

Student Work

2-1-1977

A Survey of Teacher In-Service Education in Nebraska's Class II Schools

Cal B. Bone
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Bone, Cal B., "A Survey of Teacher In-Service Education in Nebraska's Class II Schools" (1977). *Student Work*. 2496.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2496>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



A SURVEY OF TEACHER IN-SERVICE EDUCATION
IN NEBRASKA'S CLASS II SCHOOLS

Presented to the

Graduate Faculty
University of Nebraska
at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Cal B. Bone

February, 1977

UMI Number: EP74041

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74041

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

FIELD PROJECT ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the Graduate Faculty, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Supervisory Committee

Name	Department
<u>James W. Salee</u>	<u>Ed. Foundations</u>
<u>George R. Lacyford</u>	<u>Ed. Ad.</u>

Darrell Kellam Ed Ad
Chairman

3-9-77
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
THE PROBLEM	2
Statement of the problem	2
HYPOTHESES	2
PROCEDURE	2
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	3
SIGNIFICANCE OR IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY	3
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	4
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	15
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	17
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	25
SUMMARY	25
CONCLUSIONS	26
RECOMMENDATIONS	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	27
APPENDIX	30

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Status of Teacher In-Service Programs	17
II. Motivation for Participation	18
III. Planning and Execution of Programs	19
IV. Schedules of Programs	20
V. Program Length	20
VI. Activities for In-Service Education Programs . . .	22

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance and need for in-service education for educational personnel is high-lighted by the rapid expansion of knowledge. That expansion, coupled with changing methods and developing technology, has created a need for a systematic program that makes provision for professional growth of teachers while in-service.

Small school systems often have little or no in-service programs because of limited resources such as personnel, time, money and the expertise necessary to construct such programs. They rely on other agencies to provide these services. In many cases, the faculty meeting is the sole activity of a school system in-service program. It is usually rated low as a technique by teachers and is frequently devoted primarily to routine problems of administration.

Experience with Class II schools of Nebraska, which are located in communities of less than 1000 population, revealed that they were aware of the need for in-service education programs and would like to have provided such programs but could discern no way of accomplishing such provisions. They felt restricted by resources that were severely limited and looked to other agencies for the provision of in-service activities.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to survey selected, current practices of teacher in-service education programs in the eighty-eight Class II school districts of Nebraska.

HYPOTHESES

Most small school systems do not have a systematic teacher in-service program. Of those that do, the administrators, or their representatives, are responsible for planning and presenting elements of in-service education to teachers. The activities that comprise these programs are limited in variety. The purpose of this study is to investigate the need for a change in philosophy and practices of those persons responsible for in-service programs to make them current with recent findings.

PROCEDURE

To accomplish the investigation, the problem was divided into five steps, as follows:

1. Review the literature related to this investigation.
2. Construct a survey blank as an instrument to survey the 88 Class II school administrators.
3. Conduct the survey.

4. Classify, analyze and interpret data.
5. Draw generalizations and implications from study.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study was divided into five chapters. Chapter One, as an introduction, discussed the need for this study. In Chapter Two, a review of the related literature was presented. The design of the study was described in Chapter Three. Data was presented and analyzed in Chapter Four, with the summary, conclusions and recommendations stated in Chapter Five.

SIGNIFICANCE OR IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study will seek to identify the lack of services and enumerate the need for in-service education activities in the Class II schools of Nebraska. This information will suggest ways and methods by which administrators in the small schools of Nebraska can up-grade and increase the in-service educational programs of their schools.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Most educators agree that pre-service training does not adequately prepare a teacher for the exigencies he or she might face. They state that it is impossible to do so. Most recommend that a planned, comprehensive program should be developed to help teachers realize their potential, while helping them correct deficiencies in their training and to prepare for new responsibilities. One of the best, broad definitions of teacher in-service education is by Edelfelt and Johnson: "...any professional development activity that a teacher undertakes singly or with other teachers after receiving her or his initial teaching certificate and after beginning practice."¹

