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This study was undertaken to determine the prevailing practices in regard to professional laboratory experiences in teacher education in the colleges and universities of North Carolina. To obtain data for the study, check lists were mailed to the thirty-two colleges and universities of the state which have a teacher-education program. From the thirty replies to these questionnaires, the data presented were drawn.

North Carolina teacher educators report satisfaction with the general policies of their several institutions. Eighty percent reported administrative and inter-departmental co-operation to be satisfactory; a slightly greater per cent subscribe to the policy of continuous evaluation and revision of the teacher-education program. About 73% expressed satisfaction with the adequacy of the staff provided for implementation of the program, and 65% with the travel funds furnished them.

Although early and continuous laboratory experiences in professional training are recognized as basic requirements of a modern teacher-training program, comparatively few North Carolina schools report a well-rounded program from the standpoint of laboratory experiences prior to student teaching. The only activity reported by more than 60% of the institutions was observation in various forms. Never by more than 56.6% of participating schools was any activity requiring direct participation in a laboratory experience reported. The median
number of schools listing any given activity was 9.5; the mode was 9. This means only about 30%, on the average, of reporting institutions engaged in any one activity listed on the questionnaire. Half the activities, then, were reported by fewer than one-third of the colleges responding, while only 80% reported the most common of all activities, classroom observation. In the area of participation in actual classroom situations the best showing was made, with almost 40% of the listed activities in that area reported by from 53% to 80% of the schools, the remainder of the activities in this area being reported by percentages ranging from 23% to 47%. The area of study of the child ranked next, with one activity—classroom observation—reported by 77%, while the lowest percentage reporting any activity in this area was 30%. Reports on activities in the area of the study of the school community and in the area of understanding the school situation as a whole ranked almost equally low, many schools not reporting a single activity in these areas. Moreover, at least 16% of the North Carolina colleges taking part in the study reported no planned program for laboratory experiences prior to student teaching. As to general procedure in providing for pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences, most programs include such experiences as a part of required course work. Seventy per cent reported this plan, but some of these modified their replies by the report that, although laboratory experiences are thus made available, they are not required of prospective teachers.
The period of student teaching furnishes in most North Carolina colleges and universities the major portion of professional laboratory experiences in teacher education. Although it may be placed as early as the last quarter or semester of the junior year, 70% of the reporting institutions stated that most of their student teaching falls in the final quarter or semester of the senior year. Offering credits varying from three semester hours to fifteen quarter hours, North Carolina teacher-training institutions show a great deal of variety in length and intensity of the student-teaching assignment. One-third of them require a full day for a quarter or a semester, but almost as many--26.6% of them--report one hour a day for that period of time, with the remainder reporting nine other practices. The prerequisites for student teaching as reported by more than two-thirds of the thirty responding institutions were: completion of certain courses, completion of a given number of hours of work, readiness for student teaching, and a certain scholarship standing; more than 50% required also a formal application by the student and recommendations by the head of the department and other staff members.

The critic teacher, as reported by a majority of colleges, must hold a North Carolina "A" certificate, have had at least three years teaching experience, and be recommended by the principal and/or superintendent of the school in which he teaches. However, more than a third of the colleges require
nothing more than a recommendation; only two report requirement of special work in supervision of student teaching. In most cases, the responsibility of the critic teacher in supervising student teaching is shared only by the college supervisor; but 37% of the schools reported that the principal of the school and the student's major professor play an important role. Only six colleges reported assigning more than two student teachers to any one critic teacher at any one time; none reported more than four at a time, and this, they stated, only when unavoidable. College supervisors are responsible for from five to more than thirty student teachers at a time; the median assignment is between fifteen and twenty student teachers per quarter or semester. They visit each of these students five or more times, as reported by more than a third of the institutions participating, while about a fourth of them reported only three visits. The modal length of these visits is one period, two-thirds of the colleges reporting this figure. In more than a third of the cases, the college supervisor also teaches college classes, and in only a tenth of the cases does he spend his full time in supervising student teaching.

Usually (in eighty per cent of the cases) the critic teacher has a preliminary interview with the student, often (in seventy per cent of the cases) furnishing materials, textbooks, etc. before the student begins the student-teaching assignment. All but two institutions reported that during the student-teaching
period the critic teacher holds regularly scheduled conferences with the student teacher, and that he leaves the student teacher alone in charge of the class for brief intervals. Written lesson plans are required, reported 83% of the participating colleges; and 73% reported that toward the end of the teaching period the student teacher assumes charge of the class alone for several days. In 50% of the cases, the student has begun actual teaching during the second week of his assignment; very few begin earlier than this.

The variety and scope of laboratory experiences during this period are most important. An "adequate" experience in the following areas is reported in the listed proportions: Every college reports adequate experience in classroom activities; all but two, in routine duties; 77%, a bloc of time for actual teaching; 73%, work with the individual pupil; 57%, extracurricular activities; 53%, professional meetings; and 30%, community activities. Comparison with data on pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences reveals that the two fields showing least frequency of experience prior to student teaching again rank lowest: professional and community activities--two areas of teaching which according to many educators rank at the very top in meaningfulness and value.

The grade of the student teacher is reported to be based by 46.6% of the colleges on a decision reached in conference of all supervisors; in an equal number of colleges, the
supervisor either uses a grade or rating chart given by the critic teacher, or confers with him before giving the grade. In ninety to one-hundred per cent of the cases the grade is passing.

Student teaching is conducted in off-campus schools by all of the colleges. Only six have laboratory schools. Off-campus cooperating schools are chosen by more than 50% of the colleges on a basis of (1) accessibility; (2) qualifications of administration and faculty; (3) adequacy of plant and teaching aids; and (4) state accreditation. In setting up an off-campus teaching center, all colleges reported that they consult the principal of the cooperating school; 85% work with the superintendent of the administrative unit; and 57% consult the faculty. In making the assignment of the student teacher to a particular cooperating school, 93% or more of the colleges consult the principal, the critic teacher, and the student teacher. Only 43% work through the superintendent of the unit in assigning individual teachers. Student teachers are allowed to teach near their homes when financial and domestic obligations seem to warrant it, reported 47% of the participating institutions. By 33% of the colleges, they may be assigned to the schools from which they graduated, while 30% require that they live in the community in which they teach. Three schools assign their weakest students to the campus school.

There is no limit to the number of student teachers who may be assigned to any one cooperating school at any one time,
reported 83% of the responding colleges and universities. Forty-seven per cent of them pay from fifteen to thirty dollars to the critic teacher for each student teacher, while 23% pay more, and 17% pay nothing. (Some schools did not report any payment, but failed to report no payment).

After the student-teaching assignment is over, prospective teachers are often considered to have ended their laboratory experiences. By 60% of the colleges it was reported that the student teacher did have a conference with a member of the department of student teaching after completion of his assignment; 47% reported conferences with the major professor, and 40% hold seminars for the purpose of evaluating student-teaching experiences. Other activities subsequent to student teaching were reported by only a few institutions.

Half the reporting colleges lend materials such as films, charts, etc., to their first-year teachers, upon request; and written suggestions are furnished by 40% of them. Thirty per cent of the colleges reported that members of the college staff visit graduates who are first-year teachers, as a means of assisting them with their problems.

Important suggestions for improvement of the teacher-education program include:

(1) That North Carolina colleges and universities plan more varied and more frequent laboratory experiences prior to student teaching; that these experiences be initiated early and
be continuous throughout the prospective teacher's college career.

(2) That especial attention be given to providing meaningful professional laboratory experiences in the areas of community and professional activities before student teaching.

(3) That the pre-student-teaching program of professional laboratory experiences be so planned as to provide a maximum of those experiences requiring active participation on the part of the future teacher.

(4) That standards be set up to make more uniform throughout the state practices in regard to
   (a) the length and intensity of the student-teaching assignment;
   (b) the credit given for the course;
   (c) the correlation between length and intensity of the assignment and credit hours given for it;
   (d) the payment of the critic teacher.

(5) That higher and more uniform criteria for the selection for critic teachers be employed.

(6) That laboratory experiences to be included in the student-teaching activities be so planned as to give an adequate amount of experience in every phase of a teacher's work, instead of being concentrated on classroom and routine duties to the exclusion of other experiences.
(7) That every college include in its teacher-education program a course designed to follow student teaching and to give meaning and direction to the experiences of the student-teaching assignment. This would necessitate a shift of the student-teaching time-location from the prospective teacher's final quarter or semester to an earlier position.

(8) That a planned program of assistance and direction of recent graduates serving as first-year teachers be made an integral part of the teacher-education program. This means not merely "encouraging the former students to come with their problems," or "helping them on request," but a program that would reach and aid every first-year teacher from that college.

(9) That a further study be made to evaluate the success of the various teacher-training methods employed in North Carolina, and that the best of these be listed and recommended to the colleges and universities of the state.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In a time of stress, when the wars of ideology with ideology, gender wars of nation with nation and of continent with continent, the part played by the teacher of American youth is a vital one. "Teachers," says the Association for Student Teaching,¹ "must be persons who can and will act on thinking."

This means that teachers must be persons alert, intelligent, and well-trained. Their training must not involve mere rote-work, verbalization; it must open a highroad to action through thinking. "There is need for direct experience as a vital part of the professional program, in the sense of ... Webster's definition of experience: 'Personal trial, observation, or practice.'"²

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It is the purpose of this study (1) to ascertain the nature and extent of laboratory experiences provided the teacher trainees by the colleges


and universities of North Carolina, with a view toward standardization and improvement on the state level; (2) to make all college directors of student teaching in North Carolina conscious of the importance of laboratory experience in the total training of the teacher; (3) to provide a basis for a further study which should evaluate the effectiveness of those practices which are now in use; and (4) to provide a basis for recommendations as to which practices should receive more emphasis and which should receive less emphasis or be discontinued.

The problem itself presents three phases: (1) the determination of the nature and extent of laboratory experiences generally provided teacher trainees before they begin their student teaching course; (2) the determination of the nature and extent of laboratory experiences generally provided for teacher trainees during the student-teaching course; and (3) the determination of the nature and extent of laboratory experiences generally provided teacher trainees following the completion of the student-teaching course.

**Importance of the study.** The importance of a study such as this was suggested in the opening comments of the writer. With the greatest throng of school children in history crowded into the schoolrooms of the state, the capability of the teacher is more crucial than ever before. This capability implies a fulness of growth brought about by a
balanced diet of theory and practice. Unfortunately, it would seem that in an attempt to meet the ever-growing need for teachers, hastily-prepared programs have all too frequently offered an overabundance of theory, barely seasoned with practice. "Failure to provide direct experience early in the professional program may deny a vital purpose of the prospective teacher: namely, to know what is involved in teaching and his own reactions to the teaching-learning situation."³ "Laboratory experiences are a resource ... to give meaning to ideas and to help the learner see more clearly the implementation of those ideas."⁴

A study such as this should help set a higher and more uniform standard for the laboratory experiences offered in the teacher-training program. Knowledge of both the weaknesses and the strengths of North Carolina's present programs so revealed may help in making a blueprint for the erection of such a standard, while individual institutions may profit by a comparison of their practices with those of others, and with the recommendations based on these data.

Definition of terms used. The term laboratory experiences is used to refer to all those contacts with children, youth, and adults which make a direct contribution to an understanding of individuals and their guidance in the

---

teaching-learning process.

The term **student teaching** is used to refer to a specific course given for credit by the college or university, in which course the student does actual teaching in a classroom situation under the supervision of a critic teacher.

The term **critic teacher** is used to refer to the teacher in the college laboratory school or in the off-campus co-operating school who is responsible for supervising or directing the activities of student teachers assigned to him.

The term **college supervisor** is used to refer to a faculty member who is employed by the college to spend a specified part of his time in supervising student teaching by visits and conferences with both the student teacher and the critic teacher.

The term **laboratory school** is used to refer to a school located on the college campus and under the direction of the college.

The terms **off-campus school**, **off-campus teaching center**, and **co-operating school** are all used to refer to public schools located off the campus, but in which student teaching is done.

The terms **future teacher**, **prospective teacher**, and **teacher trainee** are used to refer to any college student majoring in education who plans to become a teacher.

The term **first-year teacher** is used to refer to a graduate of the department of education who is actually
teaching under contract his first school year.

**Scope of the study.** This study is restricted to a status study of current practices by the colleges and universities of North Carolina in providing laboratory experiences for their teacher trainees. It is not an extended evaluation of those practices, but rather a simple survey of them with recommendations suggested by an analysis of the data.
II. METHOD OF PROCEDURE AND SOURCES OF DATA

Statement of sources of data. The data for this study were collected as a part of a research investigation sponsored by the North Carolina State Advisory Council on Teacher Education. The sources of the data were the heads of the departments of education and/or the directors of student teaching in the colleges and universities of North Carolina. The following colleges and universities are represented in the study:

Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro.
Appalachian State Teachers College, Boone.
Atlantic Christian College, Wilson.
Barber-Scotia College, Concord.
Bennett College, Greensboro.
Catawba College, Salisbury.
Davidson College, Davidson.
Duke University, Durham.
East Carolina College, Greenville.
Elizabeth City State Teachers College, Elizabeth City.
Elon College, Elon College.
Fayetteville State Teachers College, Fayetteville.
Flora MacDonald College, Red Springs.
Greensboro College, Greensboro.
Guilford College, Guilford.
High Point College, High Point.
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte.
Lenoir-Rhyne College, Hickory.
Meredith College, Raleigh.
North Carolina College, Durham.
North Carolina State College, Raleigh.
Pembroke College, Pembroke.
Queens College, Charlotte.
Saint Augustine College, Raleigh.
Salem College, Winston-Salem.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem.
Western Carolina Teachers College, Cullowhee.
Winston-Salem Teachers College, Winston-Salem.
Woman's College, U. N. C., Greensboro.
Statement of method of procedure. Questionnaires, in the form of a check-list, were mailed, with a letter from Dr. J. E. Hillman of the State Department of Public Instruction, to the head of the department of education in each college or university in the state which offered courses preparatory to teaching. Of the thirty-two colleges receiving the questionnaire, thirty, or 93.5%, responded with usable replies.

