

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 097

95

SP 008 847

AUTHOR Sinclair, Ward
TITLE Field-Based Teacher Education and K-12 Personnel Responsibilities in Teacher Education: A Review.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 84p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); *College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; *Field Experience Programs; Inservice Teacher Education; Performance Based Teacher Education; Preservice Education; State Standards; Student Teaching; Teacher Associations; Teacher Centers; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This monograph traces the development of field-based teacher education in the U.S., from the first state-supported normal school (1839) to the present questions of control and the dual system of standards of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Some of the topics reported on are associations and unions, competency-based teacher education, local needs, teacher centers, reciprocity systems, and economic problems. The extensive appendixes provide the reader with reference material for better understanding the text. They are "Standard VI--Professional Laboratory Experiences"; "Constitution of the CITE Project"; and "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel Contract." (LP)

ED102097

FIELD-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION AND
K-12 PERSONNEL RESPONSIBILITIES
IN TEACHER EDUCATION: A REVIEW

by

Ward Sinclair

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Published by

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Sponsored by: American Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal
agent); Association of Teacher Educators;
Instruction and Professional Development,
National Education Association

February 1975

SP 008 847

SP 008 847

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Kentucky State Department of Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Kentucky State Department of Education or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

ERIC Abstract and Descriptors	7
Introduction: Background.	1
Standard VI.	3
Cooperating Teachers and Cooperating Schools	4
Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching	8
Association of Classroom Teachers Resolution	9
NASDTEC Standards.	10
NCATE Standards.	10
CBTE	13
Associations and Unions.	16
Questions of Control	21
Membership of the Profession.	22
Solving Some Problems	23
Some Effects of Field Experiences.	23
Meeting Local Needs.	25
In-Service Programs.	26
Teacher Centers.	27
Certification, Accreditation and State Education Agencies.	31
Reciprocity Systems.	33
Innovation and Experiment.	36
Economic Problems.	39
Directions for the Future	40
Appendixes	48
About ERIC	77
ERIC Order Blank	79

ABSTRACT

This monograph traces the development of field-based teacher education in the U.S., from the first state-supported normal school (1839) to the present questions of control and the dual system of standards of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Some of the topics reported on are associations and unions, competency-based teacher education, local needs, teacher centers, reciprocity systems, and economic problems. The extensive appendixes provide the reader with reference material for better understanding the text. They are "Standard VI--Professional Laboratory Experiences"; "Constitution of the CITE Project"; and "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel Contract."

ERIC DESCRIPTORS

To expand a bibliography using ERIC, descriptors or search terms are used. To use a descriptor: (1) Look up the descriptor in the SUBJECT INDEX of monthly, semi-annual, or annual issue of Resources in Education (RIE). (2) Beneath the descriptors you will find title(s) of documents. Decide which title(s) you wish to pursue. (3) Note the "ED" number beside the title. (4) Look up the "ED" number in the "DOCUMENT RESUME SECTION" of the appropriate issue of RIE. With the number you will find a summary of the document and often the document's cost in microfiche and/or hardcopy. (5) Repeat the above procedure, if desired, for other issues of RIE and for other descriptors. (6) For information about how to order ERIC documents, turn to the back pages of RIE. (7) Indexes and annotations of journal articles can be found in Current Index to Journals in Education by following the same procedure. Periodical articles cannot be secured through ERIC.

TOPIC: *Field-Based Teacher Education and K-12 Personnel Responsibilities in Teacher Education: A Review*

DESCRIPTORS

*College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; *Teacher Education
*Field Experience Programs; Preservice Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Teacher Certification; Teacher Centers; State Standards; Student Teaching; Performance Based Teacher Education; Teacher Associations; Accreditation (Institutions)

*Asterisk indicates major descriptor.

Change may stimulate efforts toward
rational responses or a sense
of fear, frustration, and futility
Joel Burdin [1]

INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND

The term "field-based teacher education" is the most recent in a long history of similar terms used to denote practice teaching, student teaching, professional laboratory experiences, pre-student teaching, or some other aspect of that part of teacher education that takes place in a setting other than the college lecture hall. In the very first state-supported normal school at Lexington, Massachusetts, in 1839, and soon after that in the normal schools at Barre and Bridgewater, students were expected to practice in the classroom those principles they had learned in lectures.

The Massachusetts State Board of Education adopted certain standing regulations for the three schools:

To each Normal School, an Experimental or Model School is attached. This School is under the control of the Principal of the Normal School. The pupils of the Normal School assist in teaching it. Here, the knowledge which they acquire in the science of teaching, is practically applied. The art is made to grow out of the science, instead of being empirical. The Principal of the Normal School inspects the Model School more or less, daily. He observes the manner in which his own pupils exemplify, in practice, the principles he has taught them. Sometimes, all the pupils of the Normal School, together with the Principal, visit the Model School in a body, to observe the manner in which the teachers of the latter, for the time being, conduct the recitations or exercises. Then, returning to their own schoolroom, in company with the assistant teachers themselves, who have been the objects of inspection, each one is called upon to deliver his views, whether commendatory or otherwise, respecting the manner in which the work has merits and defects, the Principal of the Normal School presides. After all others have presented their views, he delivers his own; and thus his pupils, at the threshold of their practice, have an opportunity to acquire confidence in a good cause, of which they might otherwise entertain doubts, and to rectify errors which otherwise would fossilize into habit. [2]

For over a hundred years, relatively little was written about field experiences for prospective teachers prior to their student teaching assignments, although during this period an entire literature was developed concerning student teaching activities. In addition, a professional organization, the National Association of Directors of Supervised Student Teaching, was formed in 1920. Twenty-five years later this group became the Association for Student Teaching. No other professional organization has contributed as much to our understanding of student teaching as has the Association. Its yearbooks, research bulletins, bibliographies, and other publications are essential to any scholarly study of the subject. In 1970, it expanded its role and changed its name to the Association for Teacher Educators, in recognition of the increasingly complex and varied range of field-based experiences which are becoming more and more commonplace in teacher education programs.

This recognition of the value and place of pre-student teaching experiences in the preparation of teachers has been a long, evolutionary process. Shortly after the turn of the century, a report by Holmes, Seeley, and Keith was published describing the type of field experiences that were then prevalent. During his time in the training school, the student was expected to grow "in tact, in judgment, in sympathetic understanding of children, in sense of the teacher's responsibility, and in all other personal qualities that make for success in teaching." [3] There is no mention anywhere in this report that a student should have any other field experience than his practice teaching.

Prior to World War I, practice teaching, the most commonly accepted term at the time, was conducted in model schools that were part of the normal schools. Both the normal school and its model school were part of the same administration. Teachers in the model school knew that their main purpose, in addition to instructing their pupils, was to provide a setting for students from the normal school to practice their art. Questions concerning extra pay for working with practice teachers, released time for conferences with practice teachers and college supervisors, and similar current issues were not relevant. The principal of the normal school was the chief administrator of both the normal school and the model school. He saw to it that there were no conflicts in schedules, that cooperation and coordination existed between the faculty of the normal school and the teachers of the model school, and that a single set of objectives for teacher education was uniformly accepted. There was never to be any question about who was in charge or about the responsibilities of each participant in the training program.

In spite of this monolithic administrative structure, the development of practice teaching was neither smooth nor constant. In the half century between the Civil War and World War I, many concerns were expressed and questions raised about the value of practice teaching. Parents did not want their children practiced on, conflicts occurred between model school teachers and normal school faculties over who should supervise the

practice teacher, and debates on whether the model school or the public school was the better placement for practice teachers combined to restrain the development of practice teaching.

An indication that practice teaching has not always been held in the high esteem that it enjoys today is found in an 1889 survey that discovered that only "fifty-five normal schools out of 94 reporting provided for practice teaching in a school for children." [4] Many normal school faculty, along with their colleagues in the model schools, thought that students could "practice teach" on one another in their methods classes and that this, in turn, would provide greater opportunities for the model school to devise, demonstrate, and evaluate new and experimental teaching techniques.

By the 1900's, practice teaching was an accepted part of the training of elementary teachers, and the next twenty years saw its almost universal acceptance for all teachers. During this period of rapid growth in practice teaching there was great variance among institutions regarding the length of the practice teaching period, the amount of supervision, the requirements for admission into practice teaching, and the evaluations made of practice teachers. This same list of differences among teacher preparatory institutions could be made today.

As practice teaching became an integral part of the preparation of both elementary and secondary teachers, it was necessary for an ever-increasing number of students to be placed in off-campus assignments. The budding acceptance of teacher education as a respectable field of study in multi-purpose universities added to this pressure of numbers. In general terms, state supported universities moved into teacher education before private colleges, starting their venture with programs for secondary teachers, and these colleges and universities usually did not have a model school associated with them, so that they were forced to seek student teaching placements in the public sector.

The normal schools, during the same period, were becoming state teachers colleges. Their growth was so rapid that their model schools could no longer take care of all of the practice teachers. The long-standing argument that the public schools could provide a more typical situation for practice teaching than could the model schools now reached a climax. By 1950 the shift of student teaching from the model or campus laboratory schools to the public schools had been accomplished. It was also apparent by this time that the term "student teaching" had superseded "practice teaching."

STANDARD VI

Up to this period, the literature dealing with field-based experiences had dealt exclusively with student teaching. The concept of planned, sequential, pre-student teaching experiences did not receive any

prominence until 1948, when the term "professional laboratory experiences" was introduced. One investigator "was not able to find the phrase 'professional laboratory experiences' used in the literature until it appeared in the report of the Sub-Committee of the Standards and Survey Committee of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education where it was published in the First Year Book of that organization." [5]

The report, known as Standard VI, formulated several basic principles related to the development of professional laboratory experiences. Jones has summarized the importance of this report:

The study made by the Sub-Committee of the American Association of Teachers Colleges constituted the most significant single contribution to the development of professional laboratory experiences in the pre-service education of teachers that has been made during the entire history of teacher education in the United States. [6]

Although concern had been expressed over the years regarding the qualifications of cooperating teachers, it was not until Standard VI was written that a serious effort was begun to combine in a systematic way the contributions and responsibilities of both the teacher-preparing institutions and the public schools in developing field-based teacher education programs. In fact, the beginning of field-based teacher education can be tied to the publication of Standard VI. Due to its preeminent position, it is included in its entirety as Appendix A.

Standard VI obviously gave new dimensions to the role of public school cooperating teachers. Prior to this they had functioned in much the same way as had the model school teachers. Now they were urged to become involved in the assignment of students to their laboratory experiences, to assist in the assessment of students' needs, and to participate in their evaluation. Even though there was a general acknowledgement, through the wide acceptance of Standard VI, of the increased responsibilities of cooperating teachers, this acceptance did not occur just because a professional association wrote that it should. Rather, there had been for some time a continuously expressed professional concern regarding the training, qualifications, and responsibilities of cooperating teachers. The members of the National Association of Directors of Supervised Student Teaching at their second annual meeting in 1922 passed a resolution that said in part, "Critic teachers as well as supervisors and directors of student participation, should have had training in such laboratory departments or similar experiences." [7]

COOPERATING TEACHERS AND COOPERATING SCHOOLS

The cooperating teacher was then, just as today, the key individual in the student teaching program. Now that the overwhelming majority of student teachers is assigned to public school classrooms, the role of the public school cooperating teacher is more critical than ever.

It is perhaps superfluous to detail the many benefits that have accrued to teacher education programs in colleges and universities from their association with local school districts. Some of the more obvious of these are: a physical setting where a student teacher can be given a full-time assignment over an extended period of time; an on-going program for all the children and youth of the community; an opportunity for college professors to become more directly involved with the practical, daily concerns of classroom teachers; and a site where research activities can be conducted and evaluated.

Although colleges have recognized for the past quarter century the fact that they could not even begin to prepare adequately elementary and secondary teachers without the cooperation of the public schools, most collaborative arrangements between the two institutions have been one-sided. Colleges have maintained a veto over the selection of cooperating teachers; colleges have decided what orientation is necessary for cooperating teachers; colleges have determined what stipend, if any, would be paid to cooperating teachers; colleges have developed the criteria used in the evaluation of student teachers; and the list could go on.

There have been, in this same period, a very few, scattered, isolated instances where colleges have carefully nurtured a working relationship with some public schools based on the concept of equal partnership. However, how many public schools have a veto over the college supervisors? How many schools have arranged an orientation to the district for college supervisors? How many schools have negotiated the payment of stipends with colleges? How many public school teachers have been involved in the development of the criteria used to evaluate student teachers? How many public school teachers have participated in any evaluation and revision of a teacher education curriculum?

Throughout these 25 years there have been constant pleas from all quarters for close cooperation between colleges and public schools. While colleges were seeking places to which student teachers could be assigned, dedicated classroom teachers were seeking help in supervising effectively the college students who were placed in their classrooms. It is an historical fact that public schools responded in an exceptionally fine manner to the requests of the teacher education institutions.

While no attempt should be made to denigrate the posture assumed by the local schools, it is important to point out that public school districts have also received many benefits from their cooperative endeavors with the colleges. Cooperating public schools have had ready access to the most recent thinking and research regarding every aspect of public education, they have been able to improve in-service programs through the assistance of the college faculty, they have been able to provide more individual attention to pupils in those classrooms where student teachers are present, they have been able to stimulate the entire staff to keep abreast of new developments in both the academic disciplines and professional education through the contributions of the student teachers and their college

supervisors, and they have had direct access to consultative services from the college for specific problems or concerns in the district.

If so many benefits have been realized by both institutions, what, then, are the problems that have caused so much concern over the years? Until very recently almost all of the points of contention between schools and colleges were similar. To be sure, there were special emphases or individual peculiarities existing between any particular school and college, but in general problems between the two centered on relatively few issues.

Local boards of education have expressed more doubts about the values to a school district from participating in a student teaching program than have teachers or administrators. Many of the local boards who look with disfavor on cooperative arrangements with colleges take the attitude, "Let George do it." Some of this group advance the theory that they do not want practice teachers "practicing" on the boys and girls in their district. Others point out that they are paying professional salaries to their teachers and they do not want their staff diverted from their prime responsibility of teaching the youngsters in their classes. One of the more valid concerns expressed by some school boards, as well as by teachers and administrators, deals with the cooperating teacher who abuses the trust placed in him. This is the teacher who looks upon the student as a substitute who will teach the classes while the regular teacher retires to the faculty lounge. Obviously, this type of criticism is not leveled against the concept of cooperative efforts between the school and college, but rather against the lack of leadership and supervision which both should provide. It is because of these and other real or imagined concerns that some school districts have established quotas for the number of student teachers they will accept at any one time, or during any one year. Formulas vary but typically one student teacher will be accepted for every so many teachers in the district, usually with the stipulation that no teacher will be assigned more than one student teacher in any academic year.

Like school districts, colleges have had some qualms about their arrangements with public schools. They have been concerned about providing adequate supervision for student teachers who are located at some distance from the campus. They have also been bothered by calendars that are different, by dress codes in some districts, but more importantly, they have consistently had problems working effectively with cooperating teachers. It is trite to say that these difficulties revolve around problems of communication, but like so many hackneyed expressions, this is generally true. Proper orientation of cooperating teachers to the philosophy, practice, and evaluative procedures of the college have been a constant source of concern and irritation. To explain the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher, from the preparation of pupils for the arrival of the student teacher, through guided observations and supervised teaching experiences, to a final evaluation and recommendation, needs more than an orientation period. A report sponsored by the National Education Association stated:

Supervising teachers must have special skills and competencies

beyond those required for effective classroom teaching. Supervising a neophyte requires skills in analysis and evaluation of teaching and knowledge of the nature of teaching. [8]

In the same year, 1966, Patterson summarized a series of statements of the Association for Student Teaching regarding the supervision of student teachers:

1. As early as 1922 the need for specialized preparation for supervising teachers had been recognized.
2. Ways to improve the quality of this supervision have been developed empirically and pragmatically. These various formal and informal devices or techniques have been reported in the publications of the Association.
3. Knowledge of these devices has been widely shared and analyzed subjectively in conferences, workshops, and bulletins in an effort to encourage individual teachers and individual institutions to improve the quality of their own supervisory efforts.
4. Professional improvement has been directed toward identifying and analyzing the operational areas of the student teaching-supervisory relationship rather than toward the analytical analysis of the learning process involved in preparing to teach. The literature abounds with discussions of lesson planning, techniques of the conference, evaluation, techniques of observing children and teaching, school and community orientation, and the like.
5. Absent from at least focal attention has been an emphasis upon the responsibility of the profession, or of the local school district, or of the state for improving the effectiveness of supervisory services available for colleges which are sending student teachers into the schools. The Association and other groups have rather assumed that the institution itself must furnish the leadership in identifying, recruiting, and preparing teachers to become effective supervising teachers.
6. Not only has there been a paucity of research in the effectiveness of ways of improving supervision, but the many different plans in use suffer from not having been developed within a philosophical and psychological setting. For example, there is little evidence in the literature that one of the requisites of a qualified supervising teacher has been his mastery of sound psychological theory or the acceptance of a philosophy of education which relates, to a minimal extent, to that which characterizes a democratic point of view. [9]

For the twenty years following the publication of Standard VI the field-based experiences of teacher education students, with rare exceptions, continued to consist only of student teaching. Some professors might occasionally arrange for their classes to visit a school, but during this period there was a definite lack of a planned, sequential, developmental series of pre-student teaching experiences available to students. Since the emphasis of field-based experiences was so overwhelmingly on student teaching, it is not surprising that this was the part of the total teacher education program on which public school personnel focused their attention. It was, after all, the one part in which they were directly involved.