Operating within this broad definition of teacher in-service education, the teacher shares with the administrator the responsibility for his or her education within a loosely knit relationship. It is, however, when that responsibility is assumed by, assigned to or delegated to administration in whatever degree is applicable in a local situation that teacher in-service education has been

¹ Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson (Editors), Rethinking In-Service Education, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975), p. 5.

of concern to school administrators who desire to increase the effectiveness of teachers and programs in the classroom. Traditionally, within formal in-service programs, this responsibility was accepted by the administrator and is one of three approaches to developing in-service programs discussed by Archer.² It is the centralized approach and is particularly prevalent among smaller systems. Another approach is the decentralized approach and is utilized by some larger school systems where the teachers completely develop the program themselves. In-service activities developed by teachers and representatives of administration are most popular with teachers and most strongly recommended by them.

Childress, while surveying available literature and research, found that most small school systems (particularly small secondary schools) do not provide systematic in-service programs.³ Many, however, do provide in-service activities for professional growth.

Childress reiterated what Archer had reported ten years

²Clifford P. Archer, "In-Service Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, (3d ed.) (Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1959), pp. 702-08

³Jack R. Childress, "In-Service Education of Teachers." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, (4th ed.) (Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1969), p. 646.

before that many school systems have a contractual requirement for participation, establishing that participation be a professional obligation.⁴ Other systems depend on the professional commitment of teachers to insure their participation. In addition, many schools provide, as an incentive for participation, released time from regular educational responsibilities. Sometimes, a program will begin within the released time period and extend past the regular school day, requiring the teacher to invest some time. The length of this time often ranges from one hour to a day or more.

Educators agree that there is no one best in-service activity. They propose that programs of continuing teacher education should continuously consider, create and increase the number of instructional options. "Teacher in-service education should emphasize instructional alternatives rather than single methods."⁵

Workshops are the most used form and are characterized by practicality.⁶ Teachers are allowed to have hands-on

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Louis J. Rubin, Improving In-Service Education; Proposals and Procedures for Change. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971) p. 70.

⁶ Archer, Op Cit, p. 706

experiences with practical ideas and materials. Workshops provide fruitful grounds for new ideas. Participants have an opportunity to develop new skills and acquire new knowledge and stimulation. A workshop allows the professional staff to feel it has been a part of cooperative effort and, at the end, to feel it has made progress toward self-determined goals.

Faculty meetings have been utilized frequently.⁷ In a large number of systems, they are identified as the sole activity in a program, particularly if the system is small and the meeting is utilized mainly for administrative purposes. The meetings are often unpopular with teachers but they should not be and need not be dismissed as valueless. Because of the history of their use, it would be discreet if they were to be carefully planned and designed to vault these negative restraints or images. They can be used positively from inherent strengths if potential weaknesses are identified.

Conferences, another popular activity, are usually organized around an interesting or controversial theme, utilizing a speaker or speakers to open discussion, and participants who listen, question, contribute, discuss and

⁷Ibid., p. 706

evaluate.⁸ It is recommended that the school personnel should participate in the planning, that conferences should be linked to current in-service education projects and that successful in-service education groups should share their experiences with other groups within the system and in other systems. The sharing process can be a learning activity for each and should be considered relative to the other activities.

Seminars comprise a kind of self-help and can be of immense help if the needs of individual participants are nearly the same.⁹ Each participant has an obligation to make a contribution of value to others. The contribution can be psychological, educational and/or professional. The success of this activity is dependent upon the skill of the person organizing it.

Teacher visitation is becoming increasingly popular because teachers like to visit other teachers and watch them

8

Maucker, J. W. and Daryl Pendergraft, "Implications of In-Service Education Programs for Teacher Education Institutions." In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, National Society for the Study of Education, 1957, p. 376.

