

A COOPERATIVE EVALUATION OF THE INSTRUCTION OF STUDENT
TEACHERS IN THE SAM HOUSTON SCHOOL, DENTON, TEXAS,
FOR THE SUMMER OF 1941

APPROVED: *copy*

J. C. Matthews
Major Professor

Jack Johnson
Minor Professor

G. A. Osborn
Director of the Department of Education

L. A. Sharp
Chairman of the Graduate Council

A COOPERATIVE EVALUATION OF THE INSTRUCTION OF STUDENT
TEACHERS IN THE SAM HOUSTON SCHOOL, DENTON, TEXAS,
FOR THE SUMMER OF 1941

THESIS

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

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Joe E. Natliff, B.S.

Big Spring, Texas

August, 1941

90751

90751

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES	7
III. THE SCHOOL STAFF	12
IV. THE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION	19
V. CONCLUSIONS	55
APPENDIX	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The Self-rating Average Score of the Student Teachers on Each of the Items of the Criteria for Teacher Evaluation	15
2. The Experience, the Self-rating Score, the Supervisors' Score, and Average Rating Score of Each Teacher	17
3. The Average Ranking of the Student Teachers in Each Grade	18
4. The Number of Children in the First Grade Ranking Superior, Average, and Fair on the Items of Evaluative Criteria at the Beginning and End of the Summer Term, and the Number for Which There Was No Basis for Judgment	25
5. The Number of Children in the Second Grade Ranking Superior, Average, and Fair on the Items of Evaluative Criteria at the Beginning and End of the Summer Term, and the Number for Which There Was No Basis for Judgment	30
6. The Number of Children in the Third Grade Ranking Superior, Average, and Fair on the Items of Evaluative Criteria at the Beginning and End of the Summer Term, and the Number for Which There Was No Basis for Judgment	38
7. The Number of Children in the Fourth Grade Ranking Superior, Average, and Fair on the Items of Evaluative Criteria at the Beginning and End of the Summer Term, and the Number for Which There Was No Basis for Judgment	45
8. The Number of Children in the Fifth Grade Ranking Superior, Average, and Fair on the Items of Evaluative Criteria at the Beginning and End of the Summer Term, and the Number for Which There Was No Basis for Judgment	51

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem of evaluating schools has been an outgrowth of the attempt made several years ago to "test" and "measure" the school. It has been found that this "test" and "measure" idea did not cover all of the phases of the child's life. A feeling began to grow that sought to find some sort of way in which to broaden the "facts" that were needed in regard to child growth. In regard to this matter Hosie has said,

A few years ago expressions in common use were "testing" and "measurement". These are now giving way to "evaluation". There is significance in the change. The earlier view assumed that educational processes could be standardized and their products "measured" by wholly objective and impersonal means. Once this was accomplished, guess work would be abolished, teaching would become certain and sure, and teachers "scientific".

Unfortunately this program assumed the continuance of formal school courses in the subjects of study. Instruments were devised to measure control of certain facts and skills which the school had traditionally endeavored to transmit. It was assumed, for example, that knowledge of what is correct will prevent errors in grammar. Hence efforts were made to determine what grammatical lore should be taught. It presently appeared that many so-called errors were not errors at all and never had been. Still more disconcerting, however, were doubts thrown upon the assumption that knowing what is right to do will insure one's doing it. In short, the effort to make language teaching scientific through a survey of errors did not get very far.

Meanwhile, the schools were changing their notions of what children should learn and what they must do in order to learn it. Civic attitudes, appreciation of music, emotional stability, good hygienic practices, interest in home making, and similar matters began to rival - sometimes to overshadow - in importance the measurable scholastic achievements on which the test makers had been concentrating. Loud demands were heard to make progressive education more scientific and the scientific movement more progressive.

Now there is a fair prospect that the two will get together. No amount of science will ever enable us to dispense with human judgment. Measuring samples of behavior can furnish data but not ready-made conclusions to be drawn from them. We must do more than

measure the child's ability to do his work in school if we are to gain an understanding of the total personality of the child. Measurement, is therefore, only an accessory. The essential act is that of evaluation.¹

During the summer of 1940 a conference was initiated in Denton, Texas, for the purpose of giving the pre-service and in-service teachers an opportunity to discover ways to work with children. It was hoped that the teachers would solve some of their problems, thereby enabling them to do a better job of teaching during the long session of 1940 - 1941. This study was made in conjunction with the Southern Association, which felt the need of a curriculum study in the South.

The study in Denton was carried on through the North Texas State Teachers College. J. C. Matthews, who is the Director of Teacher Training, was given a leading role in the formulation of the program in Denton and selected five schools in which to work. These schools were: (1) Sam Houston School, (2) Junior High School, (3) Senior High School, (4) Demonstration Elementary school, and (5) Demonstration High School.

The main problem set up by the leaders and teachers of the Conference was "How can we improve the experiences of the boys and girls for the first six weeks of the summer?"²

After reading this report the writer feels that the term instruction has taken on a broader meaning. That is, instruction must be taken to mean the teacher-help necessary to cause experiences to grow from activity. If the results of the Conference meant anything, we must begin to evaluate

¹James F. Hasic, "The Problem of Evaluation," Educational Method, XV (1936), 448.

²Report of the Southern Association Conference at Denton, Texas, (1940), pp. 1-7.

instruction in terms of the experiences of the pupil, out of which he has gained insight into the skills, knowledges, and habits of subject matter in addition to the numerable aspects which are conducive to the democratic life. Evaluation, as it can now be seen, is not intended to mean a method by which we can find out how much a pupil has learned, but takes into its concept the total growth of the child's whole life.

Statement of the Problem

The problem set forth for this study is to evaluate, in terms of pupil experiences, the instruction of the student teachers in Sam Houston School, Denton, Texas, for the summer of 1941.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to appraise the opportunities offered to the pupils of Sam Houston school; to gain experiences through self interests and democratic procedures; to develop procedures which may determine the changes taking place in these boys and girls and thereby enable the writer to discover the degree to which the school is accomplishing its significant educational purposes. Suggestions or criticisms will be incorporated; however, it is not the intended purpose of this study to suggest or criticize.

Procedure

This study is based on a cooperative undertaking of evaluating what has been done in the Sam Houston Elementary School in the summer of 1941. Those cooperating were: (1) the principal, (2) the supervisor-teachers, (3) the student-teachers, and (4) the pupils.

The type of evaluation to be done was determined in the light of

modern educational philosophy, objectives, and practices. McGaughy has said, "The evaluation of any human institution must be made in terms of the standards, practices, and ideals of the society in which that institution exists."³ Since this is the case, most of the evaluation in this study will be done by subjective methods. These methods have been formulated from items and suggestions made by various outstanding men in the educational field. They are: (1) diaries, (2) observations, (3) interviews, (4) check lists, (5) anecdotal records, and (6) rating devices.

A discussion of one of the above methods of evaluation, rating devices, is necessary. The rating devices used in conjunction with the evaluation of the children's experiences are based on the following concept:

Concern of the modern teacher for the organic wholeness of personality development requires that records be made of each pupil's developing interests, aptitudes, appreciations, understandings, and skills; his increasing sensitivity to problems of group strivings; his emotional adjustments; his effectiveness in formulating and achieving his own purposes; the kinds of enterprises in which he participates; his qualities of leadership; his qualities of followship; his health and physical development; the books he reads; the kinds of problems he discovers for himself; the manner in which he meets success and failure; his developing sense of values; the way in which he expresses himself in writing, in speech, and in art forms; his contributions to group enterprises; and the manner in which he is developing the tools of learning.⁴

The following symbols were chosen for marking the rating devices. If the child has made superior development a (+) is marked in the space provided, average development is marked with an (0), poor development

³J. R. McGaughy, An Evaluation of the Elementary School, p. 22.

⁴Edith Brader and Others, The Changing Curriculum, p. 328.

is marked with a minus (-), and if there is no basis for judgment an (N) is used.

The rating scale used to rate the teachers was one made by Roald F. Campbell.⁵ This device rates the teachers on evidence of quality, and also gives consideration to the kind of judgment the rating is made on. First, let us consider the rating on the evidence of quality in the teachers' work. If there is little evidence or some evidence of poor quality the teacher is marked one (1) or two (2) as the case may be. Considerable evidence of fair quality and some evidence of good quality is marked three (3), four (4), or five (5). Abundant evidence of excellent quality is marked six (6) or seven (7). If the basis for judgment is plentiful a one (1) is used, apparently adequate is marked with two (2), and inadequate is marked with three (3).

There are several reasons for not using the intelligence test. For the best reasoning let us repeat a statement made by McGaughy, who says,

Intelligence tests will undoubtedly play an important part in diagnostic and clinical work with definitely subnormal children for some years to come, and they will undoubtedly be of value for use in important experiments and researches, but there seems to be slight reason to defend their use with the ninety-five or ninety-eight per cent of the children who are regarded as normal children in their reactions to school situations.

As the elementary school program moves further and further away from traditional subject matter mastery and is enriched and broadened to provide truly educational experiences for children, those areas of personality which are not measured at all by our present intelligence tests will be of greater significance.⁶

⁵Roald F. Campbell, "Evaluation and the Rating of Teachers," Elementary School Journal, XLI (January, 1941), 671-676.

⁶J. R. McGaughy, op. cit., pp. 366-367.

