel Involved in Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Washington, D.C., 1973.
7. Heywood, Carl, "Evaluation of the Professional Preparation Program in Recreation at Florida State University," Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Florida State University, 1968.
8. Professional Preparation in Dance, Physical Education, Recreation Education, Safety Education, and School Health Education, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Washington, D.C., 1974.

9. Second National Conference on the Training of Recreation Leaders, Minneapolis, Minn., Farnaham Printing and Stationary Company, 1959.
10. Steir, Jr., William, F., "The Development of an Instrument and Procedures to Accompany the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education," Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Indiana University, 1970.
11. Van der Smissen, Betty, An Evaluation and Self-Study of Public Recreation and Park Agencies, National Recreation and Park Association, Arlington, Virginia, 1972.
12. Wray, Beth, "Evaluation of the Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education in Selected Public and Private Colleges and Universities in South Dakota and North Dakota," Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The first step of this study was the construction of an instrument in the form of a questionnaire to evaluate the field work experience of the professional preparation program of colleges and universities offering the undergraduate degree in recreation. Construction of the instrument involved a study of the National Recreation Accreditation Project Standards and Evaluative Criteria (5), Professional Preparation in Dance, Physical Education, Recreation, Education, Safety Education, and School Health Education (7), Guidelines for Professional Preparation Programs for Personnel Involved in Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped (3), Baccalaureate Accreditation Schedule of the California Council of Parks and Recreation Accreditation (1), the "Education Resource Survey" conducted by the National Recreation and Parks Association (2) and An Evaluation and Self-Study of Public Recreation and Park Agencies (9). The field work experience portions of the above were analyzed and the items were selected from these.

The format of the score card was the same used by Steir (8) in his study of the development of an instrument to accompany the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card. This format was adopted because of the logical check scoring of weighted items. The proposed score card is found in Appendix A.

The second step was to send the instrument to a panel of five experts. The experts were derived from a list of names submitted by the authors of the required textbooks used in the recreation professional preparation program at North Texas State University. The list contained forty-five names submitted by ten authors. The authors were asked to submit names of knowledgeable experts in the field of recreation with special consideration given to the field work experience. The panel of experts was made up of those persons whose name was mentioned by the required textbook authors. The panelists selected were those experts whose names appeared twice on the listings submitted by the textbook authors. No expert's name appeared more than twice. Five experts' names appeared twice. The five experts selected were Joseph J. Bannon, Paul R. Brown, Douglas Sessoms, Allen Sapora and Louis Twardzik. They were then asked to score the score card using the Likert Attitude Scale (4) or item analysis for each question. The Likert Scale uses a five point scale of strongly agree (5), agree (4), no opinion (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1). Each item was

scored and the experts offered comments and/or criticisms of each. Upon return of the score card, each item was analyzed and scored according to the panel. Each had to be scored four or above by three of five experts to remain in the instrument. One of the five experts disqualified himself which modified the scoring, thus, requiring a score of four or above by three of four experts. The score card was then reconstructed and the appropriate questions omitted. The score card was sent back to the four experts and again scored. Upon return of the instrument, each item was re-analyzed and each item had to receive a score of four or above by four experts to remain in the instrument.

The third step was to develop procedures to accompany the score card. These procedures included a score analysis of the actual score derived from the score card in comparison to the possible total score. Score analysis of sections of the score card were then compared to the total score of that section.

Approval of the instrument was developed according to the panel of experts score of the instrument. Each of the items had to score four or above by all four experts to remain in the final instrument. Each item was scored and each item remained or was rejected according to the scores of the experts.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Baccalaureate Accreditation Schedule, California Council on Parks and Recreation Accreditation, Fresno, California, 1970.
2. Education Resource Survey, National Recreation and Parks Administration, Washington D.C., 1967.
3. Guidelines for Professional Preparation Programs for Personnel Involved in Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Washington D.C., 1973.
4. Likert, Rensis and Murphy, Garner, Public Opinion and the Individual, New York, Harper and Row Publishers, 1938.
5. National Recreation Education Accreditation Project Standards and Evaluative Criteria, National Education Accreditation Commission, Washington D.C., 1965.
6. Professional Preparation in Dance, Physical Education, Recreation Education, Safety Education and School Health Education, American Association of Health Physical Education, and Recreation, Washington D.C., 1974.
7. Professional Preparation in Dance, Physical Education, Recreation Education, Safety Education and School Health Education, American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Washington D.C., 1973.
8. Steir, Jr., William F., "The Development of an Instrument and Procedures to Accompany the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education," Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Indiana University, 1970.