⁹Hass, C. Glen, "In-Service Education Today," In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and National Society for the Study of Education. National Society for the Study of Education, 1957, p. 376.

work.¹⁰ They want to observe innovative practices. They want to observe how their peers behave in situations similar to their own. They feel that observing someone else at work might provide an understanding of their own problems. These visitations may be to other rooms within the school but too often there is a tendency to overlook this very valuable resource within the system or to go to systems within the city, county, state or country.

Demonstration teaching within the classroom is a powerful agent for change.¹¹ Many times, this activity has been relegated to the realm of supervision and not recognized for its value to teacher in-service education. A master teacher can give assistance by working through the problem, dealing with many of the circumstances that hamper the effectiveness of the regular teacher. The regular teacher can observe another working with students, seeing those students from a different perspective. An additional

¹⁰California Council on Teacher Education. Toward Better Teachers, Bulletin V. 26, No. 3. California State Department of Education, 1957. p. 36.

¹¹Peltz, R. B., "Recommendations for an In-Service Program for the Ashland City Elementary Schools Based on a Study of the Recent Literature and the Expressed Interests of the Teaching Staff", Masters Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1969, p. 150.

value is that the demonstrating teacher will also serve as a resource person, adding a value that is usually identified as a strength of team teaching. It is important that care be taken to help the regular teacher recognize the inhibiting and exhibiting characteristics that pervade the situation. Both teachers should take into account that student behavior and performance may be greatly stimulated by this activity and not be a normal representation of a classroom. Both teachers must be involved in the process from planning through evaluation.

Consultation with an expert is a valuable in-service activity.¹² Consultants often utilize demonstration teaching but their primary concern is to determine which activity will do the job best. A consultant might function as an answer-giver, and must guard against being utilized only in this capacity. A consultant must be a good listener, sometimes allowing the teacher to verbalize until a conclusion is reached. In evaluation, care must be taken so that the teacher does not feel threatened. As an information gatherer, a consultant functions as an important resource person and can serve as an effective critic. A consultant can be found for almost any problem, with almost

¹²Childress, op. cit., p. 650

any skill. Sometimes, the consultant will be unable to address the problem at the level desired because of lack of time to become acquainted with special needs or characteristics. Also, care should be taken so that the appropriate consultant is chosen. When this activity is properly developed, teachers value it as a form of individualization addressed to their needs.

Television promised to be a big help to teacher in-service education programs.¹³ Part of that promise was fulfilled but its use was found to be dependent upon an association with other efforts. Other professions (medical, dental and law), through use of government sponsored programs, have developed extensive use of television in pre-service and in-service education programs. In some school systems, open-circuit and closed-circuit television is utilized for general activities, development of special lessons, for methodology and orientation and for work in special subject areas. In Atlanta, Georgia, television was used for visits from outstanding consultants. It was found that several independent schools and school districts could develop a lesson independently for a cooperative multi-lesson educational television series, planning those lessons

¹³Ibid., p. 649.

during cooperative meetings. Other systems utilize programs presented on the public broadcasting system and through commercial programming. Video tape recorders have been used to help teachers consider and evaluate their own performances and teaching styles, allowing them the opportunity to objectively observe themselves.

Some school systems will accept academic training as an element of in-service education of their teachers and colleges and universities have been willing to develop and present courses at various times for the convenience of the teachers.¹⁴ Courses are offered at night, afternoon, Saturdays, during the summer, by correspondence. Some are provided by college faculty members, by school district faculty members and by intermediate service unit personnel.