Organization

Chapter II will deal with the philosophy and objectives of the school. These will be a necessary part of this study, for a school is understood through the philosophy and objectives that it sets forth for the children. In this chapter some of the modern philosophies and objectives set forth by modern educators will be given and discussed so that a comparison may be made between theirs and those of the school.

The staff of the school will be discussed in Chapter III. A comparison will be made of the supervising teachers' rating with the student teachers' self-rating. The student teachers will also be studied in regard to their teaching experience, training, age, and present status.

The evaluation of instruction will be treated in Chapter IV. A general description of the school will be given first, followed by an appraisal of each grade. In this appraisal of the grades an actual account of some of the experiences and procedures will be given.

Chapter V will deal with descriptive conclusions drawn from the study.

CHAPTER II

PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES

One good way to become acquainted with a school is to study its philosophy. Of course the philosophy of any school is merely a reflection of the concepts of those who are concerned with that particular school. This philosophy should be based upon the problems of the community in which the school is located along with the concepts of modern education. Since there are many different kinds of schools in many different localities, it would be foolish to think that all schools should have the same philosophy.

It is, however, essential that schools have a definite philosophy, and that philosophy should conform to generally accepted principles which would foster democracy. For further information along this line let us look at a statement taken from Evaluative Criteria.¹

It is essential for each school to have a carefully formulated philosophy. The school should be free to determine this philosophy for itself to the extent that it promotes the principles and spirit of American Democracy. Each school should be able to justify any marked variation from the generally accepted principles. The State's philosophy should be associated with and be fundamental to the educational program of each school.

A school without a basic philosophy or guiding principles can be little more than a place where an inconsistent piece of work is going on.² If the school, then, operates without a carefully formulated philosophy it

¹Evaluative Criteria, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, p.6.

²Edith Brader and others, op. cit., p. 32.

is not likely to know where it is going or where it has been. We might compare the philosophy of a school to a foundation of a building. A building is no stronger than its foundation; likewise the school is no better than its philosophy.

It might be well to examine a modern philosophy before stating the philosophy of the Sam Houston School. Isaac Doughton states his philosophy of education as follows:³

Education is the development of human personality which results from the individual's activity in and reaction upon the natural and social environments, and which, by enriching the meaning of experience, progressively increases his power to direct subsequent experience.

The test of democracy is the extent that its fundamental philosophy and practice can be made the philosophy and practice of its schools, on the level of the growing child's knowledge and experience.

Before taking up the philosophy of the Sam Houston School the writer would like to explain how the philosophy of this school was formulated. The teachers met for the first time in the summer and during the course of the meeting it was decided that there was a definite need for a philosophy. Each teacher made contributions as to their idea of what should be included in the philosophy. After discussion among the group the following philosophy was worked out.

The teachers of the Sam Houston School recognize that every child is a changing personality with a definite place in a democratic society. An endeavor will be made to make democracy a real experience for each child who enters here, and enable all of them to have as many broad experiences as they are capable of having without trying to prescribe the same experiences for one and all alike.⁴

³Isaac Doughton, "A Philosophy of Education in Outline," Educational Forum, I (May, 1937), 504-505.

⁴Statement by Francis Jones, personal interview.

The objectives of a school are of great importance. They are more specific than the philosophy and are useful not only as a guide, but are needed to help determine the outcomes. Brueckner says,

The effectiveness of a school program depends on its ability to set up immediate objectives that will lead to the achievement of ultimate educational objectives. The work of any grade is largely determined by these immediate objectives. To the degree that immediate objectives are valid they will contribute to the attainment of the ultimate goals. The ultimate objectives of education have been stated in various ways. In general they should be defined as those qualities, attitudes, and abilities that are essential for efficient living in an evolving, industrial, democratic society.⁵

There have been many statements made as to what educational objectives should be. Of course objectives change with varying circumstances in different localities, but in general most of the broad objectives are applicable almost everywhere. Salisbury has made a short statement on objectives which seems to merit repeating. She said, "The objective of all education is to help the individual to help himself to grow aright. He gains ability to grow through experience, activity, and interest."⁶

McKnown has listed the following objectives for an elementary school.

1. To help the pupil to understand and practice desirable social relationships.
2. To train the pupil for democratic participation.
3. To discover, explore, and develop desirable individual interests and aptitudes.
4. To improve the school spirit and morale.⁷

In a program of evaluation it is necessary that the evaluation be made in terms of the objectives that have been set forth. If the teacher

⁵ Leo J. Brueckner, The Changing Elementary School, p. 4.

⁶ Ethel I. Salisbury, An Activity Curriculum, p. 4.

⁷ Harry C. McKnown, Activities in the Elementary School, pp. 8-13.

does not know what she is trying to do, it is reasonable to expect that she could do little toward evaluating what a pupil has done. Hilda Taba has said the following in regard to evaluation and objectives.

One of the major difficulties with the development of a program of evaluation is that what there is of it is often removed from the major concerns of the teacher. In order to remove this difficulty the program of appraisal should start with a careful formulation and listing of objectives by individual teachers, or by groups of teachers within one school, or by groups of schools.⁸

The teachers of the Sam Houston School met in a group and decided upon the following general objectives. Of course these were made in the light of the philosophy of the school which has already been stated.

1. To stimulate the growth of the child in as many ways as possible
2. To help the child enjoy his growth as much as possible
3. To give as many different experiences to each child as is possible
4. To offer opportunity to children to broaden and enrich their interests

The following specific objectives were formulated from the list of general objectives given above.

1. To develop the aptitudes of the child
2. To develop the appreciations of the child
3. To develop the understanding of the child
4. To develop the skills of the child
5. To develop sensitivity to problems of group strivings
6. To adjust the child emotionally
7. To develop effectiveness in formulating and achieving the child's own purpose

⁸ Hilda Taba, "The Functions of Evaluation," Childhood Education, XV (February, 1939), 249.

8. To develop leadership in the child
9. To develop fellowship in the child
10. To develop good health habits in the child
11. To develop the ability to properly meet success
12. To develop the ability to properly meet failure
13. To develop the sense of values in the child
14. To develop the child's ability to express himself in speaking and writing
15. To stimulate contributions to group enterprises
16. To develop the tools of learning
17. To encourage the child to discover problems for himself

Frequently objectives are too vague and undefined. By breaking these general objectives down into more specific ones, the teacher will have a better idea of what she is trying to do and can better evaluate what she has done. An objective should be clear so as not to confuse the teacher. If the statement is not clear, there might be as many meanings as there are teachers, thus resulting in a poorly executed program.

In comparing the philosophy and objectives of the Sam Houston School with those set forth by others, the writer found that they ranked well. The philosophy is comparatively simple, and the objectives are of such a nature that they will not be easily misunderstood. There was less emphasis placed upon acquiring skills in subject matter than would be found in other schools, but the nature of this particular school was different. Provisions were made to give the child an opportunity to make his place in society, and at the same time help him to acquire the knowledge that is necessary to keep that place.

CHAPTER III

THE SCHOOL STAFF

The classroom teacher is one of the most important individuals in a school system. Of course the children are important, as there would be no use for the teacher without the children. McGaughy says, "Next to the pupil, the teacher is the most important person in a school system."¹ Since the teacher is such an important individual, the writer feels that it is altogether fitting that this chapter be devoted to a study of the student teachers of the Sam Houston School in Denton, Texas, for the summer of 1941.

Before proceeding any further it might be well to explain just how the teaching system in the school was set up. There were two groups or classifications of teachers in the school. They were the supervising teachers and the student teachers. Each grade had a supervising teacher who worked in conjunction with the student teacher. Both the supervising teacher and the student teacher actively engaged in teaching; however, the supervising teacher gave the student teacher all of the actual teaching activities that she was capable of doing. If the student teachers did not have enough initiative to start a plan, the supervising teachers helped them. When the student teachers had a plan of work but did not know how to execute it properly the supervising teachers gave them suggestions as to the methods of procedure. Of course the supervising teachers gave the

¹McGaughy, op. cit., p. 62.

student teachers the benefit of their wider experiences and education. This helped the student teachers to grow. In many instances the supervising teachers gave actual teaching demonstrations to show the student teachers just how a thing should be done. The supervising teachers were eager to help the student teachers; however, they maintained a democratic attitude and worked through a spirit of cooperation.

There were fifteen student teachers in the school, all of whom were women. Their ages ranged from nineteen to thirty-five. Many had previous teaching experience which will be discussed later.

In the evaluation of the student teachers precaution was taken to see that each one of them had an opportunity to participate in their own evaluation. This was done to insure democratic proceedings, and to secure a better balance in the final rating scores. The supervising teachers and the student teachers were given the same items to use as a basis in the ratings. These items were as follows:

1. Encourages pupil participation in planning, executing, and evaluating
2. Uses current materials in professional study and in work with pupils
3. Provides appropriate firsthand experiences for pupils and self
4. Stimulates fair consideration in controversial issues
5. Has an agreeable personal demeanor and appearance
6. Cares for administrative details with the necessary degree of dispatch
7. Discovers and relates work to the needs of the pupils.²

The items were used in rating the teachers because they could be made into different rating sheets. One of these was for self-rating and the other

²Campbell, op. cit., Vol. XI, p. 675.

was to be used by the supervising teachers to rate the student teachers. Some of the wording was changed on the student teacher rating blanks in order to make each item more personal. The rating blanks were given to the supervising teachers and the student teachers the first week of school in order for them to familiarize themselves with the items before they made any ratings. After two weeks had passed the blanks were taken up. All the supervising teachers stated that their basis for rating the student teachers was apparently adequate. Another set of self-rating blanks were given to the student teachers the last week of school in order to get a final rating.