9. Van der Smissen, Betty, An Evaluation and Self-Study of Public Recreation and Park Agencies. National Recreation and Park Association, Arlington, Virginia, 1972.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The authors of required textbooks used in the recreation professional preparation program at North Texas State University were asked to submit five names of knowledgeable recreation educators with special consideration given to the field work experience. From this list of forty-five names, a panel of experts was derived by the number of times their name appeared on the list. This panel was asked to score each of the twenty-five items of the score card according to their attitude from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Four of the five experts returned the score card completed according to instructions. Each item and sub-item had to receive a score of four or above by three of the five experts to be retained in the instrument. Table I includes the results of this initial judgment by the panel of experts. Each of the twenty-five items and sub-items were retained in the instrument in accordance with the initial judgments of the panel of experts.

The panel was asked to comment on and/or change the content of each item if so desired. All changes requested by the panel were incorporated in the revised score card and were entered as follows:

TABLE I
 FIRST RATING OF ITEMS BY
 PANEL OF EXPERTS

	Expert One	Expert Two	Expert Three	Expert Four	Expert Five
Item I					
A	5*	5	5	5	3*
B	4*	4	5	5	3
C	5	5	5	5	3
D	4	5	5	5	3
E	4	5	4	5	3
F	5	4	5	5	3
Item II					
A	5	5	5	5	3
Item III					
A	5	5	4	5	3
B	5	4	4	5	3
C	5	4*	5	5	3
D	5	2*	4	5	3
E	5	5	2	4	3
Item IV					
A	4	4	1*	5	3
B	4	4	2	4	3
C	5	5	5	5	3
D	4	2	4	5	3
Item V					
A	5	5	5	5	3
B	5	5	4	5	3
C	5	5	5	4	3
D	5	5	2	5	3
E	5	5	4	5	3
F	5	5	5	5	3
Item VI					
A	5	5	5	5	3
Item VII					
A	4	5	5	5	3
B	5	4	5	5	3

*5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-No Opinion, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree

Item I-B -- Original

Is there a written agreement between the school and cooperating agency?

Item I-B -- Revised

Is there a written agreement between the school and cooperating agency in accepting the student?

Item I-D -- Original

What is the total number of units required for the field work experience?

Item I-D -- Revised

What is the total number of semester hours required for the field work experience?

Item I-E -- Original

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Less than 220 clock hours.
 1 pt. (2) _____ Less than 240 clock hours.
 2 pts. (3) _____ Less than 260 clock hours.
 3 pts. (4) _____ Less than 280 clock hours.
 4 pts. (5) _____ 280 clock hours or more.

Item I-E -- Revised

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Less tha 220 clock hours.
 1 pt. (2) _____ 220-239 clock hours.
 2 pts. (3) _____ 240-259 clock hours.
 3 pts. (4) _____ 260-279 clock hours.
 4 pts. (5) _____ 280 clock hours or more.

Item II-A -- Original

- 3 pts. (4) _____ Students are consulted and the student, agency and school agree upon the placement.

Item II-A -- Revised

- 3 pts. (4) _____ Students are consulted and the student, agency and school agree upon the placement from an approved list of agencies.

Item III-B -- Original

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisor holds no degree.
 1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisor holds a degree but not in
 recreation.
 2 pts. (3) _____ Supervisor holds a degree in recreation.
 3 pts. (4) _____ Supervisor holds a Masters degree in
 recreation.
 4 pts. (5) _____ Supervisor holds a Masters degree in
 recreation and is certified at the state
 level.

Item III-B -- Revised

- 1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisors are required to hold a degree
 in a related field and/or five full years
 of recreation experience.
 2 pts. (3) _____ Supervisors are required to hold a degree
 in recreation.
 3 pts. (4) _____ Supervisors are required to hold a Masters
 degree in recreation.
 4 pts. (5) _____ Supervisors are required to hold a Masters
 degree in recreation and be certified at
 the state level.

Item IV-C -- Original

Does the school supervisor provide the agency with adequate information for the field work experience?

Item IV-C -- Revised

Does the school supervisor provide the agency with vita sheet, academic records and student goals and ambitions for the experience?

The revised instrument was then returned to the panel for re-evaluation. The number of experts was reduced to four because expert five returned the initial instrument with no comment regarding each item and disqualified himself. Further effort to select a fifth expert failed. Second submission of the instrument was to a panel of four experts. Each of the panelists was asked to re-score the revised

instrument and return it. Each of the twenty-five items had to score four or more by each of the panelists to remain in the final instrument. The only item to receive less than strongly agree or agree was Item III-C which received one disagree. Table II includes the results of the second evaluation by the panel of experts.