Teacher centers have been used to help teachers with ideas and materials. Educators in Michigan wanted to broaden this concept to mean not only a physical location but also to refer to a program concept for in-service educational workers only and conceived of the idea for Professional Development Centers. In January, 1975, the State Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation and Professional Development, State of Michigan adopted

¹⁴Archer, op. cit., p. 707

"Guidelines Which Should Give Direction to the Establishment of Pilot Professional Development Centers."¹⁵

Activities that were normally considered belonging in other areas are now being utilized as fruitful activities for inclusion in an in-service program. For instance, interviewing persons who have appropriate knowledge and understanding to make a contribution to the solution of the problem at hand; Brainstorming, long an appropriate and valued tool of advertising agencies and organizations involved with problem-solving; Group discussion, a highly organized activity, can be applied directly to a problem; Buzz sessions can be the forerunner to brain-storming and group discussions;¹⁶ Participating in curriculum planning; Participation in curriculum evaluation; Using or developing exhibits; Handbook preparation; Individual project; Travel; Forums; Lectures; and the mutual value of the shared experiences and talents of team teaching.¹⁷

¹⁵Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson (Editors), Rethinking In-Service Education, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975) p. 85.

¹⁶William G. Monahan and Howard C. Miller, Planning and Developing In-Service Education. Iowa Center for Research in School Administration, Iowa University, 1970, 27 pp.

¹⁷Rubin, op. cit.

Packaged in-service programs have been offered as a solution to the problems of lack of resources and expertise.¹⁸ While many are of high quality and well constructed, many have been unsuccessful for a variety of reasons: too difficult or too elementary; not designed for particular needs; already out-of-date; did not deliver what it had promised; and, dull and uninteresting. Since in-service programs should be the result of cooperative planning by teachers and administrators and having grown out of their personal and professional needs, it is a rare pre-packaged program that can match the strengths of one built within the school system.

¹⁸Edelfelt, op. cit., pp 43-45

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Because of the uncertainty of definitive boundaries of teacher in-service education, no attempt was made to create a comprehensive study. Instead, it was meant to be selective so as to identify trends within a defined geographic area and from specific respondents. This sampling would be compared with what has been found in related literature. Strong similarities would indicate general agreement.

The survey was sent to each of the eighty-eight superintendents of the Class II school districts in Nebraska in March, 1976, asking that they complete and return, assuring them that their responses would be kept confidential. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included for the return of the questionnaire. Fifty-three of them were returned by the end of April.

This survey was designed to determine (1) whether a systematic teacher in-service education program exists in each of eighty-eight class II districts and (2) if there is not one now, is one being planned?

Additional information was sought concerning how participants were motivated who is responsible for planning and implementing in-service, and when in-service programs are held.

Respondents were asked to (1) evaluate their present in-service, (2) suggest improvements and (3) state their philosophy concerning in-service education.

Finally, the respondents were asked to list the activities in their present program as well as activities they might wish to have.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Fifty-Three of the eighty-eight administrators of the Class II school districts of Nebraska responded to the questionnaire. This represents over 60 percent.

TABLE I

STATUS OF TEACHER IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

- Number responding
% - Percentage of those responding to item.

ITEM	#	%	Yes	%	No	%
1. Provide systematic program?	53	60	22	41	31	59
2. If not, future plans for one?	30	34	12	40	18	60
3. Required teacher participation.	22	25	13	59	9	41

Of the fifty-three administrators who responded, twenty-two percent indicated that their school systems provided systematic in-service programs. Fifty-nine percent of the responding administrators indicated they did not have systematic programs. Of those who did not provide a program, sixty percent stated they did not plan to have programs in the future. This is in line with what Archer and Childress found.^{19, 20}

¹⁹Archer, op. cit., p. 702

²⁰Childress, op. cit., p. 647

Of the fifty-three participating administrators, twenty-two responded to Item 3 of the questionnaire, twenty-five percent. Fifty-nine percent of those indicated that the teachers of their system were required to participate. One stated that it was school board policy.

TABLE II

MOTIVATION FOR PARTICIPATION

# - Number of administrators responding % - Percent of those administrators Some responded more than once		
Type of motivation	#	%
Salary increment	39	44
Professional growth	1	2
Released time	33	85
Other	8	21

Forty-four percent of the administrators who responded indicated that at least one form of motivation was offered for participation. Most responded to more than one form. Eighty-five percent indicated that their school systems provided released time. Twenty-one percent provided professional growth credit, two percent utilized salary increment and twenty-one percent provided a variety of other inducements.