Table 1 shows the self-rating average of the student teachers on each of the items of the criteria for teacher evaluation. The student teachers ranked three and five-tenths on the first item of evaluative criteria in their first rating, four and eight-tenths in their second rating, these two scores averaging four and fifteen-hundredths. On the second item of evaluative criteria the teachers ranked three and six-tenths in their first self-rating, five and one-tenth in their second self-rating, the average of the two being four and thirty-five-hundredths. On the third item of the evaluative criteria the teachers ranked themselves four and five-tenths in the first self-rating, five in their second rating, the average of the two being four and seventy-five-hundredths. On the fourth item of the evaluative criteria the teachers ranked themselves three and five-tenths in their first self-rating, four and eight-tenths in their second self-rating, the average being four and fifteen-hundredths. The teachers ranked themselves five in the first rating on the fifth item of the evaluative criteria, five

TABLE 1

THE SELF RATING AVERAGE SCORE OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS ON EACH OF THE ITEMS OF THE CRITERIA FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

Evaluative Criteria	Average Ratings		
	First Rating	Second Rating	Average
Encouragement of pupil participation in planning, executing, and evaluating	3.5	4.8	4.15
Use of current materials in professional study and work with pupils	3.6	5.1	4.35
Stimulation of fair consideration in controversial issues	4.5	5.0	4.75
Provision of first hand experiences for pupils and self	3.5	4.8	4.15
Agreeable personal demeanor and personal appearance	5.0	5.9	5.45
Regard for administrative details	4.1	5.2	4.65
Discovery and relation of work to needs of the pupil	4.2	5.0	4.6
Average	4.05	5.11	4.58

and nine-tenths in the second self-rating, the average being five and forty-five-hundredths. On the sixth item of evaluative criteria the student teachers ranked themselves four and one-tenth in the first rating, five and two-tenths in the second rating, the average being four and sixty-five-hundredths. On the seventh item of the evaluative criteria the teachers ranked themselves four and two-tenths in the first rating, five in the second rating, the average being four and six-tenths.

The self-rating average of the student teachers on all the items of the criteria of evaluation was four and five-hundredths in the first rating

five and eleven hundredths in the second rating, the average of these two being four and fifty-eight hundredths. It was noted that there was a gain of one and six hundredths from the time the first rating was made to the time the last rating was made.

Table 2 shows that five of the student teachers had no previous teaching experience, two of them had one year of previous experience, three had two years of previous experience, three had three years of previous experience, one of them had four years of previous experience, and one had seven years of previous experience. The average number of years of previous experience for the group was one and eight-tenths.

There was one student teacher who ranked herself two and seven tenths. Five student teachers ranked themselves between three and four, six ranked themselves between four and five, one ranked herself five, and one ranked herself six and four tenths.

The supervising teachers ranked one of the student teachers one and seven tenths. One of the student teachers was ranked two, four student teachers were ranked between four and five, five of the student teachers were ranked between five and six, and two of the student teachers were ranked between six and seven. The average for the total group was five.

The average rankings of both groups (the student teachers and the supervising teachers) placed one student teacher as ranking two and six tenths, three ranked between three and four, eight ranked between four and five, and three ranked between five and six. The average of the entire group was four and four tenths.

The student teachers who had no previous teaching experience ranked three and ninety-two hundredths, those who had one year of previous experience ranked four and eighty-seven hundredths, those who had two years of

previous experience ranked four and sixty-two-hundredths, those who had three years of previous experience ranked four and sixty-seven-hundredths, the one who had four years of previous experience ranked three and fifteen-hundredths, and the one who had seven years of previous experience ranked five and nine-tenths. There was a difference of two and twenty-five-hundredths between those who had no previous experience and the one who had seven years of previous experience.

TABLE 2

THE EXPERIENCE, THE SELF RATING SCORE, THE SUPERVISORS' SCORE, AND AVERAGE RATING SCORE OF EACH TEACHER

Number of Teachers	Number of Years Experience	Rating Scores		
		Teacher (Self)	Supervisor	Average
1		3.1	4.9	4
2	2	4.0	5.2	4.9
3	1	5.0	6.4	5.7
4	3	4.0	4.1	4.05
5		4.7	5.0	4.85
6	2	4.2	5.2	4.85
7	2	3.8	4.7	4.25
8		2.7	5.0	3.85
9	1	3.5	4.0	3.75
10	3	4.8	6.0	5.4
11	4	4.5	2.0	3.15
12	7	6.4	5.4	5.9
13		3.4	5.2	4.3
14		3.5	1.7	2.6
15	3	3.8	5.0	4.4
Average	1.8	4.0	5.0	4.4

There were two student teachers who ranked themselves higher than the supervising teacher ranked them. It was noted that these teachers had no previous experience, which might have been the cause for this.

Table 3 shows that the average rating of the student teachers in the first grade was four and three-tenths; the second grade teachers ranked four and nine-tenths; the third grade teachers ranked four and one-tenth; the fourth grade teachers ranked four and eight-tenths; and the fifth grade teachers ranked four and nine-tenths. There was a difference of seven-tenths between the lowest group and the highest group.

TABLE 3

THE AVERAGE RANKING OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS
IN EACH GRADE

Grade	Rating
First	4.3
Second	4.9
Third	4.1
Fourth	4.8
Fifth	4.9

Only one student teacher in the first grade had no previous experience; all of the teachers in the second grade had previous experience; none of the teachers in the third grade had previous experience; one of the teachers in the fourth grade had previous experience; and all of the teachers in the fifth grade had previous experience. It was noted that all the teachers in the second and fifth grades had previous experience and ranked the highest. The teachers in the third grade ranked the lowest, none of them having had any previous experience.

Since the mean average rating of the student teachers was four and four-tenths, they may be considered in the group showing evidence of good quality.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Before going into an evaluation of the instruction of the pupils in the Sam Houston School, it might be well to discuss the various aspects of the school.

The purpose of the school was to provide as many worthwhile experiences for the pupils as was possible, and to give the student teachers an opportunity to learn and use different methods and ideas in their teaching.

The program was arranged so as to widen and extend interest, satisfy needs, and develop the highest and best capacities of the children in the various class groups. Emphasis was placed on the activities which would give the pupils an opportunity for direct firsthand experiences and active participation in rich and varied learning situations. The work was characterized by informality, opportunity for the cultivation of initiative and originality, freedom of expression, encouragement of creative self-expression through a variety of mediums, and an opportunity for democratic group living.

The children gave several reasons for going to school, which were as follows: (1) to make a half year's credit, (2) to have a good time, and (3) because their parents wanted them to go. There were only ten out of the group who went for credit. The majority went to school because they enjoyed it and had a good time.

The pupil evaluation blanks were given to the student teachers the first week of school after they had become acquainted with the pupils. The teachers filled in these blanks according to the method previously discussed. At the end of school another set of the same kind of blanks were filled out by the teachers. The results of these two ratings showed the pupil growth which will be discussed by grades later.

The evaluation of the pupils was based on the records kept by the student teachers and the observations made by them. The records included diaries, anecdotal records, rating sheets, graphs, and records of conferences and observations. Conferences with the supervising teachers were held in regard to the evaluations in order to get them as nearly correct as possible.

In selecting a criteria for evaluation it was necessary to find one that would be in harmony with the practices of the school. The following items were selected because they coincided with the specific objectives of the school. The items also covered a wide range in the personal development of the child. The criteria was discussed with the supervising teachers and the student teachers, all of whom agreed to its thoroughness and completeness. The items in the criteria were:

1. Development of interests
2. Development of aptitudes
3. Development of appreciations
4. Development of understandings
5. Development of skills
6. Development of sense of values
7. Sensitivity to group strivings

8. Emotional adjustment
9. Formulating and achieving purpose
10. Qualities for leadership
11. Qualities for followship
12. Health
13. Physical development
14. Ability to meet success
15. Ability to meet failure
16. Expressions in writing
17. Expressions in speaking
18. Contributions to group learning
19. Development in tools of learning
20. Discovery of problems for himself

First Grade Evaluation

There were twelve children in the first grade during the first six weeks. It was difficult to get children of this age adjusted in school in such a short time. The adjustment was made soon because there were four student teachers and one supervising teacher to help them. After the children orientated they worked well together.

The most important project carried on by the children in the first grade was the building of a play house. This house was furnished with things the children made. They had numerous experiences in the house playing with each other. Open house was held for the other grades.

Other activities engaged in by the pupils in the first grade were going to the zoo, feeding a baby alligator, giving a toy show, making

¹Brader and others, op. cit., p. 328.

candy, dramatizing a story, and catching insects. Most of these activities were carried on in conjunction with the playhouse. After the children got used to each other they lost many of their anti-social tendencies.

Table 4 shows that one child in the first grade ranked superior on the development of interest in the first rating, and four ranked superior on the final rating. Nine ranked average on the first rating, while six ranked average on the second rating. Two ranked fair on both ratings. The superior group gained three and the average group lost three.

On the development of aptitudes none ranked superior in the first rating, and two ranked superior in the second rating. Ten ranked average in the first rating, while nine ranked average in the second rating. Two ranked fair in the first rating, and one ranked fair on the second rating. It was noted that two moved into the superior group, and one moved from fair to average.

