DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 226   SP 016 883

AUTHOR   Dumaresg, Richard
TITLE   Teacher Education Institutions: Cooperative
                Arrangements Survey, 1980.
INSTITUTION   Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE   80
NOTE   16p.

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *College School Cooperation: Cooperative Programs:
                Curriculum Development: Educational Resources: Higher
                Education: Information Dissemination: Inservice
                Teacher Education: *Institutional Cooperation: Needs
                Assessment: *Program Evaluation: *School Districts:
                *Schools of Education: Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT
        The primary purpose of the reported survey was to
identify the extent of cooperative arrangements between local school
districts and institutions of higher education (IHE's) with approved
teacher education programs. The survey also sought information on
current service activities that IHE's are engaged in with school
districts and the potential need areas in their future relationship
with school districts. The survey population consisted of teacher
education contact persons working at the IHE's. These individuals act
as liaison between the IHE and the Pennsylvania State Department of
Education. Results indicate that although there is widespread
activity on many program levels, there does not seem to be a
significant difference in the organizational activity level. Both
individual professors and the institutions, as a whole, are equally
engaged in cooperative activities with local school districts. There
appears to be a slight movement towards a greater sharing of
resources through information dissemination, exchange of materials,
formalized referral systems, and personnel exchange. This movement
reflects a need felt by both the school system and the IHE's. Other
needs identified were: (1) more information available on educational
innovations: (2) consortial arrangements for developing and providing
cooperative programs: (3) information about resources and technical
assistance: and (4) maintaining a data base for and about education.
Results of the survey questionnaire are appended to this report.
(JD)

Teacher Education Institutions:

Cooperative
Arrangements
Survey

1980

TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS:
COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS SURVEY

1980

Report prepared by:

Richard Dumaresq
Division of Professional Development
Bureau of School Improvement
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
    Dick Thornburgh, *Governor*

Department of Education
    Robert G. Scanlon, *Secretary*

Office *of* Basic Education
    Ronald H. Lewis, *Commissioner*
    Frank J. Moran, *Deputy Commissioner*

Office of Higher Education
    Clayton Sommers, *Commissioner*

Bureau of School Improvement
    Donald Clark, *Director*

Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126

TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS SURVEY

I. PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this survey is to identify the extent of cooperative arrangements between local school districts and institutions of higher education (IHE's) with approved teacher education programs. A second purpose is to identify the types of service activities that IHE's are currently engaged in with school districts. A third purpose is to indicate those cooperative arrangements which IHE's see as potential need areas in their future relationships with school districts.

II. POPULATION

The survey population consisted of 86 teacher education contact persons working at the 86 IHE's with approved teacher education programs.[1] Of the total population 60 contact persons returned usable questionnaires. This provided an overall response rate of 69.7 percent.

The specific breakdown of response by institutional category is as follows:

RESPONSE BY INSTITUTIONAL CATEGORY

	# Responding	Total # by Category	% Responding
Independent Colleges	37	54	68%
Independent Universities	4	10	40%
State Colleges	13	13	100%
State Universities	1	1	100%
State Related Universities	3	4	75%
State Aided Universities	1	2	50%
Branch Campuses	2	2	100%

The above percentages indicate that, with the exception of independent universities, all segments are well represented in the survey results.

---

[1]The term "contact persons" refers to individuals designated by the IHE to act as liaison between the IHE and the Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

III. QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire was adapted from a 1978 NIE national study.[2] The final form of the questionnaire was developed with the assistance of the Division of Teacher Education and the Division of Research in the Department of Education. The instrument was field tested with the help of two college contact persons at a state owned and independent college. A copy of the questionnaire may be found in the Appendix.

The questionnaire was designed to focus on two organizational levels: individual faculty based activity (entrepreneurial commitment) and institution based activity (institutional commitment). This was done to assure that both individual and institutional activity were represented in the final results. In addition, a further check could then be done on the quantity and type of activity engaged in at the two organizational levels.

Survey results of the closed ended items were analyzed using simple frequency counts. Open ended items (2, 4, 6, 8, 11 and 18) were ranked according to frequency with the highest frequency receiving a rank of "1" etc.