By the later 1960's, cooperating teachers were becoming increasingly insistent in their efforts to share with colleges more of the responsibilities in student teaching programs. No sudden dramatic incident brought this about, but rather it was the culmination of a long evolutionary process. Some of the contributing arguments were a) college faculties were not doing an adequate job of supervision; b) if colleges were going to place more supervisory responsibilities on the cooperating teachers, they should receive more money and recognition; c) admission standards into student teaching were too lax; d) cooperating teachers had certain skills and competencies that would strengthen the student teaching experiences; e) some professional organizations were expressing concern over the quality of teacher education programs; and f) states were establishing standards for the approval of teacher education programs.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON STATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT TEACHING

The Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching made several recommendations in its report, including one which clearly called for state education agencies to provide the necessary leadership to strengthen student teaching programs by facilitating cooperative efforts between colleges and public schools.

That the state agencies, in providing leadership, encouragement, and coordination of student-teaching programs, consider such functions as:

- a. Giving leadership and coordination in bringing together the appropriate groups to develop and implement student-teaching policies.
- b. Cooperating with colleges, universities, and public schools in the development of standards for student-teaching programs.
- c. Encouraging public school officials to participate in student-teaching programs.
- d. Promoting continuous improvement in curricula and teaching staffs of public schools used as student-teaching centers.
- e. Facilitating the gathering of information about existing

student-teaching programs, the institutions that prepare teachers, the schools in which student teaching is done, and qualified supervising teachers available for student teaching.

- f. Cooperating with the teacher education institutions in furnishing necessary leadership, supervision, and coordination to the entire program.
- g. Considering certification or other appropriate procedures to ensure qualified supervisors of student teaching.
- h. Coordinating and participating in the evaluation of student-teaching programs. [10]

ASSOCIATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS 1969 RESOLUTION

In 1969 the Representative Assembly of the Association of Classroom Teachers, NEA, passed the following resolution on student teaching, recommending a more active role for professional organizations in cooperation with other agencies interested in improving student teaching programs:

ACT believes that student teaching is an essential phase of teacher preparation. It also believes that psychological preparation to meet classroom situations should precede student teaching and that practice teaching should include consultation with experienced teachers in clinical situations.

ACT maintains that responsibility for student teaching is, or should be, shared by the public schools, the institutions that prepare teachers, and the professional associations. It therefore recommends that classroom teachers work through their local and state associations to formulate statewide plans for improving and strengthening student teaching programs; evaluating school systems in terms of conditions of work, personnel policies, and activity programs to which the student teachers are assigned; and determining the workload and qualifications of competence for public school cooperating teachers, principals, and supervisors and for college personnel who supervise student teachers.

ACT believes that cooperating teachers should be compensated for additional responsibility.

ACT urges associations at all levels to promote necessary action to ensure full legal and liability protection for cooperating teachers, student teachers, and interns in the performance of their duties.

ACT also recommends the establishment of advisory committees composed of members of college faculties and representatives

of school districts, including classroom teachers recommended by local associations as well as classroom teachers serving as cooperating teachers, to consider policies and procedures for conducting student teaching programs in any school system in accordance with standards set in the state. [11]

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DIRECTORS OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION

At about this same time the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) produced a revised set of standards for the approval of teacher education programs. In the Foreword to the 1968 revision, Harris wrote:

Through constitutional or statutory provision, all States have either direct or implied authority 1) to accredit or approve both private and public institutions and programs for the education of teachers, and 2) to establish the rules, the procedural regulations, and the means of implementation by which such authority may best be discharged and its purposes accomplished in the public interest. [12]

It was recognized in these Standards that individuals outside the college faculty could make contributions to the development of a teacher education curriculum:

The process of curriculum development for the various teacher education programs should make provision for enlisting the cooperation and participation of 1) the public schools, 2) college teachers in fields related to the area of the public school specialization, 3) the State department of education, and 4) professional associations and appropriate committees and commissions. [13]

This statement was also included in the 1971 edition of the NASDTEC Standards, with the addition of "teacher education students," [14], as one of the groups to be represented. In addition, the 1971 Standards contains a lengthy section on School-College Relations, [15], which states very clearly that it is essential for colleges and schools to cooperate in both pre-student teaching and student teaching experiences. "All parties to the teacher education process should seek to move away from the separatism which depicts colleges as producers of teachers and school districts as consumers." [16]

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

With a single exception, the two constant threads running through all these resolutions, recommendations, and standards have been the inclusion of public school personnel in the decision-making process for teacher education and the acceptance of the fact that the state education agency has the responsibility for approving teacher education programs and for issuing certificates to graduates of those approved programs. The

exception referred to is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The Council has stated:

National accreditation of college and university programs for the preparation of all teachers and other professional school personnel at the elementary and secondary levels is the responsibility of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The NCATE has been authorized by the National Commission on Accrediting to adopt standards and procedures for accreditation and to determine the accreditation status of institutional programs for preparing teachers and other professional school personnel. [17]

No mention is made in the NCATE Standards of the contribution of public school teachers to teacher education programs, although reference is made in several instances to the contributions of various other groups, such as learned societies (Standard 1.4), professional associations (Standard 1.4, 4.1, and 4.2), students (Standard 1.3, and 3.4), and graduates (Standard 1).

In addition to its obvious usefulness as a setting for student teaching, the public school is viewed as a locale where a college faculty member can visit to keep abreast of current happenings on the local scene and where he can contribute his expertise to the improvement of the public school staff. However, there is no mention in the NCATE Standards that the converse is acceptable--that is, that public school personnel can contribute to the greater understanding and increased knowledge of college faculties. One has only to look at Standard 2.2 to understand the attitude of the Council:

2.2 Faculty Involvement with Schools

Faculty members who instruct prospective teachers need frequent contacts with school environments so that their teaching and research are current and relevant. In addition, the commitment of a teacher education faculty is to the needs of the teaching profession as a whole as well as to institutional programs. It is assumed that elementary and secondary school personnel share with faculty members in colleges and universities a common purpose and interest in teacher education. The specialized talent of the teacher education faculty is viewed as a potential resource for providing in-service assistance to the schools in the area served by the institution. [18]

The introductory statement to Part III of the NCATE Standards, Illustrative Questions, includes this explanation:

When the Standards were being written, their meaning was often sharpened by asking and answering questions and by showing what kinds of information the Committee members had in mind. To further explain the Standards, it was decided that some

illustrative and helpful questions would be printed. [19]

In looking at the questions proposed to sharpen and clarify the meaning of Standard 2.2 quoted above, it is easy to see the consistency with which the Council has viewed teacher education as the sole prerogative of college faculties. Below are the questions which are related to this issue:

Standard 2.2 Faculty Involvement with Schools

In what ways have members of the faculty for teacher education been associated and involved with activities of elementary and secondary schools?

What information shows that such association and involvement are reflected in the institution's teacher education programs?

What information indicates that the special competencies of the teacher education faculty are reflected in the services offered to the schools? [20]

It appears that NCATE perceives the schools merely as places to which college students may be sent for some on-site training and that it has not recognized the countless contributions of classroom teachers in teacher preparation. It is saddening that a prestigious organization like the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education should have such narrow vision. Perhaps, though, the greater dismay comes when one thinks of the renowned teacher education institutions across the country that have sought and received NCATE accreditation without emphasizing with pride the contributions made to their programs by interested professionals outside their own faculties. One can only surmise what the attitudes of a visiting team might be if presented with such evidence. Would the team ignore these data as irrelevant, or would they insist only on information that demonstrated how the college faculty was involved in the schools?

The position of NCATE regarding the place of public school personnel, members of professional organizations, state department officials, and other professionals in teacher education programs may soon be modified. In the past NCATE was dominated by college people, but under the new 1974 Constitution of the Council, greater parity exists between college and public school representatives. The former Council had 22 members, consisting of ten representatives from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, six from the Department of Instruction and Professional Development of the National Education Association, three from learned societies on a rotating basis, and one each from the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, and the National School Boards Association. Under the 1974 Constitution, the Council is comprised of eight representatives from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, eight from the National Education Association, and one each from the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of State

Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, and the National School Boards Association, for a total of 19 members.

In addition, the former Coordinating Board, which is the policy making body of NCATE, had 16 members with the following representation: seven from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, three from the National Education Association, and two each from the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, and the National School Boards Association. This Board, under the new Constitution, has 15 members, including six from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, six from the National Education Association, and one each from the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, and the National School Boards Association.

The increased representation from the National Education Association may well result in the practitioners in the field gaining more recognition for their contributions to teacher education. It would also follow that the contributions of other non-faculty members in teacher education programs would be reviewed more favorably by future accrediting teams from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Not all segments of the educational community have been particularly influenced by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. The New Jersey State Department of Education published a report in 1969 that not only recognized the contributions in teacher education of all sectors of the teaching profession, but also encouraged additional cooperative ventures among all the various groups. Marburger, then New Jersey Commissioner of Education, wrote in the Foreword to this report, "It recognizes the joint responsibility of public school systems, community agencies, institutions of higher education, and state agencies in the preparation of teachers." [21] The recommendations in this report, along with the NASDTEC Standards have become the basis on which the New Jersey State Department of Education approves teacher education programs in the state.

COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

The trend toward the greater involvement of college faculties with other professionals in a more equal sharing of the responsibilities for teacher education as typified by, but certainly not limited to, the New Jersey example created an entirely new set of expectations and problems. Among these is the concept of Competency-Based Teacher Education (CBTE).

No other design in teacher education has necessitated closer collaboration between institutions of higher education and public schools than CBTE. While it may be conceded that a college student can demonstrate many competencies on the college campus through simulation and other electronic or mechanical means, it is acknowledged that he must be able to perform adequately with a live class in a real setting. Traditional student teaching assignments are not sufficient to meet the performance

objectives of a competency-based teacher education program.

As increasing numbers of students in teacher education programs are being placed in public school classrooms earlier in their college careers than ever before, teachers have been asked to assume additional roles for which they have not been prepared. Even those teachers who have had previous experiences with student teachers who were in their senior year in college have been at a loss as to the proper guidance of students who come to them in their freshman or sophomore years. Rather than merely providing a place for students to observe pupil behavior, teachers in a CBTE program have been expected to provide opportunities for the college student to demonstrate certain skills or competencies that have been identified for him to master. It is evident that the classroom teacher has become, more than ever, a critical and essential partner in the education of the teacher education student.

Unless there is a determined effort by a college faculty to assist the teachers with whom they will be working in a competency-based program, even the best intentioned teachers may soon become confused and disenchanted. At present many colleges, or at least college faculty members, are trying to get on the CBTE bandwagon. They put labels like competency based, performance based, or behavioral objective oriented, on programs that are little different from their former ones. To cooperating teachers who may become involved in these efforts little direction is given. The college students may be sent into the field more often, or at an earlier stage in their college years, but neither the students nor the classroom teachers know specifically what is expected of them.

Rather than simply accepting additional college students, public school personnel, teachers, supervisors, and administrators should insist on an understanding of the expectations of the college faculty. Is the college program a field-based one? Is it an individualized program? Is it a performance or competency based one? The public school staff not only has the right to know, but they have an absolute need to know. In order to distinguish between authentic competency or performance based programs and those that only bear the title, it is helpful to be acquainted with the fine elements of such programs, as described by Elam:

There now appears to be general agreement that a teacher education program is performance-based if:

1. Competencies (knowledge, skills, behaviors) to be demonstrated by the student are
 - . derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles
 - . stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies, and
 - . made public in advance;
2. Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are

- . based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies
 - . explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions, and
 - . made public in advance;
3. Assessment of the student's competency
 - . uses his performance as the primary source of evidence
 - . takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behavior, and
 - . strives for objectivity;
 4. The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competence rather than by time or course completion;
 5. The instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of competencies specified. [22]

Since the classroom teachers are expected to observe, criticize, and evaluate students at all levels of their college careers, it is essential that they, the classroom teachers, be prepared for those tasks. When college professors work with public school teachers to help them develop the skills they need, the teachers are in a better position to understand and participate in the program that the college desires to have implemented. Without the complete understanding and cooperation of the classroom teachers, field-based programs are doomed to failure.

However, placing students in the public schools in each of their four years of college training creates additional problems. One of these concerns the numbers involved. For years directors of student teaching offices have competed with one another for the best placements for their student teachers. Under typical teacher education programs, only one class, the seniors, had to be placed at any one time. In the majority of situations the senior class was divided into two groups, and one group was assigned to student teaching in the Fall semester, while the second group received their assignments in the Spring semester. With a student body of 400 students in a four-year teacher education program, only 50 of them needed to be placed at any one time. Now, with the advent of extended field-based experiences, the college must find placements for all 400 students each year.

The supervision of students in the field is far more costly than is lecturing to a group in a classroom on campus. Colleges and universities simply do not have the financial resources to provide adequate supervision for every student in each of his off-campus locations. The public school teachers to whom these students are assigned must assume many of the

supervisory responsibilities that were formerly those of the college supervisor.

This is the case in all field-based programs. As long as students are placed in public schools in their freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior years, public school personnel are going to have a greater influence on teacher education than ever before. Arrangements must be developed that will enable the expertise of college professors and of classroom teachers to be melded together for the better preparation of future teachers.

There is as much, or possibly more danger in leaning too far in the opposite direction. To say that institutions of higher education are incapable of preparing teachers is nonsense. To pretend that public schools could do a better job in this respect is equally fallacious. To assert that either could unilaterally fulfill this mission is denying historical fact.

It seems apparent that both public schools and colleges have learned this simple fact. Neither has professed a desire to try to go it alone. As these two entities strive to widen the area of mutual concern and understanding between their traditional roles in teacher education, each must be prepared to face a new, different, and significant challenge to their rapprochement.

ASSOCIATIONS AND UNIONS

Professional associations and unions are not satisfied with the existing structure of teacher education, neither are they happy with current teacher certification rules and procedures. In order to correct these ills, as they perceive them, the associations and unions propose to take over the preparation of teachers, the accrediting of teacher education institutions, and the certification of public school professionals. One strategy being tried by the National Education Association is the creation in each state of a "Teacher Standards and Licensure Commission." The Association developed "A Model Teacher Standards and Licensure Act" that was sent to each state affiliate. It was expected that each state association would use the model act to draft legislation appropriate to its own jurisdiction.

The second section of this model act describes its policy and purpose:

Teaching in the State of _____ is declared to be a professional practice. In order to achieve the highest possible educational standards in the State of _____, highly qualified professional teachers must be attracted, retained, and stimulated to optimum performance. These objectives can be accomplished most effectively if the preparation, licensing, and certain aspects of performance of teachers are regulated by the teaching profession.