No children ranked superior in the first rating on the development of appreciations, while one ranked superior in the second rating. Nine ranked average in the first rating, and ten ranked average in the second rating. Three ranked fair in the first rating, while one ranked fair in the second rating. One moved into the superior ranking, and two moved into the average ranking.

On the development of understandings none ranked superior in the first rating, while one ranked superior in the second rating. Eleven ranked average in the first rating, and ten ranked average in the second rating. One child ranked fair in both ratings. The superior group gained one, the average group lost one, and the fair group remained the same.

In the development of skills three ranked superior in the first

rating, and three ranked superior in the second rating, there being no change. Five ranked average in the first rating, while seven ranked average in the second rating, there being a gain of two. Four ranked fair in the first rating, and two ranked fair in the last rating. The average group gained two and the fair group lost two.

No children ranked superior to sensitivity to group strivings in either of the first or second ratings. Seven ranked average in the first rating, and twelve ranked average in the second rating. There were five who ranked fair in the first rating, and none in the second rating. The average group gained five and the fair group lost five.

Three children ranked superior in the first rating on emotional adjustment, and five ranked superior in the second rating. Five ranked average in the first rating, and seven ranked average in the second rating. Four ranked fair in the first rating, while none ranked average in the second rating. There were two who went into the superior ranking, and four who went into the average ranking.

In formulating and achieving their own purpose one ranked superior in the first rating, and four ranked superior in the second rating. Eight ranked average in the first rating, and six ranked average in the second rating. One ranked fair in the first rating, and two ranked fair in the second rating. There were two in the first rating upon which there was no basis for judgment, while there were none in the second rating in this group. On this item of evaluation three went into the superior ranking, one went into the average ranking, and two left the no basis for judgment group.

Four ranked superior in health in the first rating and five ranked

superior in the second rating. Eight ranked average in the first rating, and seven ranked average in the second rating. There were no children in the other two groups in either rating. The superior group gained one, while the average group lost one.

Two ranked superior in qualities for leadership in the first ranking, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Four ranked average in the first rating, and eight ranked average in the second rating. Six ranked fair in the first rating, and one ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained five, and the group ranking fair lost five.

Two ranked superior in both ratings on qualities for followship, eight ranked average in the first rating, and nine ranked average in the second rating. Two ranked fair in the first rating, with one ranking fair in the second rating. The only change here was the one who went from fair to average.

In physical development four ranked superior in the first rating, and six ranked superior in the second rating. Eight ranked average in the first rating, and six ranked average in the second rating. Two went from the average group to the superior group.

One ranked superior in ability to meet success in the first rating, and two ranked superior in the second rating. Three ranked average in the first rating, and eight ranked average in the second rating. Four ranked fair in the first rating, and two ranked fair in the second rating. There were four in the first rating upon which no basis for judgment was found, and none in the second rating with no basis for judgment.

There were none who ranked superior on either rating in the ability

TABLE 4

THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE FIRST GRADE RANKING SUPERIOR, AVERAGE, AND FAIR ON THE ITEMS OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AT THE BEGINNING AND END OF THE SUMMER TERM, AND THE NUMBER FOR WHICH THERE WAS NO BASIS FOR JUDGMENT.

Evaluative criteria	Number Rated Superior		Number Rated Average		Number Rated Fair		Number with No Basis for Judgment	
	Beginning	Final	Beginning	Final	Beginning	Final	Beginning	Final
Development of interests	1	4	9	6	2	2		
Development of aptitudes		2	10	9	2	1		
Development of appreciations		1	9	10	3	1		
Development of understandings		1	11	10	1	1		
Development of skills	3	3	5	7	4	2		
Sensitivity to group strivings			7	12	5			
Emotional adjustment	3	5	5	7	4			
Formulating purpose	1	4	8	6	1	2	2	
Qualities for leadership	2	3	4	8	6	1		
Qualities for followship	2	2	8	9	2	1		
Health	4	5	8	7				
Physical development	4	6	8	6				
Ability to meet success	1	2	3	8	4	2	4	
Ability to meet failure			5	8	3	4	4	
Development of sense of values		1	6	7	4	4	2	
Expressions in writing				2			12	10
Expressions in speaking			4	7	3	5	5	
Contributions to group learning	2	3	4	7	6	2		
Development in tools of learning		3	5	7	5	2	2	
Discovery of problems for himself		3	4	5	6	4	2	
Total	25	48	125	148	62	34	53	10

to meet success, five who ranked average on the first rating, and eight who ranked average on the second rating. Three ranked fair in the first rating, and four ranked fair in the second rating. There were four in the first rating in the no basis for judgment group. The average group gained three

and the fair group gained one. The no basis for judgment group lost four in the second rating.

No children ranked superior in the first rating on the development of sense of values, and one ranked superior in the second rating. Six ranked average in the first rating, and seven ranked average in the second rating. Four ranked fair in both the first and second ratings. There were two in the first rating who offered no basis for judgment, and none in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost two.

No children ranked superior in either of the first or second ratings in expressions in writing, none ranked average in the first rating, and two ranked average in the second rating. None ranked fair in either rating. Twelve offered no basis for judgment in the first rating, and ten offered no basis for judgment in the second rating. The only change here was the two who went to the average group.

In expressions in speaking no children rated in either rating. Four ranked average in the first rating, and seven ranked average in the second rating. Three ranked fair in the first rating, and five ranked fair in the second rating. There were five upon which no judgment could be made in the first rating and none in the second rating. The average group gained three, and the fair group gained five.

Two ranked superior in the first rating on contributions to group learning, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Four ranked average in the first rating, and seven ranked average in the second rating. Six rated fair in the first rating, and two rated fair in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained three, and the fair group lost four.

There were no children who ranked superior in the first rating in development in tools of learning, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Five ranked average in the first rating, and seven ranked average in the second rating. Five ranked fair in the first rating, and two ranked fair in the second rating. There were two in the first rating for whom there was no basis for judgment. The superior group gained one, the average group gained two, and the fair group lost three.

No children ranked superior in the first rating on discovery of problems for himself, while three ranked superior in the second rating. Four ranked average in the first rating, and five ranked average in the second rating. Six ranked fair in the first rating, and four ranked fair in the second rating. There were two in the no basis for judgment group in the first rating and none in the second. The superior group gained three, the average group gained one, and the fair group lost two.

The total shows that there were twenty-five ranking superior in the first rating, and forty-eight ranking superior in the second rating. This was a gain of thirteen. The average group showed one hundred twenty-five in the first rating, and one hundred forty-eight in the second rating. This group also gained thirteen. The fair grouping showed sixty-two in the first rating, and thirty-four in the second rating. There was a loss of twenty-eight in this grouping. There were thirty-three in the no-basis-for-judgment group on the first rating, and ten on the second rating. The ten left in this group had not learned to write and of course could not express themselves in writing. The group upon which there was no basis for judgment lost twenty-three, these going into higher rankings.

It was noted that the superior group gained fifty-two per cent, the

average group gained one and four-tenths per cent, the fair group lost forty-one per cent, and the group with no basis for judgment lost forty-three per cent. The gain in the first two groupings and the loss in the second two groupings shows that in the six weeks a great deal of pupil growth took place among the pupils in the first grade.

Second Grade Evaluation

There were nine children in the second grade during the six weeks. All of the children seemed eager to participate in the activities, and all of them had a wholesome attitude toward the school. There was, however, one problem to begin with. This was that the children would not talk. To overcome this, a flower show was arranged and all the other pupils in the school were invited to come. The children in the second grade went around with the other children and told what each flower was and all they knew about it. After the flower show these children in the second grade talked much more freely and seemed to lose some of their timidity.

After the children had the flower show they decided to build a flower shop. All of the children enjoyed new experiences doing this, and when they had finished, they had an attractive flower shop.

Other activities participated in during the six weeks were an excursion to see flowers, finger painting, the making of looms and weaving hot pads, a picnic, and making a tray to deliver ice cream to their room.

The children were busy on things that they liked to do, and there was a noticeable air of happiness throughout the room.

Table 5 shows that two children in the second grade ranked superior on the development of interest in the first rating, while five ranked superior in the second rating. Four ranked average in the first rating, and

four ranked average in the final rating. One ranked fair in the first rating; none ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained three and the fair group lost three.

One child ranked superior on development of aptitudes in the first rating; two children ranked superior in the final rating. Six ranked average in the first rating, and six ranked average in the second rating. Two ranked fair in the first rating, and one ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained one and the fair group lost one.

Two children ranked superior on development of appreciations in the first rating, and five ranked superior in the second rating. Five ranked average in the first rating, and three ranked average in the second rating. Two ranked fair in the first rating, and one ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained three, the average group lost two, and the fair group lost one.

On development of understandings two ranked superior in the first rating, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Four ranked average in the first rating, and three ranked average in the second rating. There were three in the fair group in both the first and second ratings. The superior group gained one, the average group lost one, and the fair group remained the same.

One ranked superior in the first rating on the development of skills, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Four ranked average in both ratings. Four ranked fair in the first rating, while two ranked average in the second rating. The superior group gained two, and the fair group lost two.