TABLE III
PLANNING AND EXECUTION OF PROGRAMS

# - Number of administrators responding % - Percent of those administrators Some responded more than once		
	#	%
Practice		
Administrators	15	31
Administrators and teachers.	11	23
Teachers	7	15
Other combinations	13	27
Theory		
Administrators	4	8
Teachers	2	4
Administrators and teachers.	22	45
Administrators, teachers and consultants	21	43
Other combinations	10	20

In theory, planning for in-service activities should be a cooperative venture, according to eighty-eight percent of those responding. Only eight percent believed that the administrators should plan and execute the programs and four percent felt the teachers should do so. In practice, thirty-one percent said that administrators planned and executed the programs. Twenty-three percent of the administrators said this responsibility was shared by administrators and teachers. Thirty-two percent of the respondents said that other combinations of planners took that responsibility.

TABLE IV

SCHEDULE OF PROGRAMS

# - Number of administrators responding		
% - Percent of those administrators		
Some responded more than once		
	#	%
Release time	39	44
After school	26	58
Before school	14	31
Weekend	5	10

Of the forty-five administrators who responded, most indicated that more than one time was utilized for in-service programs. Forty-four percent utilized released time, fifty-eight percent offered activities after school, thirty-one percent presented before-school activities and ten percent used weekends.

TABLE V

PROGRAM LENGTH

# - Number of administrators responding		
% - Percent of those administrators		
Some responded more than once		
	#	%
Full day	15	43
Half day	14	40
Quarter day	11	31
One hour	14	40

In response to the query about the amount of time spent on each activity, forty percent indicated half day, thirty-one percent quarter day and forty percent one hour.

When asked about program evaluation, most of those responding said there was none. The evaluation that was done was informal and observational. Some noted changes in teaching techniques and attributed those changes to the program. Some respondents noted increased awareness of teachers about current problems, acceptance of responsibility and improved morale and professionalism.

The administrators had suggestions for the improvement of teacher in-service education programs. Several wanted the Educational Service Units to prepare and present the programs. Others wanted help from the Nebraska State Education Association, State Department of Education or the universities. One suggested that the programs should be planned to address the particular needs of small schools. Another suggested cooperative programs so that consultants of national stature with new ideas could be brought in. It was suggested that resource teachers who travel from school to school would be of value. The Helpmobile was recommended as an idea that works in an outstanding way. An in-service manual with instructions of "How to..." and a list of subjects pertinent to the school situation, revised annually, was suggested.

TABLE VI

ACTIVITIES FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

	#	%	*	%
# - Administrators who use activity				
* - Administrators who would like to use it				
% - Percentage of those responding (47 of 53 responded--89 percent)				
Curriculum committee membership.	21	45	16	34
Workshops.	43	92	13	28
Consultation with experts.	27	57	15	32
Field trips.	24	51	10	21
Orientation.	35	74	8	17
Conversations.	22	47	7	15
Forums	4	9	6	13
Lectures	11	23	5	10
Committee service.	8	17	7	15
Team teaching.	3	6	11	23
Observation visits to other schools.	26	55	21	45
Bulletin board preparation	10	21	9	19
Individual study	8	17	10	21
Book report.	1	2	2	5
Pre-opening meeting.	33	70	4	9
Demonstrations	15	32	14	30
Discussion	15	32	6	13
Meetings	23	49	2	5
Panel discussion	5	10	6	13
Faculty meetings	38	80	6	13
Routing slips.	12	26	2	5
Exhibits	10	21	7	15
Brainstorming.	8	17	8	17
Travel	5	10	17	36
Curriculum evaluation.	21	45	17	36
Oral presentations	8	17	6	13
Handbook preparation	13	28	11	23
Individual project - self initiated.	7	15	20	43