In order to determine activities of high interest to teacher education institutions, responses to questionnaire items 20-34 were treated in the following manner: It was assumed that a respondent whose institution was interested in an activity would indicate that interest by marking response choice 1, 2, 3 or 8. Hence, these responses were summed and considered a rough measure of the institutions' interest in an activity. The activities were then ranked according to the degree of interest shown in them, producing the table on page 5.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Results of the survey are found in the Appendix. Percentages refer to the percent of response to that specific item.

---

[2]Lotto, Linda and David Clark. An Assessment of Current and Potential Capacity of Education with Recommendations for Federal Support Strategies. National Institute of Education, San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory, June 1978.

Generally, there is a great deal of cooperative service activity occurring between IHE's and school districts. As one might expect, IHE's with large teacher education departments (state institutions, state related and large independent universities) are considerably more active than IHE's with small teacher education departments.

Although there is widespread activity on many program levels, there does not seem to be a significant difference in the organizational activity level. Both individual professors and the institutions, as a whole, are equally engaged in cooperative activities. However, school districts tend to call on individual faculty members more often, rather than forming institution based relationships. This is not surprising considering the fact that ---few-- institutions report having a formal referral system for handling consulting requests. In addition, other studies have shown the importance and strength of personal relationships when dealing with large organizations. Apparently, school district personnel find it easier to approach individuals known to them rather than attempting to form a relationship with the employing organization.

The types of activities engaged in by IHE's across all organizational levels were fairly common, and, could be described as traditional. Most often cited cooperative activities by rank order included:

1. Inservice workshops
2. Assisting in curriculum development
3. Needs assessment (program planning)
4. Improvement of testing procedures
5. Evaluation (curriculum and support programs)

V. DISCUSSION

Indicators of Emerging Trends in Institutional Cooperative Arrangements

Below are noted those activities which appear infrequently in the survey responses. In short, they are only mentioned once or twice by respondents. Could these "lesser" cooperative arrangement activities be emerging trends? Could they be vestigial activities? Or could they be so much an everyday activity that they were not thought to be worth mentioning? Below is the list of activities mentioned least frequently. This list was compiled from responses to items 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 18 (no rank order).

- Faculty exchange between IHE's and school districts.
- Long range (2-5 years) professional staff development for school districts.
- Helping to develop and then provide technical assistance to locally based teacher centers.
- Problem solving workshops focused on the very specific needs of a building or district (rather than approaching a district with a pre-packaged workshop).
- Institution wide committee charged with handling and directing inquiries regarding resource people to meet the unique needs of the school or district.
- Tripartite committee linking IU, LEA and the IHE.
- Use of other academic departments at colleges to support Teacher Corps, Upward Bound, Elderhostel, migrant children projects.
- Dissemination and exchange of materials.
- Formalized referral service to appropriate department at the higher education institution.
- On-site workshops at a school building.
- In-depth analysis of school climate and follow up for improvement.
- Practice and skill based workshops with an attitudinal change component as opposed to mainly cognitively oriented workshops.

There appears to be a slight movement towards a greater sharing of resources through dissemination of information, exchange of materials, formalized referral systems and personnel exchanges. At the same time, there is some activity focused on solving particular school building concerns through on-site workshops, school climate assessments, problem solving encounters and the development of local teacher centers (modeled perhaps after the federally funded centers). Finally, workshop activity suggests, in one or two instances, a shift from the one or two day in-service workshop to a systematic, long range staff development process that aims at producing lasting attitudinal change while providing practice and skill building experiences.

The data do not indicate how widespread any of the above activities are. However, the activity areas did show up in the results, and there is some support for such practices in recent educational literature, especially in the areas of educational dissemination, staff development and planned change. In short, we may have a glimpse of tomorrow's trends.

In addition to relying on the open ended items to assess current types of cooperative activity, a matrix was provided on the questionnaire (see appendix) to identify high interest and activity levels at IHE's. Below is a table showing high to low ranking of 15 activities engaged in by teacher education components as identified in the research literature.

