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ABSTRACT

The Accreditation Program of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, has accredited eighteen Louisiana elementary schools during the two years of its operation. Unique qualities of design and procedure for accreditation presented questions to participants and leadership.

The purposes of this dissertation are to evaluate:

1. quantitative standards set for accreditation of elementary schools, in terms of adequacy, practicality, and effect in assisting schools to secure tangible items of assistance.

2. effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth, in terms of stimulation of professional reading, cooperative planning, and furtherance of understanding of the entire school program by teachers.

3. effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process, in terms of teacher awareness of change in classroom practices and change in children's behavior.

4. effectiveness of the required procedure for self-study, in terms of adequacy of structure, completeness of coverage, reasonableness of requirements of teacher time and effort, and as a reflection of the school situation as viewed by participants.

Evaluative questionnaires were sent to 231 faculty participants, thirty-one administrators, and to sixty-four members of visiting committees of the eighteen accredited Louisiana elementary schools. Of
these 326 questionnaires, $29^{1/4}$ (90.2 per cent) were returned. This dissertation was based upon this information.

It was found that respondents expressed:

1. a high degree of agreement that quantitative standards of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education, established for accreditation of elementary schools, are adequate, practical, and of assistance in securing tangible items. Standards received a median and most frequent rating of "moderately high".

2. an exceptionally high degree of agreement that the self-study was valuable as an instrument of in-service growth, by stimulating professional reading and cooperative planning, and furthering the understanding of the entire school program by teachers. As an instrument of in-service growth, the self-study received a median and most frequent rating of "above average".

3. a very significant indication that the self-study had value as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process by causing teacher awareness of change in classroom practices and in students. As an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process, the self-study received a median and most frequent rating of "very effective".

4. a high degree of agreement that the self-study procedure was effective, by being adequate in structure, complete in coverage, demanding of teacher time and effort, and a reflection of the true school situation. As a reflection of the true school situation, the self-study received a median and most frequent rating of "above average".

In accordance with the findings, the following implications seemed
justified:

1. the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education could reasonably continue to administer present standards, with minor clarifications, changes, and gradual upward revision as circumstances warrant.

2. teachers have reached the state of professional readiness for accepting and using a unique, flexible design of school evaluation in which they plan, structure, and carry out their own professional studies.

3. the centering of attention and efforts on faculty-selected problems and teaching practices would result in significant changes in classroom practices and in students.

4. the basic design and procedure for accreditation of elementary schools by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education are sound. Instruments used to guide the program need clarification and revision.

5. high qualities of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education should be maintained, and advantage taken of gains in status granted by the 1961 Constitution to make elementary school accreditation an integral part of the program of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

6. the continuous improvement aspect of the standards should be made effective, acceptable, workable, and in keeping with the philosophy of initial accreditation.
CHAPTER I

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ACCREDITATION PROGRAM

At its annual business meeting in Memphis, Tennessee on December 1, 1960 the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools approved the action of the Central Coordinating Committee of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education of accrediting certain listed schools. These schools: (1) had previously participated in the Cooperative Program in an affiliated study status; (2) had completed a self-study, or self-evaluation, in accordance with provisions of the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools; (3) had been visited by a committee; and (4) had been recommended for accreditation by their respective state elementary committees.¹

This action was unique in that no other regional accrediting agency had concerned itself with elementary school accreditation or improvement as an important part of its interest in improving and strengthening secondary school and college programs.

I. THE COOPERATIVE PROGRAM IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

History. The movement to begin elementary school activities by the Southern Association was recorded as follows:

¹Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation of Elementary Schools (Atlanta: Cooperative Program in Elementary Education, Commission on Research and Service, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1959), pp. 8-29.
The Association's elementary school activities began in 1946, when the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research voted unanimously to devote its efforts to the problems of the elementary school and the education of its teachers.

With the approval and assistance of the Association, the cooperation of other agencies in the South, and a grant-in-aid from the General Education Board, the Cooperative Study in Elementary Education was begun in 1948.2

In November, 1948 a three-year program of research and action was started. There was no paid staff, except for secretarial help, and the entire program depended on state groups composed of personnel from state departments of education, state education associations, state and local school systems, universities and colleges, and other sources. A representative chosen by each state group formed the Central Coordinating Committee, which was given the authority to determine policies for the Cooperative Study by the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research. States participating were the eleven states of the official region of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools plus Arkansas and Oklahoma.

The Central Coordinating Committee met in Memphis in December 1948 with the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to set up tentative objectives and chart a course for the next three years.3

In cooperation with the Southern States Work Conference, the first of a series of annual workshops was held in Daytona Beach, Florida from May 31 to June 8, 1949. The Executive Committee of the Central

2Ibid., p. 3.