Scoring the score card would result in an item total and instrument total and from these a maximum score can be derived. A percentage compliance score was developed which consisted of dividing the number of points actually scored on a section of the total instrument by the maximum possible points for that section or the total instrument. The resulting percentage would indicate the amount of compliance a field work experience program did achieve in comparison with the possible achievement according to the Conner Score Card for Evaluating the Field Work Experience in Recreation. Percentage compliance scores are calculated on a one-hundred, seventy-five, fifty, and twenty-five percentage score. Each of the maximum scores as well as the maximum score for each section along with the percentage compliance scores are found in Table III.

TABLE II

SECOND RATING OF ITEMS BY
PANEL OF EXPERTS

	Expert One	Expert Two	Expert Three	Expert Four
Item I				
A	5*	5	5	5
B	5	5	5	5
C	5	5	5	5
D	5	4*	5	5
E	5	5	5	5
F	4	5	4	5
Item II				
A	5	5	5	4
Item III				
A	5	5	5	5
B	5	5	4*	5
C	5	4	2*	5
D	5	5	5	5
E	5	4	5	5
Item IV				
A	5	5	5	5
B	5	5	5	5
C	5	4	5	4
D	4	4	4	5
Item V				
A	4	5	5	5
B	5	5	5	5
C	5	4	5	5
D	5	5	5	5
E	5	5	5	5
F	4	5	5	5
Item VI				
A	5	5	5	5
Item VII				
A	5	5	5	4
B	4	4	5	5

*5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-No Opinion, 2-Disagree,
1-Strongly Disagree

TABLE III

SCORE ANALYSIS OF THE SCORE CARD FOR
EVALUATION OF THE FIELD WORK
EXPERIENCE IN RECREATION

	Maximum Score	Percentage Compliance Scores			
		100%	75%	50%	25%
Total Instrument	53	53	39.75	26.50	13.25
Excluding Section VII	50	50	37.00	25.00	12.50
Section I	13	13	9.75	6.50	3.25
Section II	3	3	2.25	1.50	.75
Section III	11	11	8.25	5.50	2.75
Section IV	9	9	6.75	4.50	2.25
Section V	9	9	6.75	4.50	2.25
Section VI	5	5	3.75	2.25	1.25
Section VII	3	3	2.25	1.50	.75

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

An instrument for evaluation of the field work experience in recreation was constructed after studying nationally adopted accreditation standards, criteria, guidelines and evaluations of professional preparation programs. The evaluation was constructed in the form of a questionnaire using a partial compliance check system of weighted items. The instrument was evaluated by item analysis according to the attitudes of a selected panel of four experts. The instrument was revised according to comments and evaluations of the experts and re-evaluated by the same panel. A predetermined scale was established to decide whether an item remained in the instrument according to the evaluations of the experts. Procedures for scoring the instrument were developed on a maximum and percentage compliance basis. Twenty-five items made up the original instrument and were submitted to the panel of experts for two evaluations. Twenty-four items remain in the final instrument (Appendix C).

Conclusions

1. The final instrument contains twenty-four items, each of which have been evaluated by a panel of four experts.
2. Each of the items received a Strongly Agree or Agree on the Likert Scale of Attitude Analysis.
3. A method has been developed to score the instrument according to maximum score and percentage compliance score of each section of the instrument.

Recommendations

1. The instrument should be field tested. Field testing should be done by submitting it to colleges and universities offering the undergraduate degree in recreation. Scores from these field tests should be compiled and reliability of the instrument determined.
2. The instrument should become part of a total score card for the evaluation of the total professional preparation program in recreation.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND
ORIGINAL INSTRUMENT

February 24, 1975

Dr. Allen V. Sapora
Professor
Dept. of Recreation and Park Administration
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

Dear Mr. Sapora:

The field work experience in recreation, an organized and supervised opportunity to relate theory to practical application, is apparently critical to the success of the recreation professional preparation program. Therefore, I have undertaken a study entitled, "The Construction of a Score Card for Evaluating Field Work Experience in Recreation." This study will partially fulfill the requirements of the Master of Science degree in Recreation at North Texas State University.

You have been selected as one of the top five recreation educators in North America according to a recent national survey of recreation textbook authors. I am writing to ask for your assistance in evaluating my proposed score card. Would you please respond to the following items:

1. Score each of the twenty-five items pertaining to the field work experience on the enclosed form. Indicate your attitude regarding each item by checking one of the five attitudes provided immediately below each item.
2. Include your comments and/or criticisms of each in the space provided and on the back of the same sheet if so desired. Include other items if you feel additional items are warranted please include them, or the topic they would pertain to, on the provided sheet.
3. Please return the form to me in the enclosed envelope.

The original score card will be reconstructed according to the attitudes, comments, criticisms and additional items submitted by the five experts.

I would greatly appreciate your response by March 7, 1975.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Conner, Jr.