Two ranked superior in the first rating on sensitivity to group strivings, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Four ranked average

TABLE 5

THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE SECOND GRADE RANKING SUPERIOR, AVERAGE,
AND FAIR ON THE ITEMS OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AT THE BEGINNING
AND END OF THE SUMMER TERM, AND THE NUMBER FOR WHICH
THERE WAS NO BASIS FOR JUDGMENT

Evaluative criteria	Number Rated Superior		Number Rated Average		Number Rated Fair		Number with No Basis for Judgment	
	Beginning	Final	Beginning	Final	Beginning	Final	Beginning	Final
Development of interests	2	5	4	4	3			
Development of aptitudes	1	2	6	6	2	1		
Development of appreciations	2	5	5	3	2	1		
Development of understandings	2	3	4	3	3	3		
Development of skills	1	3	4	4	4	2		
Sensitivity to group strivings	2	3	4	3	3	3		
Emotional adjustment	1	2	5	6	3	1		
Formulating and achieving purpose	2	3	3	4	2	2		
Qualities for leadership	1	2	3	6	3	1		
Qualities for followship	2	3	4	5	3	1		
Health	1	2	6	7	2			
Physical development	2	2	6	7	1			
Ability to meet success	2	3	3	5	2	1	2	
Ability to meet failure		2	5	6	2	1	2	
Development of sense of values		2	6	6	2	1	1	
Expressions in writing	2	3	4	5	2	1	1	
Expressions in speaking		4	4	3	3	2	2	
Contributions to group enterprises		4	7	3	2	2		
Development in tools of learning	2	2	4	6	3	1		
Discovery of problems for himself		1	5	6	5	2		
Total	23	55	94	97	54	26	8	

in the first rating, and three ranked average in the second rating. The fair group remained the same with three in it on both ratings. The superior group gained one, the average group lost one, and the fair group remained the same.

On emotional adjustment one ranked superior in the first rating, and two ranked superior in the second rating. Five ranked average in the first rating; six ranked average in the second rating. Three ranked fair in the first rating; one ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group one, and the fair group lost two.

Two ranked superior in the first rating on formulating and achieving purpose, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Five ranked average on the first rating, and four ranked average on the second rating. Two were in the fair group on both ratings. The superior group gained one and the average group lost one.

One ranked superior in the first rating on qualities for leadership, and two ranked superior in the second rating. Three ranked average in the first rating, and six ranked average in the second rating. Five were in the fair group in the first rating and one in the second. The superior group gained one, the average group gained three, and the fair group lost four.

On qualities for fellowship two ranked superior in the first rating, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Four ranked average in the first rating, and five ranked average in the second rating. One ranked fair in the first rating, and there were none in this group in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained one, and the fair group lost two.

One ranked superior on health in the first rating, and two ranked superior in the second rating. Six were in the average group on the first rating, and seven were in the group on the second rating. There were two who ranked fair in the first rating and none ranked fair in the second

rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained one, and the fair group lost two.

Two ranked superior on physical development in the first and second ratings. Six ranked average in the first rating, and seven ranked average in the second rating. There was one in the fair group on the first rating and none in the group in the second rating. The superior group remained the same, the average group gained one, and the fair group lost one.

On ability to meet success two ranked superior in the first rating, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Three ranked average in the first rating; five ranked average in the second rating. Two were in the fair group on the first rating, and one was in this group on the second rating. There were two in the no-basis-for-judgment group on the first rating and none in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained two, the fair group lost one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost two.

No children were in the superior group on ability to meet failure in the first rating; two were in the group on the second rating. Five were in the average group on the first rating, and six were in the group on the second rating. There were two in the fair group on the first rating, and one in this group on the second rating. Two were in the no-basis-for-judgment group in the first rating and none were in the group in the second rating. The superior group gained two, the average group gained one, the fair group lost one, and the group with no basis for judgment lost two.

There were none who ranked superior on development of sense of values in the first rating; two ranked superior in the second rating. Six ranked

average in both ratings. The fair group had two in the first rating, and one in the second rating. There was one in the group for which no basis for judgment was available in the first rating. The superior group gained two, the average group remained the same, the fair group and the group with no basis for judgment lost one each.

Two ranked superior in the first rating on expressions in writing, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Four were in the average group in the first rating and five in the second rating. Two were in the fair group on the first rating and one in the second rating. There was one in the group with no basis for judgment in the first rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained one, and the fair group and no-basis-for-judgment group lost one each.

There were no children in the superior group in the first rating on expressions in speaking and four in the superior group on the second rating. The average group had four in the first rating and three in the second rating. The fair group had three in the first rating and two in the second rating. The group for which no basis for judgment was available had two in the first rating and none in the second rating. The superior group gained four, the average group lost one, the fair group lost one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost two.

On contributions to group enterprises there were none in the superior group in the first rating and four in the second rating. There were seven in the average group in the first rating and three in the second rating. The fair group remained the same with two in it on both ratings. The superior group gained four, and the average group lost four.

Two ranked superior in both ratings on development in tools of

learning. The average group contained four in the first rating and six in the second rating. The fair group had three in the first rating and one in the last rating. The average group gained two and the fair group lost two.

There were no children in the superior group in the first rating on discovering problems for themselves and one was in the second rating. Five were ranked average in the first rating and six in the second rating. Five ranked fair in the first rating and two ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained one, and the fair group lost two.

The superior group gained thirty-two, or 143 per cent; the average group gained one, or six-hundredths per cent; the fair group lost twenty-nine, or fifty-five per cent; and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost eight, or 100 per cent. It was significant that the first two groups showed a gain and the last groups showed a loss.

Third Grade Evaluation

There were fifteen pupils in the third grade during the six weeks. Only one of these was going to school for credit. There was no big project in the third grade room as the childrens' interests were varied and many activities were required to fill their desires. Because of the many activities that went on, the children received many experiences, and were always busily engaged in something.

The activities for the six weeks were giving a play for the Fourth of July, exhibiting art work, weaving mats and scarfs, knitting, making belts, painting, clay modeling, linoleum block printing, rug making, making

a riddle book of science, taking care of small animals, making looms, making bird houses, arranging the library, collecting and exhibiting insects, making butterfly nets, going to Lake Dallas to observe the flood waters, making excursions to the college art gallery, going on a picnic, playing games, singing songs, making diaries, using thermometers, and distributing ice cream.

Table 6 shows that two ranked superior in both ratings on development of interests. Eleven ranked average in the first rating, and twelve ranked average in the second rating. There were two in the fair group in the first rating and one in the second rating. The average group gained one and the fair group lost one.

There were no children in the superior group in either rating on development of aptitudes. The average group had ten in the first rating and twelve in the second rating. There were three in the fair group on both ratings. The no-basis-for-judgment group had two in the first rating and none in the second rating. The average group gained two and the group with no basis for judgment lost two.

There were two in the superior group on both ratings on development of appreciations. The average group had eight in the first rating and twelve in the second rating. The fair group had two in the first rating and one in the second rating. The group with no basis for judgment had three in the first rating and none in the second rating. The average group gained four, the fair group lost one, and the group with no basis for judgment lost three.

On the development of understandings there were three in the superior group in the first rating and four in the second rating. There were eight

in the average group in the first rating and eleven in the second rating. There were two in the fair group in the first rating and none in the second rating. The group for which there was no basis for judgment had two in the first rating and none in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained three, the fair group lost two, and the group with no basis for judgment lost two.

Three ranked superior in both ratings on development of skills. There were eight who ranked average in the first rating and nine in the second rating. The fair group contained two in the first rating and three in the last rating. The group for which there was no basis for judgment had two in the first rating and none in the second rating. The average group gained one, the fair group gained one, and the group with no basis for judgment lost two.

On sensitivity to group strivings two were in the superior group in both ratings, three were in the average group in the first rating, and six were in this group in the second rating. There were seven in the fair group in both ratings. The group for which there was no basis for judgment had three in the first rating and none in the second rating. The average group gained six, and the group with no basis for judgment lost three.

No children ranked superior in emotional adjustment on either ranking. Twelve ranked average in the first rating, and fourteen ranked average in the second rating. Three ranked fair in the first rating, and one ranked fair in the second rating. There was one in the group for which there was no basis for judgment in the first rating and none in the second rating. The average group gained six, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost three. The fair group lost two in the second rating.

There were three in the superior group in both ratings on formulating and achieving own purpose. The average group had six in the first rating and eight in the second rating. The fair group had three in the first rating and four in the second rating. There were three in the group for which there was no basis for judgment in the first rating. The average group gained two, the fair group gained one, and the group with no basis for judgment lost three.

Two ranked superior in the first rating on qualities for leadership, and five ranked superior in the second rating. Ten ranked average in the first rating and nine in the second rating. There were two in the fair group in the first rating and one in the second rating. The superior group gained two, the average group lost one, and the fair group lost one.

Two were in the superior group in the first and last ratings on health. Twelve were in the average group in the first rating, and thirteen were in this group in the second rating. The fair group contained one in the first rating and none in the second rating. The average group gained one, and the fair group lost one.

On physical development there were two in the superior group in the first rating and three in the second rating. There were thirteen in the average group in the first rating and twelve in the last rating. There was a gain of one in the superior group and a loss of one in the average group.

There was one in the superior group in the first rating on ability to meet success and two in this group in the last rating. There were thirteen in the average group in the first rating and twelve in the second rating. The fair group had one in the first rating and one in the last rating.