It is the purpose of this Act to establish a regulatory agency,

a structure, and procedures which will enable the teaching profession, through qualified members, to control and regulate the preparation, licensing, and certain aspects of performance of those persons who teach or perform educational duties in the educational institutions of this State. [23]

A regulatory agency for teacher education and certification called a Teacher Standards and Licensure Commission or similar name is, on the surface, not a new idea. State boards of education or other state agencies have exercised control in these matters since certification was first introduced. What does make a difference, however, in any regulatory agency, is the identity of the members and how they are chosen. The National Education Association's model act provides the following guidelines:

Section 5. Appointment of Commissioners

A. Nominations for Appointment

1. The Governor shall appoint members of the Commission, by and with the advice and consent of the (appropriate house of the legislature), only from among the qualified candidates nominated as provided herein.

a. Any professional teachers organization may submit for each vacant position on the Commission one nomination of a qualified candidate to the Governor for each _____ members in good standing who hold valid licenses issued by the Commission. [24]

Two contrasting reactions to the NEA position are presented here. Each statement summarizes the views of its respective constituency. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has stated:

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education strongly supports the expanded involvement of the teaching profession in the establishment and maintenance of effective standards of professional development. The Association has a continuing record of support for meaningful cooperative effort of school and college personnel directed toward the realization of high standards for teaching personnel at every level.

The AACTE recognizes that often there has been minimum involvement of elementary and secondary school practitioners in the process of licensure, accreditation, and other matters affecting professional standards in teaching. It recognizes further the urgent need to correct such inadequacies now. The Association is troubled, however, by the "Model Teachers Standards and Licensure Act," currently proposed by the National Education Association. . . . In calling for state standards commissions of thirteen members, the NEA model act provides for

only two members representative of higher education. While certain responsibilities of such standards commissions might appropriately be discharged by groups composed chiefly of elementary and secondary teachers, it is clear that decisions regarding the programs of preparation of teachers at pre-service and continuing education levels must reflect a much broader involvement of other members of the profession whose major responsibilities and competencies are in those areas. [25]

An anonymous article in the NEA's own journal has presented the teacher's view:

In the past, almost everybody but the teacher has called the tune in education. Teachers have traditionally taken direction from others--local and state school boards, legislators, parents, powerful community leaders. Because most teachers are paid from the public funds, many think of them as public servants, and, as such, subject in all matters to the whims of the taxpayers.

That concept is changing. With the increased public demand that teachers be accountable for the learning of children, the entire teacher profession is taking a new look at what is needed to improve teaching and learning. And some members of the profession (among them leaders of NEA) are concluding that teachers are not able to teach as well as they know how to teach because they unfortunately have little control over their profession.

Practitioners therefore are actively seeking more responsibility for professional matters. They maintain it is neither feasible nor fair for them to be held accountable for whether or not Johnny and Jane and Hector and Paula learn to read or to understand math concepts or whatever until teachers also have the responsibility for making decisions about how reading teachers, math teachers, and other teachers should be trained, in what institutions they should study, who should be licensed to teach, and how teacher's skills can be kept up to date. [26]

An illustration of how one individual state association has adapted the model act to fit its own situation can be found in the legislation that was recently proposed by the New Jersey Education Association. The bill, which was introduced into the State Senate on January 28, 1974, provides for a fifteen member council:

The council of 15 members shall be composed of

- a. category A - eight members who are teaching staff members in positions requiring the holding of a teaching certificate;
- b. category B - two members who are teaching staff members in

positions requiring the holding of an administrative certificate;

- c. category C - two members who are teaching staff members in positions not included in the categories A and B above; and
- d. category D - three members who are engaged in the professional preparation of teachers for a major portion of their time as a teacher, supervisor or administrator in a New Jersey institution of higher education accredited for teacher education with two employed in public institutions and one employed in a private institution, and provided further that at least two shall be active teachers. [27]

Under this bill, members of the council shall be:

. . . appointed by the commissioner with approval of the State board from nomination lists compiled either by petition or upon the recommendations of professional organizations as hereinafter provided. [28]

Nominations to the Commission of Education shall be made in the following manner:

a. Category A nominees

- (1) organizations, a majority of whose members are employed in category A positions may submit one name for each vacant position for each 6,000 members or major fraction thereof but not in excess of three per vacancy. Local, county and state affiliates of a state organization shall be considered a part of the parent State organization and shall not have the right to make nominations.
- (2) a teaching staff member from a category A position may be nominated for a vacancy by a petition signed by at least 200 members in category A.

b. Category B nominees

- (1) organizations, a majority of whose members are employed in category B positions may submit one name for each 600 members or major fraction thereof but not in excess of three per vacancy.
- (2) a teaching staff member from a category B position may be nominated for a vacancy by a petition signed by at least 50 members in category B.

c. Category C nominees

- (1) organizations, a majority of whose members are employed in category C positions may submit one name for each vacant position for each 600 members or major fraction thereof but not in excess of three per vacancy.
- (2) a teaching staff member from a category C position may be nominated by a petition signed by at least 50 members in category C.

d. Category D nominees

- (1) organizations, a majority of whose members are employed in category D positions may submit one name for each vacant position for each 200 members or major fraction thereof but not in excess of three per vacancy.
- (2) a higher education employee from a category D position may be nominated for a vacancy by a petition signed by at least 50 members in category D. [29]

These provisions would effectively place the control of teacher education, accreditation, and certification in New Jersey in the hands of a single organization, the New Jersey Education Association. Sole control of any one of these three aspects of the educational profession in any state by any single organization would appear contrary to common sense.

Where similar commissions have been established the problems of teacher education, accreditation, and certification have not been solved:

These commissions have usually had less authority than professional association advocates hoped. Conflict has occurred between commissions and state boards and between associations and unions. As unions and associations merge and as the supply of teachers continues to be greater than the demand, pressures by teacher organizations to control preparation and licensure will undoubtedly increase. [30]

Advocates for control of education by teachers often argue that other professions control themselves, so why not the teaching profession? In a hearing before the Pennsylvania House of Representatives Education Committee on a bill to establish a Professional Standards and Practices Commission, John C. Pittenger, Secretary of Education, was questioned on this point by Representative Edward F. Burns, Jr.:

Representative Burns: Mr. Secretary, as a point of information for myself, I would like to know, today we have lawyers, we have doctors, we have engineers who apparently police themselves. It seems to me that the teaching profession is probably the one major profession that does not have any policing powers. And

you have brought out here how very difficult it would be for the teaching profession to police itself. Why isn't it difficult just as much for the medical profession or for the law profession or for the engineering profession or whatever--they don't seem to have this trouble that you are pointing out.

Secretary Pittenger: Oh, but they do. That is the whole problem and I can say, as a Member of the Lancaster County, Pennsylvania and American Bar Association--I guess I am not anymore, but I was--but I think the Bar does a terrible job in policing itself and, indeed, rather than having the teaching profession copying the Bar and medical profession, we ought to be moving the Bar and the medical profession in the opposite direction. I am thoroughly convinced that neither of those professional groups are capable of acting except in the most extreme cases, and I wouldn't want to give you the grave details, but that is one point.

The second is that there is, you know, a rather substantial difference between the position of a public school teacher and the position of a lawyer. If I have a child who is in the second grade in a particular attendance district in the Slenko school district, southern Lancaster County, that child has a second grade teacher, and I can't go into the Principal in the ordinary case and say, my child isn't getting along with Mrs. Jones. I would like another teacher. The system is such that there is a monopoly. I don't quarrel with that. It seems to me that it is inevitable. If I don't like the lawyer I can fire him and go get somebody else. So there is a monopolistic element in this, it seems to me, to require somewhat more gingerly treatment of self-regulation. That does not mean, let me be clear, that teachers and other educators ought not to be involved in the process. It does mean, I think, that total self-regulation is something I have serious qualms about. [31]

QUESTIONS OF CONTROL

In discussions about control or governance, it is necessary to keep in focus what it is that is being discussed. Certain questions are relevant to some areas and not particularly apropos to others. For example, if control of public schools is the issue, the following questions need to be addressed: Who controls the curriculum? Who will be allowed to teach in the school? Who decides? How will the financial resources of the district be distributed? If control of teacher education were the focal point, other segments of the educational community would be more directly involved. Control of teacher education poses a different set of questions than does control of public schools. Relevant questions in this area would include: Who should be admitted into training programs? What should the training programs consist of? How long must one spend in a training period and/or an apprenticeship program before being admitted into the profession? Who decides what criteria are used to evaluate an individual when he has

completed his training?

When accreditation questions are in the limelight, it seems that everyone wants to get into the act. Who sets the standards to be used in accreditation? Who should be members of an evaluation team? Who should decide whether or not accreditation is the basis for accepting graduates from an institution for certification, for employment, or for post graduate studies?

Traditionally, certification of teachers has been a state responsibility under the control of the state board of education, which in all states is either dominated by, or totally composed of, non-educators. For the time being certification is still thought to be a state function, but who, in each state, should decide what the certification requirements should be? Should permanent or life certificates be issued, or should professional personnel be required to be recertified every five or ten years throughout their careers? Should there be alternate routes to certification, and if so, who will decide which alternatives are acceptable and which are not?

Each of these areas of concern impinges on all the others. Questions and issues cannot be limited to a single area as they have been in the illustrations above. Instead, the tendency is for each group to get excited and defensive whenever it thinks another group is reaching out for a larger share of the action. Centralization of authority in American education is anathema not only to the general public, but also to the members of the educational profession.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROFESSION

There is no denying that teachers make up the majority of the profession. According to the National Education Association, the composition of the profession is as follows:

2,000,000	teachers in public elementary and secondary schools
200,000	teachers in private elementary and secondary schools
300,000	administrators, supervisors, consultants, researchers, and other specialists in public and private elementary and secondary schools
800,000	professional personnel in higher education institutions
100,000	professional staff members in professional organizations, in government offices of education, in accreditation offices, and in private agencies with education programs
<hr/>	
3,400,000	This is the sum total of the teaching profession. [32]

SOLVING SOME PROBLEMS

Even the most vociferous opponents of teacher control of education do not seek to exclude teachers from exerting their influence, and the principal contention centers around the degree of control that should be vested in any one segment of the population.

After the dispute that occurred throughout most of 1973 over the control of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, one lesson, at least, has been learned. That is that thoughtful, professional people can resolve highly emotionally charged issues when the future of their organization is at stake. If this be true of educators concerned with a single organization, it would certainly hold true if the future of public education as it is now known in this country were the issue.

The result of the NCATE dispute was a compromise in which neither colleges nor practitioners emerged as the dominant group. While it is still too early to support a judgment with hard data, the consensus of most observers is that NCATE is a stronger organization now than it was before.

As colleges and school districts attempt to develop better programs in teacher education, it would be foolhardy not to include the local bargaining unit and also the lay public. The lesson has been well taught, that teacher education is no longer the sole prerogative of institutions of higher education. Neither should teacher education become dominated by any other single group, be it public schools, professional organizations, or any other vested interest association.

SOME EFFECTS OF FIELD EXPERIENCES

One of the most significant changes to occur in teacher education as a result of increased field-based experiences has been a greater emphasis on the specificity of assignment for the student, rather than the more general preparation that previously prevailed. When the only field-based experience that students had was student teaching, that single stint, or occasionally two classroom placements, had to prepare them for any job that might be available. There was a commonality in the sequence of events through which all students progressed. These usually followed a pattern of observation at the beginning of the student teaching experience, through a limited participation, culminating in full time teaching responsibilities. Whether the students were placed in an urban, suburban, or rural area made little difference. Upon satisfactory completion of student teaching and other requirements for their degree and certification, the students were as well prepared as any of their peers to seek a job in any location.

An entire commentary could be written about individuals who found themselves accepting positions in which they had only the slightest chance of success. The teaching ranks have far too many members who are dissatisfied with their particular positions, but who, through a variety of incidents over which they had little personal control, have become firmly locked into situations in which they are merely putting in time. The dissatisfaction

that some teachers feel in their roles began during their college years. For a number of reasons they thought that teaching was the thing to do, but it was not until their senior year that they had an opportunity for direct experience with boys and girls. With three or three and a half years of college behind them, they had too much time, effort, and money invested in their teacher education programs to change. Consequently, they completed the program, were certified, employed, and are now existing from one pay day to the next. Considering the design of the teacher education programs through which these people passed, it is almost a miracle that there are not more teachers in this category throughout the country.

The opportunities now are quite different for college students. Freshmen who profess an interest in education are given opportunities to visit schools, talk with children, meet with teachers, and have other experiences that will help them to decide on their careers. After a student has declared an education major, whether it be at the freshman or sophomore level, he will probably be given many opportunities for getting together with youngsters. Often this becomes a self selection process for those marginal students who are not sure that education is the key to the future for them.

Some students think that they would enjoy working with children five or six years old. After some experiences with wet boots and runny noses, they decide that this is not their life's ambition. Some of these students will opt for other age groups, while some may choose to seek careers in other fields. At the other end of the spectrum are those students who think they would like to work with high school students where they can teach a subject in greater depth. After a few experiences with teenagers, they may discover that they cannot cope with the boy-girl relationship or the classroom discipline problems. As long as students make these discoveries early in their college careers they have an opportunity to change direction. They are no longer locked into a career in which they have little or no interest. Classes that they have attended in their freshman and sophomore years will almost all be acceptable in another program, cutting down on the loss of time that a later transfer to another curriculum would involve. All of these early experiences provide students with information on which to make judgments about their commitment to a career in education.

A second and equally important benefit to teacher education resulting from early field-based experiences is the opportunity they provide for students to focus their experiences on a particular group of pupils. The prospective teacher who wants to work in urban centers can be exposed to children from a wide range of racial, ethnic, social, and economic backgrounds. As the college student gains a variety of early experiences with different groups of pupils, he is better able, if he so chooses, to focus his later experiences on a more specific group. Teachers and administrators in the public schools often identify college students whom they urge and counsel to follow a particular path. Through a four-year sequence of field-based experiences, the college student is able to become more specialized during his undergraduate period than were teachers who were prepared earlier.

There is also a greater opportunity for those college students who need a variety of experiences before deciding on their ultimate careers. There is time to explore various alternatives within an urban setting or among settings outside the urban area. It is perhaps even more important for these college students to have the variety of exposures that a field-based teacher education program affords.

MEETING LOCAL NEEDS

While there are still many teacher-preparing institutions in the country that attempt to train teachers in a general way, an increasing number are attempting to prepare teachers for local needs. In this latter group will be found most of the municipal colleges and universities. In recent years these institutions have developed a greater social consciousness about the plight of the cities in which they are located, and this is reflected in the teacher education programs that they offer. Their programs have become more and more specialized in order to meet the needs of the urban centers. Even if their motives are not quite as altruistic as they would have them appear, municipal colleges and universities, as well as those institutions more remote from the cities, would have to attempt to deal with the problems of urban schools or risk serious competition from the urban districts themselves. Stewart of the Detroit Public Schools has said:

Indeed the notion of gearing training programs to local needs is so crucial today that many educational leaders have come to the rather extreme view that local school systems--especially large cities--should assume a teacher education function. [33]

It should be recognized that specialization of this kind is not without its drawbacks. Obviously there is no guarantee that a student attending a metropolitan college, and who is prepared to teach in that particular urban district, will continue to spend his life in the area. Given the mobility of the American people, and especially the mobility of teachers, such a "narrow" preparation might appear, at first glance, to limit severely the options the student will have after graduation or later in his career. However, the evidence suggests that students who have been raised in a city and have attended college in that environment rarely move too far from large population centers. The skills, techniques, and understandings that have been learned in one urban setting are easily transferable to another.

A greater problem exists for students who have not been as specifically prepared for a career in urban schools, but who find themselves in a large city. The adjustment from a rural or suburban setting, either during preservice experiences or as a classroom teacher, to a city environment is greater than the adjustment involved in moving from one urban center to another.

IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

When teachers new to a district first report to their jobs, they quickly discover that many things are different from what they previously experienced or expected. Certain administrative details are handled in a different manner, forms are different, procedures for reporting absences are different, and the way materials and supplies are obtained are different. More substantive differences may occur in the grouping of children, the materials that are available and how they are expected to be used, and how the special services needed to help certain youngsters are obtained. For decades school districts have had orientation programs at the beginning of the school year. These have ranged from formal instructional programs covering several days to a gathering lasting a short hour or two while the superintendent, or his designee, reads the calendar of events for the coming year. Most districts, in addition to their orientation sessions, have special meetings for beginning teachers, including those teachers with previous experience who are new to the system. While these meetings help teachers survive their first weeks in their new positions, they are no substitute for an ongoing, continuing educational staff development program for the teachers.