A SCORE CARD FOR EVALUATING THE
FIELD WORK EXPERIENCE
IN RECREATION

Item I-A

Is there a written statement for the field work experience including objectives, progression and scope, policies and procedures, and forms, records and reports? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No
1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-B

Is there a written agreement between the school and cooperating agency? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No
1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-C

Do students receive a wide variety of realistic experiences? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Students have no input on planning the program.
1 pt. (2) _____ Students have input on planning the program but do not have the final say.

Item I-C (Continued)

2 pts. (3) _____ The students and the supervisor
plan the program.

2 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-D

What is the total number of units required for the
field work experience? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ 3 hrs.

1 pt. (2) _____ 4 hrs.

2 pts. (3) _____ 5 hrs.

3 pts. (4) _____ 6 hrs.

4 pts. (5) _____ 7 or more hrs.

4 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-E

What is the total number of clock hours required in
the field work experience in full time participation in the
school program? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Less than 220 clock hours

1 pt. (2) _____ Less than 240 clock hours

2 pts. (3) _____ Less than 260 clock hours

Item I-E (Continued)

3 pts. (4) _____ Less than 280 clock hours

4 pts. (5) _____ 280 clock hours or more

4 pts. Maximum Points earned _____Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-F

Is credit for the field work experience given on the same basis as that of comparable work in other parts of the curriculum? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No

1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item II- A

Do the agency and the school jointly agree upon placement of students after consulting with students in relation to what the agency can offer? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Students are not consulted about their placement.

1 pt. (2) _____ Students are consulted but have no final say on the placement.

2 pts. (3) _____ Students are consulted and both the student and school agree on the placement.

3 pts. (4) _____ Students are consulted and the student, agency and the school agree upon the placement.

3 pts. Maximum Points earned _____Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-A

Is written criteria developed to be used as guides for the selection and approval of agencies for the field work experience?

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No written criteria is used for selection of the agencies.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Written criteria is used for the selection of agencies.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-B

Do agencies furnish qualified supervisors for the field work experience? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisor holds no degree.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisor holds a degree but not in recreation.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Supervisor holds a degree in recreation.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Supervisor holds a Masters degree in recreation.
- 4 pts. (5) _____ Supervisor holds a Masters degree in recreation and is certified at the state level.

4 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-C

Is proper time allotted to the agency supervisor to supervise the student?

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Two hours or less is allotted.
 1 pt. (2) _____ Three to four hours a week are allotted.
 2 pts. (3) _____ Five to six hours a week are allotted.
 3 pts. (4) _____ Seven or more hours a week are allotted.

3 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
 Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-D

Do agencies have suitable activity areas and equipment available for recreation programs appropriate to the agencies goals, objectives and needs?

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Lack of adequate facilities
 1 pt. (2) _____ Adequate facilities in more than one-half of the agencies
 2 pts. (3) _____ All agencies have adequate facilities

2 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
 Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-E

Are students required to submit weekly reports to the agency and/or school supervisor? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No
 1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
 Strongly Disagree _____

Item IV-A

Is the school supervisor required to keep forms and records adopted by the school for reporting of anecdotal records, time schedules, job description, rating scales and evaluations? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisor is not required to keep adopted forms and records.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisor is required to keep forms and records but of his own making.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Supervisor is required to keep adopted forms and records.

_____ Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item IV-B

What is the average number of hours per semester spent by the school supervisor with a given student including supervision of work and conferences? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ 13 to 15 hrs.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ 16 to 19 hrs.
- 2 pt. (3) _____ 20 to 23 hrs.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ 24 or more hours.

_____ Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item IV-C

Does the school supervisor provide the agency with adequate information for the field work experience?
(Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No pre-preparation is offered the agency before placement of the student.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ The agency is provided with information on the student's background.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ The school supervisor visits the agency at least twice during the term of the field work experience.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ The agency is provided information about the student, consulted on the placement and visited at least twice for conferences with the school supervisor.

_____ Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item IV-D

What is the school supervisor-student ration computed at? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ 20 Or more students for full time teaching load.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ 15 to 19 for full time teaching load.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ 10 to 14 for full time teaching load.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Less than 10 for full time teaching load.

_____ Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-A

Is a continuous evaluation provided for guiding the learning of the student? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No continuous evaluation is provided.

1 pt. (2) _____ Continuous evaluation is provided.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-B

Is the evaluation data from the school supervisor made available to responsible staff members for guidance of the students?

0 pts. (1) _____ Data is not made available.

1 pt. (2) _____ Data is made available.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-C

Are students provided with channels for frequent reporting and self-evaluation? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No channels are provided.

1 pt. (2) _____ Adequate channels are provided.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-D

Is an evaluation conference held to discuss the field work experience with the agencies? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No conference is held.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ One conference is held each year.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ One conference is held each semester.