Four questionnaires were sent each college: the first dealing with general policy; the second, with laboratory experiences prior to student teaching; the third, with laboratory experiences during student teaching; and the fourth, with laboratory experiences following student teaching. Strict anonymity as individual schools was guaranteed participating institutions.

In addition, visits of several hours' duration were made to representative institutions. Additional valuable material resulted from these visits, during which the head of the department of education, the director of student teaching, and other key persons were interviewed in strict confidence. All responded freely and with apparent sincerity.

5 See Appendix A.

6 See Appendix A.
It was hoped that the assurance of anonymity would evoke frank responses both in the interview situation and in the replies to the questionnaire. However, many responses were so qualified as to be unusable, and were discarded; others were crossed out as reflecting obvious misreadings or misunderstandings of the question. The very nature of some of the questions rendered replies liable to a certain degree of subjectivity, especially in Questionnaire "A", in regard to general policy. These will be pointed out in the treatment of the data. It is to be suspected that other replies than these assumed an aura of subjectivity, so that the data cannot be regarded as absolutely objective in all cases, despite all precautions to achieve such objectivity. However, all data received were handled with complete objectivity, the aim of this paper being merely to present the responses given to the questionnaires.

Summary. In this chapter the problem, professional laboratory experiences offered the prospective teacher by North Carolina colleges and universities, has been presented in its three aspects: those experiences provided prior to, those provided during, and those provided subsequent to student teaching. The purpose, importance, and scope of the study have been discussed, with a statement of sources of data and methods of procedure.

Chapter II contains a review of related studies, ranging
from surveys national in scope to evaluations of the teacher-training programs of individual institutions. Standards and evaluative criteria for judging the efficacy of the professional laboratory experience program are presented.

Chapter III deals with data on the general policy governing professional laboratory experiences in the colleges of North Carolina, and with the nature, variety, and adequacy of professional laboratory courses offered by these institutions prior to the student teaching assignment.

The administration of the student-teaching courses offered by North Carolina teacher-training programs, and the organization, nature, and effectiveness of these programs will be discussed in Chapter IV.

Chapter V describes laboratory experiences provided subsequent to student teaching and also deals with the problem of guidance and aid to the first-year teacher. It contains also attempts to evaluate, in the light of problems and experiences of beginning teachers, the effectiveness of the teacher-education program.

Conclusions based upon the findings of the survey, and recommendations based on the comparison of these findings with national trends and with the standards set up by the Flowers committee, are presented in Chapter VI.

7 John G. Flowers, and Florence Stratemeyer, Allen D. Patterson, and Margaret Lindsay, Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experience and Student Teaching, and Evaluative Criteria. San Marcos, Texas: Record Print, 1949. 38pp.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

In recognition of the vital relation between adequate laboratory experience and adequate teacher preparation, many studies of trends in individual states, regional divisions, or on a national scale, have been made. These studies range from many rather recent ones to a few pioneer surveys twenty years old. Summaries of some of the most significant of these studies are presented in this chapter, in order that the findings of the present study may be viewed in relation to the national picture. Of the many available studies of this nature, the writer selected for review those which seemed, after careful reading and comparison, most important and most pertinent.

Studies dealing with general trends in all areas of professional laboratory experience. In 1931, Jacob I. Baugher\(^1\) made a survey of the organization and administration of student teaching in privately-endowed liberal arts colleges. He visited seventeen private colleges in Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, and the District of Columbia, interviewing the director of student teaching and the principal of the laboratory school.

\(^{1}\) Jacob I. Baugher, Organization and Administration of Practice-Teaching in Privately Endowed Colleges of Liberal Arts, Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education Series, Number 487. New York: Columbia University, 1931, 127pp.
A check list was sent to 440 colleges throughout the nation; 171 replies proved usable. Important findings of this study were: (1) that liberal arts schools had a very small number of students receiving laboratory experience, and owing to this factor almost twice as many institutions used only one school for laboratory work as used two, while less than one-fourth of the schools used more than two schools for work other than observation; (2) that critic teachers, paid amounts varying all the way from nothing to $121 per student teacher (more than one-half of them received nothing), were rated above average in ability in 60% of cases, although only 6% had had special work in supervision, and although most of them carried two or more student teachers at a time; (3) that most laboratory experience was confined to the senior year, only two colleges offering a definite laboratory course prior to the median seventeen weeks of student teaching during the senior year—a course which more than one-half of the institutions stated no student ever fails; (4) that the experiences offered during the student teaching course were limited by the following factors: (a) most students taught only an hour or less per day; (b) a negligible number of students attended school faculty meetings—only about a tenth of the colleges reported any definite attempts to build up professional spirit; and (c) supervision was too close for the student to achieve independence, the critic teacher never leaving the room in 72.6% of
cases, while the college supervisor visited daily, weekly, or at least bi-weekly, for one period. Baushep concluded his study with the recommendation that liberal arts colleges be required at least to meet the minimum requirements of the American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Esther Marion Nelson\(^2\) in 1932 completed an analysis of the content of student-teaching courses in state teachers colleges. Her data were collected by personal visits to fifty-seven representative state teachers colleges in twenty-seven states from coast to coast. At each college she interviewed the student teachers and the laboratory school faculty. Four hundred fifty faculty members and 2550 student teachers filled out check lists for her. Personal experience and observation, correspondence with participating institutions, and catalog analysis also contributed to the findings of the study. The following strengths were found in student teaching practices:

1) most students got adequate experience in such difficult-to-direct laboratory experiences as dealing with the problems of child behavior and discipline, guiding children in research, studying and analyzing the student-teacher's own personality in the light of the objectives and principles of modern education;

2) most students got adequate experience in such

---

easy-to-direct laboratory experiences as preparing materials of instruction for daily work, utilizing different methods of instruction, and taking charge of classroom routine. The following weaknesses in the student-teaching program were revealed: (1) inadequacy of laboratory equipment; (2) excessive supervisory loads carried by the majority of the critic teachers; (3) poor academic and professional background prior to student teaching; (4) poor coordination between college departments and the laboratory school; (5) little or no experience for student teachers in such vital laboratory situations as the direction of extra-class activities like pageants and festivals, participation in professional activities, and participation in community life.

A study very similar to that of Baugher was made by Elisha Lane Henderson, except that where as Baugher investigated liberal arts colleges, Henderson's research was concerned with the administration and organization of student-teaching courses in state teachers colleges. The forty-one schools checked by Henderson were all members of the American Association of Teachers Colleges. After interviews with each director of student teaching, during which questionnaires were filled out (supplemented later by questionnaires to student teachers),

---

thirty-seven colleges were selected for the study. Rechecking five years later, Henderson discovered little change in trends. His main findings were: (1) most colleges had administrative control of the laboratory schools and had, in addition, facilities for off-campus schools; (2) work in the college departments was too widely separated from that in the training school; (3) student teachers, most frequently required to average "C" or above scholastically, and to have mastered a course in the principles of teaching before taking a course in student teaching, taught from 12-24 weeks for one hour a day, and were given their grade by the critic teacher; (4) half the colleges reported that sixty per cent or more of the teaching was done in the laboratory school by student teachers; and (5) there was a distressing lack of uniformity in requirements as to pre-student-teaching laboratory experience.

A study by Williams\(^4\) on the relative uses made of laboratory schools revealed that only a fraction of the potential usages of such schools has been touched in present-day practice. An evaluation of types of student teaching made by Edna M. Marshall\(^5\) showed that the effectiveness of student teaching was greatly increased by early and continuous experience in the school situation.

---


Another facet of the problem— that of cooperation between the faculty of the campus laboratory school and other departments of teachers colleges— was investigated by Mary I. Cole. Her information, based on a representative sampling of teacher-training institutions studied by personal visit and questionnaire, demonstrated that only the teachers of professional courses make any effort either to point out relationships or to observe work done by student teachers, and that in only a very small percentage of colleges are observation and participation evenly distributed throughout the student's course of study.

One of the most recent and most complete studies of this nature was that published under the auspices of the American Association of Teachers Colleges in 1948. The committee appointed for this study of school and community laboratory experiences in teacher education began by sending rather extensive questionnaires to the 182 member institutions of the Association and to 50 liberal arts schools. Responses were received from 157 teachers colleges and 23 liberal arts colleges, 6

---

6 Mary I. Cole, Cooperation Between the Faculty of the Campus Training School and Other Departments of Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools, Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 746. New York: Columbia University, 1939. 254 pp.

7 John Garland Flowers, and Allen D. Patterson, Florence B. Stratemeyer, and Margaret Lindsay, School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1948. 348 pp.
representing a wide geographic range and a variety of types of curricula. Meetings were held with representatives from some of these institutions, and visits to other colleges followed.

In connection with the first aspect of the problem—laboratory experiences prior to the student teaching assignment—several quite significant national conditions were found. It was shown that opportunities for professional laboratory experiences prior to student teaching were relatively uncommon. Observation, most often integrated with professional courses, was more frequently reported than any other pre-student-teaching laboratory experience. Of the 133 elementary education training schools, 105 reported that observation in connection with professional courses was a uniform or general practice, while of the institutions preparing secondary teachers, 79 of the 109 reported the same. A conspicuous fact revealed by the data was that academic departments are prone to neglect a tie-in with professional laboratory experiences. Only 12 out of 205 reporting institutions claimed any degree of laboratory experience in connection with academic courses. In view of these data, the committee suggested that participation in laboratory experiences as well as observation become general at the pre-student teaching level, with more continuity of laboratory contacts, which at present seem to be concentrated almost exclusively in the senior year.
Student teaching itself, which in a majority of cases came after the student had completed all basic professional and most of his academic courses, is usually placed in the first semester of the senior year. Most frequently required pre-requisites for admission to the course were: (1) completion of course requirements on a certain level of scholarship; (2) formal application by the student; (3) a review of the student's cumulative record by the faculty; and (4) a health examination. Least frequently required were: (1) an oral or written professional examination; (2) review of previous laboratory experience; and (3) a review of the student's record in conference with the student. As a rule, actual assignment of the student teacher to a particular laboratory situation was made by the director of student teaching, although requests of the student teachers were given consideration. Before the student began actual teaching, most critic teachers had a personal conference with him to tell him about his future pupils; and throughout his student-teaching course, he would in most colleges meet with all the other student teachers for weekly conferences. The schedule in most colleges was one hour of teaching a day for eighteen weeks, but extremes varied from a three-week course of five-hour days to an eighteen-week course of ten-hour days. During this time the college supervisor would have visited the student teacher more or less according to his estimate of the student's need, although in
some colleges he would make a point of weekly visits. Most frequently used were campus laboratory schools, with "affiliated" public schools ranking next, and rural consolidated schools least used. In setting up off-campus cooperating schools, qualifications most generally required of the school were (1) teachers able to supervise student teaching; (2) an attitude on the part of faculty and administration favorable to proper induction of student teachers.

Reaching the conclusion that "laboratory experiences should be an integral part of the work of each of the four years of the college program," the committee made the following recommendations: 8 (1) that professional education should be a responsibility shared by all members of the college faculty; (2) that adequate personnel should be provided and given time to operate effectively; (3) that laboratory experience prior to student teaching should be integrated with other parts of the college program; and (4) that provision should be made for adequate follow-up to student teaching.

An even more recent study was that sponsored by the Association for Student Teaching, 9 which was published as the Yearbook for 1951, entitled Off-Campus Student Teaching.


This dealt primarily with the problem of laboratory experience during student teaching and provided by off-campus situations. The findings of this committee pointed to several recommendations pertinent to our present topic: (1) earlier, more adequate, and continuous laboratory experiences for the pre-student-teaching education major; (2) better cooperation and more purposeful approach from all departments of the college; (3) more attention to making the induction as effective and helpful as possible; (4) broader experience during student teaching, including community and extra-class activities as well as actual teaching; (5) higher requirements for staff personnel—critic teachers, methods instructors, and others—with a lessening of the teaching load for them and increased pay; (5) the development of a broader and more adequate concept of the value of laboratory experience in teacher education.

Studies dealing with laboratory experience as provided by individual institutions. In addition to these large-scale researches, several individual colleges have analyzed their own professional training programs in relation to their provision for laboratory experiences. One of these institutions is Southwest Texas State College.10 There, laboratory experience

begins in the sophomore year with some experiences in testing in the laboratory school, followed in the junior year by observation as a part of professional courses. The latter is gradually expanded to include case studies of individual children and planning of specific experience units. These units are usually taught by the student to the group he has been observing during his student teaching course, future secondary teachers earning three semester hours' credit by teaching five hours a week, and elementary majors earning six hours' credit with about eighteen hours a week. Extra-class activities are also planned and evaluated by students.

The West Georgia College\(^1\) has a community cooperation program which provides unusually pertinent experiences for the prospective rural teacher. A supervisor provided cooperatively by the county and the college helps make the contributions of the college and the student teacher more practical and meaningful to the county schools, while coordinating the whole. The college not only participates actively in community life and work, but also (1) provides a farm helper and supervisor cooperatives; (2) provides a continuous program of community-school-teacher-trainee planning which results in an alert and active approach on the part of all concerned; and, until the

\(^{1}\)Katie Dorons, and Grace Tietje, "Pre-Service Education of Rural Elementary Teachers," Professional Laboratory Experiments, Twenty-Seventh Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, pp. 10--18.
community could handle the situation; (3) offered a Rural Life
course for freshman teacher trainees, (which was implemented
in the county schools); (4) sponsored a health program for the
county; (5) was the center for a tri-county library.

"An Adventure in Teacher Education"\textsuperscript{12} is the title of
a report on the program of Michigan State College. This pro-
gram is notable in that it centers around a course in community
living, wherein students for twelve weeks live in the community
where they are doing student teaching. During this period they
are guided to learn through experience in natural surroundings
facts of the community's social and economic life, to locate
community resources and to use them in the school program, and
to develop and carry forward plans for community improvement.