The five activities reported as most used by the responding administrators (listed in order of preference) were workshops, faculty meetings, orientation, pre-opening meetings and consultations with experts. Thirteen

administrators would like to use workshops in a program in the future and fifteen would like to use consultation with experts. The five activities marked most often as "those you would like to do" were observation visits to other schools, individual project (self-initiated), travel, curriculum evaluation and membership on curriculum planning committees. No one was using book reports but two administrators would like to do so. Only two were using team teaching but twelve would like to do so. Five indicated travel as an activity in their school system in-service education and seventeen would like for it to be a part of their programs.

There was a variety of other activities that had been used and found successful by respondents. "We are fortunate to live in a school where teachers eat lunch together every day and can gather at recess breaks," wrote one administrator. Another recommendation was to have articles in a newsletter from the Educational Service Unit. Also recommended was Teacher Effectiveness Training, Classroom UPDATE, and departmental all-day workshops conducted by the State Department of Education and the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. It was suggested by one that having graduates return and speak would be of value.

Only two administrators suggested other activities they would consider appropriate and would like to use. One wrote,

"Would like something to help teacher--not something that sounds important by an expert that hasn't been in a public school classroom for 10-20 years." The other wrote, "Alteration of teaching assignments from year to year to stimulate getting out of 'old ruts'."

There appeared to be a pervasive desire for someone outside the school system to furnish leadership in the development of teacher in-service education. Many suggested that the Educational Service Units provide some or all of the activities of a particular program. Other sources of aid suggested were the State Department of Education and Nebraska State Education Association.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to survey representative, current practices of teacher in-service education in the Class II schools of Nebraska, compare those practices with those nationwide and suggest changes. Sixty-three (60 percent) of the administrators of the eighty-eight Class II schools responded.

It was found that most of the Class II schools in Nebraska do not have a systematic in-service education program and most of those do not plan to have one. Most do not have a contract requirement for participation, relying on such inducements as released time and professional growth credit to motivate the teachers. It is generally agreed that it is the administrators who plan and execute the program but they feel that it should be done by a team composed of administrators and teachers. Very little evaluation of the effects of the activities was in evidence.

Workshops were the most popular of in-service activities. Other popular ones were faculty meetings, orientation, pre-opening meeting and consultation with experts. The survey indicated a desire to try such activities as observation visits to other schools, individual projects, travel,

curriculum evaluation and membership on curriculum planning committees. Few other suggestions for activities were listed.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Teacher in-service education in Class II schools of Nebraska follow the pattern of those nationwide, for apparently the same reasons.
2. Administrators are aware of recent findings and recommendations regarding teacher in-service education.
3. Leadership for the development of in-service programs is sought from the school system, even though it is recognized that the strongest programs are those cooperatively developed by a team of administrators and teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the findings in this study, the following recommendations are:

1. That provisions be made, as a college course or workshop, for instruction in the development of viable in-service programs, attracting both teachers and administrators.
2. That awareness be developed of the rich resources available potentially in each teacher for use.
3. That educators investigate the possibility of a cooperative venture in in-service education programs.
4. That consideration be given to the development of "professional development centers" to provide opportunity for personal professional growth.


BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Archer, Clifford P., "In-Service Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Third Edition, (Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association, 1960)
- 2., Berge, Marvin L., Harris E. Russell and Charles B. Walden, "In-Service Education Programs of Local School Systems", In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, National Society for the Study of Education, 1957.
3. Bessent, E. W. and others, Designs for In-Service Education, Texas University, Austin, R. & D. Center for Teacher Education, 1967
4. California Council on Teacher Education. Toward Better Teachers, Bulletin V. 26, No. 3. California State Department of Education, 1957
5. Childress, Jack R., "In-Service Education of Teachers", Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Fourth Edition, (Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association, 1969)
6. Edelfelt, Roy A. and Margo Johnson (Editors), Rethinking In-Service Education, (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1975)