2 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-E

Is the agency supervisor required to submit written evaluation reports of the student to the school supervisor? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No written reports are required.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ One written report is required at the end of the field work experience.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Two written reports are required.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Three written reports are required, one-third, two-thirds, and at the end of the field work experience.

3 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-F

Is the student allowed to attend the final evaluation conference of the school and agency supervisors? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ The student is not allowed to attend.

1 pt. (2) _____ The student is allowed to attend.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item VI-A

Is the field work experience program re-evaluated by the entire professional staff and all agencies? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Program is re-evaluated every five years.

1 pt. (2) _____ Program is re-evaluated every four years.

2 pts. (3) _____ Program is re-evaluated every three years.

3 pts. (4) _____ Program is re-evaluated every two years.

4 pts. (5) _____ Program is evaluated yearly.

4 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER AND
REVISED INSTRUMENT

April 18, 1975

Dr. Allen V. Sapora
Professor
Dept. of Recreation and Park Administration
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

Dear Dr. Sapora:

I am again asking for your assistance in evaluating my proposed score card for evaluating the field work experience in recreation. The original score card has been reconstructed according to the attitudes, comments, criticisms and additional items submitted by the evaluation panel. Would you please respond to the following items:

1. Score each of the twenty-five items of the reconstructed score card on the enclosed form. Indicate your attitude regarding each of the items by checking one of the five attitudes provided immediately below each item.
2. Indicate your attitudes for each item on the enclosed self-addressed stamped post card.
3. Please return the post card to me.

The reconstructed score card will be revised according to the attitudes submitted by the panel.

I would greatly appreciate your response by May 5, 1975.

Sincerely,

John A. Conner, Jr.

A SCORE CARD FOR EVALUATING THE
FIELD WORK EXPERIENCE
IN RECREATION

Item I-A

Is there a written statement for the field work experience including objectives, progression and scope, policies and procedures and forms, records and reports? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No

1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-B

Is there a written agreement between the school and cooperating agency in accepting the student? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No

1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-C

Do students contribute input for the experience? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Students have no input on planning the program.

1 pt. (2) _____ Students have input on planning the program.

2 pts. (3) _____ The student, school supervisor, and agency supervisor plan the program.

Item I-C (Continued)

2 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
 Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-D

What is the total number of semester hours required for the field work experience? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ 3 hrs.
 1 pt. (2) _____ 4 hrs.
 2 pts. (3) _____ 5 hrs.
 3 pts. (4) _____ 6 hrs.
 4 pts. (5) _____ 7 or more hours.

4 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
 Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-E

What is the total number of clock hours required in the field work experience in full time participation in the school program?

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Less than 220 clock hours.
 1 pt. (2) _____ 220-239 clock hours.
 2 pts. (3) _____ 240-259 clock hours.
 3 pts. (4) _____ 260-279 clock hours.
 4 pts. (5) _____ 280 clock hours or more

4 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
 Strongly Disagree _____

Item I-F

Is credit for the field work experience given on the same basis as that of comparable work in other parts of the curriculum? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No
 1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
 Strongly Disagree _____

Item II-A

Do the agency and the school jointly agree upon placement of students after consulting with students in relation to what the agency can offer?

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Students are not consulted about their placement.
 1 pt. (2) _____ Students are consulted but have no final say on the placement.
 2 pts. (3) _____ Students are consulted and both the student and school agree on the placement.
 3 pts. (4) _____ Students are consulted and the student, agency and school agree upon the placement from an approved list of agencies.

3 pts. Maximum

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
 Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-A

Is written criteria developed to be used as guides for the selection and approval of agencies for the field work experience? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No written criteria are used.

1 pt. (2) _____ Written criteria are used.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-B

Do agencies furnish qualified supervisors for the field work experience? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisors are not required to hold a degree.

1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisors are required to hold a degree in a related field and/or 5 full years of recreation experience.

2 pts. (3) _____ Supervisors are required to hold a degree in recreation.

3 pts. (4) _____ Supervisors are required to hold a Masters degree in recreation.

4 pts. (5) _____ Supervisors are required to hold a Masters degree in recreation and be certified at the state level.

4 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-C

Is proper time allotted to the agency supervisor to supervise the student? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Two hours or less a week are allotted.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Three to four hours a week are allotted.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Five to six hours a week are allotted.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Seven or more hours a week are allotted.

_____ Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-D

Do agencies have activity areas and equipment available for recreation programs appropriate to the agencies' goals, objectives and needs? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Lack of adequate equipment and facilities.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Adequate facilities and equipment in more than one-half of the agencies.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ All agencies have adequate equipment and facilities.