ACTIVITY	$\%^3$	Rank
Providing consultant assistance to LEA's as a formal service to the institution.	81.9	1
Conducting in-service projects and programs for LEA personnel (excluding regular advanced degree programs).	81.7	2
Education faculty participation in in-service council(s) of intermediate unit(s).	80.9	3
Helping LEA's effect desired changes.	80.3	4
Demonstrating new practices and innovations to LEA's.	77.9	5
Evaluating LEA practices.	77.6	6
Conducting field service projects with/ for LEA's.	73.9	7
Disseminating information about educational innovations to LEA's.	73.8	8
Servicing and nurturing new programs that have been installed in LEA's.	71.9	9
Producing basic knowledge about education.	71.2	10
Producing applied knowledge about education.	70.7	11
Developing educational products (e.g., tests, other curricular materials) to meet needs of LEA.	69.7	12
Consortial arrangements with other higher education institutions for developing and providing cooperative programs with LEA's.	66.1	13
Disseminating information about resources and technical assistance offered to LEA's.	65.8	14
Maintaining a data base for/about education.	56.4	15

[3]Percent of respondents who answered the questionnaire item by marking a 1, 2, 3 or 8 response choice.

Not surprisingly, the most highly valued matrix items (ranked 1-6 above) were also mentioned in the open ended questionnaire items as those activities which institutions and individual faculty were most often engaged in. These appear, once again, to be the traditional cooperative service activities.

On the other hand, it was noted that items 8, 13, 14 and 15, above, although not rated as high interest activities, were rated on the matrix (see appendix) as the most highly needed activities. These four low ranked activities, interestingly enough, closely parallel those activities cited as possible emerging trends in a previous section of this paper. The identified matrix activities are:

8. Disseminating information about educational innovations to LEA's.

13. Consortial arrangements with other higher education institutions for developing and providing cooperative programs with LEA's.

14. Disseminating information about resources and technical assistance offered to LEA's.

15. Maintaining a data base for/about education.

The fact that the above four areas were identified as high need areas for IHE's, shows that there is a clear recognition regarding the needs and future relationships of teacher preparation organizations and school districts. College faculty members and administrators who answered the questionnaire were reflecting the recent educational research literature. Respondents clearly indicated the activities they perceived to be important for the coming decade. The question, of course, remains: will the institutions possessing the resource capabilities be able to shift their emphases to meet the emerging needs of school districts and school buildings? Part of that answer may lie in the response to survey item 36. While 46 percent of the respondents indicated that they were undecided about whether to expand their present involvement with school districts, 44 percent reported that they would be expanding cooperative activities in the near future.

VI. CONCLUSION

Dissemination and Utilization

In educational circles it often happens that once a survey is completed and the information analyzed, there is a brief circulation period, and then the data are filed away. It is not the intent of the Pennsylvania Department of Education to allow that to happen to the information collected in the open ended sections of the survey.

Instead, the data will be viewed as a starting point for collecting more definitive information on existing cooperative arrangements between IHE's and local school districts. This information will then be placed in the Pennsylvania Educational Resources file under the Promising Practices category. The information on this computerized file will be available to all intermediate unit, IHE and school district personnel throughout Pennsylvania. It is hoped that the dissemination of such information may eventually spark the development of additional cooperative activities among IHE's, school districts and intermediate units.

For additional information about the report or the types of programs offered by specific institutions, please call Richard Dumaresq (717-783-3747).

A P P E N D I X

TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS:
COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS SURVEY

Instructions

Please answer all items. If the space provided is insufficient, please attach additonal pages and number each item as necessary.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Richard Dumerasq at (717) 783-3747.

Definition

For the purpose of this survey, cooperative arrangements are defined as the delivery of any educational services by faculty (acting as independant agent(s) or as designated representative(s) of the institution) to a school district, school building, and/ or intermediate unit. Services may include, for example, demonstrating a new teaching technique, developing a program evaluation process, assisting in the selection of new course materials. Providing inservice courses, implementing a needs assessment or self study, etc.

Special Note

Item 11 refers to what you consider to be your most significant cooperative program. With your permission (Item 12), your answer will be listed in a statewide resource data bank of model cooperative Projects. Please be as specific as possible when answering Item 11. Include the Purpose of the Project, specific services and particular/desired outcomes.

Thank you for your help.

---

1. Has your *institution* (i.e., not individual faculty members acting on their own) participated in a cooperative Program(s) with schools, school districts and/or inter-mediate units in the past two academic years?

   Yes __69.1%__ No __30.9%__(If *No*, proceed to Item 4.)
      (1)   (2)

2. What was the Purpose of the cooperative Program(s)? (For example, needs assessment, demonstrating a new teaching technique, assistance in selecting new practices responsive to local needs, program evaluation, inservice education.)