The way in which Wayne University,\textsuperscript{13} situated in a
metropolitan location, organizes community experiences may be
adaptable for use in other situations as well. The first
semester of the freshman year initiates the future teacher in
a laboratory course which includes group leadership activities
in connection with Scouts, Y. M. C. A., and similar youth

\textsuperscript{12} Guy H. Hill and Troy L. Stearns, "An Adventure in
Teacher Education: The Marshall Plan," Professional Laboratory
Experiences, Twenty-Seventh Yearbook of the Association for
Student Teaching, pp. 26--32.

\textsuperscript{13} W. E. Lessenger, "How a Large University Provides
Laboratory Experiences for Prospective Teachers," Professional
Laboratory Experiences, Twenty-Seventh Yearbook of the Asso-
ciation for Student Teaching, pp. 39--44.
organizations. Observation in classroom situations follow; then come interviews with laboratory school personnel, making a case study of an individual child, attendance at professional faculty meetings, and finally assumption of teaching responsibilities.

The early induction of the teacher trainee into laboratory experience is a special point of emphasis at the University of Cincinnati. In the freshman course, "Introduction to Education," a special laboratory period is provided each week. Observation, community study, and public relations activities are all a part of this course, which includes units on teaching as a profession, the modern school at work, the school and society, and challenging educational problems.

In a report on one phase of the teacher-education program at New York University, Blanche Obermaier tells of effective use of public and private resources for laboratory experiences. As freshmen, teacher trainees in this university study the complex socio-economic makeup of the city, and as

14 Margaret G. McKim, "Opportunities for Laboratory Experiences in a Course in Introduction to Education," Professional Laboratory Experiences, Twenty-Seventh Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, pp. 45--52.

15 Blanche Obermaier, "The Utilization of Public and Private Resources for Laboratory Experiences," Professional Laboratory Experiences, Twenty-Seventh Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, pp. 53--58.
sophomores they begin actual participation in community life through directed work in hospitals, settlement houses, and similar child-welfare agencies. Actual classroom participation in teaching begins in the third year of training, during which each student is given a chance to familiarize himself with both public and private schools in sociologically different areas of the city. As a senior, the future teacher finds his full-time student-teaching program enriched by many community activities, with particular emphasis on the interrelation of school and community.

An experiment in community living is reported by Tuskegee Institute\(^1\) to be especially fruitful. Some of the community experiences into which the student teacher is guided are: (1) making a community survey; (2) cooperation with community agencies; (3) studying and using community resources; (4) planning service projects; (5) participating in the work of P. T. A. groups; and (6) home visitation. All this is in an attempt to help the prospective teacher "see the task of the school in terms of the larger community involving its social, economic, and political problems."\(^1\)

\(^1\) Deborah Cannon Partridge, "Student Teachers Participate in Community Living," Professional Laboratory Experiences, Twenty-Seventh Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, pp. 66--74.

\(^1\) Op. Cit., p. 74.
One of the faults most frequently cited in studies of present teacher-education programs is the failure to make laboratory experience an integral part of academic courses for teacher trainees. Central Michigan College of Education\(^{18}\) has made an attempt to link the professional with the academic viewpoint. Social studies students conducted community surveys and analyses, followed, when indicated, by social action; special speakers in various academic courses helped apply the course's values to teaching; foreign language departments encouraged work with school children from non-English-speaking backgrounds; and home economics courses furnished nursery school contacts. This inter-departmental program enriched both academic and professional learnings by integrating the two around professional experiences.

Western Carolina Teachers College\(^{19}\) worked out a program of laboratory experiences to be centered around professional courses in the junior and senior years. In addition to generally required observation, juniors must also (1) visit an off-campus school for at least two days; (2) participate actively in the

\(^{18}\) Ethel M. Praeger, "Professional Laboratory Experiences Provided in Integrated Courses in General Education," Professional Laboratory Experiences, Twenty-Seventh Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, pp. 75--82.

campus laboratory school, teaching individual children or small groups, supervising the loading and unloading of buses, preparing teaching materials, supervising play periods; (3) work with a community project such as Scouting, church organizations, or school organizations; (4) make a case study of one particular child. Particularly significant is the follow-up of careful placement of graduates in suitable situations, with check-ups on graduates soon after going into service, and again after two or three years.

Studies dealing with general standards for professional laboratory experience. Finally, it would be well for the reader to have in mind, while studying subsequent chapters, a part of the report of the Committee on Standards and Studies and Member Institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The pertinent portion of this report consists of evaluative criteria and recommended standards governing professional laboratory experiences. The report recommends: (1) that professional laboratory experiences should be an integral part of the work of each year of college; (2) that the program should offer opportunity for responsible

---

participation in the major areas of the teacher's work (this includes the role of the teacher in the school and community, understanding children of heterogeneous backgrounds and abilities, and some full-time student teaching and adequate follow-up during the first year of service); (3) the length of the student-teaching assignment should be adequate for broad and varied experiences and should include some full-time teaching; (4) guidance of the program should be in cooperation with the teacher trainee; (5) guidance of the program should be the joint responsibility of the person directly responsible in the laboratory situation and college representatives; (6) there should be provision of laboratory facilities adequate for the varied and intensive training under "normal" situations, and near enough for convenience of the student and the college staff.

Summary: These studies serve to demonstrate certain strengths and weaknesses which seem to obtain throughout the nation. A growing awareness of the need for more adequate laboratory experience and some provision for a broader and richer experience during the student-teaching program is apparent. However, it is generally reported that there is poor integration of laboratory experience with academic course work; that such experience is inadequate before and after the student-teaching course, and far from ideal even then; that laboratory school staffs, while usually fairly well-prepared,
are overworked and underpaid; and that there is a lack of concerted, purposeful approach on the part of the all-college program to formulate and implement definite standards in this vital phase of teacher education. Certain institutions are pioneering in meaningful and continuous laboratory experience, and suggestions from their program of teacher education are worthy of consideration. Together with the standards held up by the American Association of Teachers Colleges, these suggestions can be used in building a teacher-training course which can largely overcome prevalent deficiencies and weaknesses in regard to professional laboratory experiences.
CHAPTER III

GENERAL POLICY GOVERNING PROFESSIONAL
LABORATORY EXPERIENCES; AND LABORATORY EXPERIENCES
PRIOR TO STUDENT TEACHING

I. GENERAL POLICY GOVERNING PROFESSIONAL
LABORATORY EXPERIENCES

One of the basic standards for worthwhile professional laboratory experiences in teacher education is that of a sound general policy. "Direct laboratory experiences . . . should be an integral part of the work of each of the four years of college."\(^1\) This aim can be achieved only when every department of the college is actively participating in teacher education, when the teacher-training program is constantly evaluated and accordingly modified, and when an adequate staff, adequately financed, is provided for the program.

Does the policy of North Carolina colleges and universities sufficiently undergird the teacher-education program? Table I shows the extent to which such vital policy requirements as administrative and inter-departmental cooperation, constant evaluation and revision of the teacher-education program, adequate staff, and adequate travel funds appear to prevail. Of course, the interpretation of the word "adequate" must be

---

\(^1\)Flowers, et al., Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences, p. 5.
subjective in some degree, for a staff considered ample in one institution might appear quite inadequate in the estimation of another.

TABLE I. GENERAL POLICY OF COLLEGES IN REGARD TO THE TEACHER-EDUCATION PROGRAM AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General policy</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education is recognized as a college-wide function and receives full cooperation and support from every department and division.*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite provision is made for continuous study and evaluation of the teacher-education program and for its modification when the need arises.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A staff adequate for carrying on the type of program offered is provided.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funds for travel necessary to your teacher-education program are provided</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, fifteen reported that the administrative policy of their institution was satisfactory in regard to cooperation and support given from the various departments and divisions; nine of the ten colored colleges report satisfaction with this phase of policy, making a total of 24 out of 30 North Carolina colleges so reporting.
Findings:

It is evident that, on the whole, the heads of education departments in North Carolina schools and colleges indicate a high degree of satisfaction regarding the general policy of their several institutions.

(1) Eighty per cent of the responding colleges reported that the ideal of administrative and inter-departmental cooperation is a point of recognized policy. However, a few liberal arts colleges tempered their affirmative replies by such remarks as that of one department head who commented that while the administration was particularly cooperative, three departments of the college made no effort at cooperation. It will be noted that only six colleges of the entire group and only one colored college failed to report satisfaction on this score.

(2) Eighty-three per cent of the reporting institutions expressed their satisfaction with their policy of continuous evaluation and subsequent modification of the teacher education program. None qualified this response in any way.

(3) Fewer (73.3%) reported that an adequate staff was provided for the type of teacher-education program projected. This is, however, almost three-fourths of the total number of responding institutions. Yet these reports must be modified by the findings revealed in Table XVI,² where it is shown that
in more than a third of the cases persons responsible for the supervision of student laboratory experiences must also teach college classes. For example, one supervisor of student teaching noted, "I teach nine or twelve hours per semester in addition to supervising student teaching." While this is at one extreme, at the other end of the scale stand those institutions--three of them--which provide full time supervisors of student teaching. In other words, one-tenth of the colleges report full-time supervisors, while more than one-third must depend upon college faculty members already teaching as much as a full load. These circumstances should be considered in relation to the "adequacy" of staff reported.

(4) Only 63.3 per cent of the responding colleges reported that adequate travel funds were supplied.

(5) It is safe to assume that the majority of North Carolina colleges and universities taking part in the study are proceeding upon policies in dealing with teacher education which they consider to be sound in relation to principles described in Chapter II.
II. PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES
PRIOR TO STUDENT TEACHING

That professional laboratory experiences should be early initiated, continuous, and varied is one of the most oft-repeated precepts of teacher education.

"There is perhaps no phase of professional laboratory experiences where practices are more confused and more in need of study and experimentation than that of the experiences which should precede student teaching . . . That the committee recognizes the significance of this phase . . . is evidenced in the following principles formulated regarding . . . laboratory experience prior to student teaching . . .: (1) Direct experience facilitates learning . . . (2) The need for direct experience . . . applies equally to academic and professional courses . . . (3) The need for direct experiences applies equally at all levels of maturity . . . Such direct laboratory experiences, therefore, should be an integral part of the work of each of the four years of college. These basic ideas suggest (1) that initial contacts with new areas of learning call for participation in laboratory experiences rather than observation only . . .; (2) that the above-mentioned type of active participation calls for continuity in the study of a given laboratory situation." 3

With these ideals in mind, together with the second area standard of the Committee on Standards—"The professional program should be designed to afford opportunity for responsible participation in all the major areas of the teacher's work" 4

---

3 Flowers, et al., School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, pp. 139—141.

4 Flowers, et al., Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences, p. 6.
the questionnaire \(^5\) on laboratory experiences prior to student teaching was prepared to determine the nature, frequency, and variety of such experiences. It was decided that the "major areas of the teacher's work" should include (1) the study of the child; (2) the study of the school community; (3) participation in actual classroom situations; (4) understanding of the school situations as a whole. These areas were analyzed, and various activities contributing toward experience in each area suggested in the questionnaire. It was also in line with these standards that the organization and administration of pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences were checked.

**Administrative policies of the colleges and universities as applied to pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences.**

Table II shows the administrative policies of the colleges and universities of North Carolina as applied to laboratory experiences before student teaching.

---

\(^5\) Appendix A, Questionnaire B.
TABLE II. METHODS OF ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF LABORATORY EXPERIENCES PRIOR TO THE STUDENT-TEACHING ASSIGNMENT, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of organization</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A planned program of laboratory experiences preceding student teaching is offered each student separately from required course work.*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory experiences preceding student teaching are coordinated with required course work and required of students planning to be teachers.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records of laboratory experiences preceding student teaching are kept for each student.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory experiences preceding student teaching are made available to those students who desire them, but are not required of them.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no planned program for laboratory experiences preceding student teaching.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, five offer a planned program of laboratory experiences preceding student teaching, apart from regular course work; four of the ten reporting colored colleges do so, making a total of nine out of thirty North Carolina colleges which report such a program.
Findings:

(1) By far the most common policy is that of coordinating laboratory experiences with required course work and requiring such experiences of teacher trainees. Slightly more than two-thirds of the institutions use this method. This is one of the more highly-recommended procedures. "Other things being equal, laboratory experiences prior to student teaching take on added meaning when integrated with other parts of the college program . . . The student derives more from his laboratory contacts . . . when they grow out of and are brought back to his work in college courses."6

(2) Nine colleges, or 30 per cent of the responding institutions, reported a separate course in laboratory experiences. Of these, six added a statement that laboratory experiences were also included in regular courses and were required of prospective teachers; three reported that although this course was offered, it was not required of teacher trainees. One college offered such experiences as a separate course, or in coordination with other courses, but required none.

(3) It is significant that 13.3% of the schools reported absolutely no planned program for laboratory experiences preceding student teaching. It is reasonable to suppose that one institution which left blank the replies concerning

administration of these early experiences may be added to the group. Also, two schools reported that laboratory experiences prior to student teaching were provided only to elementary majors (which in most colleges in North Carolina number fewer than secondary majors). Three colleges reported that no pre-student teaching laboratory experience was required. It is therefore possible that almost one-third of North Carolina's prospective teachers "get by" without any laboratory experiences before student teaching.

Tables III, IV, V, and VI show reports on the activities in various areas of teaching which are included as part of the pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences in North Carolina colleges. A rather wide range of activities, with a rather low incidence in each activity, is shown.

Pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences in the area of study of the child. Table III covers laboratory experiences in the area of study of the child.
TABLE III. PRE-STUDENT-TEACHING LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN THE AREA OF THE STUDY OF THE CHILD AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory experience</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing play of children*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing classroom activities of children at various age levels</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping a child with some problem</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing extra-curricular activities of pupils</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with different teachers about home of some child</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording anecdotal information about a child</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining mental, physical, emotional, and social difference in children</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining the school records of a child</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining the out-of-school activities of children at different age levels</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting a case study</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling stories to children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing the child in natural situations in home and community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing a child to class</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering tests to children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, six require at least seventy-five per cent of their teacher trainees to direct the play of children; three of the ten colored colleges report that they do so, making a total of nine out of thirty North Carolina colleges who report that at least seventy-five percent of their prospective teachers have this experience prior to student teaching.
Findings:

(1) Observation rather than participation is more common as a laboratory experience preceding student teaching. Twenty-three out of the thirty reporting schools offered some form of classroom observation. That is nearly 77%, as compared with 53% of the institutions reporting the next most common professional laboratory experience, which is itself observational in nature: "observing extra-curricular activities of pupils." (This trend is further indicated by the findings revealed in Table V, relating to laboratory experience in the area of participation in actual classroom situations, where observational practices again are much more frequent.) While these findings are in line with national practices, it runs contrary to the ideal of participation and of "learning by doing." The incidence of activities demanding more actual participation in a laboratory situation is very low.