It is not difficult to identify school districts that have run formal in-service education programs for forty or fifty years. The quality of these programs, however, like the quality of the orientation sessions, has ranged from absolute horror to challenging, exciting learning experiences.

One kind of in-service program that was more popular a few years ago than it is now was instituted by an administrator or supervisor who thought that a certain group of teachers would benefit from participation. Often the supervisor or administrator would ask a few teachers whether or not they agreed with the proposed plan. Before the days of tenure and other teachers' rights, it was a very brave teacher who did not agree that a particular in-service program was indeed necessary. The person responsible for instituting the in-service program might decide to conduct it himself, or he might contact some professor at a neighboring college or university to run the program for the district.

Another type of in-service program involved book publishers. Whenever a school district adopted a new text, the publishing company would provide resource people to conduct in-service programs in the use of their product. A prime example of this type of in-service program occurred in the late 1950's and early 1960's when the "new math" was being introduced into the schools. Every district that bought a set of text books in the new math also tried to obtain the services of consultants from the publisher for in-service programs. The publishers were not the only people offering such programs, but they certainly were among the most popular resources available.

A third type of in-service program originated with the teachers. A group of teachers from the same grade level in the elementary schools or from the same department in the secondary schools would get together and

decide that they needed help in a particular area. The usual pattern was to petition the superintendent, principal, or department head to bring to the group the experts they requested. These in-service programs were often the most effective, for the simple reason that the teachers themselves had initiated them. The administration provided the necessary financial backing to bring the outside experts to the school, but the teachers were responsible for determining objectives, getting other teachers to participate, and evaluating the program.

A final example of traditional in-service programs involved those initiated and conducted by the teachers themselves. For instance, a group of teachers might decide that they would like to know more about a certain art medium. Those teachers interested in learning about ceramics would contact the art teacher and together plan for an in-service program in which this particular skill would be presented. This type of program was usually less formal than the others and often served a social as well as an educational purpose.

In these in-service programs, the length of time spent varied greatly. Some programs might consist of a one-shot, two or three hour affair, while others, involving the evaluation of certain teaching techniques with a group of children, might run an entire school year.

Although these efforts have gone on for many years, there has been no consistency in their quality even within a single district, to say nothing of the differences existing between districts. Even neighboring school systems serving essentially the same type of school population tend to have different approaches and different levels of success with their in-service programs.

One early attempt to pull together the in-service education resources of several districts occurred in 1959 in Ingham County, Michigan. Two districts in that county first talked of pooling their resources, but then decided to expand the idea to include all the school districts in the county. Although not every district joined immediately, within two years every district was involved. The in-service programs run through the Ingham County Council for Curriculum and Instruction were organized around the expressed desires of teachers. During the fifteen years of the Council's existence the operating procedures have become more formalized, but the essential elements of collaboration among districts for in-service education have remained.

TEACHER CENTERS

The concept of the teacher center is related to in-service education. This idea, which emerged six years ago, has already become a vital, significant force in teacher education. As yet there is no uniformity of definition, but the concept can be found under a variety of names such as teaching center, learning center, staff development center, or teacher education center.

Schmieder and Yarger have developed the following definition:

A place, in situ or in changing locations, which develops programs for the training and improvement of educational personnel (in-service teachers, preservice teachers, administrators, para-professionals, college teachers, etc.) in which the participating personnel have an opportunity to share successes, to utilize a wide range of education resources, and to receive training specifically related to their most pressing teaching problems. [34]

Teaching centers have sprung up around the country like mushrooms. They range from state-wide projects to others which involve only one school district in conjunction with one other agency. Some teaching centers are loosely organized while others operate under formal rules and procedures; some have been organized around a particular theme like competency-based teacher education and others are designed to meet the needs in staff development of an entire major school district. Some examples of different types of teacher centers may help to provide an understanding of their wide diversity. The Teacher Learning Center of San Francisco organizes workshops, holds seminars, provides individual consultation services, and conducts a wide variety of other activities:

Short Fact Sheet about the TLC

- Teacher** Anyone who is involved in children's learning: administrator, parent, tutor, student, volunteer, paraprofessional, as well as those with the official title of teacher.
- Learning** Learning about learning is the theme of all TLC activities. How children learn must be the focus of schools; the TLC aim is to help maintain that focus.
- Center** More than a place, the TLC is designed to assist teacher learning activities in the most appropriate locations. The staff is the TLC.
- TLC** The more common use of these initials is important, too. How could we expect all kinds of good things to happen without a lot of tender, loving, care? [35]

The Rhode Island Teacher Center is an example of a state-wide effort:

The Rhode Island Teacher Center (RITC) is a collaborative and cooperative organizational structure which has as its purpose the improvement of education for all children. Based on the belief that reform or change efforts which do not recognize the interrelatedness of individuals and the system within which they operate will have but limited payoff, the RITC is designed

to improve both the system itself and the personnel within it.

Major purposes of the project are:

To develop a model for comprehensive needs assessment and to assist local education agency needs assessment.

To conduct statewide needs assessment in the area of staff development.

To link Rhode Island educators with national, regional and local sources of educational research and of new and validated approaches in education.

To support and assist adoption/adaptation of validated educational programs which are consistent with local and statewide needs through in-service training in local education agencies.

To study and develop a pilot performance based teacher education and certification system.

A management unit provides support for RITC operations and an internal evaluation system provides formative and summative data as feedback to the Center. Other components of the RITC include Teacher Needs Assessment, Alternate Learning Center and Competency Based Teacher Education/Certification. A fifteen member Board of Directors, operating on a parity basis, serves as the policy recommending body for the Center responsible to the Commissioner of Education. This Board includes teachers, local education agency administrators, higher education personnel, community members and State Education Agency staff. [36]

One of the most formal organizations is the CITE Project in New York. The Constitution and Bylaws of this Project are included as Appendix B.

Another example of a teacher center comes from Minneapolis. It is similar to the one in San Francisco, but its beginning was quite different. Originally the Minneapolis Public Schools/University of Minnesota Teacher Center was a part of the "Southeast Alternatives," a federally funded project in the city. The project has been described as having a three-fold dimension:

One, the students and their parents, the consuming public, are the decision-makers as to which school the student will attend, not the administrators or staffs. Second, the alternative, whatever the philosophy, is a comprehensive full-day educational program which stresses cognitive and affective skills. Third, the school community, made up of parents, students, faculty, and administrators is substantively involved in the planning,

implementation, operation and evaluation of the school. [37]

The Teacher Center opened its doors in Fall, 1972, a year after the project started. It "was designed to offer teachers a unified approach to staff development funds." [38] A year later the Teacher Center expanded, in cooperation with the University of Minnesota, to include the entire city.

The final example is the oldest teacher center in the country. The Kanawha County Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center (MITEC) in West Virginia began in 1968. Five institutions of higher education joined with the Kanawha County School System to form this Center. Continuous education from preservice through in-service is the thrust of MITEC:

The Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center is dedicated to the concept of a partnership commitment in teacher education and to professional development as a continuous process. The responsibility rests equally with the public schools and colleges to upgrade all components of teacher education; pre-service, internship, and inservice. MITEC is committed to preparing prospective teachers and inservice teachers to become diagnosticians of students' needs and learning problems, innovators, planners, and implementers of ideas.

The Center's involvement in inservice has a two-fold purpose. First of all, through the use of numbers of individuals from various institutions and an increase in time spent by those individuals, the process of continuous teacher education is strengthened and made more meaningful.

Secondly, through increased expertise that is made available to the public schools through the Center, greater amounts and more concentrated inservice can be directed to the teachers themselves. Thus the two-fold purpose would result in more meaningful student teaching experiences and, at the same time, allow the influence of ideas to develop in the public schools through the use of college personnel. It is anticipated that highly competent elementary and secondary corollary process to continuous education is not only the exchange of ideas between college and public school personnel but a greater exposure of college-based teacher educators will be provided in the public schools. [39]

Whatever the organization and whatever the purpose, the only teacher center model that the professional organizations could support, according to Selden and Darland, is the autonomous model:

- a. Autonomous, self-governing teacher center as non-profit corporation
- b. Charter drawn up in cooperation with representatives selected by teachers (or their bargaining agents)

- c. Advisory council of university, community, and administration representatives (if the latter are on the Board of Directors, teachers should have voting majority)
- d. Teachers in charge--parity in governance does not have practical meaning for teacher center. [40]

It is readily apparent that planners of collaborative efforts between teacher preparing institutions and public schools are going to have to consider the position of the professional organizations. As Mathieson has said, "Progress has indeed been made and new approaches are being tried, but it would be naive to believe that the world of teacher education is all sweetness and light, and that controversies do not exist about roles and responsibilities." [41]

CERTIFICATION, ACCREDITATION, AND STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

As colleges, public schools, and professional organizations strive for greater parity in the training of teachers, they must be aware of the interest and legal concern of the state education agencies. The legal responsibility for the certification of teachers lies with each state education agency.

Over forty states now issue certificates through the approved program approach. In essence this means that the state agency has evaluated the teacher education programs in a college according to some criteria. If the programs meet the criteria, they are approved. Students at that institution who successfully complete one of the approved programs and are recommended for certification by the institution are automatically issued the appropriate teaching certificate by the state.

Some states use the criteria that have been developed locally solely for use in their own jurisdictions. Over half of the states use the Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education that have been developed by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) as the basis for evaluating programs. These Standards are the most stringent of any that are used nationally. In addition to general criteria about the institution as a whole, the NASDTEC Standards include specific standards for 37 different teaching fields. A listing of the teaching areas from the Table of Contents will show how extensive these Standards are:

- Agriculture
- Art
- Business
- Driver Education
- Early Childhood Education
- Elementary
- English
- Exceptional Children
- Emotionally Disturbed

Hearing Impaired
Mentally Retarded
Physically Handicapped
Visually Impaired
Learning Disabilities
Speech Correction
Foreign Languages
Health
Health and Physical Education
Home Economics
Industrial Arts
Instructional Media
School Librarian
MAT-Type Programs
Mathematics
Music
School Nurse
Physical Education
Science
 Biology
 Chemistry
 Earth and Space Science
 General Science
 Physical Science
 Physics
Social Studies
Speech Arts
Vocational Education [42]

It is quite possible for an evaluation team using these Standards to recommend approval of some programs in an institution and not to recommend approval of others. This type of evaluation is very different from regional accreditation visits or evaluations conducted by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. With regional accreditation the entire institution is either accredited or not accredited. There are no provisions for granting accreditation to one department in a college and not to another. Similarly, NCATE accredits or rejects an institution's entire secondary education program on the basis of the total picture. When an institution receives NCATE accreditation there is no way to determine which departments in secondary education are outstanding and which are weak.

During the 1974-75 academic year NCATE plans to conduct some individual program evaluations on an experimental basis. If these experiments prove successful the last big obstacle in the way of bringing the NCATE and NASDTEC Standards together will have been overcome. It should then be but a short step for the two organizations to agree on a single set of standards to be used for evaluating all teacher education programs in the country.

All accrediting agencies and the states, too, as they review field-based teacher education programs in which a greater degree of parity has

been negotiated among a college, a school district, and the local bargaining unit, face the problem of who should be held accountable for the quality of the program. If true parity really exists, how can any accrediting body hold a college responsible for something over which it has only partial control? Does this mean that the school district and the local bargaining unit will also have to be approved or accredited? Perhaps a more basic question is whether accreditation by an outside agency is needed in a field-based program or whether the participating organizations, the teacher training institution, the local school district, and the professional organization, could jointly and collectively attest to the state authority that their programs in each teaching subject adequately meet existing criteria. If this were done, the state would probably have some kind of monitoring responsibility, but it might be quite different from the approved program approach that is now so common.

RECIPROCITY SYSTEMS

Another thorny issue tied to accreditation and approved programs is reciprocity. In the 1950's and 1960's reciprocity across most state lines became a reality. At first it was based almost entirely on gentlemen's agreements among the certification officers of participating states. With the advent of national accrediting, however, those tenuous, personal arrangements gave way to reciprocal agreements based on accreditation. During the past five years the trend has definitely shifted so that today more reciprocity agreements are based on approved programs than on national accreditation, and the two national reciprocity systems in the country are both based on approved programs.

The NASDTEC Reciprocity System which began in 1965 now has 24 participating states. Approximately 10,000 programs in over 450 colleges have been approved. A student who successfully completes one of these programs is eligible for certification in any of the participating states. Each year the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification publishes a "List of Approved Programs," [43] that has been widely used by employers to check the eligibility of out-of-state candidates for certification.

The Interstate Agreement on the Qualification of Educational Personnel, commonly called the Interstate Certification Project, is the newer of the two national reciprocity systems. It is the only system based on actual legal enactments. In order for a state to become a member of the Interstate Certification Project, it must first pass a piece of enabling legislation. All states that have joined in this agreement have passed the identical law. The first Article of the legislation describes the purpose, findings, and policy of the agreement:

Article I

Purpose, Findings, and Policy

1. The States party to this Agreement, desiring by common action

to improve their respective school systems by utilizing the teacher or other professional educational person wherever educated, declare that it is the policy of each of them, on the basis of cooperation with one another, to take advantage of the preparation and experience of such persons wherever gained, thereby serving the best interests of society, of education, and of the teaching profession. It is the purpose of this Agreement to provide for the development and execution of such programs of cooperation as will facilitate the movement of teachers and other professional educational personnel among the States party to it, and to authorize specific interstate educational personnel contracts to achieve that end.

2. The party States find that included in the large movement of population among all sections of the nation are many qualified educational personnel who move for family and other personal reasons but who are hindered in using their professional skill and experience in their new locations. Variations from State to State in requirements for qualifying educational personnel discourage such personnel from taking the steps necessary to qualify in other States. As a consequence, a significant number of professionally prepared and experienced educators is lost to our school systems. Facilitating the employment of qualified educational personnel, without reference to their States of origin, can increase the available educational resources. Participation in this Compact can increase the availability of educational manpower. [44]

Article III of this same law deals with the contracts that a designated state official may sign with another state. Since the first contracts were signed in 1969 for a five year term, all other states which joined the Project during that period agreed to have their contracts end in 1974 so that a certain degree of uniformity would prevail. A second five year contract will be circulated among the states for the 1974-79 period.

Article III, Section 1 of the enabling act is particularly germane to the question of teacher preparation.

Article III

Interstate Educational Personnel Contracts

1. The designated State official of a party State may make one or more contracts on behalf of his State with one or more other party States providing for the acceptance of educational personnel. Any such contract for the period of its duration shall be applicable to and binding on the States whose designated state officials enter into it, and the subdivisions of those States, with the same force and effect as if incorporated in this Agreement. A designated state official may enter into a contract pursuant to this Article only with States in which he finds that there are programs of education, certification standards or

other acceptable qualifications that assure preparation or qualification of educational personnel on a basis sufficiently comparable, even though not identical to that prevailing in his own State. [45]

The contract used among the states is the same for all. A copy of the New Jersey contract is included as Appendix C. When the appropriate state official signs this contract it becomes as binding as any other legal contract. A state must issue a certificate to a qualified applicant from any other state with which this contract has been signed.

Some states are members of both reciprocity systems, some have joined only one, and a third group of states has not participated in either. Below is a list of states in each of the reciprocity systems as of June, 1974.

NASDTEC Reciprocity System

Alaska	New Jersey
Colorado	New Mexico
Delaware	North Carolina
District of Columbia	Ohio
Idaho	Oklahoma
Indiana	Pennsylvania
Kansas	South Dakota
Kentucky	Utah
Maryland	Vermont
Massachusetts	Virginia
Minnesota	Washington
Nebraska	Wisconsin

Interstate Certification Project

Alaska	New Hampshire
California	New Jersey
Connecticut	New York
Delaware	North Carolina
Florida	Ohio
Hawaii	Oklahoma
Idaho	Pennsylvania
Indiana*	Rhode Island
Iowa**	South Dakota
Kentucky	Utah
Maine	Vermont
Maryland	Virginia
Massachusetts	Washington
Minnesota**	West Virginia
Nebraska	Wisconsin

* Partial participation. Signed with only a few other states.