_____ Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item III-E

Are students required to submit weekly reports to the agency and/or school supervisor? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No

1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item IV-A

Is the school supervisor required to keep forms and records adopted by the school for reporting of anecdotal records, time schedules, job description, rating scales and evaluations? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisors are not required to keep adopted forms.

1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisors are required to keep their own forms.

2 pts. (3) _____ Supervisors are required to keep adopted forms and records.

2 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item IV-B

What is the average number of hours per semester spent by the school supervisor with a given student including supervision of work and conferences? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ 13 to 15 hours

1 pt. (2) _____ 16 to 19 hours

Item IV-B (Continued)

2 pts. (3) _____ 20 to 23 hours

3 pts. (4) _____ 24 or more hours

3 pts. Maximum Points earned _____Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item IV-C

Does the school supervisor provide the agency with vita sheet, academic records, and student goals and ambitions for the experience?

0 pts. (1) _____ No

1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item IV-D

What is the school supervisor-student ration computed at? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ 20 or more for full time teaching
load1 pt. (2) _____ 15 to 19 for full time teaching
load2 pts. (3) _____ 10 to 14 for full time teaching
load3 pts. (4) _____ Less than 10 for full time teaching
load3 pts. Maximum Points earned _____Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-A

Is a continuous evaluation provided for guiding learning of the students? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No continuous evaluation is provided.

1 pt. (2) _____ Continuous evaluation is provided.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-B

Are the evaluation data from the school supervisor made available to responsible staff members for guidance for the students? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Data are not made available.

1 pt. (2) _____ Data are made available.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-C

Are students provided with channels for frequent reporting and self evaluation? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No channels are provided.

1 pt. (2) _____ Adequate channels are provided.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-D

Is an evaluation conference held to discuss the field work experience with the agencies? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No conference is held.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ One conference is held each school year.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ One or more conferences are held each semester.

2 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-E

Is the agency supervisor required to submit written evaluation reports to the school supervisor?

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No written reports are required.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ One written report is required at the end of the experience.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Two written reports are required.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Three written reports are required.

3 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item V-F

Is the student allowed to attend the final evaluation conference of the school and agency supervisors?

- 0 pts. (1) _____ The student is not allowed to attend.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ The student is allowed to attend.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item VI-A

Is the field work experience program re-evaluated by the entire professional staff and all agencies? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Program is re-evaluated every five years.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Program is re-evaluated every four years.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Program is re-evaluated every three years.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Program is re-evaluated every two years.
- 4 pts. (5) _____ Program is re-evaluated yearly.
- 5 pts. (6) _____ Program is constantly re-evaluated and updated by the division of field work supervisors.

_____ Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

ITEMS VII-A AND B DO NOT APPLY TO THOSE SCHOOLS NOT OFFERING A THERAPEUTIC RECREATION PROGRAM.

Item VII-A

Are agency supervisors in the Therapeutic recreation setting qualified by being registered as a recreation director? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisors are not required to be registered.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisors are required to be registered.

_____ Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

Item VII-B

In the Therapeutic recreation settings for the field work experience are students supplied with appropriate clinical information about clients they will work with? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Students are supplied with no information.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Students are supplied with all medical records.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Students are supplied with all medical records and are provided with opportunities to communicate with all agencies providing services to clients.

_____ Maximum

Points earned _____

Strongly Agree _____, Agree _____, No Opinion _____, Disagree _____
Strongly Disagree _____

APPENDIX C
FINAL INSTRUMENT

CONNER SCORE CARD FOR EVALUATING THE
FIELD WORK EXPERIENCE IN
RECREATION

The score card was developed as the result of research and study by the author at North Texas State University. There appears to be a need in field testing the instrument.

At the present time a similar scoring device is not available for the evaluation of recreation fieldwork as a part of the professional preparation of recreation majors. Therefore, comparative scores are not available. As data is collected using the Conner device, a gradual accumulation of comparative information will develop.

The author is anxious to receive reports and criticisms regarding use of the instrument. Please forward to:

John A. Conner, Jr.

412E Harding Ave.
Blacksburg, Va.
24060

HOW TO SCORE

- READ each of the items carefully before checking the appropriate response.
- Check the appropriate response as the item pertains to your situation.
- Respond only to the question and check appropriate compliance.
- Place the points earned for each item in the appropriate space provided.

SCORE ANALYSIS

- Total the points earned for each section of the instrument and place this total in the spaces provided below.
- Total the points earned for the entire instrument and place this score in the Total space provided.
- Compare the total points earned overall and in each section to the maximums and percentage compliance scores provided in the table.