(2) It will be noted that not one activity in the area of the study of the child, other than the two phases of observation already referred to, is practiced in more than half the institutions.

7 See above, p. 16.

8 Flowers, et al., School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, p. 140.
(3) In only thirty per cent of the schools is practice in directing the play of children, in recording anecdotal information about a child, and in determining out-of-school activities of children at different age levels, provided for more than seventy-five per cent of the teacher trainees.

(4) Three colleges—one-tenth of those replying—reported no pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences other than observation.

(5) Institutions reporting other activities in this area listed such practices as story-telling, bringing children to class for observation, and administration of reading readiness tests. One liberal arts college reported observation of a particular child in natural situations in his home and community over a period of weeks.

Pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences in the area of study of the school community. Table IV shows the incidence of laboratory experiences in the study of the school community prior to student teaching.
TABLE IV. PRE-STUDENT-TEACHING LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN THE AREA OF STUDY OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory experience</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending P.T.A. meetings*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching a Sunday School class</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting in the Y.M.C.A., Boy Scout, or other youth program</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining the socio-economic status of pupils in certain attendance areas.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a map of a school community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting several homes in different parts of the community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending school board meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending social functions of a given community</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining how resources of a given community can be employed in a unit of study</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, eight state that at least seventy-five per cent of their teacher trainees have attended P.T.A. meetings prior to beginning student teaching; two of the ten colored colleges report this, making a total of ten out of thirty North Carolina colleges having this activity as a general laboratory experience.
Findings:

(1) Although the area of study of the school community is admittedly one of the richest for student laboratory experiences, only one activity (determining the use of community resources in a unit of study) rated an incidence above forty per cent.

(2) No institution reported student attendance at school board meetings.

(3) Only a third of the colleges reported any pre-student-teaching attendance at P. T. A. meetings.

(4) No other activity in this area (listed in Table IV) was reported by as many as a third of the responding institutions.

(5) It is noteworthy that the colored schools of North Carolina apparently face certain community problems more readily than do white colleges. For example, while only 15% of the colleges for whites analyze racial and religious problems of the community, 60% of the colored institutions do so. Whereas only 23% of the white schools report that their students attend community social functions before beginning student teaching, 50% of the colored schools do so. While 50% of white institutions providing experience in the use of community resources in unit planning, 70% of the Negro colleges do so.

(6) The all-over view of the situation as recorded in Table IV shows a very low frequency of professional laboratory experiences in the area of study of the school community before
the student-teaching assignment.

Pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences in the area of participation in the actual classroom situation. Table V records the number of affirmative replies regarding various activities in the field of participation in actual classroom situations as a pre-student-teaching professional laboratory experience.
TABLE V. PRE-STUDENT-TEACHING LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN THE AREA OF PARTICIPATION IN ACTUAL CLASSROOM SITUATIONS AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory experience</th>
<th>White colleges</th>
<th>Colored colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing different teachers*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing and analyzing effective teaching</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting individual pupils with classroom work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching small groups of pupils for a short time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing instruction on different grade levels as a basis for comparison</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering tests to pupils</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging for the housekeeping details of the classroom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting papers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching an entire class under effective supervision</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical examination of instructional materials of classes observed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking pupils on a field trip</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting on puppet shows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling out reports and records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, thirteen require at least seventy-five per cent of their teacher trainees to interview different teachers; three of the ten colored colleges report that they do so, making a total of sixteen out of thirty North Carolina colleges who report that at least seventy-five per cent of their prospective teachers have this experience prior to student teaching.
Findings:

(1) More attention is given to this area of the teacher's task than to community situations in the North Carolina teacher-training institutions.

(2) That observation rather than participation is prevalent in North Carolina practice is corroborated by similar findings listed in the discussion under Table III. Twenty-four schools, or 80% of the thirty reporting, have more than 75% of their prospective teachers observe and analyze effective teaching; twenty of them (two-thirds) have such students observe at various grade levels for the purpose of comparison; and 18, or 60%, emphasize critical examination of instructional materials of classes observed.

(3) A few over half of the responding institutions report interviews with critic teachers as a standard requirement for pre-student-teaching teacher trainees; just fewer than half report that most of such students gain experience in correcting papers. The reports on other classroom experiences showed an even lower incidence.

(4) Fewer than one-third of the institutions report any degree of teaching experience prior to the commencement of student teaching.

(5) Fewer than a fourth of the schools report that most of their pre-student-teaching teacher trainees acquire experience in taking field trips with pupils.
(6) Variant practices reported by individual institutions include story-telling, staging of puppet-shows, keeping of class records and reports.

(7) Strongly varying opinions on the part of participating institutions as to the value of this type of laboratory experiences prior to student teaching were expressed. Some expressed approval by checking affirmatively almost every activity in the area of participation in actual classroom situations, while another remarked pungently, "We don't see the practicability or desirability of doing many of these prior to student teaching."

Pre-student-teaching laboratory experience in the area of understanding the school situation as a whole. Table VI shows the report concerning professional laboratory experiences in the realm of understanding the school situation as a whole. It might be well to note here that this is one of the weakest points in the teacher-education program in the nation. Early induction into experiences in the area of understanding the school situation as a whole is recommended as a means of development of professional spirit in prospective teachers.

---

9See page 11.
TABLE VI. PRE-STUDENT-TEACHING LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN THE AREA OF UNDERSTANDING THE SCHOOL SITUATION AS A WHOLE AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory experience</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a tour of a school plant*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing routine practices in the school office</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing an individual principal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing the superintendent or assistant superintendent about the operation of the schools within a given system</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying a brief visit to all the schools within a small school district</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending teachers' professional meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting in on faculty meetings concerned with curriculum revision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining curriculum requirements for different groups within a school system</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendering administrative assistance prior to the opening of school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting in on faculty meetings concerned with determination of school policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, thirteen require at least seventy-five per cent of their teacher trainees to make a tour of a school plant; six of the ten colored colleges report that they do so, making a total of nineteen out of thirty North Carolina colleges who report that at least seventy-five per cent of their prospective teachers have this experience prior to student teaching.
Findings:

(1) Very nearly two-thirds (63.3%) of the colleges report that their teacher trainees tour a school plant before going into student teaching.

(2) Forty per cent of reporting institutions report that most of their prospective teachers interview a school principal.

(3) Thirty per cent report that future teachers observe office routine prior to taking up the student teaching assignment.

(4) Such valuable experiences as attendance at faculty meetings concerned with school policy or curriculum revision, and rendering administrative assistance before school opens are reported by only a negligible number of colleges. Other valuable professional experiences referred to in the questionnaire were infrequently reported; fewer than one-third of the institutions listed any one activity other than making a tour of a school plant and interviewing a principal.

Although not shown in the above table, seven institutions reported no activities prior to student teaching in the area of understanding the school as a whole. This is 23.3% of the total. Eight more colleges reported only one activity in this area, making a total of 50% reporting one or fewer activities toward understanding the entirety of the school situation.
Summary: North Carolina teacher educators report satisfaction with the general policies of their several institutions. Eighty percent reported administrative and inter-departmental cooperation to be satisfactory; a slightly greater percent subscribe to the policy of continuous evaluation and revision of the teacher-education program. About 73% expressed satisfaction with the adequacy of the staff provided for implementation of the program, and 63% with the travel funds furnished them.

Although early and continuous laboratory experiences in professional training are recognized as basic requirements of a modern teacher-training program, comparatively few North Carolina schools report a well-rounded program from the standpoint of laboratory experiences prior to student teaching. The only activity reported by more than 60% of the institutions was observation in various forms. Never by more than 56.6% of participating schools was any activity requiring direct participation in a laboratory experience reported. The median number of schools listing any given activity was 9.5; the mode was 9. This means only about 30%, on the average, of reporting institutions engaged in any one activity listed on the questionnaire. Half the activities, then, were reported by fewer than one-third of the colleges responding, while only 80% reported the most common of all activities, classroom observation. In the area of participation in actual classroom situations the
best showing was made, with almost 40% of the listed activities in that area reported by from 53% to 80% of the schools, the remainder of the activities in this area being reported by percentages ranging from 23% to 47%. The area of study of the child ranked next, with one activity--classroom observation--reported by 77%, while the lowest percentage reporting any activity in this area was 30%. Reports on activities in the area of the study of the school community and in the area of understanding the school situation as a whole ranked almost equally low, many schools not reporting a single activity in these areas. Moreover, at least 16% of the North Carolina colleges taking part in the study reported no planned program for laboratory experiences prior to student teaching. As to general procedure in providing for pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences, most programs include such experiences as a part of required course work. Seventy per cent reported this plan, but some of these modified their replies by the report that, although laboratory experiences are thus made available, they are not required of prospective teachers.

This chapter has presented the data secured on the subject of general policy and administrative arrangements in connection with professional laboratory experiences prior to student teaching in North Carolina colleges and universities. The next chapter deals with laboratory experiences during the student-teaching assignment.
CHAPTER IV

PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES DURING STUDENT TEACHING

Since student teaching is in almost every case the most prolonged, intensive, and significant professional experience in the pre-service education of teachers, every phase of it should be made as meaningful as possible. This meaningfulness, according to criteria perceived by the writer to be generally accepted, may be achieved by (1) adequate preparation for the experience of student teaching; (2) adequate time in the laboratory situation to experience its essential aspects; (3) adequate supervision; (4) adequate breadth and thoroughness of experience; (5) adequate equipment and materials; (6) proper administration. Some teacher-training colleges in North Carolina find the meeting of these standards a double problem, for they have student teachers working both in the campus laboratory schools and in off-campus cooperating schools. Both these phases of the student-teaching situation will be considered in this chapter, as well as those factors mentioned above as indispensable to a meaningful student-teaching experience.

Location of the student-teaching assignment. Table VII shows the location of the student-teaching assignment in the total program—in what quarter or semester it is first permitted, and when it is most customarily done.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in program</th>
<th>Student teaching first permitted</th>
<th>Most customary location of student teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
<td>Colored colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last quarter or semester of the junior year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the first quarter or semester of the senior year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle quarter of the senior year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last half of the first semester and the first half of the last semester of the senior year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last quarter or semester of the senior year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally distributed in the quarters of the senior year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, three first permit student teaching in the final quarter or semester of the junior year; none of the ten reporting colored colleges permits student teaching in that quarter or semester, making a total of three out of thirty colleges reporting such a practice. No white college reports that most of their prospective teachers do their student teaching at that time, nor does any colored college, making a total of no colleges reporting that it is most customary to locate student teaching in the junior year.
Findings:

(1) In 70% of North Carolina colleges and universities student teaching is concentrated in the final quarter or semester of the senior year. This would signify that

(a) most student teachers have completed their professional and academic course-work before beginning student teaching; and

(b) little opportunity for follow-up to the student-teaching experience is given.

(2) In all except a small number of cases, student teaching is restricted to the senior year, with 90% of the teaching done then.

(3) The heavy grouping of student teaching in the final quarter or semester is contrary to national practice, which places student teaching in the first quarter or semester of the senior year.¹

Preparation for student teaching. To say that adequate preparation for the student-teaching experience is pre-requisite to an effective experience is a truism. Table VIII lists the prerequisites for admission to the student-teaching course, as reported by the participating institutions.

¹Flowers, et. al., School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, p. 147.
#TABLE VIII. PRACTICES ACCOMPANYING ADMISSION TO STUDENT TEACHING AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission Prerequisite</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting prerequisite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of a given number of hours of work*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of certain courses</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for student teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health examination</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and/or written professional examination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A certain scholarship standing</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations of head of department and other staff members</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal application by student, submitted well in advance of student teaching assignment</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of having participated in certain laboratory experiences</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of scholastic deficiencies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by director of student teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than fifteen hours academic load during assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at teacher workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, eighteen require at least seventy-five percent of their teacher trainees to complete a given number of hours of work before being admitted to the student-teaching course; seven of the ten colored colleges report that they do so, making a total of twenty-five out of thirty North Carolina colleges who report that at least seventy-five percent of their prospective teachers must meet this requirement.*
Findings:

(1) One hundred per cent of the thirty reporting institutions require the completion of certain courses before student teaching. Eighty-three per cent require completion of a given number of hours of work, and an equal percentage report a certain scholarship standing as a prerequisite.

(2) Readiness for student teaching—a psychological factor—is considered in 73.3% of cases.

(3) A little over half of the colleges reported as prerequisites to student teaching recommendation by the head of the department and other staff members, and a formal application by the student, submitted well in advance of the student-teaching assignment.

(4) Only 40% of the responding colleges report evidence of participation in certain laboratory experiences as a requirement for student teaching. This means that over half the colleges will accept for student-teaching persons who have had no previous contact with laboratory situations.

(5) A third or fewer colleges reported the following admission practices: a health examination, oral and/or written professional examination, removal of scholastic deficiencies, attendance at a teacher workshop, and approval by the director of student teaching. One college reported a requirement of no more than fifteen hours academic load during student teaching; however, information obtained in personal interviews with other college
directors indicated that this practice of restricting the academic load during student teaching is a common one.

A second basis of meaningful experience during student teaching is that the student teacher spend adequate time in the laboratory situation to meet a teacher's life in all its aspects.