** Passed enabling legislation. Have not signed contracts.

It is obvious from the number of states involved in these two reciprocity systems and from the emphasis in both systems on approved programs that the state education agency will continue to be a potent force in teacher education. Not only is each state now approving programs for certification purposes within its own boundaries, but also its approval now has implications far beyond its own jurisdiction.

Without laboring the point, it does seem appropriate to call attention to the definite benefits of these reciprocity systems, which apply equally to employing school districts and to teachers seeking employment. When a district has a vacancy it can mount a national search for the best talent available, and a teacher can apply across the country for any job that may be of interest. The added options open to both local boards of education and to teachers provide more opportunities to bring together the proper person for a particular position.

It is easy to see that the implications for accreditation and reciprocity of field-based programs built on parity among different institutions have far-reaching effects. It may be that new criteria will have to be developed and agreed upon. If field-based programs are not mandated, but are permitted in a state, will two sets of criteria be necessary? In other words, a double standard might exist in a state where some programs are field-based and others are of a more traditional type. Provision will have to be made for the approval of an increasing variety of teacher education programs. Accreditation and/or program approval must not stand in the way of new ideas for better programs in teacher education.

INNOVATION AND EXPERIMENT

The NASDTEC Standards have attempted to encourage colleges and universities to develop innovative and experimental teacher education programs through the inclusion of the following criteria designed specifically for this purpose:

The Standards contained in this Chapter have been prepared to emphasize the importance which the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification places on the continuous development of new programs for the preparation of school personnel. The Association unequivocally supports the position that innovative and experimental programs of teacher education must be encouraged. However, it does not support the idea that innovative and experimental programs that are ill conceived, poorly designed, weakly administered, or grossly lacking in evaluative criteria should receive the approval of any state education agency. Consequently, the Standards which follow have been designed to create an awareness on the parts of both the program developers and the accrediting agencies of the concerns which must be considered in the conception, approval, and implementation of innovative and experimental programs.

5.1 Types of Programs. All types of programs may be considered under the rubric of "innovative and experimental programs." Some examples are:

5.1.1 Programs designed to develop new approaches, new arrangements, and/or new contexts for the preparation of school personnel.

5.1.2 Programs designed to prepare school personnel for new types of positions that are emerging on the education scene.

5.1.3 Programs designed to meet the special needs of particular segments of our society such as:

- A. Urban education
- B. Correctional education
- C. Bilingual education
- D. Education of socio-economically disadvantaged, rural and urban
- E. Minority group education
- F. Adult education

5.1.4 Programs designed for specific curricular areas, for which recognized standards have not been developed such as:

- A. Career education
- B. Environmental education
- C. Drug abuse education
- D. Aerospace education

STANDARD I Justification. A clear statement justifying the request for the approval of an experimental or innovative program shall be provided and it shall include the assumptions, rationale and objectives on which the proposed program is based.

STANDARD II Objectives. Each program should be built upon a clear-cut statement of the purpose and objectives of teaching in this area of the public school curriculum, and a well-formulated statement of the nature of the public school program that is needed to accomplish these objectives. These statements should be prepared cooperatively by the agencies concerned with teacher education, should be based on analyses of current practices and trends in this field of the public school curriculum, and should be available in writing.

STANDARD III Competencies. Each program should include a clearly formulated statement of the competencies needed by teachers in this area of the public school curriculum. These competencies should include the attitudes, knowledges, understandings, and skills that are required, and the degree of expertise necessary for a beginning teacher. This statement

of competencies should be available in writing, and should be based upon the statement developed in the preceding Standards regarding the objectives and program of the public school.

STANDARD IV Organization. The administrative structure of the program shall be such that responsibility for the program is vested in the preparing institution. Institutions which accept responsibility for the education of teachers should establish and designate the appropriate division, school, college, or department within the institution to act within the framework of general institutional policies on all matters relating to such experimental programs.

STANDARD V Process. The experimental program must include a description of the process by which the personnel will be prepared, provision for keeping records of the students' progress in the program, and arrangements for systematic review of the process at stated intervals by both institution and the state education agency.

STANDARD VI Resources. The program should be supported by sufficient and appropriate human and physical resources which are clearly identified. The continuing availability of such resources should be assured for the duration of the program.

Any resources not under the control of the teacher education institution should be outlined and further confirmed by the controlling agency.

STANDARD VII Timetable. The innovative-experimental program must include a timetable which sets forth the starting and terminal dates. This should include:

- A. The sequence of activities that will occur.
- B. The anticipated schedule of evaluative check points.
- C. The identification of competencies or other changes at selected intervals in the program.

The timetable must give the approximate dates on which periodic program reports are to be submitted to the appropriate institutional officials and to the state education agency.

STANDARD VIII Evaluation. The experimental program shall have continuing evaluation with definite provisions for performance criteria and follow-up, at specific intervals during the timetable for the project. The evaluation plan must include definition and specification of the kinds of evidence that will be gathered and reported. Evaluation should provide information to identify areas in the programs that need strengthening and to suggest new directions for program development. [46]

No longer can teacher preparing institutions use the excuse that an outside force such as the state or an accrediting agency is preventing them from mounting new programs. Although NCATE has not developed a set of standards like those of NASDTEC, the Council has expressed itself very clearly on the subject:

Responsible experimentation and innovation are essential to improvement of teacher education programs. A deliberate attempt has been made in these standards to encourage individuality, imagination, and innovation in institutional planning. An institution must, of course, assume responsibility for the quality of all its programs, regular and experimental.

[47]

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Institutions of higher education are suffering from the same economic crunch that is affecting each of us. Field-based experiences are more expensive to provide than lectures in classrooms. However, as colleges experiment with field-based programs, they have to weigh the desired outcomes against the cost. In multipurpose colleges and universities, the school of education must compete for existing funds with all other units of the institution. Any attempt to initiate a new program, whether in teacher education or in another discipline, is going to be subjected to a more rigorous fiscal review than ever before.

One plan that has been explored by some teacher education programs is to try to convince the public schools and the professional organizations with whom they are working that the costs of running a field-based program should be shared. Another device has been to charge students a "laboratory fee" in every term or semester that they receive a field-based assignment. Neither of these ideas has proved either popular or successful.

The costs of a college education have risen steadily over the past few years. Students are paying higher tuitions as well as increased rates for room, board, and books. An additional levy for their field-based experiences has been vigorously and, for the most part, successfully opposed by students.

The public school districts do not look upon teacher education as their top priority. To take local tax dollars to support a teacher education program is not only politically unwise but, in some instances, may even be illegal. Texas, recognizing this dilemma and further recognizing the need for public school participation in teacher education, passed legislation to appropriate money to local districts for the support of student teaching programs:

Student Teacher Centers

(a) To provide college students, facilities, and supervision for student teaching experience required by law as a prerequisite to the issuance of a valid Texas Teaching Certificate, it is

necessary that joint responsibility among the colleges or universities approved for teacher education by the State Board of Education of this state, the Texas Public School districts, and the State of Texas be hereby established.

(b) The Central Education Agency, with the assistance of colleges, universities, and public school personnel, shall establish standards for approval of public school districts to serve as Student Teacher Centers, and define the cooperative relationship between the college or university and the public school which serves the student teaching program.

(c) The approved public school district serving as a Student Teacher Center and the college or university using its facilities shall jointly approve or select the supervising teachers, employees of the district, to serve in the program and adopt an agreed continuing in-service improvement program for said supervising teachers.

(d) There shall be paid to the public school district serving as a Student Teacher Center the sum of Two Hundred Dollars (\$200) for each supervising teacher, to be an additional increment for such additional services to the annual salary of each such serving supervising teacher. In addition there shall be paid to the district the sum of Fifty Dollars (\$50) per each supervising teacher usable to assist in meeting the costs incurred in providing facilities for student teaching. This total, Two Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$250) per supervising teacher, shall be paid from the Minimum Foundation Program Fund; this cost shall be considered by the Foundation School Fund Budget Committee in estimating the funds needed for Foundation School Program purposes. The total number of supervising teachers to receive the additional increment herein provided shall never exceed seventy percent (70%) of the total number of student teachers enrolled in the practice teaching program. [48]

Although this legislation deals only with student teaching, it is a major step forward in support of field-based experiences.

DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Professional organizations have to date had a set of priorities that did not include teacher education. Salaries, working conditions, and other direct benefits to their members have been their first order of business. Now that most of these concerns have become more or less routine items for contract negotiations, the organizations can turn their attention to other matters, including teacher education. As they become more deeply involved in the decision-making sphere of teacher education, and especially in the field-based component of these programs, it is not unlikely that their tangible support will increase.

It seems safe to make the assumption that field-based teacher education programs will be with us for a long time to come. Whether other movements in teacher education, such as competency-based programs, succeed or not, there is no whit of evidence that teacher educators will return to their lecture halls. Students in teacher education programs are going to be placed in the field in ever increasing numbers and for a greater portion of their undergraduate days.

Resourcefulness, ingenuity, and expediency will characterize the efforts of teacher educators to overcome the obstacles that get in the way of their attempts to provide more relevant teacher education programs. Never has the future of teacher education looked so bright. Rather than the cloistered programs of the past, teacher education has become the center of attention of other institutions in the main stream of the total educational endeavor. More individuals from the education community and more professional organizations are actively seeking ways in which they can contribute to the preparation of future teachers than this country has ever known. As teacher education programs become more field-based and less campus-based the opportunities for capitalizing on the interest and expertise of all professional educators are tremendously enhanced. The problem will be to bring it all together.

Some different types of organizational patterns have been tried, some different kinds of cooperative arrangements have been explored, and some different methods of assigning students have been examined. No one has yet proclaimed that he has discovered the perfect combination. In fact, one arrangement may be the optimum in one situation while another is equally good in a different setting.

The more common of two different models of college supervisors is that in which the supervision of a student teacher is conducted by a specialist in the field. If a student were preparing to become an English teacher, he would be supervised during his student teaching by a college supervisor from English education and/or the English department. Such a supervisor is fortunate if he has ten students in one building. More often than not he must spend considerable time traveling from school to school in order to visit all his students. The strengths of this approach lie in the knowledge that the supervisor has of the subject and the added possibility that he may have had previous contacts with his student teachers in other classes on campus.

The other model is one in which the college supervisor is a generalist. He is assigned to one school, or perhaps two, to which 20 student teachers are assigned. The student teachers are placed according to their majors in a variety of departments--English, French, chemistry, etc. The theory behind this system is that the classroom teacher with whom the student teacher is placed is the subject matter specialist, while the college supervisor is the pedagogical expert. The strengths in this arrangement are the increased time for supervision that is available to the supervisor because his students are concentrated in only one or two locations, and the need for close cooperation between the cooperating

teacher and the college supervisor.

One kind of cooperative arrangement that has been tried with varying degrees of success involves two or more colleges sharing supervisory responsibilities. For example, when two or more institutions are located near each other, they can agree that one college will supervise all the foreign language student teachers from all the participating colleges, the second college will supervise all the social studies students, and the third would do the same in another area of study. The student teachers from all the institutions would be supervised according to their major rather than to the college in which they were enrolled. Many public school principals like this approach because they would know the supervisor for the English student teachers without having to find out which college a particular student teacher attends. When a problem occurs, only one person would need to be contacted.

Another variation on this type of sharing is found when the cooperating colleges use the generalist type of supervision. One college would have a supervisor in a particular school to which all colleges would send their student teachers, while another college would provide the supervisor at a different school.

There are many different specifics that are possible through cooperative efforts among colleges. Some have proved to be particularly helpful to smaller institutions.

One danger that should be noted is the difficulty of bringing together public and non-public institutions. The primary problem revolves around the differences in tuition. When a group of non-public colleges agree to share their resources, they can adjust their tuition and other costs to meet the situation, even when their on-campus fees differ. However, when a public college or university is involved, these problems are magnified. Parents who are paying \$60 per credit for their son or daughter to attend a private college find it difficult to accept the fact that their child is in a group with students from a public college who are paying only \$20 per credit.

Although cooperative student teaching arrangements have been mentioned specifically, similar arrangements among colleges can be made for all field-based experiences. In the area of student assignments there are again wide variations. Instead of individual assignments for each student every time he enters the field, a team of six to ten students could be assigned as a unit. The team could decide whose turn it was to participate in a certain activity on a given day through cooperative planning with their college professors and public school teachers. The team concept might work better than individual assignments in team teaching situations, differentiated staffing programs, or any other organizational pattern.

Traditionally student teaching has been based on a one-to-one relationship. That is, one student teacher has been assigned to one cooperating teacher. There is no evidence that this is a better learning

environment for student teachers than having two student teachers assigned at the same time to a cooperating teacher. In fact, there are strong indications that the latter model might be better. Griffen reported a study in which elementary student teachers were given an opportunity to observe one another and to offer suggestions. "They deemed 92 percent of their observations of each other worth the time and effort expended. Supervising teachers were substantially in agreement." [49] Additional studies in this area may prove extremely useful.

Field-based experiences have recently been expanded to include social agencies, church groups, and other nonschool activities where college students could be with children in many different settings. As part of a teacher preparation program, college students might also be assigned to the central office of school districts, to administrative units in intermediate districts or county offices, to state education offices, to the offices of professional organizations, and to many other places that are engaged in the business of education. Students would surely be better prepared to assume their place as professionals if they had a greater understanding of the magnitude of the educational enterprise.

Change is inevitable in teacher education as it is in all our other endeavors. Instead of looking for all the reasons why a new idea will not work, we should seek the reasons why it will. An optimist is right as often as a pessimist and he enjoys life a whole lot more.

REFERENCES

1. Burdin, Joel L., Changing Dimensions in Teacher Education. Twentieth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967. p.iii.
2. Barnard, Henry, Normal Schools and Other Institutions, Agencies, and Means Designed for the Professional Education of Teachers. Hartford, Conn.: Cape, Tiffany, and Company, 1851. p.57.
3. Holmes, Manfred J., and others, "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education," The Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Part II. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1903. p.29.
4. McAllister, Jane Ellen, "Glimpses of the Past," The Outlook in Student Teaching. Association for Student Teaching, 41st. Yearbook. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1962. p.6.
5. Sinclair, William Ward, "An Analysis of Three Pre-Student Teaching Experiences in the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1961. p.14.
6. Jones, Isabel Fleming, "A Study of the Relationship of Various Types of Pre-Student Teaching Experiences to Success in Student Teaching." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1955. p.32.
7. Patterson, Allen D., "What It All Means," Professional Growth Inservice of the Supervising Teacher. Association for Student Teaching, 45th. Yearbook. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1966. p.101.
8. Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching, Who's In Charge Here? Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1966.
9. Patterson, op. cit., p.106.
10. Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching, op.cit.
11. Association of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association, Role of the Classroom Teacher in the Student Teaching Program. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1970. p.22.
12. Harris, Arthur L., Foreword to Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education. Salt Lake City, Utah: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1968 Revision. p.III.

13. Ibid., p.11.
14. Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education, 1971 Edition.
Salt Lake City, Utah: National Association of State Directors
of Teacher Education and Certification, 1971. p.18.
15. Ibid., pp.15-7.
16. Ibid., p.16.
17. Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education: The Accreditation
of Basic and Advanced Preparation Programs for Professional
School Personnel. Washington, D.C.: National Council for
Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1972. Introduction.
18. Ibid., p.6.
19. Ibid., p.17.
20. Ibid., p.19.
21. Marburger, Carl L., Foreword to Learning to Teach: Focus on Direct
Experiences. Trenton, N.J.: State of New Jersey, Department of
Education, 1969. p.3.
22. Elam, Stanley, Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State
of the Art? Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education, 1971. pp.6-7.
23. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards,
in consultation with the National Commission on Professional
Rights and Responsibilities and the NEA General Counsel,
"A Model Teacher Standards and Licensure Act." Washington, D.C.:
National Education Association, 1971. p.1.
24. Ibid., p.5.
25. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, AACTE Alert.
Washington, D.C.: the Association, February 1972.
26. "What Does Governance Mean?" Today's Education, December 1971.
pp.20-1.
27. Senate, No.674. State of New Jersey. Introduced January 28, 1974.
pp.3-4.
28. Ibid., p.3.
29. Ibid., p.5.
30. Drummond, William H., "Role of State Department of Education," New

Perspectives on Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973. p.90.

31. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, House of Representatives Education Committee, "Transcript of Hearing Held in the Minority Caucus Room, Main Capitol Building, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, on Thursday, May 31, 1973, 10:00 A.M." pp.17-9.
32. "The Teaching Profession," Today's Education. December, 1971. p.22.
33. Steward, Charles E., "Facilitating Local Options and Coordination of Programs," The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education: Report of the Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972. p.184.
34. Schmieder, Allen A., and Sam J. Yarger, "Teacher/Teaching Centering in America," The Journal of Teacher Education, Spring, 1974. p.6.
35. "The Teacher Learning Center: Short Fact Sheet About TLC." San Francisco, Calif.: San Francisco Unified School District, undated.
36. Rhode Island Teacher Center. Providence, R.I.: State Department of Education, Division of Development and Operations, undated. pp.1-2.
37. French, Sally, ed., Southeast Alternatives, 1974. Minneapolis, Minn.: the Public Schools, 1974. p.54.
38. Ibid., p.48.
39. Maddox, Kathryn, ed., In West Virginia It Is Working: One Teacher Center in Action. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972. p.55.
40. Selden, David, and Dave Darland, "Teacher Centers--Who's In Charge?" Teacher Centers: An Outline of Current Information. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, May, 1972. p.8.
41. Mathieson, Moira B., "What Do They Mean By Parity?" The Journal of Teacher Education, Winter, 1972. p.501.
42. Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education, 1973 Edition (Revised). Salt Lake City, Utah: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 1973. Table of Contents.
43. NASDTEC Certification Reciprocity System: 1973-74 List Approved Programs. Trenton, N.J.: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 1973.
44. N.J.S.A. 18A:26-11, et.seq.

45. Ibid.
46. Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education. 1973 Edition (Revised). op.cit., Chapter V.
47. Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education. op.cit. Introduction.
48. Texas Education Code. Bulletin 721 of the Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1971. Chapter 11, Section 311, pp.77-8.
49. Griffin, Robert J., "Student Teachers Can Learn from Each Other," Readings in Student Teaching: For Those Who Work with Student Teachers. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Book Co., 1967. p.360.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A'

STANDARD VI--PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES

From: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Revised Standards and Policies for Accrediting Colleges for Teacher Education of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Oneonta, N.Y.: the Association, 1951. pp. 20-32.

Meaning and Function of Professional Laboratory Experiences

The significance of direct experience in the learning process requires that the curriculum of teacher education make provision for such experience, for the need is great at all maturity levels. To build the resourcefulness needed by today's teacher in meeting varying and different situations requires many opportunities to study the major professional activities of the teacher by participating in such activities. There is need for direct experience to develop understanding that goes beyond verbalization and fixed skills; to develop action based upon thinking and the flexible and creative use of skills. Such direct experience for the teacher-to-be may be called professional laboratory experiences. These laboratory experiences should provide:

1. an opportunity to implement basic concepts and ideas discussed in college classes so that the student may study the pragmatic value of the theory and check his understanding of the theory in action;
2. help for the student in seeing his needs (both personal and professional) and outlining experiences which should be included in his further study; and
3. an opportunity for the student to study his ability to guide actual teaching-learning situations.

The first two of these purposes call for laboratory experiences as an integral part of education courses and of professionally treated content courses. In fact, such laboratory experiences may well be part of academic courses whose content, while directed toward the student as individual and citizen, is used professionally by the teacher of children and youth. The third purpose suggests a period of intensive, continuous work with a given group of learners in which the student carries major responsibility for guiding the learning process. Such a period also contributes to the first two purposes and may well be provided through a separate course known as student teaching. Although the student teaching period contributes to all

three purposes, it cannot take the place of the more diversified laboratory experiences extending throughout the period of college study. Such experiences need to be included in course work to give meaning to ideas discussed and concepts developed. Nor can laboratory activities had in connection with college classes replace the more intensive work with a given pupil group. Both are needed in the program of professional education of teachers. "Professional laboratory experiences" is an inclusive term; student teaching is one type of such experience.

Professional laboratory experiences include 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.

Student teaching is a period of guided teaching when the student takes increasing responsibility for guiding the school experiences of a given group of learners over a period of consecutive weeks.

Implementing the Concept of Professional Laboratory Experiences

To be adequate, a standard for implementing the foregoing concept of professional laboratory experiences must deal with the qualitative aspects of the college program. The abilities and needs of individual students vary within any given college while the background of experience of students in one college may differ greatly from that of students enrolled in another institution. Therefore, a simple quantitative standard must give way to one that is flexible, yet gives direction in planning a desirable program for a teacher education institution. The following paragraphs outline the several aspects of a standard which is designed to guide the development of professional laboratory experiences appropriate for the purposes and conditions of each member institution.

A. The Place of Professional Laboratory Experiences in the College Curriculum.

The nature of a student's preceding experiences in a given area, rather than the age of the learner or his position in the educational ladder, is the criterion for determining the amount and place of direct experience in the college curriculum. *Professional laboratory experiences, therefore, should be an integral part of the work of each year of college.* This aspect of the standard is implemented most fully:

1. When laboratory experiences prior to student teaching are integrated with other parts of the college program. The student derives more from his direct experiences prior to student teaching when they grow out of and are brought back

to his work in college courses than when they comprise a separate and independent series of guided experiences.

2. When there is flexibility in planning for professional laboratory experiences as work progresses rather than scheduling laboratory experiences for a considerable period in advance. This is necessary if provision is to be made for the needs of individual students and for student participation in the planning of experiences.
3. When the intensive period of work, known as student teaching, occurs at that point in the professional sequence when the student is ready to assume a growing share of the responsibility for guiding the experience of a group of learners. Such readiness has many component parts, both personal and professional, and is conditioned by a variety of factors. For example, the student who is ready to engage in student teaching should possess some sensitivity to problems and factors affecting a teaching-learning situation, some understanding of the major aspects of child growth and development, some ability to study the needs, interests, and abilities of a given group of learners, and some understanding of how to apply basic principles of learning. He should likewise possess some degree of emotional stability, a reasonable amount of poise, and good mental and physical health. These factors of readiness should be viewed in terms of development to the point where the student can profitably extend his competencies by assuming greater responsibility for guiding the activities of a group of learners over a consecutive period of weeks.

Readiness is an individual matter. Recognition of individual differences means that not all students will enter upon the work of student teaching at the same point in the professional sequence. Each placement is contingent upon the ability of the student and the nature of earlier professional laboratory experiences.

4. When provision is made for professional laboratory experiences following student teaching: (a) to permit students to do more intensive work in areas of special interest or competence; (b) to make it possible to strengthen shortage areas; (c) to help students gain a new overview of the larger school situation and to study the inter-relationships of its various parts. Again, the nature and extent of laboratory experiences at this point will vary greatly in terms of the needs of the individual student. For some the work will be largely observation, for others

direct teaching; for some there will be many short contacts, for others an extended period of work in a single situation; for some the experiences will be largely within the school situation, for others chiefly in the community. For some such laboratory contacts will be extensive; for others they will be a resource to be used occasionally.

B. Nature of Professional Laboratory Experiences.

If the student is to build an action-picture of the role of the teacher in public education there must be opportunity to experience the work of the teacher both within and without the classroom. This includes a study of the work of the school as a whole, of pupil and community backgrounds as a basis for improving the educational program, of the responsibilities of the teacher and the school in sharing and improving community activities. The professional program should be designed to afford opportunity for responsible participation in the major areas of the teacher's work. This aspect of the standard is implemented most fully:

1. When a variety of experiences helps the student to form working concepts of the role of the teacher in the school and the community; to understand children and youth of varied abilities and socioeconomic backgrounds; and to develop competence in working with children, parents, colleagues, and community agencies.
2. When the period of student teaching provides opportunities for the student to perceive the major aspects of the teacher's work as a whole and to gain in a functional understanding of the interrelationships among the various aspects through being an active agent in the teaching process.
3. When provision is made for some full-time student teaching-- a period of constructive weeks when the student's college program consists only of those activities related to student teaching. While the student may have contact with a range of activities of the teacher through diversified laboratory experiences prior to student teaching, it is through a period of full-time student teaching that the student can best see these activities in relationship, in a single setting, and test his ability to carry on these activities concurrently.
4. When the needs of the individual student dictate for each area of teaching the particular activities to be engaged in and the sequence of those activities.

5. When the activities engaged in are those inherent in the particular laboratory situation and ones that would normally be carried on with the given group of learners.
6. When the internship, as a part of a fifth year of professional study, is recognized as providing certain experiences that have unique values for the preparation of teachers. Chief among the values to be kept in mind by colleges having an opportunity to develop an internship program are: (a) continuity between pre-service and inservice education; (b) gradual induction as a member of a school staff with part-supervision by those who know the beginning teacher; (c) more effective placement for work; (d) opportunity for the college to study the effectiveness of its work and make needed curricular modifications.

C. Assignment and Length of Laboratory Experiences.

Where the student should engage in the various types of professional laboratory experiences and how long he should continue with a given experience, and how long he should remain in each situation are conditioned by the needs of the student, the degree to which the given experience can contribute to those needs, and the student's rate of growth. *Choice of laboratory situation and length of time spent there will vary with individuals. Each experience should be long enough to help the student achieve the purposes for which he entered upon it.* This aspect of the standard is implemented most fully:

1. When the assignment to a particular laboratory situation is based upon the needs, interests, and abilities of the individual student and the characteristics and opportunities of the given situation. Attention should be given to the personality of the student, the kind of professional work anticipated, and indicated professional competence and need. In judging the laboratory situation such items as the following should be considered:
 - a. The group of children or youth. Is this projected assignment in the best interest of the children?
 - b. The person directly responsible for guiding the laboratory experience (hereafter called the laboratory teacher). What is the ability of this teacher to give the particular type of guidance needed by the student? Is such an appointment advisable in terms of the teacher's total load--teaching load, committee responsibilities, health factors?
 - c. The program of the group and the school. Are the

normal interests and activities of the group
those which provide the needed experiences for the
given student?

2. When the length of time spent in a given laboratory situation, as well as in each professional laboratory experience or activity, is flexible in terms of the best interests of the student. This includes consideration of the needs of the individual student, his rate of growth, whether his needs can best be met during the present period or through later experiences in other situations, and consideration of opportunities provided in the given situation to meet the *changing* needs of the student.
3. When provision is made for continuity in the study of a given laboratory situation. Really to understand a situation, to be intelligently active about it, and to note change and how it came about call for continuing contact with that situation. Other things being equal, fewer laboratory situations, of varying types, studied in their various aspects and really understood are to be preferred to a larger number that are partial and not continued long enough really to achieve the purposes for which they are designed.
4. When the period of full-time student teaching is long enough to permit the student teacher to understand the growth of learners resulting from the guidance given. There is need for each student to stay with at least one laboratory situation for a period sufficiently long to observe how activities develop and how learnings are extended and horizons widened. The student should stay with a laboratory situation long enough to see the growth emerging from cooperative efforts of teachers and learners so that he may know the satisfactions of teaching, know his strengths and weaknesses in guiding teaching-learning situations, and attain a functional understanding of the learning process.
5. When withdrawal from a laboratory situation is made with consideration for the nature of the particular activities the student is developing with children. A contact would be terminated with regard for the best interests of the children and at the point where withdrawal can be satisfying to the student himself.
6. When the number of different laboratory contacts is varied to meet the needs of individual students. What and how many contacts are needed by the student are contingent upon opportunities in a given situation to meet the needs of the student for experience with the scope of the teacher's

work in the school and the community, with pupils of different socioeconomic backgrounds, abilities, and maturity levels, and with different curriculum patterns and administrative organizations in school.

D. Guidance of Professional Laboratory Experiences.

The quality of the professional laboratory experience is as important as the range of experience, if not more so; quality of experience is conditioned in large part by the guidance given as the student engages in a particular activity. The quality and nature of the guidance given become especially important when fixed patterns and prescribed regulations are replaced by concern for individual differences among students. *Guidance of professional laboratory experiences should at all times be in terms of basic educational principles.* Guidance should demonstrate the principles recommended for use in working with children and youth. This aspect of the standard is implemented most fully:

1. When the student has a vital and growing part in the managing of his professional laboratory experiences. As the student shares in developing plans for his own program, he has first hand experience with the guidance process and can see its effect upon himself. Thus, he can grow in his understanding of what is involved in the process of guiding children and youth.
2. When guidance of professional laboratory experiences is directed toward helping the student generalize from experiences and develop a set of educational principles, rather than patterns and fixed ways of responding, give the prospective teacher the power needed to meet changing conditions in the laboratory situation and in later teaching situations.
3. When evaluation of growth in meeting and dealing with laboratory experiences is a continuous and integral part of the learning process rather than a separate activity engaged in periodically and when it is in terms of the student's ability to use basic generalizations in meeting new experiences. Throughout, evaluation is based on study and analysis by the staff, cooperatively with the student, of anecdotal and other types of descriptive records of specific reactions to situations.

E. Guidance of Professional Laboratory Experiences as a Cooperative Responsibility.

If professional laboratory experiences are to be an integral

part of the college program, the development of these experiences should be the joint responsibility of the person directly responsible in the laboratory situation and the college representatives most closely associated with the student's activities in the laboratory situation. Laboratory and college staff members should work together to help the student see the interrelationships between laboratory experiences and other college activities and mutually to re-enforce learning experiences. College and laboratory staff members should coordinate their efforts to eliminate conflicts that interfere with learning. This aspect of the standard is implemented most fully:

1. When assignments to laboratory situations are made cooperatively by those persons who are most fully acquainted, on one hand, with the student and his needs and, on the other, with the needs and opportunities in the laboratory situation. Usually these persons are the student's college advisor, the student himself, and the director of the laboratory program who brings knowledge of the work of the various laboratory groups and the over-all program of the laboratory center.
2. When data relative to the needs, abilities, and background of experience of the student are shared with the laboratory teacher prior to student's work in the laboratory situation. This may be done through conference, a special report, or making student cumulative records easily accessible. Coordination is more easily realized where provision is made for the cooperative study and discussion of the data.
3. When conferences and other channels of communication between laboratory and college teachers are easily available throughout the several years of college. These, both with and without the participation of the student, may include consideration of such items as selection of laboratory experiences, evaluation of student progress and growth, determining needed additional laboratory experiences, advisement regarding teaching problems in a given laboratory situation, and understanding the respective philosophies and educational points of view of laboratory and college teachers.
4. When both college and laboratory teachers share in the supervision of laboratory experiences. Each has a definite contribution to make to the growth and development of the student--the college teacher in helping implement ideas developed in college courses, in building upon the student's particular abilities and background of experience, and in turn modifying his own teaching and the

college curriculum in terms of the needs shown by students at work in laboratory situations; the laboratory teacher in providing guidance based upon an intimate knowledge of a particular teaching-learning situation, upon a depth of understanding of child development, and upon the competencies of a capable teacher of children.

F. Facilities Needed to Implement the Program of Professional Laboratory Experiences.

Facilities should always be viewed with reference to the goals to be achieved. They are essentially service tools and their worth and the use to which they are to be put can be judged only in terms of that which they are to serve. The number of college students to be served, the specific curriculum design, the nature and availability of educational resources in the given community are all factors that condition decisions regarding the scope and nature of needed laboratory facilities. There is need for *laboratory facilities sufficiently extensive to provide for each student contact with "normal" situations, varied enough to provide contacts with different pupil groups and different curriculum and administrative organizations, and located for student convenience and staff accessibility.* This aspect of the standard is implemented most fully:

1. When one or more college-controlled schools are available for laboratory experiences related to a school and its community. Control refers to a reasonable influence by the college over policies relating to selection of staff and to procedures in curriculum development. In general, this school (or schools) should be a representative school in the sense of having a non-selected group of children or youth and a definite community setting, a staff of able teachers qualified to guide professional laboratory experiences, and a program that is dynamic and forward-looking. The school should be one in which the staff, the administration, and the community are willing to cooperate in making the school a situation serving the dual function of providing the best possible program for children and of providing desirable experiences for prospective teachers. In some cases this will mean a college-owned campus laboratory school, in others an off-campus school or schools developed cooperatively by the college and the local school system, in still others a combination of campus and off-campus facilities.
2. When a range of other school situations is available. No one school can provide the needed range of experiences with children of varied socioeconomic backgrounds, with different major educational philosophies, with varied types of instructional materials, with different patterns of

administrative organization. No one school can provide the suggested range of professional laboratory experiences for a large student body. Schools or particular situations within a school should be selected for the differentiating philosophy, curriculum design, administrative organization, and community setting presented. Like the college-controlled situations named in the preceding paragraph, these schools should be staffed by teachers qualified to help students study the particular point of view or organization represented, see what is involved in its implementation, and analyze critically its effects upon children, teachers, and the community.