	TOTAL SCORE	Maximum Score	Percentage Compliance Scores			
			100%	75%	50%	25%
Total Instrument		53	53	39.75	26.50	13.25
Excluding Section VII		50	50	37.00	25.00	12.50
Section I		13	13	9.75	6.50	3.25
Section II		3	3	2.25	1.50	.75
Section III		11	11	8.25	5.50	2.75
Section IV		9	9	6.75	4.50	2.25
Section V		9	9	6.75	4.50	2.25
Section VI		5	5	3.75	2.25	1.25
Section VII		3	3	2.25	1.50	.75

CONNER SCORE CARD FOR EVALUATING THE
FIELD WORK EXPERIENCE
IN RECREATION

Item I-A

Is there a written statement for the field work experience including objectives, progression and scope, policies and procedures, and forms, records and reports? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No

1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item I-B

Is there a written agreement between the school and cooperating agency? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No

1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item I-C

Do students receive a wide variety of realistic experiences? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Students have no input on planning the program.

1 pt. (2) _____ Students have input on planning the program but do not have the final say.

2 pts. (3) _____ The students and the supervisor plan the program.

2 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item II-A

Do the agency and the school jointly agree upon placement of students after consulting with students in relation to what the agency can offer? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Students are not consulted about their placement.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Students are consulted but have no final say on the placement.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Students are consulted and both the student and school agree on the placement.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Students are consulted and the student, agency and the school agree upon the placement.

3 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item III-A

Is written criteria developed to be used as guides for the selection and approval of agencies for the field work experience? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No written criteria is used for selection of the agencies.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Written criteria is used for the selection of agencies.

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item III-B

Do agencies furnish qualified supervisors for the field work experience?

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisor holds no degree.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisor holds a degree but not in recreation.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Supervisor holds a degree in recreation.

Item I-D

What is the total number of units required for the field work experience? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ 3 hrs.
 1 pt. (2) _____ 4 hrs.
 2 pts. (3) _____ 5 hrs.
 3 pts. (4) _____ 6 hrs.
 4 pts. (5) _____ 7 or more hrs.

4 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item I-E

What is the total number of clock hours required in the field work experience in full time participation in the school program? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Less than 220 clock hours
 1 pt. (2) _____ Less than 240 clock hours
 2 pts. (3) _____ Less than 260 clock hours
 3 pts. (4) _____ Less than 280 clock hours
 4 pts. (5) _____ 280 clock hours or more

4 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item I-F

Is credit for the field work experience given on the same basis as that of comparable work in other parts of the curriculum? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No
 1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item II-A

Do the agency and the school jointly agree upon placement of students after consulting with students in relation to what the agency can offer? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Students are not consulted about their placement.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Students are consulted but have no final say on the placement.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Students are consulted and both the student and school agree on the placement.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Students are consulted and the student, agency and the school agree upon the placement.

3 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item III-A

Is written criteria developed to be used as guides for the selection and approval of agencies for the field work experience? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No written criteria is used for selection of the agencies.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Written criteria is used for the selection of agencies.

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item III-B

Do agencies furnish qualified supervisors for the field work experience? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisor holds no degree.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisor holds a degree but not in recreation.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Supervisor holds a degree in recreation.

Item III-B (Continued)

3 pts. (4) _____ Supervisor holds a Masters degree
in recreation.

4 pts. (5) _____ Supervisor holds a Masters degree
in recreation and is certified at
the state level.

4 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item III-C

Do agencies have suitable activity areas and equip-
ment available for recreation programs appropriate to the
agencies goals, objectives and needs? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Lack of adequate facilities.

1 pt. (2) _____ Adequate facilities in more than
one-half of the agencies.

2 pts. (3) _____ All agencies have adequate facil-
ities.

2 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item III-D

Are students required to submit weekly reports to the
agency and/or school supervisor? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No

1 pt. (2) _____ Yes

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item IV-A

Is the school supervisor required to keep forms and records adopted by the school for reporting of anecdotal records, time schedules, job description, rating scales and evaluations? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisor is not required to keep adopted forms and records.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisor is required to keep forms and records but of his own making.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Supervisor is required to keep adopted forms and records.

2 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item IV-B

What is the average number of hours per semester spent by the school supervisor with a given student including supervision of work and conferences? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ 13 to 15 hrs.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ 16 to 19 hr.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ 20 to 23 hrs.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ 24 or more hours.

3 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item IV-C

Does the school supervisor provide the agency with adequate information for the field work experience? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No pre-preparation is offered the agency before placement of the student.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ The agency is provided with information on the student's background.

Item IV-C (Continued)

- 2 pts. (3) _____ The school supervisor visits the agency at least twice during the term of the field work experience.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ The agency is provided information about the student, consulted on the placement and visited at least twice for conferences with the school supervisor.

3 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item IV-D

What is the school supervisor-student ration computed at? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ 20 or more students for full time teaching load.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ 15 to 19 for full time teaching load.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ 10 to 14 for full time teaching load.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Less than 10 for full time teaching load.