   (a) In-service involvement mainly through workshops

   (b) Assisting in curriculum development

   (c) Needs assessment

   (d) Evaluation

3. Does your institution maintain a committee charged with responsibility for stimulating, coordinating and/or supporting cooperative programs with schools, school districts and/or intermediate units?

   Yes __31.9%__ No __68.1%__
      (1)   (2)

4. If *Yes*, Please specify the primary responsibilities and/or emphases of the committee's work.

   (a) Inservice involvement - planning programs, evaluation.

   (b) Teacher education -planning, evaluation, revision through committees and cooperation/liaison with schools

5. At your institution are there any special arrangements (e.g., joint appointments or interdepartmental projects) which bring together education faculty and faculty from other academic units to work on cooperative projects with schools, school districts and/or intermediate units?

   Yes __45.4%__ No __54.5%__
      (1)   (2)

6. If *Yes*, please describe the arrangements briefly.

   (a) Inter-disciplinary cooperation

   (b) Student teaching supervision and evaluation

   (c) In-service involvement

   (d) Programs provided for specific needs of school districts.

7. Does your institution service arrangements with schools, school districts and/or intermediate units in which faculty members participate *as a part of their regular load?*

Yes <u>21.1%</u> No <u>78.9%</u>
    (1)   (2)

8. If *Yes*, please list some examples of services performed, (e.g., conducting curriculum survey, ran on-site needs assessment workshop, etc.)?

(a) <u>Workshops</u>

(b) <u>In-service involvement</u>

(c) <u>Needs assessment</u>

9. How often do schools, school districts and/or intermediate units request formal assistance from your institution (as an institution) for service projects (e.g., help in adopting or generating new programs, help in solving local problems, etc.)? (Check *one.*)

<u>8.9%</u> Frequently (3 or more times a month)
   (1)

<u>19.6%</u> Occasionally (once or twice every month)
   (2)

<u>51.8%</u> Rarely (two or three times a year)
   (3)

<u>19.6%</u> Never
   (4)

10. Is your institution currently participating in or planning an especially innovative cooperative program with a school, school district and/or intermediate unit?

Yes <u>41.1%</u> No <u>58.9%</u>
    (1)   (2)

11. If *Yes*, please describe the program below.

(a) <u>"Teacher Corps" - program designed</u>
<u>to improve instruction in public schools</u>

(b) <u>Use of television for classroom</u>
<u>instruction.</u>

(c) <u>Speech and language services for</u>
<u>hearing impaired.</u>

(d) <u>Ethnic heritage program.</u>

(e) <u>Summer activities for gifted</u>
<u>students.</u>

12. May we share this description with others?

Yes <u>N/A</u> No <u>N/A</u>
    (1)   (2)

13. Sometimes an *institution* is not involved in cooperative projects with schools, school districts and/or intermediate units, although its faculty, acting independently, are. Is this the case with your institution?

<u>50.8%</u> Yes
   (1)

<u>15.8%</u> No (If *No,* proceed to Item 19.)
   (2)

<u>31.6%</u> Faculty are involved both independently and
   (3)   through institutional involvement.
1.8% No Response

14. Approximately how many of your teacher education faculty are independently involved during an average academic year?

<u>N/A</u> Faculty members acting independently.

15. These faculty represent what percent of total education faculty?

<u>N/A</u> %

16. Who typically initiates this involvement?

<u>11.9%</u> Faculty   20.3% No response
<u>52.5%</u> School District/IU
15.3% Both

17. How often do schools, school districts and/or intermediate units make requests of assistance from your faculty? (*Check one.*)

<u>15.3%</u> Frequently (3 or more times a month)
   (1)

<u>25.4%</u> Occasionally (once or twice every month)
   (2)

<u>44.1%</u> Rarely (two or three times a year)
   (3)

<u>1.7%</u> Never
   (4)
13.5% No response

18. Please list examples of the services performed by faculty members acting independently (e.g., conducted curriculum survey, ran on-site needs assessment workshops, etc.).