3. When non-school educational agencies are available for use cooperatively by the college. Learning to understand and help educate children and youth means seeing them in a variety of situations, recognizing the place of the school in the community, and understanding its role in relation to other educational agencies. Direct contact with a range of community agencies and situations helps to develop the understanding necessary for the modern teacher. Initiative for the supervision of the student's work in these agencies should be taken by the college representatives. The staffs of the agencies can make a direct contribution to the student's thinking but should not be expected to have the same qualifications for the guidance of professional laboratory experiences as the teachers named in items 1 and 2 foregoing.
4. When the extent of facilities is such that (a) each student has contact with varied types of school and community situations, (b) a student can continue in a situation for a period of time that the experience has learning value for him, and (c) his experiences in the situation are consistent with those inherent in the given setting. This means, for example, that class groups should not be divided to accommodate a given or growing number of college students, nor should the length of laboratory contacts be conditioned by the number of students. Rather, as college enrollments increase, steps should be taken to extend laboratory facilities.
5. When each laboratory teacher qualified as a child specialist, a competent teacher of children, and one skillful in guiding another in the art of teaching through direct participation in teaching-learning situations. It is not enough that the laboratory teacher who is responsible for guiding the experiences of the college student be a teacher highly qualified to work with children. He should be equally competent in his understanding of the college student

and in his ability to guide the student in working with children.

6. When the contribution of college instructors and laboratory school teachers is recognized as differing in type rather than in quality or extent. If the college program and laboratory activities are to be coordinated as closely as they should be, responsibility for developing the curriculum of the college-controlled laboratory schools should be shared by the entire college staff, and planning of the unique function of laboratory experiences in the college program should be done jointly by the college and the laboratory school teachers. The laboratory school teacher who carries major responsibility for guiding the student should be a recognized member of the college faculty. There should be no differences in remuneration, rank, or faculty privileges to cause status barriers to arise.
7. When the instructional load of all staff members (laboratory teachers of college classes) is adjusted to provide for the inclusion of activities with students in laboratory situations. Not only should the load of each staff member be adjusted to make it possible to include professional laboratory activities, but those activities should be considered a regular part of the teaching load. To view the teaching load in terms of number of classes or clock hours of class instruction does not coincide with the basic point of view of this report.
8. The laboratory school library should serve three main purposes:
 - a. It should be a demonstration library for the laboratory school and an important part of the educational experiences of the children.
 - b. It should help student teachers to learn how to use public school libraries and community libraries effectively both as a teaching tool and as a means of continuing their own education.
 - c. It should serve as a laboratory and practice center for the preparation of teacher-librarians in those institutions in which these are prepared.

If the laboratory school facilities of the college are located in a separate building or in separate buildings a library unit should be provided in each building or in each closely-located group of buildings. This need is sometimes met, although less adequately, by providing a reading room and other facilities for the laboratory school children

in the main library.

Provisions should be made in the laboratory school library for such facilities as reading tables and chairs of appropriate height for all students who will use it, and for a small adjacent room in which student-teachers can work on the preparation of teaching units and have ready access to the children's books and materials that are kept in that library.

Librarians, experienced in the field of public school library service, should have general responsibility for the special library units in the laboratory schools and should be able to demonstrate the services of a school library with children of various ages and also supervise the work of prospective school librarians, and classroom teachers in the use of the school library.

The foregoing standard is described in terms of six major aspects, all parts of an integral whole. As the art of teaching is a mosaic made up of many parts, so the various aspects of professional laboratory experiences are an integral part of the total program of teacher education. Each has a part to play and that part must be seen in the light of the total design of the curriculum of the teachers college.

APPENDIX B

CONSTITUTION OF THE CITE PROJECT

From: Papers on Collaboration and Teacher Preparation. Albany:
University of the State of New York and State Education
Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification,
undated. pp.39-47.

CITE Member Agencies

College representatives from:	Manhattanville College Pace University SUC New Paltz Teachers College, Columbia University
College student representatives from:	Manhattanville College Pace University SUC New Paltz Teachers College, Columbia University
School district representatives from:	Greenburgh Central Schools Putnam/Westchester BOCES (Board of Cooperative Educational Services) Somers Central Schools Yorktown Central Schools
Teacher representatives from:	Greenburgh Central Schools Somers Central Schools Yorktown Central Schools
Community representatives from:	Greenburgh Central Schools Somers Central Schools Yorktown Central Schools

Preamble

As citizens and educators concerned with the quality of American education and committed to its improvement by increasing the competence of educational personnel through cooperative efforts, we do hereby adopt

this Constitution.

Article I. Name, Goals, Objectives and Governance.

Section 1. Name. The name of this organization shall be the CITE Project, Cooperation in Teacher Education in the Putnam and Westchester Counties.

Section 2. Goals. The goals of the CITE Project are (1) the cooperative development and (2) continuous assessment by colleges, schools, and communities of a (3) competency-based program for the (4) preparation, induction, and certification of elementary teachers. The organizational structure provided by this Constitution shall have the necessary power to take action for the attainment of the goals.

Section 3. Specific objectives in the pursuance of the stated goals reflect CITE's commitment to a cooperative process which involves (1) the identification of objectives and determination of priorities of the schools involved, (2) the translation of those objectives into teacher competencies, (3) the design of components of teacher education programs, and (4) the development of tools for assessing teacher performance. Additional objectives may be periodically established in the Bylaws of this Constitution as the CITE Project moves toward other cooperative training ventures.

Section 4. Governance. The CITE Project shall be governed by its Constitution and by the Bylaws and such actions as the General Assembly may take consistent with them.

Article II. Membership.

Membership in the CITE Project shall include those agencies responsible for and affected by the Project. Membership is initially limited to those educational and community agencies that originally responded to an invitation to join the Project and subsequently participated in preliminary activities. In order to preserve the broad representative nature of the project, membership shall reflect a balance among the participating agencies. Other agencies must apply to the Executive Board for membership. Full or part-time membership of new agencies will require a two-thirds affirmative vote of the full Executive Board conducted by mail ballot, and providing a Resolution of Commitment has been accepted. Any agency may withdraw membership upon written notification to the Director of CITE following approval of withdrawal by the governing board or administrator of the agency.

a. Full membership. Those agencies, including sub-categories, that have signed, or have been included in an authorized signature, a Resolution of Commitment as provided by the Executive Board indicating continuous commitment to all phases of the Project.

b. Part-time membership. An agency or individual participating on a limited, or part-time, basis for special tasks that have specified time and/or participatory limits. Such members may seek selective or appointive non-voting positions in the CITE organizational structure upon written request to the Executive Board.

Article III. General Assembly.

Section 1. Meetings. The General Assembly shall meet semiannually in May and November. Additional meetings may be called by: 1, a majority of Executive Board members voting at an Executive Board meeting; 2, a majority of the Executive Board members presenting a signed petition to the Chairman of the Executive Board; or 3, petition signed by official delegates of three member agencies and presented to the Chairman of the Executive Board.

Section 2. Composition and Selection. The General Assembly shall be composed of one official delegate from each participating agency except as noted in the Bylaws. The delegates shall be chosen by the active members of each agency. Additional non-voting delegates chosen by each agency may attend the General Assembly meetings.

Section 3. Terms. Each delegate shall serve for a term of two years with half of the representatives elected each year.

Section 4. General Assembly: Functions. The General Assembly shall:

- a. Serve as the representative body of the participating agencies with representatives actively engaged in the support and implementation of the policies, objectives and programs of the CITE Project;
- b. Provide for the election of Executive Board at the May meeting and within the limitations stated in the Bylaws;
- c. Consider and act upon proposed amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws;
- d. Adopt the annual budget;
- e. Take such action not in conflict with this Constitution or bylaws necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of CITE;
- f. Decide all issues requiring voting by majority vote of official delegates present at the General Assembly.

Article IV. Executive Board.

Section 1. There shall be an Executive Board composed of representatives from each agency participating in the Project as identified and

enumerated in the Bylaws. The Director of the Project and one State Department of Education representative shall serve as ex-officio, non-voting members.

Section 2. Terms. Members of the Executive Board shall serve two-year terms. Half of the Board members shall be elected each year. For the first year following the adoption of this Constitution, half of the membership shall be elected for one year, the other half for two-year terms. Elections to the Board shall be conducted at the May meeting.

Section 3. Chairman of the Executive Board. The Executive Board shall elect a Chairman from the membership of the Board. The Chairman shall preside over the meetings of the Executive Board, assist in the preparation of the agenda of meetings, and otherwise assist the Director in the implementation of Board policies and activities.

Section 4. Functions. The Executive Board shall:

- a. Consider and act on all matters of policy, objectives, plans, and standards for programs and resources in accordance with the goals and objectives of the CITE Project;
- b. Serve as the Local Education Authority for fiscal matters, adopt an annual budget, be responsible for approval for payment of all expenditures, approve monthly fiscal reports, present a yearly report at the May General Assembly meeting, and provide an annual audit of the Project;
- c. Select the Director of the Project and determine the terms of his contract with regard to salary and responsibilities;
- d. Designate a treasurer and determine bonds of security;
- e. Designate a secretary to serve the Executive Council to keep appropriate minutes of all meetings;
- f. Consider and act on requests of agencies to become full- or part-time participating members of the Project;
- g. Establish a regular calendar of meetings and call special meetings as requested by one of the participating agencies;
- h. In cooperation with the Director, adopt the agenda and set the date for meetings of the General Assembly;
- i. Assess and evaluate current operations in relation to policy, objectives, plans, and standards;
- j. Represent the interests of those participating agencies

which elected members of the Executive Board and provide means and methods for keeping all participating agencies and members informed of the activities of the Project;

k. In cooperation with the Director, establish and dissolve committees and groups as is necessary to carry out the policies, objectives, plans, and standards of the Project.

Section 5. Voting Procedures. All questions on which a formal vote is requested, either by the Chair or by one member present, shall be decided by majority vote providing a quorum is present. A Quorum shall consist of at least fifty percent of the official Executive Board.

Article V. The Director. Staff.

Section 1. A Director shall be recruited, selected, and appointed by the Executive Board in accordance with criteria established by the Board and the policies and objectives of the CITE Project.

Section 2. Term and Salary. The term and salary of the Director shall be determined by the Executive Board.

Section 3. The Director shall be responsible to the Executive Board.

Section 4. Functions. The Director shall:

a. Administer policies, objectives, and plans developed by the Executive Board;

b. Prepare and administer the budget, as authorized by the Executive Board, and establish a procedure for accounting for expenditures;

c. Serve as a non-voting consultant and adviser to the Executive Board;

d. Initiate and present plans to the Executive Board designed to implement the policies and objectives of the Project;

e. In administering approved policies and programs, be responsible for decision making, organizing and delegating responsibility with respect to daily (or short term) operation of programs, personnel, physical facilities, and finance;

f. Oversee Project activities as developed and/or approved by the Executive Board, facilitating arrangements, assisting groups as needed, and serving as consultant;

g. Serve as the central agent for receiving reports, organizing them for dissemination as required;

- h. Develop a regular means for keeping all participants and agencies informed of the activities, plans, decisions, and accomplishments of the Project;
- i. Assist the Executive Board in the recruitment and selection of individuals and/or groups to serve the Project in consultative and advisory capacities for specified tasks;
- j. In cooperation with the Executive Board, plan the agenda and set the date for the meetings of the General Assembly;
- k. In cooperation with the Chairman of the Executive Board, plan the agenda and set dates for the meetings of the Board;
- l. Prepare an annual written report of CITE activities to be submitted to the Executive Board one month prior to the May General Assembly meeting.

Section 5. Staff. Recruit and select staff for the office of the Director as authorized by the Executive Board.

Article VI. Amendment of the Constitution and Bylaws.

Section 1. Proposal of Amendments: Sponsors. Amendments to the Constitution or the Bylaws may be proposed by one or more of the following sponsors:

- a. By a vote of the Executive Board equal to at least half of the membership of the Executive Board;
- b. By at least two (2) agency delegations to the General Assembly, either by a majority vote of each delegation, or by a petition signed by a majority of the members of each delegation;
- c. By petition of any ten (10) or more official delegates to the General Assembly.

Section 2. Amendment of the Constitution. This Constitution may be amended at a meeting of the General Assembly by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the delegates present and voting if the proposed change shall have been presented to the Executive Board thirty (30) days in advance of consideration by the General Assembly, and if distributed by the Executive Board to the official delegates to the General Assembly fifteen (15) days in advance of consideration by the General Assembly.

Section 3. Amendment of the Bylaws. A proposal for amendment of the Bylaws shall be presented in writing to the Executive Board no later than thirty (30) days preceding a meeting of the General Assembly. The text of the proposed amendment shall be printed and distributed

to official delegates to the General Assembly at least fifteen (15) days in advance of its consideration at such a meeting. The amendment shall be effective if approved by a majority of the delegates present and voting.

Section 4. Voting on Amendments. Effective Date. In voting on proposed amendments to the Constitution or the Bylaws, printed ballots or their equivalents shall be used. Unless the Amendment otherwise provides, it shall take effect thirty (30) days following its adoption.

Section 5. Withdrawal of Proposed Amendments. The sponsor of a proposed amendment to the Constitution or the Bylaws may request its withdrawal as follows:

- a. If proposed by the Executive Board, the request shall be made by signed petition by at least half of the membership of that body;
- b. If proposed by two (2) agency delegations, the request shall be signed by at least two thirds (2/3) of the delegates from each agency;
- c. If proposed petition of any ten (10) or more official delegates to the General Assembly, the request shall be signed by at least two-thirds (2/3) of such delegates.

Requests for withdrawal shall be submitted in writing to the Chairman of the Executive Board three (3) days prior to the date set for consideration of the proposed amendment by the General Assembly. Withdrawal of a proposal shall be effective when consented to by the General Assembly by majority vote of delegates present and voting.

Article VII. Ratification and Effective Date.

This Constitution shall be adopted when ratified by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of members of a General Assembly meeting present and voting. It shall become effective sixty (60) days following ratification by the General Assembly.

PROPOSED BYLAWS

1. Goals and Objectives. The goals and objectives of CITE are stated in Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution. Changes in or additions to the objectives shall be consistent with the goals of the Project and upon two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Executive Board.

2. Membership

2.1. Categories of Membership. Membership in the CITE Project may be drawn from the following categories and sub-categories. Membership becomes effective when application for membership is complete and approved by the Executive Board:

Members of the school community of the schools participating

Members of Boards of Education of school districts with school communities participating in CITE

Members of the BOCES staff serving the area in which participating school communities are located

Members of a school district or school officially designated by Boards of Education in accordance with a Resolution of Commitment. Members are to be selected from each of the following sub-categories (also known as "agencies"):

Superintendent of Schools, or similar district-wide positions

Building principals of the schools designated to participate

Classroom teaching staff of each school participating

Members of professional teacher organizations representing those organizations and not as representatives of the school or school district

Teacher Education Students from the institutions of higher education participating in CITE with two sub-categories:

Undergraduate teacher education students

Graduate teacher education students

Institutions of Higher Education engaged in and/or committed to teacher education with the following sub-categories:

Supervisors of student teaching

Instructors of college courses

Administrators at the institutions of
higher education

2.2. Agencies. An agency engaged as a participant in the CITE Project shall be defined as:

A group of people, an organization, or an institution that meets the requirements of one of the categories or sub-categories of membership in the CITE Project.