7. Edmonds, Fred and others, In-Service Teacher Education: Crucial Process in Educational Change. Kentucky University, Lexington, 1966
8. Fennegan, Harry, Into Thy Hands...Staff Development, TIP, XI:4, October, 1972
9. Frymier, Jack R., (Editor), "Models of Staff Development, I.", TIP, XI:5, October, 1974
10. Frymier, Jack R., (Editor), "Models of Staff Development, II.", TIP, XI:5, December, 1972
11. Gilchrist, Robert S., Clarence Fielstra and Anna L. Davis, "Organization of Programs of In-Service Education", In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors and Administrators, National Society for Study of Education, 1957
12. Hass, C. Glen, "In-Service Education Today", In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators National Society for the Study of Education, 1957
13. Henry, Nelson B. (Editor), In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, National Society for the Study of Education, 1957
14. Johnston, D. J., Teachers In-Service Education, Elmsford, N. Y.: Pergamon Press, 1971)
15. Jirik, Edward F., "The Ohio Education Association's Staff Development Programs", TIP, XI:5, December, 1972

16. Maucker, J. W. and Daryl Pendergraft, "Implications of In-Service Education Programs for Teacher Education Institutions", In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors and Administrators, National Society for the Study of Education, 1957
17. Miles, Matthew B. and A. Harry Passow, "Training in the Skills Needed for In-Service Education Programs", In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors and Administrators, National Society for the Study of Education, 1957
18. Monahan, William G. and Howard E. Miller, Planning and Developing In-Service Education. Iowa Center for Research in School Administration, Iowa University, 1970
19. Peltz, R. B., "Recommendations for an In-Service Program for the Ashland City Elementary Schools Based on a Study of the Recent Literature and the Expressed Interests of the Teaching Staff", Masters thesis, The Ohio State University, 1969
20. Rubin, Louis J. (Editor), Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971)

APPENDIX



The University of Nebraska at Omaha
Box 688 Omaha, Nebraska 68101 402/554-2721

College of Education
Educational Administration and Supervision

March 15, 1976

The state of teacher in-service education is constantly changing as its integral factors change. An example of this is the increased participation of teachers in decision-making regarding in-service education. People interested in this vital activity must be aware of recent changes. I am conducting research on the current practices in teacher in-service education and plan publication of the results.

Enclosed is a survey composed of two sheets. Your prompt response will be deeply appreciated. A stamped, addressed envelope is provided for your convenience. You need not identify yourself and your specific responses shall be anonymous.

Thank you for your contribution.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cal B. Bone".

Cal B. Bone
Research Assistant

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

1. Does your school system now provide a systematic program for teacher in-service education? Yes _____ No _____
2. If you do not, do you plan to have such a program in the near future? Yes _____ No _____
3. If so, is there a contract requirement that teachers participate? Yes _____ No _____
4. Check any or all of the following that are used to motivate participation: Professional growth credit _____ released time _____ salary increment _____ other _____
(Please list) _____
5. Who plans and executes the in-service education program in your school system? Administrators _____ Teachers _____ County Superintendent _____ Consultants _____ Other _____
6. Who do you think should ideally plan and execute the program? Administrators _____ Teachers _____ County Superintendent _____ Consultants _____ Other _____
7. At what times are the in-service education activities offered? Before school _____ After School _____ Release time _____ Weekend _____
8. On the average, how much time is given to each activity? Full day _____ Half day _____ Quarter day _____ 1 hour _____
9. Have you evaluated the change that results from the in-service program? (Please list) _____

10. Do you have any suggestions or other comments you think might make for improvement in teacher in-service education programs in Nebraska? _____

11. Listed below are activities that have often been used in in-service education programs. In Column I, identify with check mark those activities used by your school system. In Column II, identify with a check those you would like to do.