**Time spent in the laboratory situation.** Table IX shows the time-basis of the North Carolina student-teaching programs.
TABLE IX. THE TIME-BASIS OF THE STUDENT-TEACHING PROGRAM AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-Basis</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting time-basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One hour a day for one quarter or semester*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One hour a day for two quarters or semesters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-half day for one quarter or semester</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A full day for one quarter or semester</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;More than one hour a day for one quarter&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two hours for two quarters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two hours for one semester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A full day for six weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two hours for six to eight weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-half to one full day for one semester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin with one hour and gradually increase to a day</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, seven require their student teachers to teach one hour a day for one quarter or semester; one of the ten colored colleges does so, making a total of eight out of thirty North Carolina colleges who report that their student-teaching program is organized on this time-basis.
Findings:

(1) One-third of the colleges reported that the time of their student-teaching assignment is on a basis of a full day for one quarter or semester. However, only 20% of the white colleges reported this practice, while 60% of the colored colleges did so.

(2) Almost as many colleges (26.6%) veer to the other extreme, reporting a time-basis of one hour a day for one quarter or semester. More of the white colleges (35%) reported this practice than reported any other time-basis.

(3) The wide differences between these two limits may be pointed out more sharply when it is viewed from this approach: whereas one-third of the colleges offer their student teachers as many as 250 hours of laboratory experience during student teaching, over one-fourth of them offer only the state-required minimum of 45 hours of laboratory experience during student teaching.

(4) The other 40% of the colleges vary greatly from these extremes and from one another in practices regarding length and intensity of the student-teaching assignment, no single variant being reported by more than 6.6% of the responding colleges.

Table X sets forth the statistics on the amount of academic credit-hours offered for the student-teaching course.
TABLE X. AMOUNT OF CREDIT OFFERED FOR STUDENT TEACHING AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of credit</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting</th>
<th>White colleges</th>
<th>Colored colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than six semester hours or nine quarter hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six semester hours or nine quarter hours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight semester hours or twelve quarter hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten semester hours or fifteen quarter hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than six semester hours for secondary majors, six hours for elementary majors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most student teachers earn three hours credit; a few earn six</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, five offer less than six semester hours or nine quarter hours credit for the student-teaching course; two of the ten colored colleges report that they do so, making a total of seven out of thirty North Carolina colleges who report this amount of credit is given student teaching.
Findings:

1. The wide difference in actual time spent in student teaching is reflected in varying amounts of credit given for the student-teaching course, the lowest credit given being three semester hours, and the highest being ten semester hours or fifteen quarter hours.

2. More colleges (43.3%) report six semester hours or nine quarter hours credit than any other amount.

3. Twenty-three and three-tenths per cent of the responding institutions report less than six semester hours or nine quarter hours of credit; 26.6% report more than this amount.

4. Variant practices include a "sliding-scale" set-up, wherein the student-teaching assignment might be prolonged or intensified for those wishing more than the standard credits, and giving differing credits to elementary and secondary majors.

(Although not revealed in the table, in most cases less credit is given for the one-hour-a-day teaching than for all-day teaching. The reports showed, however, at times, a lack of proper relationship between the time spent in teaching and the credits given, but in most cases there was some positive correlation.

Supervision of student teaching. The third rule for making the student-teaching experiences of greatest value is provision of adequate supervision. Guidance gives direction and meaning to laboratory experiences. Tables XI - XXI deal with data on this phase of the student-teaching program.
Table XI gives the statistics as to the persons responsible for the counseling and placement of student teachers—a rather important area of supervision in the light of the fact that all reporting colleges state that they use off-campus schools for student teaching.

TABLE XI. PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Counseling or placing Student Teacher</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting major role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The director of student teaching*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college supervisor of student teaching</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student's major professor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal of the school where the student is to be placed</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The critic teacher of the school where the student is to be placed</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student teacher himself</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of the school of education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dean of residence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The head of the department and the staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists in the field of education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, sixteen report that the director of student teaching plays a major role in the counseling and placement of student teachers; eight of the ten colored colleges report that he does so, making a total of twenty-four North Carolina colleges who report that the director of student teaching takes a part in placement of student teachers.
Findings:
(1) The director of student teaching is most often responsible for guidance and placement of the student teacher; in 80% of the colleges he plays a major role in counseling.

(2) The college supervisor, the principal of the school where the student is to be placed, and the critic teacher are important figures in this phase of supervision in the programs of more than half the institutions.

(3) In two-thirds of the reporting institutions, the student teacher himself plays a major role in his placement. (In personal and confidential interviews it was revealed that in some cases the student teacher was solely responsible for his own placement.)

Since one of the persons most intimately responsible for the supervision of the student teacher is the critic teacher, it is of interest to know the qualifications generally demanded of a critic teacher by the teacher-training institutions of North Carolina. Table XII gives the criteria used in the selection of critic teachers.
TABLE XII. CRITERIA USED IN SELECTION OF CRITIC TEACHERS AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bachelor's degree*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A North Carolina &quot;A&quot; certificate</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A graduate degree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A graduate teaching certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special work in supervision of student teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least three years of teaching experience</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation by the principal and the superintendent of the school in which he teaches</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two years of experience, one in the present situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public school supervisor's recommendation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, ten report that a bachelor’s degree is one of the requirements for a critic teacher; four out of the ten colored colleges report that it is, making a total of fourteen out of thirty North Carolina colleges reporting that one criterion for a critic teacher is a bachelor’s degree.
Findings:

(1) The most commonly reported criterion is that of recommendation by the principal and/or superintendent of the school in which the critic teacher is working; 70% of the cooperating colleges report this.

(2) In 60% of the cases, a North Carolina "A" certificate and at least three years of teaching experience are required; however, this leaves two-fifths of the colleges not requiring either.

(3) Only 46.6% of the colleges report that they require a bachelor's degree of a critic teacher; a graduate degree is required by 26.6% of them, though a graduate teaching certificate is required by only one college.

(4) Special work in supervision of student teaching is required of the critic teacher in only two of the participating colleges; both of these are colored colleges.

(5) There is a noticeable lack of uniformity throughout the state in requirements for critic teachers.

Table XIII shows the persons reported to play a major role in the supervision of student teaching.
TABLE XIII. PERSONS PLAYING A MAJOR ROLE IN THE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHERS AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person playing major role in supervision of student teachers</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting major role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The critic teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal of the school in which the student is teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college supervisor of student teaching</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student's major professor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The head of the education department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public school supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists in education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors of college methods courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, all twenty state that the critic teacher plays a major role in supervising the student teachers; nine of the ten colored colleges report that he does so, making a total of twenty-nine out of thirty North Carolina colleges who report that in at least seventy-five percent of the cases the critic teacher is important as a supervisor.*
Findings:

(1) The critic teacher and the college supervisor are the key persons in supervision, both being reported as playing a major role by 97% of the colleges.

(2) Next in importance are the student's major professor, and the principal of the school in which the student is teaching, each of whom is reported as a key person by 36.6% of the colleges.

Supervision may be made less effective when either the critic teacher or the college supervisor is overburdened. Table XIV and XV deal with the maximum number of student teachers assigned to these supervisors at one time--Table XIV relates to the critic teacher and Table XV to the college supervisor.
TABLE XIV. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO CRITIC TEACHER AT ANY ONE TIME AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum number of student teachers</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, eight report that the maximum number of student teachers assigned to any one critic teacher at any one time is one; six of the ten colored colleges report this number, making a total of fourteen out of thirty North Carolina colleges reporting this maximum.

Findings:

1. Less than one-half the reporting colleges (46.6%) set a limit of one student teacher to a critic teacher at any one time.

2. One-third of the colleges report two as the maximum number of student teachers to be at one time under the supervision of one critic teacher.

3. No college reports more than four student teachers per critic teacher, although 6.6% do assign four teachers.
TABLE XV. NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO COLLEGE SUPERVISOR DURING A QUARTER OR SEMESTER, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of student teachers assigned</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-five</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than thirty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, two report five as the number of student teachers usually assigned to the college supervisor at a time; none of the ten colored colleges report this number, leaving a total of two out of thirty reporting this number.

Findings:

(1) 26.6% of the colleges report ten student teachers to be the maximum assigned to the college supervisor during a quarter or semester.

(2) Almost as large a percentage (23.3%) of the colleges, however, report the supervisor to be responsible for more than thirty student teachers per quarter or semester.
(3) One-fourth of the white colleges report more than thirty student teachers per quarter or semester, an equal number of white colleges also reporting fifteen. Seventy per cent of the white colleges report fifteen or more student teachers to each supervisor.

The findings in regard to the schedule of the supervisor are recorded in Table XVI.
TABLE XVI. POLICIES REGARDING THE TIME SCHEDULE OF THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR OF STUDENT TEACHING AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college supervisor spends full time in supervision of student teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college supervisor spends half time in supervision of student teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college supervisor spends a fourth of his time in supervision of student teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College faculty members who supervise student teaching have their college loads decreased accordingly</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college supervisor spends two-thirds of his time in supervision of student teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college supervisor spends one-third of his time in supervision of student teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college supervisor spends three-fourths of his time in supervision of student teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One supervisor spends full time, one spends half time, and the demonstration school principal spends some time in supervision of student teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor teaches full time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, two report that the college supervisor spends his full time in supervision of student teaching; one of the ten colored colleges reports this policy, making a total of three out of thirty North Carolina colleges having a full time supervisor.
Findings:

(1) Only three of the colleges report that the supervisor spends his full time in supervision of student teaching.

(2) Forty per cent of the colleges report that the supervisor is a regular college faculty member who has his college load decreased according to the time he must spend in supervision. One responding department head reported that he teaches full-time at the college, supervising as well.

Table XVII shows the number of visits made by the college supervisor to each student teacher under his care; Table XVIII shows the length of these visits.
TABLE XVII. NUMBER OF VISITS MADE BY THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR TO EACH STUDENT TEACHER AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>White colleges</th>
<th>Colored colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One†</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies with situation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, none reports once as the number of times each student teacher is visited by the college supervisor; one of the ten colored colleges reports that this is the case, making a total of one college reporting one visit per student teacher; this out of the thirty reporting colleges.

Findings:

(1) More than a third (36.6%) of the colleges report five or more visits with each student teacher.

(2) Just less than a fourth (23.3%) of the colleges report the supervisor makes three visits per student teacher.

(3) Other replies ranged from one visit per student teacher to eighteen visits per student teacher. One institution gave no reply.
TABLE XVIII. THE AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT BY THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR ON EACH OF HIS VISITS WITH EACH OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of time</th>
<th>White colleges</th>
<th>Colored colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A full day*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A half-day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One period</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two periods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies with need of student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies with distance from college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, none reports that the college supervisor spends a full day on each visit with a student teacher; two of the ten colored colleges so report, making a total of two out of thirty responding North Carolina colleges reporting this practice.

Findings:

(1) In two-thirds of the cases, the college supervisor makes his visit to each student teacher one period in length.

(2) Other institutions report visits varying in length from less than one period (reported by 6.6%) to a full day (reported by 6.6%).

What steps are taken by the critic teacher in preparing for the arrival of a student teacher assigned to her? Table XIX gives these statistics.
TABLE XIX. PREPARATION ON THE PART OF THE CRITIC TEACHER FOR THE ARRIVAL OF THE STUDENT TEACHER, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices prior to the arrival of the student teacher</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher reviews college record of student teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher writes a note of welcome to the student teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher has preliminary interview with the student</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher furnishes student with materials, textbooks, etc.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher, principal, and student hold conference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, seven have the critic teacher review the college record of the incoming student teacher; one of the ten colored colleges does so, making a total of eight out of thirty North Carolina colleges and universities reporting this as a practice preliminary to the arrival of the student teacher.

**Findings:**

1. In 80% of the cases the critic teacher has a preliminary interview with the student teacher; only one college reports that this is a three-way conference, with the principal of the cooperating school also participating.

2. The critic teacher furnishes in advance textbooks and other teaching materials to the student teacher in 70% of the cases.

3. The student's college record is reviewed by the critic
teacher in 26.6% of cases.

(4) No college reports that the critic teacher writes a note of welcome to the incoming student teacher.

Table XX deals with the principles underlying supervision of student teaching from the standpoint of the critic teacher.

**TABLE XX. PRINCIPLES FOLLOWED BY CRITIC TEACHER IN SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle of supervision</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher never leaves classroom#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher leaves student teacher alone for short intervals</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher allows student teacher to have class alone several days toward end of teaching period</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher holds regularly scheduled conferences with student teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers are required to have lesson plans</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, none has as a principle of supervision that the critic teacher never leaves the classroom; one of the ten colored colleges does so, making a total of one college out of the thirty colleges in North Carolina reporting this general principle of supervision.
Findings:

(1) In 93% of the cases, the critic teacher holds regularly scheduled conferences with the student teacher, and leaves the student teacher in charge of the class for a short interval.

(2) Student teachers are required to have lesson plans in three-fourths of the white colleges and in all of the colored colleges.

(3) In 73% of the colleges, the critic teacher allows the student teacher to have class alone for several days, along toward the end of the teaching period.

(4) Although only one college reports it to be a general practice that the critic teacher never leaves the classroom, others remark, "This does happen frequently enough to be a serious problem."

Table XXI, the final one on supervision, deals with the time at which the student teacher actually begins teaching.
TABLE XXI. TIME AT WHICH THE STUDENT TEACHER TAKES OVER THE ACTUAL TEACHING RESPONSIBILITY FOR ONE OR MORE CLASSES, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time responsibility assumed</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First day of student teaching*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First week of student teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third week of student teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second to tenth week of student teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After twenty hours' observation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 45 hours' observation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 60 hours' observation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies with readiness of student teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differs with elementary or high school major, the former, first week, the latter, third.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, one reports its student teachers in seventy-five percent of the cases begin teaching on the first day of the student-teaching course; none of the ten colored colleges reports this, making a total of one out of thirty North Carolina colleges reporting first-day student teaching.
Findings:

(1) Fifty per cent of the colleges report that, on the average, their students take over the actual teaching responsibility for the class during or after the second week of student teaching.