TABLE 6

THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE THIRD GRADE RANKING SUPERIOR, AVERAGE,
AND FAIR ON THE ITEMS OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AT THE BEGINNING
AND END OF THE SUMMER TERM, AND THE NUMBER FOR WHICH
THERE WAS NO BASIS FOR JUDGMENT

Evaluative criteria	Number Rated Superior		Number Rated Average		Number Rated Fair		Number with No Basis for Judgment	
	Beginning	End	Beginning	End	Beginning	End	Beginning	End
Development of interests	2	2	11	12	2	1		
Development of aptitudes			10	12	2	2	2	
Development of appreciations	2	2	3	12	2	1	3	
Development of understandings	3	4	3	11	2		2	
Development of skills	3	3	3	9	2	3	2	
Sensitivity to group strivings	2	2	3	6	7	7	3	
Emotional adjustment			12	14	3	1	1	
Formulating and achieving purpose	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	
Qualities for leadership	2	3	3	3	5	4		
Qualities for followship	3	5	10	9	2	1		
Health	2	2	12	13	1			
Physical development	2	3	13	12	1	1		
Ability to meet success	1	2	13	12	1	1		
Ability to meet failure	1	3	5	10	9	2		
Development of sense of values	1	3	9	7	4	5	1	
Expressions in writing	1	1	3	3	2	6	9	
Expressions in speaking	3	4	4	7	7	4	1	
Contributions to group learning	1	1	3	3	7	3	1	
Development of tools of learning		2	6	9	2	4	7	
Discovery of problems for himself	1	3	3	7	7	5	1	
Total	32	48	157	174	64	59	33	

The superior group gained one and the average group lost one during the first six weeks.

On ability to meet failure there was one in the superior group in the first rating and three in the second rating. There were five in the

average group in the first rating and ten in the group in the second rating. There were nine in the fair group in the first rating and two in the last rating. The superior group gained two, the average group gained five, and the fair group lost seven.

There was one in the superior group in the first rating on development of sense of values and three in the group in the second rating. The average group had eight in the first rating and seven in the second rating. There were four in the fair group in the first rating and five in the second rating. The group for which there was no basis for judgment had one in the first rating and none in the second rating. The superior group gained two, the average group lost one, and the fair group gained one. The group for which there was no basis for judgment lost one during the six weeks.

There were two in the superior group on expressions in writing in both ratings. The average group had three in the first rating and eight in the second rating. There were two in the fair group in the first rating and six in the last rating. On the first rating there were nine in the no-basis-for-judgment group. The average group gained five and the fair group gained four.

Three ranked superior in the first rating on expressions in speaking, and four were in this group in the second rating. There were four in the average group in the first rating and seven in the second rating. There were seven in the fair group in the first rating and four in the last. The group for which there was no basis for judgment had one in the first rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained three, the fair group lost three, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost one.

There was one in the superior group in both ratings of contributions to group learning. The average group had six in the first rating and eight in the last rating. The fair group had seven in the first rating and six in the second rating. There was one in the first rating upon which no basis for judgment was available. The average group gained two, the fair group lost one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost one.

On development of tools of learning there was none in the first rating and two in the second rating who ranked superior. The average group had six in the first rating and nine in the second rating. There were two in the fair group in the first rating and four in the second rating. The group for which there was no basis for judgment had seven in the first rating. The superior group gained two, the average group gained three, the fair group lost two, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost seven.

One ranked superior in the first rating on discovery of problems for himself, and three ranked superior in the second rating. There were six who ranked average in the first rating and seven in the second rating. Seven were in the fair group in the first rating and five in the second rating. There was one in the first rating upon whom no basis for judgment was available. The superior group gained two, the average group gained one, the fair group lost two, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost one.

The superior group gained sixteen, or fifty percent in the total, the average group gained seventeen, or ten and eight-tenths per cent, the fair group lost six, or ten and three-tenths per cent, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost thirty-three, or 100 per cent. It was noted that this group made less progress than any of the other groups. This group was also the only one that did not have student teachers with experience.

Fourth Grade Evaluation

There were sixteen pupils enrolled in the fourth grade during the first six weeks. Since it was summer there was a noticeable trend to engage in activities which had to do with vacationing. These children were very much interested in getting outside to study nature and observe various things. There were a great many activities carried on within the room in which all the children busily engaged themselves. This group of children read a great deal more than those in the lower grades, because their interests lead them to search for information in many books.

Perhaps the most interesting single activity that was carried on was the making of a canoe. This seemed to fascinate the boys of the class, and they did not want to stop work on it. The canoe was completed before the six weeks were up and it was a well-done piece of work.

Other activities engaged in were making an excursion to Lake Dallas to see the flood waters, mounting butterflies, collecting and classifying stones, finger painting, making candles, potato printing, going on a picnic, tying and dyeing scarfs, making match holders, making rugs, purses, mats, belts, and beaded bracelets, splatter painting, and keeping a diary.

It was noted that the children of this age group had begun to have broader interests and worked with more independence than those in the lower grades. They were quite definite as to how they were going to do things and were successful in their undertakings.

The children gave a program for the Fourth of July and invited all of the other children in school to come in and see it. This program helped the children to express themselves before others and increased their patriotism.

Table 7 shows that there were eleven who rated superior in development of interest in the first rating and twelve in the second rating. There were three in the average group in the first rating and four in the second rating. There were two in the fair group in the first rating and none in the second rating. The superior group gained one and the average group gained one.

There were six who ranked superior on development of aptitudes in the first rating and seven in the second rating. Seven were in the average group in both ratings. Both ratings showed two in the fair group. One was in the group for which there was no basis for judgment in the first rating. The superior group showed a gain of one, and the group with no basis for judgment lost one.

Both ratings showed eight in the superior group on development of appreciations. There were four in the average group in the first rating and seven in the group in the second rating. There were three in the fair group in the first rating with one having a fair ranking in the second rating. The no-basis-for-judgment group had one in the first rating and none in the second rating. The average group showed a gain of four, and the no-basis-for-judgment group showed a loss of one.

On the development of understandings four were placed in the superior group in the first rating, and five were in the group in the second rating. There were nine in the average group in the first rating and ten in the group in the second rating. Two were in the fair group in the first rating and one in the second rating. One was in the group for which there was no basis for judgment in the first rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained one, the fair group lost one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost one.

In the development of skills three were in the superior group in the first rating, and seven were in the group in the second rating. There were eleven who ranked average in the first rating and seven ranked average in the second rating. In the fair group there was one in the first rating and two in the second rating. There were two in the first rating for which there was no basis for judgment. The superior group gained four, the average group lost three, the fair group gained one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost two.

There were three who ranked superior in sensitivity to group strivings in the first rating, and four in the second rating. Both ratings gave the average group nine, and the fair group three. There was one in the group for which there was no basis for judgment. The superior group gained one and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost one.

In emotional adjustment none ranked superior in the first rating, and two ranked superior in the second rating. There were eight in the average group in the first rating and nine in the second rating. The fair group had two in the first rating and five in the second rating. There were six in the no-basis-for-judgment group in the first rating. The superior group gained two, the average group gained one, the fair group gained four, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost six.

Five ranked superior in the first rating on formulating and achieving own purpose, and eight ranked superior in the second rating. There were six in the average group in both ratings. The fair group had two in both ratings, and the no-basis-for-judgment group had two in the first rating. The superior group gained two, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost two.

On qualities for leadership there were four who ranked superior in the

first rating and eleven in the second rating. There were six in the average group in the first rating and three in the second rating. There were three in the fair group in the first rating, and two in the fair group in the second rating. There were three in the no-basis-for-judgment group in the first rating. The superior group gained seven, the average group lost three, the fair group lost one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost three.

Four ranked superior in the first rating on qualities for follow-ship, and six ranked superior in the second rating. There were seven in the average group in the first rating and nine in the average group in the second rating. The fair group had five in the first rating and one in the second rating. There was a gain of two in the superior group, a gain of two in the average group, and a loss of four in the fair group.

Two ranked superior on health in the first rating, and five ranked superior in the second rating. Eleven ranked average in the first rating, and ten ranked average in the second rating. There were three in the fair group in the first rating and one in the second rating. The superior group gained three, the average group lost one, and the fair group lost two.

Two ranked superior in physical development in the first rating, and six ranked superior in the second rating. There were nine ranking average in the first rating and ten in the second rating. Five ranked fair in the first rating, and none ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained four, the average group gained one, and the fair group lost five.

On ability to meet success there were no children ranking superior in

TABLE 7

THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE FOURTH GRADE RANKING SUPERIOR, AVERAGE,
AND FAIR ON THE ITEMS OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AT THE BEGINNING
AND END OF THE SUMMER TERM, AND THE NUMBER FOR WHICH
THERE WAS NO BASIS FOR JUDGMENT

Evaluative criteria	Number Rated Superior		Number Rated Average		Number Rated Fair		Number with No Basis for Judgment	
	Beginning	End	Beginning	End	Beginning	End	Beginning	End
Development of interests	11	12	3	4	2			
Development of aptitudes	6	7	7	7	2	2	1	
Development of appreciations	8	8	4	7	3	1	1	
Development of understandings	4	5	9	10	2	1	1	
Development of skills	3	7	11	7	1	2	2	
Sensitivity to group strivings	3	4	9	9	3	3	1	
Emotional adjustment		2	8	9	2	5	6	
Formulating and achieving purpose	5	8	6	6	2	2	2	
Qualities for leadership	4	11	6	3	3	2	3	
Qualities for fellowship	4	6	7	9	3	1		
Health	2	5	11	10	3	1		
Physical development	2	6	9	10	5			
Ability to meet success		2	9	13		1	7	
Ability to meet failure		1	3	7	3	7	8	
Development of sense of values	2	6	6	7	2	2	4	
Expressions in writing	2	3	6	9	3	4	3	
Expressions in speaking	1	5	13	13	2	1		
Contributions to group learning	2	2	12	13	2	1		
Development in tools of learning	2	4	6	9	7	3	1	
Discovery of problems for himself	3	7	7	6	4	3	2	
Total	64	109	167	171	56	42	42	

the first rating and two in the second rating. There were nine who ranked average in the first rating and thirteen in the second rating. One ranked fair in the second rating and none ranked fair in the first. There were seven in the first rating in the no-basis-for-judgment group. The

superior group gained two, the average group gained four, the fair group gained one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost seven.