<u>I</u>		<u>II</u>
___	Membership on curriculum planning committees	___
___	Workshops	___
___	Consultation with experts	___
___	Field trip	___
___	Orientation	___
___	Conversations	___
___	Forums	___
___	Lectures	___
___	Committee service	___
___	Team teaching	___
___	Observation visits to other schools	___
___	Bulletin board preparation	___
___	Individual study	___
___	Book report	___
___	Pre-opening meeting	___
___	Demonstrations	___
___	Discussion	___
___	Meetings	___
___	Panel discussion	___
___	Faculty meetings	___
___	Routing slips	___
___	Exhibits	___
___	Brainstorming	___
___	Travel	___
___	Curriculum evaluation	___
___	Oral presentations	___
___	Handbook preparation	___
___	Individual project - self initiated	___

What other activities have you used and found to be successful? _____

What other activities would you consider appropriate and like to use? _____

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

1. Does your school system now provide a systematic program for teacher in-service education? Yes 22 No 31
2. If you do not, do you plan to have such a program in the near future? Yes 12 No 18
3. If so, is there a contract requirement that teachers participate? Yes 20 No 24
4. Check any or all of the following that are used to motivate participation: Professional growth credit 8 released time 33 salary increment 1 other 3
(Please list) _____
5. Who plans and executes the in-service education program in your school system? Administrators _____ Teachers _____
County Superintendent _____ Consultants _____ Other _____
6. Who do you think should ideally plan and execute the program? Administrators _____ Teachers _____ County Superintendent _____
Consultants _____ Other _____
7. At what times are the in-service education activities offered? Before school 14 After School 26 Release time 39 Weekend 5
8. On the average, how much time is given to each activity? Full day 15 Half day 14 Quarter day 11 1 hour 14
9. Have you evaluated the change that results from the in-service program? (Please list) _____

10. Do you have any suggestions or other comments you think might make for improvement in teacher in-service education programs in Nebraska? _____

11. Listed below are activities that have often been used in in-service education programs. In Column I, identify with check mark those activities used by your school system. In Column II, identify with a check those you would like to do.

<u>I</u>		<u>II</u>
<u>21</u>	Membership on curriculum planning committees	<u>16</u>
<u>43</u>	Workshops	<u>13</u>
<u>27</u>	Consultation with experts	<u>15</u>
<u>24</u>	Field trip	<u>10</u>
<u>35</u>	Orientation	<u>8</u>
<u>22</u>	Conversations	<u>7</u>
<u>4</u>	Forums	<u>6</u>
<u>11</u>	Lectures	<u>5</u>
<u>8</u>	Committee service	<u>7</u>
<u>3</u>	Team teaching	<u>11</u>
<u>26</u>	Observation visits to other schools	<u>21</u>
<u>10</u>	Bulletin board preparation	<u>9</u>
<u>8</u>	Individual study	<u>10</u>
<u>1</u>	Book report	<u>2</u>
<u>33</u>	Pre-opening meeting	<u>4</u>
<u>15</u>	Demonstrations	<u>14</u>
<u>15</u>	Discussion	<u>6</u>
<u>23</u>	Meetings	<u>2</u>
<u>5</u>	Panel discussion	<u>6</u>
<u>38</u>	Faculty meetings	<u>6</u>
<u>12</u>	Routing slips	<u>2</u>
<u>10</u>	Exhibits	<u>7</u>
<u>8</u>	Brainstorming	<u>8</u>
<u>5</u>	Travel	<u>17</u>
<u>21</u>	Curriculum evaluation	<u>17</u>
<u>8</u>	Oral presentations	<u>6</u>
<u>13</u>	Handbook preparation	<u>11</u>
<u>7</u>	Individual project - self initiated	<u>20</u>

What other activities have you used and found to be successful? _____

What other activities would you consider appropriate and like to use? _____