3 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item V-A

Is a continuous evaluation provided for guiding the learning of the student? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No continuous evaluation is provided.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Continuous evaluation is provided.

1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item V-B

Is the evaluation data from the school supervisor made available to responsible staff members for guidance of the student?

0 pts. (1) _____ Data is not made available.

1 pt. (2) _____ Data is made available.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Item V-C

Are students provided with channels for frequent reporting and self-evaluation? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No channels are provided.

1 pt. (2) _____ Adequate channels are provided.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Item V-D

Is an evaluation conference held to discuss the field work experience with the agencies? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ No conference is held.

1 pt. (2) _____ One conference is held each year.

2 pts. (3) _____ One conference is held each semester.

2 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

Item V-E

Is the agency supervisor required to submit written evaluation reports of the student to the school supervisor? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ No written reports are required.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ One written report is required at the end of the field work experience.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Two written reports are required.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Three written reports are required, one-third, two-thirds, and at the end of the field work experience.

_____ 3 pts. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item V-F

Is the student allowed to attend the final evaluation conference of the school and agency supervisors? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ The student is not allowed to attend.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ The student is allowed to attend.

_____ 1 pt. Maximum

Points earned _____

Item VI-A

Is the field work experience program re-evaluated by the entire professional staff and all agencies? (Check one)

- 0 pts. (1) _____ Program is re-evaluated every five years.
- 1 pt. (2) _____ Program is re-evaluated every four years.
- 2 pts. (3) _____ Program is re-evaluated every three years.
- 3 pts. (4) _____ Program is re-evaluated every two years.

Item VI-A (Continued)

4 pts. (5) _____ Program is evaluated yearly.

4 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

ITEMS VII-A AND B DO NOT APPLY TO THOSE SCHOOLS NOT OFFERING A THERAPEUTIC RECREATION PROGRAM.

Item VII-A

Are agency supervisors in the Therapeutic recreation settings qualified by being registered as a recreation director? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Supervisors are not required to be registered.

1 pt. (2) _____ Supervisors are required to be registered.

1 pt. Maximum Points earned _____

Item VII-B

In the Therapeutic recreation settings for the field work experience are students supplied with appropriate clinical information about clients they will work with? (Check one)

0 pts. (1) _____ Students are supplied with no information.

1 pt. (2) _____ Students are supplied with all medical records.

2 pts. (3) _____ Students are supplied with all medical records and are provided with opportunities to communicate with all agencies providing services to clients.

2 pts. Maximum Points earned _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Anderson, Jackson M., Annual Survey of Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculums in Recreation and Park Administration, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1967.
- Baccalaureate Accreditation Schedule, California Council on Parks and Recreation Accreditation, Fresno, California, 1970.
- Bookwalter, Karl W., A Score Card For Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education, Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press, 1962.
- Butler, George D., Introduction to Community Recreation, 4th Edition, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Directory of Professional Preparation Institutions, Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, (September, 1974), National Education Association Publication, Washington, D.C.
- Education Resource Survey, National Recreation and Parks Administration, Washington, D.C., 1967.
- First National Conference on the Training of Recreation Leaders, Minneapolis, Minn., Farnham Printing and Stationary Company, 1938.
- Fitzgerald, Gerald B., Leadership in Recreation, New York, Barnes & Company, 1951.
- Guidelines for Professional Preparation Programs for Personnel Involved in Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Washington, D.C., 1973.

Likert, Rensis and Murphy, Garner, Public Opinion and the Individual, New York, Harper and Row Publishers, 1938.

Professional Preparation in Dance, Physical Education, Recreation Education, Safety Education and School Health Education, American Association of Health Physical Education, and Recreation, Washington D.C., 1973.

Professional Preparation in Dance, Physical Education, Recreation Education, Safety Education and School Health Education, American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Washington D.C., 1974.

Van der Smissen, Betty, An Evaluation and Self-Study of Public Recreation and Park Agencies, National Recreation and Park Association, Arlington, Virginia, 1972.

Reports

American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, "Evaluative Standards and Guide in Health Education, Physical Education and Recreation," Washington, D.C., 1959.

National Recreation Education Accreditation Project Standards and Evaluative Criteria, National Education Accreditation Commission, Washington, D.C., 1965.

Second National Conference on the Training of Recreation Leaders, Minneapolis, Minn., Farnham Printing and Stationary Company, 1939.

Unpublished Materials

Dollgener, Robert J., "A Critical Appraisal of a Selected Score Card for Evaluation of Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education," Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Indiana Univeristy, 1965.

Heywood, Carl, "Evaluation of the Professional Preparation Program in Recreation at Florida State University," Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Florida State University, 1968.