No children were ranked superior in the first rating on ability to meet failure, while there was one in this group in the second rating. There were five who ranked average in the first rating and seven in the second rating. Three ranked fair in the first rating, and seven ranked fair in the second rating. Eight were in the no-basis-for-judgment group in the first rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained two, the fair group gained four, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost eight.

Two ranked superior in the first rating on development of sense of values and six rated superior in the second rating. Eight ranked average in the first rating and seven ranked average in the second rating. There were two in the fair group on both ratings. The group for which no basis of judgment was available contained four in the first rating. The superior group gained four, the average group lost one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost four.

Two ranked superior on expressions in writing in the first rating, and three ranked superior in the second rating. There were eight in the average group in the first rating and nine in the average group in the second rating. There were three in the fair group in the first rating and four in the group in the second rating. The no-basis-for-judgment group had three in the first rating. There was a gain of one in the superior group, a gain of one in the average group, a gain of one in the fair group, and a loss of three in the no-basis-for-judgment group.

One child rated superior on expressions in speaking in the first

rating, and three children ranked superior in the second rating. There were thirteen in the average group in the first rating and twelve in the average group in the second rating. There were two in the fair group in the first rating and one in the second rating. The superior group gained two, the average group lost one, and the fair group lost one.

There were two in both ratings on contributions to group learning in the superior group. The average group had twelve in the first rating and thirteen in the second rating. There were two in the fair group in the first rating and one in the second rating. The average group gained one and the fair group lost one.

On development of tools of learning there were two who ranked superior in the first rating and four in the second rating. Six ranked average in the first rating and nine ranked average in the second rating. There were seven in the fair group in the first rating and three in the group in the second rating. One was in the group with no basis for judgment. The superior group gained two, the average group gained three, the fair group lost four, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost one.

Three were in the superior group in the first rating on discovery of problems for self, while there were seven in this group in the second rating. There were seven in the average group in the first rating and six in the second rating. The fair group had four in the first rating and three in the second rating. There were two in the no-basis-for-judgment group. The superior group gained four, the average group lost one, the fair group lost one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost two.

There were forty-five, or seventy per cent, who went into the superior group in the second rating, four who went into the average group, this

being two and nine-tenths per cent. The fair grouping lost fourteen, or thirty-three per cent, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost forty-two or 100 per cent.

Fifth Grade Evaluation

There were fourteen students enrolled in the fifth grade during the first six weeks. Five of these students were going to school to make credit. There were more in the fifth grade trying to make credit than there were in any other grade. The students were slow but showed enthusiasm in their work during the summer.

One of the most outstanding interests of the children in this group was their interest in snakes. It so happened that on a fishing trip a snake was caught. This aroused the curiosity of the children and lead them to make a study of snakes. They made an excursion to the college biology department to see the various specimens of snakes. When the term was over, the students' interest in snakes was still high and they desired to continue their study about them.

Other activities engaged in during the first six weeks were splatter painting, soap carving, tying and dying, weaving, knitting, wood working, tempera painting, free hand drawing, pastel drawing, making dolls, doing stencil work, going fishing, making cork animals, making hot pad holders, going to Lake Dallas, having a news club, and making excursions.

Table 8 shows that there were none who ranked superior in the first rating on development of interests and one in the second rating. There were twelve who ranked average in both ratings. Two ranked fair in the first rating, and one ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained one and the fair group lost one.

On the development of aptitudes there were no children who ranked superior in either rating. Six ranked average in the first rating and eleven ranked average in the second rating. There were eight who ranked fair in the first rating; three ranked fair in the second rating. The average group gained five and the fair group lost five.

No children ranked superior in the first rating on development of appreciations, while two ranked superior in the second rating. There were nine ranking average in the first rating and ten in the second rating. The fair group showed five in the first rating and two in the second rating. The superior group gained two, the average group gained one, and the fair group lost three.

On the development of understandings no children ranked superior in the first rating and one ranked superior in the second rating. There were thirteen in the average group in both ratings. The fair group had one in the first rating and none in the second rating. The superior group gained one and the fair group lost one.

In the first rating there were none in the superior group on development of skills, and one in the group in the second rating. There were eleven in the average group in the first rating and twelve in the second rating. Three ranked fair in the first rating, and one ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained one, and the fair group lost two.

There were no children ranking superior in either rating on sensitivity to group strivings. Seven ranked average in the first rating and ten ranked average in the second rating. There were seven ranking fair in the first rating and four ranking fair in the second rating. The average group gained three and the fair group lost three.

No children were in the superior group in the first rating on emotional adjustment, while three ranked superior in the second rating. Two ranked average in the first rating, and ten were average in the second rating. There were no children in the fair group in the first rating and one in this group in the second rating. The no-basis-for-judgment group had twelve in the first rating and none in the second rating. The superior group gained three, the average group gained eight, the fair group gained one, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost twelve.

In formulating and achieving purpose there were none ranking superior in the first rating and two ranking superior in the second rating. Six ranked average in the first rating, and nine ranked average in the second rating. Eight were in the fair group in the first rating, and three were in the group in the second rating. The superior group gained two, the average group gained three, and the fair group lost five.

One child ranked superior on qualities for leadership in the first rating, and three ranked superior in the second rating. Five ranked average in the first rating, and eleven ranked average in the second rating. There were four in the fair group in the first rating and none in the second rating. Four were in the no-basis-for-judgment group in the first rating with none in the group in the last rating. The superior group gained two, the average group gained six, the fair group lost four, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost four.

There were no children ranking superior in either rating on qualities for followship. Eight ranked average in the first rating and thirteen ranked average in the second rating. There was one in the fair group in each rating. The no-basis-for-judgment group contained five in the first

TABLE 8

THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE FIFTH GRADE RANKING SUPERIOR, AVERAGE,
AND FAIR ON THE ITEMS OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AT THE BEGINNING
AND END OF THE SUMMER TERM, AND THE NUMBER FOR WHICH
THERE WAS NO BASIS FOR JUDGMENT

Evaluative criteria	Number Rated Superior		Number Rated Average		Number Rated Fair		Number with No Basis for Judgment	
	Beginning	End	Beginning	End	Beginning	End	Beginning	End
Development of interests		1	12	12	2	1		
Development of aptitudes			6	11	8	3		
Development of appreciations		2	9	10	5	2		
Development of understandings		1	13	13	1			
Development of skills		1	11	12	3	1		
Sensitivity to group strivings			7	10	7	4		
Emotional adjustment		3	2	10		1	12	
Formulating and achieving purpose		2	6	9	8	3		
Qualities for leadership	1	3	5	11	4		4	
Qualities for fellowship			8	13	1	1	5	
Health		5	14	8		1		
Physical development		4	14	10				
Ability to meet success				14			14	
Ability to meet failure		1		9	1	4	13	
Development of sense of values		2	12	10	2	2		
Expressions in writing		3		7		4	14	
Expressions in speaking	2	3	8	9	4	2		
Contributions to group learning		1	12	12	2	1		
Development of tools of learning		2	12	10	2	2		
Discovery of problems for himself		5	12	7	2	2		
Total	3	39	163	202	52	36	49	

rating and none in the last rating. The average group gained five and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost five.

No children ranked superior in health in the first rating and five ranked superior in the second rating. There were fourteen ranking average

in the first rating and eight in the second rating. No children ranked fair in the first rating and one ranked fair in the second rating. This was due to the fact that one child became ill after the first rating was made and remained ill most of the six weeks. The superior group gained five, the average group lost six, and the fair group gained one.

Four ranked superior on physical development in the second rating and none ranked superior in the first rating. Fourteen ranked average in the first rating and ten ranked average in the second rating. There were none in the other two groups in either rating. The superior group gained four, the average group lost four, and the fair group had none.

There were no children in the superior group in either rating on ability to meet success. Fourteen ranked average in the second rating, and none ranked average in the first rating. There were none in the fair group in either rating. The no-basis-for-judgment group contained fourteen in the first rating and none in the second rating. The average group gained fourteen and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost fourteen.

No children ranked superior in the first rating on the ability to meet failure, and one ranked superior in the second rating. There were none in the average group in the first rating and nine in the average group in the second rating. One was in the fair group in the first rating and four were in this group in the second rating. There were thirteen in the no-basis-for-judgment group in the first rating and none in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained nine, the fair group gained three, and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost thirteen.