(2) Almost one-fourth (23.3%) of the student teachers begin actual teaching during the third week of the course.

(3) Other replies varied all the way from the first day of student teaching to the tenth week of student teaching.

Breadth and variety of experience in student teaching. Adequate breadth and variety of the laboratory experiences furnished in student teaching are needed by the student teacher. Table XXII is a presentation of the reports in this connection. Again, it should be noted that the word "adequate" is liable to subjective interpretation; therefore, all replies may not indicate uniform bases for evaluation.
TABLE XXII. AREAS OF TEACHING IN WHICH ADEQUATE EXPERIENCE IS REPORTED TO BE OFFERED ALL STUDENT TEACHERS, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of teaching</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting experience in area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with individual pupil*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom activities</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular activities</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional meetings</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine duties</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloc of time for actual teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance N.C.E.A. and membership in the F.T.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, twelve report adequate experience in work with the individual pupil in practically every case; six of the ten colored colleges do so; making a total of eighteen out of thirty North Carolina colleges reporting adequate experience in this area of teaching.

Findings:

(1) All colleges reported that all their student teachers receive adequate experience in classroom activities; 93% of them reported adequate experience in routine duties as well.

(2) Twenty per cent fewer colleges reported the next most common activities. Provision of a block of time for actual teaching and work with individual pupils was reported by approximately three-fourths of the colleges, said to furnish all
their student teachers with adequate experience in this respect.

(3) The two areas with lowest incidence of reply are those two ranking lowest in the pre-student-teaching experiences of the teacher trainee. Professional experiences, corresponding roughly with "an understanding of the school situation as a whole" appearing in the earlier questionnaire, was reported as adequately supplied only in 53.3% of cases, while the area of community activities is even more neglected, needs in this area being met in only 30% of the cases.

**Administration and organization of student teaching.**

Proper and adequate administration and organization of the student-teaching program is one of the more important factors in its effectiveness and success. Tables XXIII--XXXII will deal with various phases of administrative policy.

Table XXIII shows the practices in regard to grading student teachers.

---

2See above, p. 49.
TABLE XXIII. PRACTICES IN REGARD TO GRADING STUDENT TEACHERS AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading practice</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade based on conference of all supervisors*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of student teaching gives grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal of school gives grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critic teacher gives grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor gives grade based on rating or recommendation of critic teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, eleven of them base the student-teaching grade on conference of all supervisors; three of the ten colored colleges do so, making a total of fourteen out of thirty North Carolina colleges holding all-supervisor conferences to give grades.

Findings:

(1) In 46.6% of the cases, the grade is based on a conference of all supervisors; in an equal number of cases the director of student teaching or the college supervisor actually gives the grade but bases it on the rating or recommendation of the critic teacher. In 93.3% of cases, then, at least two of the supervisors collaborate in giving the grade.

(2) In only two instances, both reported by colored colleges, are grades given by a single individual.
Table XXIV shows the percentage of student teachers passing the course in student teaching. Many of the responses to the questions here tabulated were qualified in some degree, suggesting that the percentage limits set are either too arbitrary, or are too far apart. For example, many colleges reporting that 90% of their student teachers passed commented, "More than 90%, but less than 100% of our student teachers pass." Others reporting 100% passing grades added, "Those students who are proving unsuccessful are withdrawn from the course", or, "Students repeat the course until they do pass it", or, "Our guidance program does not permit poorly-qualified or unready students to attempt student teaching."
TABLE XXIV. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PASSING THE STUDENT TEACHING COURSE, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage passing</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One hundred per cent*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninety per cent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges responding, sixteen report that one hundred per cent of their teacher trainees pass the student-teaching course; five out of ten colored colleges do so, making a total of twenty-one out of thirty North Carolina colleges passing one hundred per cent of student teachers.

Findings:

(1) A large majority of the colleges pass all student teachers, 70% of them so reporting.

(2) In 30% of the colleges, 90% of the student teachers are given passing grades.

(3) It is interesting to note that while the colored colleges divide their reports equally between 100% passing and 90% passing, white colleges report 80% of them as passing 100% of their student teachers, only 20% reporting that 90% of the students pass.
Table XXV shows the places where student teaching in North Carolina is done.

**TABLE XXV. PLACES WHERE STUDENT TEACHING IS DONE, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an on-campus laboratory school*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In public schools in local community</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In public schools in nearby areas</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In public schools in widespread areas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, four have student teaching done in an on-campus laboratory school; two of the ten colored colleges do so, making a total of six colleges reporting an on-campus laboratory school: this out of the thirty reporting colleges.*

**Findings:**

1. Every college uses for student teaching public schools located in the college community.

2. Public schools in nearby areas are used for student teaching, reported 80% of the colleges.

3. Only 30% of the colleges reported the use of public schools in widespread areas for student teaching.

4. Campus laboratory schools are maintained for student teaching by only 20% of the colleges reporting. Most colleges
so reporting are state-supported teachers colleges.

Table XXVI lists the criteria governing the selection of off-campus schools for student teaching.

TABLE XXVI. CRITERIA GOVERNING SELECTION OF OFF-CAMPUS SCHOOLS FOR STUDENT TEACHING, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion of selection</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State accreditation *</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in the Southern Association</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from the college itself</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of community in which located</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications of administration and faculty</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of plant and of teaching aids</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, thirteen report that state accreditation is a factor occurring in the selection of off-campus schools for student teaching; seven of the ten colored colleges so report, making a total of twenty out of thirty North Carolina colleges reporting this as a criterion of selection.

Findings:

(1) All but two of the colleges (93.3%) consider the distance from the college itself as a major factor in choosing an off-campus cooperating school.
(2) Eighty per cent of the colleges take into consideration the qualifications of the administration and faculty, and 70%, the adequacy of the plant and teaching aids.

(3) One-third of the responding colleges did not report state accreditation as a requirement for an off-campus teaching center; 70% of them did not report membership in the Southern Association as a factor in choice of such a center. It is hard to reconcile these statements with the larger percentages reporting a criterion of "qualified administration and faculty", or "adequacy of plant and of teaching aids."

Table XXVII shows the persons consulted in setting up an off-campus teaching center.
TABLE XXVII. PERSONS CONSULTED IN THE PROCESS OF SETTING UP AN OFF-CAMPUS TEACHING CENTER, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person consulted</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The superintendent and board of education of administrative unit*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal of the cooperating school</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty of the cooperating school</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public school supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white schools reporting, nineteen consult the superintendent and board of education of the administrative unit before setting up an off-campus teaching center; six of the ten colored schools do so, making a total of twenty-five North Carolina colleges and universities reporting this contact in the process of establishing such a center.

Findings:

(1) The principal of the cooperating school is consulted in 100% of the cases in the process of setting up an off-campus teaching center.

(2) Forty per cent of the colored colleges, and 5% of the white colleges do not consult the superintendent and board of education of the administrative unit before establishing a teaching center in a school.
(3) In 53.3% of cases, the faculty of the cooperating school is not consulted before the school becomes an off-campus teaching center.

Table XXVIII shows the persons consulted before making the assignment of any one student teacher to a particular off-campus school.

| Table XXVIII. PERSONS CONSULTED BEFORE MAKING FINAL ASSIGNMENT OF STUDENT TEACHER TO OFF-CAMPUS SCHOOL, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Person consulted | Number of institutions reporting consultation |
|                  | White colleges | Colored colleges | Total |
| Critic teacher*  | 20              | 8               | 28    |
| Principal of cooperating school | 20          | 10              | 30    |
| Superintendent of unit      | 10                | 3               | 13    |
| Student teacher             | 19                | 9               | 28    |
| Public school supervisors   |                   | 1               | 1     |

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, twenty consult the critic teacher before making final assignment of a student teacher to the cooperating school; eight of the ten colored schools do so, making a total of twenty-eight colleges and universities of North Carolina reporting this practice.

Findings:

(1) In every case the principal of the cooperating school is consulted before final placement of a student teacher in a
given school, and in most cases (93.3%) the critic teacher and the student teacher are consulted.

(2) In 56.6% of the cases, the superintendent of the unit is not consulted before assignment of the student teacher.

One of the policies in administration of the student-teaching program in which there is greatest lack of uniformity of practice throughout the state is that of payment of the critic teacher. Table XXIX shows the practices reported.

**TABLE XXIX. PAYMENT OF CRITIC TEACHERS IN COOPERATING SCHOOLS, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment policy</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting payment policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pay for critic teacher*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15--$30 per student teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30--$50 per student teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 per semester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15 per month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.00 to the critic teacher, $2.50 to school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services such as films loan, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, three do not pay the critic teacher in off-campus schools for supervising the student teacher; two of the ten colored colleges do not, making a total of five out of thirty North Carolina colleges which do not pay the critic teacher.
Findings:
(1) Payment of $15 to $30 per student teacher is the most common practice in paying the critic teacher. This figure was reported by 46.6% of the colleges.
(2) Twenty-three per cent of the colleges participating pay $30 to $50 per student teacher.
(3) No pay for the critic teacher is the policy of 16.6% of the colleges, although another college reports payment only in materials, film loans, etc.

The practices regarding the number of student teachers assigned to any one school at any one time are shown in Table XXX.
### TABLE XXX. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO ANY ONE COOPERATING SCHOOL AT ANY ONE TIME, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum number assigned</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting</th>
<th>Number of students assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No limit other than the number of qualified teachers in cooperating school*</td>
<td>White colleges: 16</td>
<td>Colored colleges: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more than one student teacher for each ten teachers in the cooperating school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more than one for each five teachers in the cooperating school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than six to a school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to wishes of the administration of the cooperating school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, sixteen set no limit to the number of student teachers assigned to any one off-campus school than the number of qualified teachers in that school; nine of the ten colored colleges follow this policy; leaving a total of twenty-five out of thirty North Carolina colleges reporting this practice.

**Findings:**

1. A large majority (83.3%) of the colleges report that there is no limit to the number of student teachers assigned at any one time to any one cooperating school, other than the number of qualified critics teachers. (One college qualified this with...

---

3See Table XII, p. 62.
a statement that no grade or class was given a student teacher more than once a year.)

(2) Other practices include limiting the ratio to one student teacher for each ten regular teachers, or to one student teacher for each five regular teachers; one school reported it never assigns more than six student teachers to any school at one time.

Table XXXI gives the reports on practices employed in group conferences or seminars of the student teachers during their assignment.
TABLE XXXI. PRACTICES EMPLOYED IN GROUP CONFERENCES OR SEMINARS  
DURING THE STUDENT TEACHING PERIOD, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES  
AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED  
COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small conferences of student teachers in a particular area*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly conferences of the entire group</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times each term</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week at night</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, seven hold small area conferences of student teachers during the student-teaching assignment; eight of the ten colored colleges do so, making a total of fifteen out of thirty colleges and universities of North Carolina following this practice.

Findings:

(1) The most general practice in North Carolina (reported by almost two-thirds of the colleges) is to have the entire group of student teachers meet weekly.

(2) Thirty per cent of the colleges reported small conferences of student teachers in a particular area.

Policies governing final placement of the student teacher in a laboratory situation are shown in Table XXXII.
### TABLE XXXII. PRINCIPLES FOLLOWED IN FINAL PLACEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle of placement</th>
<th>White colleges</th>
<th>Colored colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers are allowed to teach near home when financial and domestic obligations warrant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers may be assigned to schools from which graduated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers are required to live in community where teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers considered weak students assigned to campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings:**

1. All but one-third of the colleges reported that student teachers may be assigned to the schools from which they graduated. (One college qualified this report with the comment that this was done only in the case of veterans who had graduated from high school ten or more years before.)

2. Student teachers are allowed, if financial or domestic obligations seem to warrant, to teach near their homes by 46.6% of the colleges.

3. Seventy percent of the colleges did not report requiring student teachers to live in the community in which
they teach. This is in line with earlier findings\(^4\) revealing the area of community experience to be the weakest link in the pre-student-teaching and the student-teaching programs.

\(^{(4)}\) The low incidence of responses to the question, "Are student teachers who are considered weak assigned to the campus?" must be interpreted in the light of the fact that only six of the colleges report having a campus laboratory school.

**Summary.** The period of student teaching furnishes in most North Carolina colleges and universities the major portion of professional laboratory experiences in teacher education. Although it may be placed as early as the last quarter or semester of the junior year, 70% of the reporting institutions stated that most of their student teaching falls in the final quarter or semester of the senior year. Offering credits varying from three semester hours to fifteen quarter hours, North Carolina teacher-training institutions show a great deal of variety in length and intensity of the student-teaching assignment. One-third of them require a full day for a quarter or a semester, but almost as many—26.6% of them—report one hour a day for that period of time, with the remainder reporting nine other practices. The prerequisites for student teaching as reported by more than two-thirds of the thirty responding institutions were completion of certain courses, completion of a

\(^{4}\) See above, pp.49 and 79.
given number of hours of work, readiness for student teaching, and a certain scholarship standing; more than 50% required also a formal application by the student and recommendations by the head of the department and other staff members.

The critic teacher, as reported by a majority of colleges, must hold a North Carolina "A" certificate, have had at least three years teaching experience, and be recommended by the principal and/or superintendent of the school in which he teaches. However, more than a third of the colleges require nothing more than a recommendation; only two report requirement of special work in supervision of student teaching. In most cases, the responsibility of the critic teacher in supervising student teaching is shared only by the college supervisor; but 37% of the schools reported that the principal of the school and the student's major professor play an important role. Only six colleges reported assigning more than two student teachers to any one critic teacher at any one time; none reported more than four at a time, and this, they stated, only when unavoidable. College supervisors are responsible for from five to more than thirty student teachers at a time; the median assignment is between fifteen and twenty student teachers per quarter or semester. They visit each of these students five or more times, as reported by more than a third of the institutions participating, while about a fourth of them reported only three
visits. The modal length of these visits is one period, two-thirds of the colleges reporting this figure. In more than a third of the cases, the college supervisor also teaches college classes, and in only a tenth of the cases does he spend his full time in supervising student teaching.