(a) <u>Workshops held by faculty in curriculum</u>
<u>and up-dating instructional techniques</u>

(b) <u>In-service involvement - workshops</u>
<u>and programs</u>

(c) <u>Evaluation of school's curriculum,</u>
<u>testing program (needs assessment)</u>

19. Some institutions are seeking ways to alter their present faculty reward structures to create more incentives for faculty participation in cooperative programs with

schools. school districts and/or intermediate units. If you have any suggestions. please write them below.

(a) Count faculty involvement with

   school districts. as workload

(b) Equate collegiate credit with faculty

   involvement

(c) Re-evaluate PDE's rigid limits

   on use of staff and funds.

Listed below are some activities often engaged in by teacher education institutions. Please indicate your *institution's* involvement in each activity by checking the appropriate space(s). (In the matrix "LEA" means "local education agency," which, in this case, should be construed to include both public and Private schools, school districts and/or intermediate units.

Activity	In Operation 1	Being Planned 2	Needed 3	Not Needed 4	Not Interested 5	Could Use Outside Aid to Develop 6	Could Help Others to Develop 7	Some Faculty Acting Independently Are Involved 8
20. Developing educational products (e.g., texts, other curricular materials) to meet needs of LEA.	7.6%	4.5%	25.8%	3.0%	1.5%	4.5%	21.2%	31.8%
21. Disseminating information about educational innovations to LEA's.	12.3%	10.8%	21.5%	3.1%	1.5%	4.6%	16.9%	29.2%
22. Helping LEA's effect desired changes.	19.7%	8.2%	23.0%	1.6%	–	6.6%	11.5%	29.5%
23. Evaluating LEA Practices.	13.4%	6.0%	26.9%	1.5%	4.5%	6.0%	10.4%	31.3%
24. Producing basic knowledge about education.	19.7%	7.6%	21.2%	3.0%	–	9.1%	16.7%	22.7%
25. Producing applied knowledge about education.	23.1%	6.2%	20.0%	1.5%	–	7.7%	20.0%	21.5%
26. Maintaining a data base for/about education.	10.9%	5.5%	32.7%	3.6%	9.1%	14.5%	16.4%	7.3%
27. Conducting inservice projects and programs for LEA personnel (excluding regular advanced degree Programs).	26.8%	7.3%	17.1%	1.2%	–	4.9%	12.2%	30.5%
28. Providing consultant assistance to LEA's as a formal service of the institution.	19.7%	9.1%	27.3%	1.5%	1.5%	4.5%	10.6%	25.8%
29. Conducting field service Projects with/for LEA's.	20.0%	6.2%	24.6%	3.1%	1.5%	6.2%	15.4%	23.1%
30. Demonstrating new Practices and innovations to LEA's.	14.7%	10.3%	25.0%	2.9%	–	5.9%	13.2%	27.9%
31. Servicing and nurturing new programs that have been installed in LEA's.	12.3%	7.0%	33.3%	3.5%	5.3%	3.5%	15.8%	19.3%
32. Disseminating information about resources and technical assistance offered to LEA's.	9.3%	11.1%	29.6%	3.7%	11.1%	3.7%	16.7%	14.8%
33. Consortial arrangements with other higher education institutions for developing and providing cooperative Programs with LEA's.	16.9%	5.1%	40.7%	3.4%	1.7%	11.9%	16.9%	3.4%
34. Education faculty participation in inservice council(s) of intermediate unit(s).	42.9%	1.6%	15.9%	4.8%	–	3.2%	11.1%	20.6%
35. Other (specify).	66.7%	–	–	–	–	–	16.7%	16.7%

15

36. Is your institution planning to expand its present involvement in cooperative service to schools, school districts and/or intermediate units in the near future?

Yes <u>44.4%</u>   No <u>9.3%</u>   Undecided <u>46.3%</u>
    (1)   (2)   (3)

37. Who is the person to contact at your institution regarding cooperative services?

Name _____

Title _____

Address _____

_____

Phone _____

Institution: _____

38. Would you like to receive a summary of the responses to this questionnaire?

Yes _____   No _____
     (1)   (2)

39. Other then that provided in Item 11, may we share this information with others?

Yes _____   No _____
     (1)   (2)

Please return to: Dr. Clayton Sommers by March 24, 1980
                      Commissioner for Higher Education
                      Pennsylvania Department of Education
                      333 Market Street
                      Harrisburg, PA 17126