No children ranked superior in the first rating on development of sense of values and two ranked superior in the second rating. Twelve

ranked average in the first rating and ten ranked average in the second rating. Two ranked fair in each rating. The superior group gained two, the average group lost two, and the other groups remained the same.

On expressions in writing none ranked superior in the first rating and three ranked superior in the second rating. No children ranked average in the first rating, and seven ranked average in the second rating. There were none ranking fair in the first rating and four ranking fair in the second rating. Fourteen were in the no-basis-for-judgment group in the first rating, all of these moving into other groups in the second rating.

Two ranked superior on expressions in speaking in the first rating and three ranked superior in the second rating. Eight ranked average in the first rating and nine ranked average in the second rating. Four ranked fair in the first rating and two ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group gained one, and the fair group lost two.

There were no children ranking superior in the first rating on contributions to group learning, while one ranked superior in the second rating. There were twelve ranking average on both ratings. Two ranked fair in the first rating and one ranked fair in the second rating. The superior group gained one, the average group remained the same, and the fair group lost one.

No children ranked superior on development of tools of learning in the first rating, and two ranked superior in the second rating. There were twelve in the average group in the first rating and ten in this group in the second rating. The fair group had two in both ratings.

The superior group gained two, the average group lost two, and the other groups remained the same.

No children ranked superior in the first rating on discovery of problems for self, and five ranked superior in the second rating. The average group had twelve in the first rating and seven in the last rating. There were two in the fair group in both ratings. The superior group gained five, the average group lost five, and the fair group remained the same.

The total shows that the superior group gained thirty-six, or 1,200 per cent; the average group gained thirty-nine, or twenty-four per cent; the fair group lost sixteen, or thirty per cent; and the no-basis-for-judgment group lost forty-nine, or 100 per cent.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

From the findings of this study it was concluded that:

1. The Sam Houston Elementary School had a definite philosophy which was based upon modern educational concepts. This philosophy recognized the place of the child in society, and also recognized the fact that children must be provided with broad experiences. Consideration was given to the fact that children were different in capacity and interests. Provision was made for democratic proceedings in the school so as to give the child real democratic experiences. The school provided these democratic experiences and did not try to force a child to enter into the activities which he was not capable of doing.

2. There were adequate objectives set up which recognized the need for pupil participation in varied experiences. These objectives provided for more than mere drill and formal procedures. They took into consideration the experiences which would make the child a better citizen in a democracy, and provided for the health and general welfare of the child. The objectives set up covered all phases of the child's life, and were designed to make the child a well-rounded personality.

3. The objectives of the school were met in a very effective way. The evaluation of the students of the Sam Houston School shows that all but seven of them made progress. This progress was made by the pupils being given an opportunity to participate in many activities during the summer. The children enjoyed their work during the summer. This was

evidenced by their actions. When school was out, the interests of the children were much more versatile and enriched. The children had many different experiences during the term which grew out of the activities in which they engaged.

4. The average rank of the student teachers based upon self-rating was lower than the ranking given to them by the supervising teachers. The difference may have been due to modesty on the part of the student teachers, or it may be attributed to the fact that the student teachers who were using new methods and procedures had doubt as to their efficiency. The difference between the supervising teachers' ranking and the student teachers' self-ranking was one point.

5. The student teachers in the Sam Houston School ranked in the grouping which showed considerable evidence of good quality. The student teachers were better than average since they ranked four and four-tenths on the teacher rating scale. The average teacher would have rated four on this rating scale. This could reasonably be expected because the supervising teachers helped the student teachers constantly, giving them guidance and advice. There was no discord among any of the staff during the entire term. The student teachers did their jobs cheerfully and efficiently, and the supervising teachers gave help and advice to them in a pleasing, effective manner.

6. The student teachers who had experience ranked higher than those who had no previous experience. The second and fifth grade student teachers all had previous teaching experience which reflected in their work. The second and fifth grade showed the greatest percentage of gain for the six weeks. In the grades where the more experienced

student teachers taught, larger projects were attempted. In the second grade there was an outstanding example of this since there were more extensive undertakings in this grade.

7. The fact that fifty-six out of sixty-six children went to school without trying to make any credit indicates that they were having appropriate experiences. It further indicates that the children's interests were in the things that were done in school. This is important since it shows that the school is becoming a place where children can go to enjoy their lives by participating in things which will not only give them an understanding of things, but will also equip them for living in a complex society.

8. There were many activities carried on in the school during the first six weeks. The activities ranged from drill in subject matter to activities carried on entirely out of the building. The activities consisted of making various articles, collecting specimens, going on field trips, making excursions, constructing playhouses, giving programs, singing, fishing, painting, recreational reading, weaving, knitting, picnicking, drawing, and clay modeling. The children were always busy in their work and often did not want to leave it to go outside to play.

9. It was noted that all groups made considerable progress during the first six weeks. There was a fifty-two per cent gain in the superior group in the first grade. The average group gained one and four-tenths, and the fair group lost forty-one per cent.

A gain of 143 per cent was shown in the superior group in the second grade. The average group gained one and six-hundredths per cent,

and the fair group lost fifty-five per cent. This group was second in the amount of progress made during the term.

The superior group in the third grade gained fifty per cent, the average group gained ten and eight-tenths, and the fair group lost ten and three-tenths per cent.

There was a seventy per cent gain in the superior group in the fourth grade, the average group gained two and nine-tenths, and the fair group lost thirty-three per cent.

The superior group in the fifth grade gained 1,200 per cent, the average group gained twenty-four per cent, and the fair group lost thirty per cent.

APPENDIX

PUPIL EVALUATION SHEET

Name _____ Age _____ Grade _____

- _____ 1. Development of interests
- _____ 2. Development of aptitudes
- _____ 3. Development of appreciations
- _____ 4. Development of understandings
- _____ 5. Development of skills
- _____ 6. Sensitivity to problems of group strivings
- _____ 7. Emotional adjustment
- _____ 8. Effectiveness in formulating and achieving his own purpose
- _____ 9. Qualities for leadership
- _____ 10. Qualities for followship
- _____ 11. Health
- _____ 12. Physical development
- _____ 13. Ability to meet success
- _____ 14. Ability to meet failure
- _____ 15. Development of sense of values
- _____ 16. Expressions in writing
- _____ 17. Expressions in speaking
- _____ 18. Contributions to group enterprises
- _____ 19. Development in tools of learning
- _____ 20. Discovery of problems for himself
- _____ 21. Enterprises participated in _____

SUPERVISORS' RATING SHEET

Name of student teacher _____ Average Rating _____

Rank each of the factors below in accordance with evidence defined.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3
Little or no evidence or some evidence of poor quality		Considerable evidence of fair quality and some evidence of good quality			Abundant evidence of excellent quality		Plenti-ful	Appar-ently ade-quate	Inade-quate

A. Encourages pupil participation in planning, executing, and evaluating

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3

B. Uses current materials in professional study and in work with pupils

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3

C. Stimulates fair consideration in controversial issues

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3

D. Provides appropriate firsthand experiences for pupils and self

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3

E. Has an agreeable personal demeanor and appearance

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3

F. Cares for administrative details with necessary degree of dispatch

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3

G. Discovers and relates work to the needs of the pupil

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3

STUDENT TEACHER SELF-RATING SHEET

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Date started to college _____ Number of years experience _____

Grade you teach in your position _____ Grade taught here _____

Below is a list of items on which you may rate yourself as a teacher. All information is strictly confidential and your name will be omitted when the study is written.

Rank yourself on each item below with the evidence defined.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Average Rating
Little or no evidence or some evidence of poor quality		Considerable evidence of fair quality and some evidence of good quality			Abundant evidence of excellent quality		_____

A. To what extent do I encourage pupil participation in planning, executing, and evaluating?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B. To what extent do I use current materials in professional study and in work with pupils?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

C. To what extent do I stimulate fair consideration in controversial issues?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

D. To what extent do I provide appropriate firsthand experiences for the pupils and for myself?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

E. To what extent do I have an agreeable personal demeanor and appearance?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

F. To what extent do I care for administrative detail?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

G. To what extent have I related the work to the needs of the pupil?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Brader, Edith M., and others, The Changing Curriculum, New York, D. Appleton-Century Co., 1937.
- Brueckner, Leo J., The Changing Elementary School, New York, Inor Publishing Co., 1931.
- Good, Carter V., Barr, A. S., and Scates, Douglas E., The Methodology of Educational Research, New York, D. Appleton Co. Inc., 1936.
- McCaughy, J. R., An Evaluation of the Elementary School, New York, The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1937.
- McKown, Harry C., Activities in the Elementary School, New York, McGraw Hill Book Co. Inc., 1938.
- Reavis, William C., Pierce, Paul R., and Stullkin, Edward H., The Elementary School, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Salisbury, Edith I., An Activity Curriculum, San Francisco, Harr Wagner Publishing Co., 1924.

Reports

- Evaluative Criteria, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, Education Policies Commission, Washington, D. C., 1937.

Articles

- Doughton, Issac, "A Philosophy of Education in Outline," Educational Forum, XVI (May, 1937), 504-505.
- Hilda, Taba, "The Functions of Evaluation," Childhood Education, XV (February, 1939), 250-253.
- Hosic, James F., "The Problem of Evaluation," Educational Method, XV (May, 1939), 446-451.
- Tyler, Ralph W., "Appraising Progressive Schools," Educational Method, XV (May, 1936), 412-415.