Usually (in eighty per cent of the cases) the critic teacher has a preliminary interview with the student, often (in seventy per cent of the cases) furnishing materials, textbooks, etc. before the student begins the student-teaching assignment. All but two institutions reported that during the student-teaching period the critic teacher holds regularly scheduled conferences with the student teacher, and that he leaves the student teacher alone in charge of the class for brief intervals. Written lesson plans are required, reported 83% of the participating colleges; and 73% reported that toward the end of the teaching period the student teacher assumes charge of the class alone for several days. In 50% of the cases, the student has begun actual teaching during the second week of his assignment; very few begin earlier than this.

The variety and scope of laboratory experiences during this period are most important. An "adequate" experience in the following areas is reported in the listed proportions: Every college reports adequate experience in classroom activities; all but two, in routine duties; 77%, a bloc of time for actual
teaching; 73%, work with the individual pupil; 57%, extracurricular activities; 53%, professional meetings; and 30%, community activities. Comparison with data on pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences reveals that the two fields showing least frequency of experience prior to student teaching again rank lowest: professional and community activities--two areas of teaching which according to many educators rank at the very top in meaningfulness and value.

The grade of the student teacher is reported to be based by 46.6% of the colleges on a decision reached in conference of all supervisors; in an equal number of colleges, the supervisor either uses a grade or rating chart given by the critic teacher, or confers with him before giving the grade. In ninety to one-hundred per cent of the cases the grade is passing.

Student teaching is conducted in off-campus schools by all of the colleges. Only six have laboratory schools. Off-campus cooperating schools are chosen by more than 50% of the colleges on a basis of (1) accessibility; (2) qualifications of administration and faculty; (3) adequacy of plant and teaching aids; and (4) state accreditation. In setting up an off-campus teaching center, all colleges reported that they consult the principal of the cooperating school; 83% work with the superintendent of the administrative unit; and 57% consult the faculty. In making the assignment of the student teacher to a
particular cooperating school, 93% or more of the colleges consult the principal, the critic teacher, and the student teacher. Only 43% work through the superintendent of the unit in assigning individual teachers. Student teachers are allowed to teach near their homes when financial and domestic obligations seem to warrant it, reported 47% of the participating institutions. By 33% of the colleges, they may be assigned to the schools from which they graduated, while 30% require that they live in the community in which they teach. Three schools assign their weakest students to the campus school.

There is no limit to the number of student teachers who may be assigned to any one cooperating school at any one time, reported 83% of the responding colleges and universities. Forty-seven per cent of them pay from fifteen to thirty dollars to the critic teacher for each student teacher, while 23% pay more, and 17% pay nothing. (Some schools did not report any payment, but failed to report no payment).

This chapter has presented and interpreted the data in regard to professional laboratory experiences during student teaching in the colleges and universities of North Carolina. Chapter V deals with post-student-teaching laboratory experiences and the follow-up given first-year teachers.
CHAPTER V

LABORATORY EXPERIENCES FOLLOWING STUDENT TEACHING, AND FOLLOW-UP OF FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

This chapter deals with laboratory experiences provided after student teaching in North Carolina colleges, and with the assistance and direction extended to the newly-graduated education major as he does his first year's teaching.

I. LABORATORY EXPERIENCES FOLLOWING STUDENT TEACHING

It is only recently that educators have become fully aware of the tremendous value latent in post-student-teaching laboratory experiences. The American Association of Teachers Colleges reports: "Three major purposes can be served by professional laboratory experiences following student teaching: (1) to permit students to do more intensive work in areas of special interest or competence; (2) to make it possible for students to strengthen shortage areas; (3) to help students gain a new overview of the larger school situation."

The placement of student teaching at the very end of the teacher-training course in North Carolina colleges²

¹Flowers, et. al., School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, p. 199.
²See above, p. 52.
presents a serious handicap in implementing post-student-teaching laboratory experiences. Table XXXIII lists the laboratory experiences following student teaching, as provided by the colleges and universities taking part in the study.

**TABLE XXXIII. POST-STUDENT-TEACHING LABORATORY EXPERIENCES AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory experience</th>
<th>White colleges</th>
<th>Colored colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional course work in special field for which a need was found during student teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional professional courses for which a need was found during student teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A seminar for the purpose of evaluating student-teaching experiences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual conferences with a member of the department of student teaching</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations to relate theory and practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual conferences with major professor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three weeks of classes following student teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:

(1) The only activity following student teaching reported by more than half the colleges is individual conferences between the prospective teacher and a member of the department of student teaching; this was reported by 60% of the colleges. Only 46.6% of the institutions reported individual conferences of the prospective teacher with his major professor after the completion of student teaching.

(2) Forty per cent of the responding colleges reported that they hold a seminar for the purpose of evaluating student-teaching experiences.

(3) When weaknesses are detected during student teaching, in 26.6% of the colleges the student is given special course work if the weakness is academic; if it is professional in nature, he may be given additional work in 16.6% of the colleges.

(4) One college reported an unusual organization of the student-teaching program. For five weeks prior to the beginning of student teaching, all those registered for the student-teaching course meet as a class. Then, after the completion of the actual student teaching, three more weeks of classwork designed to give direction to the experiences of student teaching follow.
II. FOLLOW-UP METHODS FOR FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

The experiences of the first-year teacher can often be interpreted and made more meaningful for him if given some direction by the college in which he has completed his teaching course. Table XXXIV shows the amount and method of follow-up employed by North Carolina colleges and universities.

TABLE XXXIV. FOLLOW-UP METHODS FOR FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS, AS REPORTED BY THIRTY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA (TWENTY WHITE AND TEN COLORED COLLEGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-up method</th>
<th>Number of institutions reporting method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits by members of the college staff with first-year teachers to assist with problems</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishing written suggestions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lending teaching materials, such as charts, films, etc.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires on effectiveness of student-teaching course</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal letters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reads as follows: Of the twenty white colleges reporting, six state that staff members visit first-year teachers for the purpose of helping with their problems; three of the ten colored colleges reporting do so, making a total of nine out of thirty North Carolina colleges and universities which report visits as a method of follow-up with first-year teachers.
Findings:

1. No activity in this field was reported by more than fifty per cent of the colleges.

2. The most prevalent method of follow-up of the first-year teacher is that of lending teaching materials, such as charts, films, etc., reported by 50% of the participating colleges. However, many replies to this question were modified by such statements as, "upon request", "when needed", etc.

3. Forty per cent of the colleges furnish written suggestions to first-year teachers.

4. Only thirty per cent reported visits by members of the college staff to assist first-year teachers with problems. It was not stated whether this was done regularly or upon request.

5. Only three colleges reported any other activity after student teaching.

Summary. After the student-teaching assignment is over, prospective teachers are often considered to have ended their laboratory experiences. By 60% of the colleges it was reported that the student teacher did have a conference with a member of the department of student teaching after completion of his assignment; 47% reported conferences with the major professor, and 40% hold seminars for the purpose of evaluating student-teaching experiences. Other activities subsequent to student teaching were reported by only a few institutions.
Half the reporting colleges lend materials such as films, charts, etc., to their first-year teachers, upon request; and written suggestions are furnished by 40% of them. Thirty percent of the colleges reported that members of the college staff visit graduates who are first-year teachers, as a means of assisting them with their problems.

Chapter V has presented the data concerning practices in regard to professional laboratory experiences subsequent to student teaching, and with the follow-up given first-year teachers. Chapter VI gives the conclusions and recommendations growing out of the writer's interpretation of the data in the light of the standards suggested by the American Association for Teacher Education.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was undertaken to determine the prevailing practices in regard to professional laboratory experiences in teacher education in the colleges and universities of North Carolina. To obtain data for the study, check lists were mailed to the thirty-two colleges and universities of the state which have a teacher-education program. From the thirty replies to these questionnaires, the data presented in preceding chapters were drawn; and on the findings thus made the conclusions and recommendations which follow are based.

Conclusions. Data presented in preceding chapters show certain strengths and certain weaknesses inherent in the North Carolina teacher-education program. Conclusions based upon the writer's analysis of the data are presented as follows:

(1) The general administrative policies of most institutions are favorable to improvement and progress in the teacher-education program.

(2) While the minimum standards for laboratory experiences in teacher education set by the state of North Carolina are lower than those of most other states, at least three of the colleges reporting have a program far in advance of these standards.
and seven others are requiring more student-teaching experience of their students than the state requires.

(3) The North Carolina teacher-education program is weaker in the areas of laboratory experiences prior to and succeeding student teaching than in the area of student teaching itself.

(4) The program of laboratory experiences prior to, during, and succeeding student teaching is weakest in the areas of community and professional experiences.

(5) Many North Carolina colleges are hampered by lack of funds and/or lack of access to well-equipped laboratory schools in the implementation of the program of laboratory experiences they would like to promote.

(6) Almost every college has plans for the improvement of its teacher-training curriculum toward goals surpassing state standards.

Conclusions relating to laboratory experiences prior to student teaching are as follows:

(1) North Carolina teacher-training institutions provide a good program of observational experiences prior to student teaching.

(2) Activities requiring observation are emphasized disproportionately to those requiring active participation on the part of the prospective teacher.
(3) At least 50% of the reporting colleges lack a program of varied, active, and broad laboratory experiences before student teaching, particularly in the areas of community and professional activity.

(4) Inadequate planning and coordination of pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences is one factor in weakening the teacher-education program at this point. The most highly-recommended method of organization—that of coordinating laboratory experiences with regular required course-work—is practiced by 70% of the colleges; but that this does not guarantee valuable laboratory experiences is demonstrated by the fact that no pre-student-teaching laboratory experience requiring active participation was reported by more than 56.6% of the colleges, and that 60% of the colleges did not report that evidence of certain laboratory experiences is prerequisite to student teaching.

Conclusions relating to laboratory experiences during student teaching are as follows:

(1) The most outstanding weaknesses of the North Carolina student-teaching program are as follows:

(a) A lack of uniformity in the student-teaching program on the state-wide level, specifically in

(1) the length and intensity of the student-teaching assignment,
(2) the credit-hours given for the course,
(3) the payment of the critic teacher.

(b) A lack of adequate supervision, due to

(1) low standards for selection of the
critic teacher,
(2) overloading of critic teacher,
(3) overloading of college supervisor.

(c) A lack of sufficiently broad and varied laboratory experiences during student teaching, especially in the areas of professional and community activity.

(2) The student-teaching program is the most carefully-planned and best-provided-for phase of the laboratory experiences offered in the teacher-education program.

(3) While other prerequisites for the student-teaching course are high, far too few colleges make evidence of previous laboratory experiences a requirement for admission to the course.

(4) The superintendent and the board of education of the administrative unit are too often ignored in the setting-up of an off-campus teaching center, and even more often in the placement of the student teacher.

(5) Convenience of location as a factor in the selection of off-campus cooperating schools is sometimes emphasized to the detriment of other important considerations in making such a choice.

(6) Off-campus cooperating schools may be in many cases filled past the saturation point with student teachers.

(7) Placement of the student teacher is not sufficiently defined as a responsibility of a given staff member in cooperation with the school where the student teacher is to be placed.
(8) Too few student teachers are required to live in the community in which they teach.

(9) Group conferences or seminars of the student teachers during the student-teaching period, although reported by a commendable percentage of colleges, is not a sufficiently-emphasized practice among North Carolina colleges.

Conclusions relating to laboratory experiences after student teaching and as to the follow-up given first-year teachers are as follows:

(1) Laboratory experiences following student teaching and intended to supplement and give direction to those experiences gained during the student teaching assignment are not offered by a sufficient number of North Carolina teacher-training institutions.

(2) The location of student teaching in the last quarter or semester of the senior year prevents a worthwhile program of meaningful post-student-teaching laboratory experiences.

(3) There is insufficient planning for follow-through with graduates of the teacher-education curriculum, the college taking too little initiative in assisting and directing the first-year teacher.

Recommendations. These conclusions, when compared with the recommended standards presented by the American Association for Teacher Education, give rise to the following recommendations:
(1) That standards for student-teaching laboratory experiences be set to provide the best preparation for the future teacher.

(2) That North Carolina colleges and universities plan more varied and more frequent laboratory experiences prior to student teaching; that these experiences be initiated early and be continuous throughout the prospective teacher's college career.

(3) That especial attention be given to providing meaningful professional laboratory experiences in the areas of community and professional activities before student teaching.

(4) That the pre-student-teaching program of professional laboratory experiences be so planned as to provide a maximum of those experiences requiring active participation on the part of the future teacher.

(5) That the most valuable and practicable laboratory experiences be ascertained through appropriate experimentation and evaluation, and that the results be incorporated into required courses, both professional and academic; and that the evidence of successful completion of these experiences be made prerequisite to admission to student teaching in every college in North Carolina.

(6) That standards be set up to make more uniform throughout the state practices in regard to
(a) the length and intensity of the student-teaching assignment;
(b) the credit given for the course;
(c) the correlation between length and intensity of the assignment and credit hours given for it;
(d) the payment of the critic teacher.

(7) That higher and more uniform criteria for the selection for critic teachers be employed.

(8) That the critic teacher be given no more than one student teacher during any given quarter or semester.

(9) That the college supervisor be given time and funds adequate for proper discharge of his duties.

(10) That the laboratory experiences to be included in the student-teaching activities be so planned as to give an adequate amount of experience in every phase of a teacher's work, instead of being concentrated on classroom and routine duties to the exclusion of other experiences.

(11) That placement of the student teacher be regarded as a responsibility of members of the college staff in cooperation with the personnel of the school in which the student is to be placed; although the student should be consulted before placement, under no circumstances should he assume sole responsibility for his own placement.

(12) That the proper procedure for setting up an off-campus teaching center should be
(a) study and selection of a qualified school,
(b) consultation with the superintendent of the administrative unit
(c) consultation with the principal of the school,
(d) consultation with the faculty of the school,
(e) approval by the school board of the local school and of the administrative unit.

(13) That, in order to provide laboratory experiences of greatest value to the student teacher, only those schools sufficiently well-equipped and well-staffed to merit state accreditation be considered as cooperating schools.