The members of each agency shall be that agency's constituency from which representatives to the General Assembly shall be selected. Each agency shall determine its membership consistent with the categories or sub-categories of membership.

2.3. All agencies and members shall be eligible to receive services from CITE consistent with the goals and objectives of the Project and to receive reports and publications of the Project.

2.4. The right to vote and to hold elective office or appointive position shall be limited to active members of the agencies that are full-time participants in the CITE Project, unless otherwise provided by action of the Executive Board.

3. General Assembly. The General Assembly shall be composed of one official delegate from each participating agency with the following exceptions:

Teacher Education Students may have two official delegates from each teacher education institution sending delegates to the General Assembly and six official doctoral student delegates from graduate teacher education institutions sending delegates to the General Assembly

BOCES Districts shall be entitled to two official delegates to the General Assembly

Each Institution of Higher Education, in addition to teacher education students, shall be entitled to one official delegate to the General Assembly from each of the following sub-categories:

Supervisors of student teaching

Instructors of college courses

Administrators at the institution

The New York State Education Department shall be entitled to

two delegates to the General Assembly

4. Executive Board. The Executive Board shall be composed of one representative from each agency with official delegates at the Annual General Meeting, with the following exceptions:

One representative from the Business/Industry category, selected from the Business/Industry delegates to the annual General Assembly

Three Teacher Education Students, selected by the official undergraduate teacher education student delegates at the annual General Assembly

Two Doctoral Teacher Education Students, selected by the official graduate teacher education student delegates to the annual General Assembly

One representative from each Institution of Higher Education, selected by the official delegates of each Institution to the annual General Assembly

One non voting representative from New York State Education Department

The Director of the Project, non voting status.

APPENDIX C

INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON QUALIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL CONTRACT

covering certification of teachers

From: Interstate Agreement of Qualification of Educational Personnel.
Copies on file in the State Education Agency of each
participating state.

The State of New Jersey and the States entering into this contract with
the State of New Jersey hereby covenant and agree as follows:

1. Consideration and Authority

The consideration for this contract is the mutual implementation of
the policy and purpose set forth in the "Interstate Agreement on
Qualification of Educational Personnel" and the benefits flowing
therefrom as declared in the said Interstate Agreement. The authority
for the making of this contract is the "Interstate Agreement on
Qualification of Educational Personnel," as enacted by each of the
contracting States, and the applicable statutes of each such State
in implementation of the Agreement.

2. Incorporation of Interstate Agreement and Definitions

(a) This contract is pursuant to and in implementation of the
"Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel."
All provisions of that Agreement shall govern, to the extent that
they apply to the subject matter of this contract, whether or not
such provisions are specifically set forth or referred to herein.

(b) Terms defined in the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of
Educational Personnel," when used in this contract, shall have the
same meanings as in that Agreement.

(c) As used in this contract, the term "teacher" means a person
whose primary function is to provide instruction to students at the
pre-school or kindergarten level, or in any one or more grades from
Grade 1 to Grade 12, inclusive.

3. Interstate Acceptance: Teacher Preparatory Programs

(a) Any applicant for certification as a teacher, who is a graduate
of a baccalaureate or postbaccalaureate teacher preparatory program
of an institution in any State party to this contract, shall be deemed

to have met all requirements for initial regular certification in any State party to this contract, if all of the following conditions are met:

1. On or after January 1, 1964, the appropriate education agency of the State in which the institution is located has classified the program as being of sufficient caliber to make it acceptable for interstate purposes pursuant to the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel."
2. The institution from which the applicant was graduated and the program which he completed had an accredited or approved status at the time of the applicant's graduation and completion, and the applicant offers such proof as may be required of such graduation and completion.
3. The originating State accepts completion of the program in satisfaction of its educational requirement for a certificate comparable to or broader in scope than the one being applied for in the receiving State.
4. The applicant meets all non educational requirements and all requirements not relating to teaching experience of the State to which application is being made.

(b) Anything in subparagraph (a) hereof to the contrary notwithstanding, each State party to this contract reserves the right to refuse acceptance of an applicant pursuant to this paragraph who is a graduate of a teacher preparatory program offered by an institution which was not accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting body, at the time of the applicant's graduation from the institution.

(c) The States party to this contract agree that in accrediting and approving institutions and programs pursuant to this paragraph they will perform or require the following:

1. Each institution will present evidence satisfactory to the originating State that the teacher preparatory programs being evaluated are systematically planned in a manner reasonably calculated to produce effectively prepared teachers.
2. Final accreditation or approval of the institution and programs occur only after an on site visit by the State.
3. Reasonable opportunity is provided for representatives of each State party to this contract, at their discretion, to be present during such on site visits.

4. The final accreditation or approval of each institution and program is reevaluated at least once every five years.

(d) *The States party to this contract recognize that there are a number of methods which can be employed effectively for the preparation of teachers and the individual States reasonably may elect to require or allow any one or more of such methods to be developed, implemented and employed by teacher preparatory institutions within their borders. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the States party to this contract that in administering their systems and procedures for the approval of teacher preparatory programs they will give due weight and consideration to standards for teacher preparation developed or recommended by generally recognized agencies of the State and Federal Governments having expertise in teacher education and, to standards emanating from professional organizations in education and related fields.*

4. Interstate Acceptance: Certificates and Experience

(a) Any person who holds an initial regular or advanced certificate issued by a State party to this contract, which certificate is still in force, shall be entitled to a like or comparable certificate at the initial regular level in any other State party to this contract, if all of the conditions set forth in this paragraph are met.

(b) The person applying for a certificate pursuant to this paragraph:

1. Has taught in one or more schools or school systems of the States party to this contract for a time totaling at least twenty-seven months during the seven years next preceding the date of application for the certificate. No time shall be counted toward the twenty-seven requirement unless the teaching was performed pursuant to an appointment requiring service for fifty percent or more of the school day during fifty percent or more of the school year.
2. Has taught at least eighteen months of the time required by item 1 hereof under the certificate on the basis of which application is being made for a like or comparable certificate or qualifying document. If no certificate was required pursuant to State law, it shall be sufficient that the applicant taught the grade, subject or subjects to which the certificate applies in a school, attendance at which, satisfies the requirements of the State compulsory school attendance law.
3. Meets all noneducational requirements and all requirements not relating to teaching experience of the State to which application is being made.

(c) This paragraph applies only to persons holding certificates issued in whole or in part on the basis of the holding of a baccalaureate or post baccalaureate degree, but accreditation or approval of the institution or program from which the applicant graduated shall not be material or requisite.

(d) Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to waive or permit the waiver of any requirement that an applicant for a certificate be the holder of a master's or other postbaccalaureate degree, or have completed satisfactorily a prescribed amount of postbaccalaureate study, even if such degree or amount of study was not required for the certificate from another State.

(e) The experience referred to in sub paragraph (b), Items 1 and 2 thereof, shall be only experience of which the administrative or other supervisory authority having charge or direction of the school or school system involved attests to have been satisfactory in quality and manner of performance.

5. Special and Ancillary Requirements

Any requirement of a State party to this contract that an applicant for certification as a teacher have completed specific numbers of course credits in particular subjects or fields of study or have taken courses in local customs, institutions, or history peculiar to a given jurisdiction shall not apply to any applicant graduated from a program in an originating State, if that applicant meets the requirements for initial regular certification pursuant to paragraph 3 of this contract. However, nothing in this contract shall be construed to prevent the application of any requirements which a State may impose as prerequisites for positions requiring advanced education or training beyond that of which an initial regular teaching certificate is evidence.

6. Publication, Transmittal, and Filing

The designated state official of each State party to this contract shall:

(a) Publish a list of all programs which he has classified as acceptable for the purposes of the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel." If acceptability is for particular subject matter areas, as well as for elementary, secondary, or other teacher preparation generally, the subject matter fields for which each program has been classified as acceptable shall be enumerated for each program. If the list required hereby is published by an agency or officer other than the designated state official, he shall secure or reproduce a sufficient supply to meet the requirements of this paragraph.

(b) File or cause to be filed in his office and in the office of

the central state recordskeeping agency copies of each list published or received by him covering programs in his own State and all other States party to this contract.

(c) Transmit to each designated state official of the other States party to this contract at least two copies of the list of programs classified as acceptable by the appropriate education agency of his State.

(d) Upon request, make a copy of any list of acceptable programs for his State available to any person. Such copy shall be furnished either without charge or with a charge no higher than necessary to cover the actual cost of furnishing it.

(e) Revise the list for his own State or secure its revision once in each calendar year, and file and transmit each revision, properly dated to show the date of publication, in the same manner as required for an original list pursuant to items (a) - (c) of this paragraph. Revisions shall be as of July 1 of each year.

(f) If at any time in the interim between the yearly revisions of a list, the designated state official finds that a program is newly acceptable or has newly ceased to be acceptable, he shall publish this information and make transmittals and filings thereof, in the same manner as for a yearly revision.

7. Committee of Administrators

The designated state officials or their representatives of the States party to this contract shall serve as a contract committee to:

(a) Review, publish and alter (when appropriate) procedures and practices in and among the States party to this contract which will assist in achieving the purposes of the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel."

(b) Formulate approval and acceptance processes and standards which are mutually acceptable.

(c) Exchange information.

8. Term

This contract shall be for a term to commence when executed by the first two States becoming parties hereto. Thereafter this contract shall become effective as to any other State upon its completion of mutual execution with another party State as evidenced by subscription hereto. This contract shall terminate on June 30, 1974. It may be renewed for five years or lesser periods. Withdrawal of a State party hereto, except withdrawal by failure to renew, may be on one year's

written notice to the designated state officials and central state recordskeeping agencies of all other States party hereto.

The State of New Jersey, acting by the Secretary of the State Board of Examiners and with the approval of the State Board of Education as authorized by New Jersey Laws of 1969 c.114, hereby contracts with each of the other States in accordance with and as signified by the mutual subscriptions of duly authorized officials of said States indicated and appearing below.

ABOUT ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) forms a nationwide information system designed to serve and advance American education. It was established by the U.S. Office of Education and is now administered by the National Institute of Education. Its basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents (e.g., research reports, articles, theoretical papers, program descriptions, published and unpublished conference papers, newsletters, and curriculum guides or studies) and to publicize the availability of such documents. Central ERIC is the term given to the function of the National Institute of Education, which provides policy, coordination, training funds, and general services to the clearinghouses in the information system. Each clearinghouse focuses its activities on a separate subject-matter area; acquires, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes documents; processes many significant documents into the ERIC system; and publicizes available ideas and information to the education community through its own publications, those of Central ERIC, and other educational media.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND ERIC

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, established June 20, 1968, is sponsored by three professional groups--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); the Association of Teacher Educators; and Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association. It is located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SCOPE OF CLEARINGHOUSE ACTIVITIES

Users of this guide are encouraged to send to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education documents related to its scope, a statement of which follows:

The Clearinghouse is responsible for research reports, curriculum descriptions, theoretical papers, addresses, and other materials relative to the preparation of school personnel (nursery, elementary, secondary, and supporting school personnel); the preparation and development of teacher educators; and the profession of teaching. The scope includes the preparation and continuing development of all instructional personnel, their functions and roles. As of March 1973 the Clearinghouse has also been responsible for selected aspects of health, physical education, and recreation. While the major interest of the Clearinghouse is activities in the U.S., it also is interested in international aspects of these fields.

The scope also guides the Clearinghouse's Advisory and Policy Council and staff in decision making relative to the commissioning of monographs, bibliographies, and directories. The scope is a flexible guide in the idea and information needs of those concerned with the pre- and in-service preparation of school personnel; the profession of teaching; and health, physical education, and recreation.

PRICE LIST

MICROFICHE (MF)		PAPER COPY (HC)	
Number	Price	Number	Price
1 to 5.....	\$.75	1 to 25	\$1.50
6.....	.90	26 to 50	1.85
7.....	1.05	51 to 75	3.15
8.....	1.20	76 to 100	4.20
Each additional microfiche15	Each additional 25 pages	1.20
Postage: \$.18 for up to 60 microfiche \$.08 for each additional 60 fiche		Postage: \$.18 for first 60 pages \$.08 for each additional 60 pages	

STANDING ORDERS

Subscription orders of microfiche copies of all ERIC reports announced in each issue of *Research in Education* average \$116 per month at the rate of 7.8¢ per microfiche. Postage extra.

BACK COLLECTIONS (postage included)

Reports in <i>Research in Education</i> for 1966 and 1967	\$ 351.25
Reports in <i>Research in Education</i> for 1968	1057.37
Reports in <i>Research in Education</i> for 1969	1261.43
Reports in <i>Research in Education</i> for 1970	1284.37
Reports in <i>Research in Education</i> for 1971	1498.96
Reports in <i>Research in Education</i> for 1972	1549.60
Reports in <i>Research in Education</i> for 1973	1351.24
Reports in <i>Research in Education</i> for 1974 (4 issues)	444.89
Entire Collection	8799.11

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS (postage included)

<i>Office of Education Research Reports 1956-65</i>	369.24
<i>Pacesetters in Innovation, Fiscal Year 1966</i>	132.05
<i>Pacesetters in Innovation, Fiscal Year 1967</i>	160.09
<i>Pacesetters in Innovation, Fiscal Year 1968</i>	102.47
<i>Selected Documents on the Disadvantaged</i>	306.06
<i>Selected Documents in Higher Education</i>	140.14
<i>Manpower Research: Inventory for Fiscal Year 1966 and 1967</i>	72.81
<i>Manpower Research: Inventory for Fiscal Year 1968</i>	40.66
<i>Manpower Research: Inventory for Fiscal Year 1969</i>	52.77

NOTE

1. Postage for first class airmail or foreign is extra.
2. Paper copy (HC) will be full page reproductions with heavy paper covers.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

5. LIABILITY

CMIC's liability, if any, arising hereunder shall not exceed restitution of charges.

In no event shall CMIC be liable for special, consequential, or liquidated damages arising from the provision of services hereunder.

6. WARRANTY

CMIC MAKES NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER WHATSOEVER INCLUDING ANY WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

7. QUALITY

CMIC will replace products returned because of reproduction defects or incompleteness. The quality of the input document is not the responsibility of CMIC. Best available copy will be supplied.

8. CHANGES

No waiver, alteration, or modification of any of the provisions hereof shall be binding unless in writing and signed by an officer of CMIC.

9. DEFAULT AND WAIVER

a. If Customer fails with respect to this or any other agreement with CMIC to pay any invoice when due or to accept any shipment as ordered, CMIC may without prejudice to other remedies defer any further shipments until the default is corrected, or cancel this Purchase Order.

b. No course of conduct nor any delay of CMIC in exercising any right hereunder shall waive any rights of CMIC or modify this Agreement.

10. GOVERNING LAW

This Agreement shall be construed to be between merchants. Any question concerning its validity, construction, or performance shall be governed by the laws of the State of New York.

1. PRICE LIST

The prices set forth herein may be changed without notice; however, any price change will be subject to the approval of the National Institute of Education Contracting Officer.

2. PAYMENT

The prices set forth herein do not include any sales, use, excise, or similar taxes which may apply to the sale of microfiche or hard copy to the Customer. The cost of such taxes, if any, shall be borne by the Customer.

Payment shall be made net thirty (30) days from date of invoice. Payment shall be without expense to CMIC.

3. REPRODUCTION

Materials supplied hereunder may only be reproduced for not-for-profit educational institutions and organizations, provided however, that express permission to reproduce a copyrighted document provided hereunder must be obtained in writing from the copyright holder noted on the title page of such copyrighted document.

4. CONTINGENCIES

CMIC shall not be liable to Customer or any other person for any failure or delay in the performance of any obligation if such failure or delay (a) is due to events beyond the control of CMIC including, but not limited to, fire, storm, flood, earthquake, explosion, accident, acts of the public enemy, strikes, lockouts, labor disputes, labor shortage, work stoppages, transportation embargoes or delays, failure or shortage of materials, supplies or machinery, acts of God, or acts or regulations or priorities of the federal, state, or local governments, (b) is due to failures of performance of subcontractors beyond CMIC's control and without negligence on the part of CMIC, or (c) is due to erroneous or incomplete information furnished by Customer.