(14) That no cooperating school have so many student teachers at one time, or in the course of a year, that the program defeats its own ends as well as those of education. There should be a limit.

(15) That student teachers, in order to acquire more experience in the area of community contacts, should be required in all but exceptional cases to live in the community where they teach.

(16) That group conferences or seminars of student teachers during the teaching period be made an essential part of the student-teaching experience.

(17) That every college include in its teacher-education program a course designed to follow student teaching and to give meaning and direction to the experiences of the student-teaching assignment. This would necessitate a shift of the student-
teaching time-location from the prospective teacher's final quarter or semester to an earlier position.

(18) That a planned program of assistance and direction of recent graduates serving as first-year teachers be made an integral part of the teacher-education program. This means not merely "encouraging the former students to come with their problems," or "helping them on request," but a program that would reach and aid every first-year teacher from that college.

(19) That a further study be made to evaluate the success of the various teacher-training methods employed in North Carolina, and that the best of these be listed and recommended to the colleges and universities of the state.
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APPENDIX A
LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE
January 28, 1953

To Department of Education Heads, North Carolina Senior Colleges

RE: STUDENT LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The State Advisory Council on Teacher Education now has as one of its special studies the broad field of student laboratory experiences as a part of teacher education. The colleges, at the annual Conferences last fall, agreed to participate in the study.

Dr. Herbert Wey, Director of Teacher Training, Appalachian State Teachers College, and a member of the Advisory Council, has prepared a questionnaire which would give us the present status of the subject in our colleges. I am sure you agree with me that we need basic data on the present practices before we can chart any future course of action.

Dr. Wey has arranged for a graduate student at the Appalachian State Teachers College to analyze the data and to make the necessary statistical evaluation. Our responsibility now is to see that the data are furnished for each of our institutions.

I am enclosing two copies of the questionnaire, one to be returned to me, and the other to be retained by you. The institutions are not to be identified by Dr. Wey, but when you send your report to me please let me know from where it has come, so that if reports are not received from all the institutions I shall know who the "sinners" are. I shall send the questionnaires, unidentified, to Dr. Wey.

The questionnaire may seem a little long, but since you need only to check the items, it should not require much of your time to execute it. You appreciate the fact that the study will not be very valuable unless we have returns from all of the institutions. I know that you are interested in the subject, and that we may expect the cooperation of every college. I hope you will get your report to me at once, because a student's Master's thesis may be tied up with the study. I am counting upon you.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Hillman, Director
Division of Professional Service

Enc.
Appendix A. Questionnaire

Status Study of Student Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education

The information requested in the following questionnaire is needed in making a status study of practices in the use of student laboratory experiences in connection with teacher education in the state of North Carolina.

In the questionnaire, the term "laboratory school" will be used to designate a school on the college campus, owned and administered by the college. The term "cooperating school" or "off-campus school" will signify a school owned and administered by the public, located off the campus of the reporting institution.

All information will be kept strictly confidential. Return completed Questionnaire to James E. Hillman, State Department of Education, Raleigh, N. C.

A. GENERAL POLICY

1. If the following policies are subscribed to by your institution, please indicate by checking those which you feel are being met very satisfactorily:

   1. Teacher education is recognized as a college-wide function and receives full cooperation and support from every department or division. ...........

   2. Definite provision is made for continuous study and evaluation of the teacher education program and for its modification when the need arises. ...........

   3. A staff adequate for carrying on the type of program offered is provided. ...........

   4. Adequate funds for travel necessary to your teacher education program are provided. ...........

II. Check the system on which your institution operates:

   1. On a semester basis ...........
2. On a quarter basis

3. Other

B. LABORATORY EXPERIENCES PRIOR TO STUDENT TEACHING

I. Check the following activities in the area of study of the child in which seventy-five percent or more of your students have experience prior to the student teaching assignment:

1. Directing the play of children
2. Observing the classroom activities of groups of children at different age levels
3. Helping a child with a particular problem
4. Observing extra-curricular activities of pupils
5. Talking with different teachers about a child
6. Recording anecdotal information about a child
7. Determining mental, physical, emotional, and social difference in children
8. Examining the school records of a given child
9. Determining the out-of-school activities of children at different age levels
10. Conducting a case study
11. Other

II. Check the following activities in the area of study of the school community in which seventy-five percent or more of your students have experience prior to the student teaching assignment:

1. Attending P.T.A. meetings
2. Teaching a Sunday School class
3. Assisting in the Y.M.C.A., Boy Scout, or other youth program
4. Determining the socio-economic status of pupils in certain attendance areas
5. Making a map of a given school community
6. Visiting several homes in different parts of the community
7. Attending school board meetings
8. Attending social functions of a given community
9. Determining how resources of a given community can be employed in a unit study
10. Analyzing racial and religious problems of a given community
11. Other .................................................................

III. Check the following activities in the area of participation in actual classroom situations in which seventy-five percent or more of your students have experience prior to the student teaching assignment:

1. Interviewing different teachers
2. Observing and analyzing effective teaching
3. Assisting individual pupils with classroom work
4. Teaching small groups of pupils for a short time
5. Observing instruction on different grade levels as a basis for comparison
6. Administering tests to pupils
7. Arranging for the housekeeping details of the classroom
8. Correcting papers
9. Teaching an entire class under effective supervision
10. Critical examination of instructional materials of classes observed
11. Taking pupils on a field trip
12. Other .................................................................

IV. Check the following activities in the area of understanding the school situation as a whole in which seventy-five percent or more of your students have experience prior to the student teaching assignment:

1. Making a tour of a school plant
2. Observing routine practices in the school office
3. Interviewing an individual principal
4. Interviewing the superintendent or assistant superintendent about the operation of the schools within a given system

5. Paying a brief visit to all the schools within a small school district

6. Attending teachers' professional meetings

7. Sitting in on faculty meetings concerned with curriculum revision

8. Determining curriculum requirements for different groups within a school system

9. Rendering administrative assistance prior to the opening of school

10. Sitting in on faculty meetings concerned with determination of school policy

11. Other

V. Check the following statement or statements which most nearly describe your methods of organization and administration of laboratory experiences prior to the student teaching assignment:

1. A planned program of laboratory experiences preceding student teaching is offered each student separately from required course work.

2. Laboratory experiences preceding student teaching are coordinated with required course work and required of students planning to be teachers.

3. Records of laboratory experiences preceding student teaching are kept for each student.

4. Laboratory experiences preceding student teaching are made available to those students who desire them, but are not required of students.

5. There is no planned program for laboratory experiences preceding student teaching.
C. STUDENT TEACHING

I. Check the quarter or semester in which student teachers are first allowed to do student teaching. Double check the quarter or semester in which most of your student teachers do student teaching:

1. In the last quarter or semester, junior year
2. In the first quarter or semester, senior year
3. In the middle quarter of the senior year
4. In the last quarter or semester of the senior year
5. Other

II. Check all the following items which are required in seventy-five percent or more of cases as prerequisite to student teaching:

1. Completion of a given number of hours of work
2. Completion of certain courses
3. Readiness for student teaching
4. Health examination
5. Oral and/or written professional examination
6. A certain scholarship standing
7. Recommendations of head of department and other staff members
8. Formal application by student, submitted well in advance of student teaching assignment
9. Evidence of having participated in certain laboratory experiences
10. Other

III. Check the time basis on which your student teaching program is planned in seventy-five percent or more of cases:

1. One hour a day for one quarter or semester
2. One hour a day for two quarters or semesters
3. One-half day for one quarter or semester
4. A full day for one quarter or semester
5. Other
IV. Check the following item which tells the amount of credit which your institution offers for student teaching:

1. Less than six semester hours or nine quarter hours
2. Six semester hours or nine quarter hours
3. Ten semester hours or fifteen quarter hours
4. More than ten semester hours or fifteen quarter hours
5. Other

V. Check each of the following who has a major role in the counseling and placement of your student teachers:

1. The Director of student teaching
2. The college supervisor of student teaching
3. The student's major professor
4. The principal of the school where the student is to be placed
5. The critic teacher of the school where the student is to be placed
6. The student teacher himself
7. Others

VI. Check each of the following criteria used in at least seventy-five percent of cases by your institution in selecting critic teachers:

1. A bachelor's degree
2. A North Carolina "A" certificate
3. A graduate degree
4. A graduate teaching certificate
5. Special work in supervision of student teaching
6. At least three years of teaching experience
7. Recommendation by the principal and the superintendent of the school in which he teaches
8. Other
VII. Check each of the following who has a major role in the supervision of seventy-five percent or more of your student teachers:

1. The critic teacher
2. The principal of the school in which the student is teaching
3. The college supervisor of student teaching
4. The student's major professor
5. Other

VIII. Check the maximum number of student teachers assigned to any one critic teacher at any one time:

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. More than four

IX. Check the number of student teachers assigned to the college supervisor during a quarter or semester:

1. Five
2. Ten
3. Fifteen
4. Twenty
5. Twenty-five
6. Thirty
7. More than thirty

X. Check the statement that most appropriately fits your case:

1. The college supervisor spends full time in supervision of student teaching
2. The college supervisor spends half time in supervision of student teaching
3. The college supervisor spends a fourth of his time in supervision of student teaching
4. College faculty members who supervise student teaching have their college loads decreased accordingly
5. Other
XI. Check the number of times that the college supervisor visits each student teacher during his student teaching assignment:

1. Once
2. Twice
3. Three times
4. Four times
5. Five or more times

XII. Check the amount of time spent in seventy-five percent or more of cases by the college supervisor on each of his visits with each student teacher:

1. A full day
2. A half-day
3. One period
4. Less than one period
5. Other

XIII. Check each of the steps which you require your critic teachers to take preliminary to the arrival of the student teacher to begin his student teaching assignment:

1. Reviewing the college record of the student
2. Writing a note of welcome to the student
3. Having a preliminary interview with the student
4. Furnishing the student teacher with materials, textbooks, etc.

XIV. Check each of the following principles which in seventy-five percent or more cases your critic teachers follow in supervision:

1. Critic teacher never leaves classroom.
2. Critic teacher leaves student teacher alone for short intervals.
3. Critic teacher allows the student teacher to have class alone for several days toward the end of the teaching period.
4. Critic teacher holds regularly scheduled conferences with the student teacher.
5. Student teachers are required to have written lesson plans.
XV. Check the time at which the student teacher in seventy-five percent or more cases takes over actual teaching responsibility for one or more classes:

1. First day of student teaching
2. First week of student teaching
3. Second week of student teaching
4. Other

XVI. Check all the following in which practically all student teachers have adequate experience:

1. Work with the individual pupil
2. Classroom activities
3. Extra-curricular activities
4. Professional meetings
5. Community activities
6. Routine duties
7. A bloc of time for actual teaching
8. Other

XVII. Check the practices used by your institution in regard to grading practice teachers:

1. The grade is based on a decision reached through conference of all supervisors
2. The director of student teaching gives the grade
3. The principal of the school gives the grade
4. The critic teacher gives the grade
5. Other

XVIII. Check the percentage of students who pass the student teaching course:

1. One hundred percent
2. Ninety percent
3. Seventy-five percent
4. Sixty percent
5. Fifty percent
6. Twenty-five percent
7. Less than twenty-five percent
XIX. Check each of the places in which your student teaching is done:

1. In an on-campus laboratory school
2. In public schools in the local community
3. In public schools in nearby areas
4. In public schools in widespread areas
5. Other

---

IF YOU DO NOT USE OFF-CAMPUS SCHOOLS FOR STUDENT TEACHING, omit the remainder of this questionnaire, and turn to D.

XX. If you use off-campus schools for student teaching, check any of the following which occur as factors in selection:

1. State accreditation
2. Membership in the Southern Association
3. The distance from the college itself
4. The type of community in which it is located
5. The qualifications of administration and faculty
6. The adequacy of the plant and of teaching aids
7. Other

---

XXI. Check all the following who are contacted in the process of setting up an off-campus student teaching center:

1. The superintendent and board of education of the administrative unit
2. The principal of the cooperating school
3. Faculty of the cooperating school
4. Other

---

XXII. Check all the following who are consulted before making final assignment of a student teacher to an off-campus school:

1. The critic teacher
2. The principal
3. The superintendent of the unit
4. The student teacher
5. Other
XXIII. Check the policy you follow in paying teachers in off-campus cooperating schools:

1. No pay for the critic teacher
2. $15 - $30 per student teacher
3. $30 - $50 per student teacher
4. Other

XXIV. Check the maximum number of student teachers you assign to any one cooperating school at any one time:

1. No limit other than the number of qualified teachers in the cooperating school
2. No more than one student teacher for each ten teachers in the cooperating school
3. No more than one for each five teachers in the cooperating school
4. Other

XXV. Check the practices employed in group conferences or seminars during the student teaching period:

1. Small conferences of student teachers in a particular area
2. Saturday or weekly conferences of the entire group, held on the campus
3. Other

XXVI. Check the following principles which are followed in final placement of seventy-five percent or more of your student teachers:

1. Student teachers are allowed to teach near their homes when financial and domestic obligations seem to warrant it.
2. Student teachers may be assigned to the schools from which they graduated.
3. Student teachers are required to live in the community in which they teach.
4. Student teachers who are considered weak students are assigned to the campus
5. Other
D. LABORATORY EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING

I. Check any of the following in which most of your student teachers participate after student teaching:

1. Additional course work in special field for which a need was found during student teaching
2. Additional professional courses for which a need was found during student teaching
3. A seminar for the purpose of evaluating student teaching experiences
4. Individual conferences with a member of the department of student teaching
5. Individual conferences with major professor
6. Other

II. Check any of the following that your college does for your graduates who are first-year teachers:

1. Visits by members of the college staff with first-year teachers as a means of assisting them with their problems
2. Furnishing of written suggestions
3. Lending of teaching materials such as films, charts, etc.
4. Other

It would be appreciated if, in the following space or on separate sheet, you would briefly evaluate your present student teaching program, and outline the recommendations you have in mind for improving this program in your institution.