Coordinating Committee met in Gatlinburg, Tennessee, July 29 and 30, 1949 to discuss an arrangement for the employment of a coordinator to give direction to the program and to help the individual state groups. Dr. Harold Drummond of George Peabody College was selected, and the offer of George Peabody College for special secretarial, editorial and distribution services was accepted. In addition, three consultants were secured without remuneration: Dr. Henry J. Otto of the University of Texas, Dr. John E. Brewton of George Peabody College, and Dr. T. M. Stinnett of the National Education Association.

Assistance and encouragement to leaders in Negro education was afforded by means of a workshop held in Orangeburg, South Carolina in the summer of 1949. This workshop was mainly concerned with the problem of evaluating the elementary school. A report of the workshop, Learning to Evaluate the Elementary School, was published by the State Agricultural and Mechanical College at Orangeburg.

A workshop from June 13 to July 20, 1949 at Florida State University was charged with the responsibility of preparing an instrument for evaluating the elementary school. Arrangements were made by Dr. Sarah Lou Hammond, serving as chairman of the subcommittee on elementary school evaluation. Dr. W. T. Edwards of Florida State University conducted the workshop, while Dr. Louis Raths of New York University and Dr. Laura Zirbes of Ohio State University served as consultants. The result of the workshop was published by the Cooperative Study under the title Tentative Edition - Elementary Evaluative Criteria, (Volumes I and II).
During the school session 1949-50 selected schools in each of the southern states used the tentative edition of Elementary Evaluative Criteria and made suggestions for its improvement. At the Southern States Work Conference in Daytona Beach June 4 to 9, 1950, the Cooperative Study group made recommendations for consideration by members of two workshops which met in Nashville later in the summer (one at George Peabody College and one at Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State College). These workshop groups produced a mimeographed brochure, Suggestions For Using The Tentative Edition Of The Elementary Evaluative Criteria, which was distributed by the Coordinator. Elementary Evaluative Criteria was issued in revised form under the title Evaluating The Elementary School, A Guide For Cooperative Study.

On December 2, 1951 a Final Report of the Southern Association's Cooperative Study in Elementary Education was made to the Commission on Research and Service. In addition to these previously named, the following publications were the results of committee action: Good Schools For Children, Education of Elementary School Personnel, and Promising Practices in Elementary Schools. In addition, newsletters were furnished state committee men under the title The Southern Newsletter. Included in the Final Report of the Southern Association's Cooperative Study in Elementary Education was information concerning the activity of state committees. The report of Louisiana activities during this period

---

Two proposals concerning the relationship between the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and elementary schools in the region were made in this report:

1. Since a great deal of educational improvement has been stimulated by the Cooperative Study in Elementary Education which the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research has sponsored for the past four years, and since throughout the southern region concern is apparent for the total program of education - kindergarten through university - it is recommended that the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research establish a committee on elementary education to foster continued interest in elementary education.

2. Since many communities in the region are providing educational opportunities for secondary school youth which meet the standards required for membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools without sufficient regard for the support of elementary schools which are in the same administrative unit, since some secondary schools apply the Evaluative Criteria without giving much thought to feeder elementary schools, and since good secondary schools and college programs are impossible if elementary schools are neglected, it is recommended that the Commission on Secondary Schools of the Association be urged to implement their established policy which states: "Membership in the Southern Association shall not be acquired or retained if as a consequence other schools in the same administrative unit are handicapped in achieving their purpose."

The report concluded that the three-year study was a success due to the desire of people of the South for better schools for children.

Further,

The study has proven that an association with a history which is definitely linked with accreditation of colleges and secondary schools can be an effective force in stimulating improvement of elementary schools.

At the conclusion of the three-year study in 1951, the Commission

---

5 Ibid., pp. 38-39.
6 Ibid., p. 42.
on Curricular Problems and Research was designated as an interim committee to consider the continuing relationship of the Association with elementary schools. During the year of study a proposal was agreed upon, establishing the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education. The Statement Regarding the Relationship of Elementary Schools to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was placed in Appendix F of this study, because it established an outline for future operation.

On the basis of the Statement mentioned above, adopted December 1, 1952 by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education functioned through the activities of its regional and state committees. A coordinator for the program was employed on a part-time basis in 1954 and on a full-time basis each year since 1955.

Interest and participation in the affiliation program increased, with the result that the Cooperative Program became self-supporting from its initiation. During the school session 1955-56 there were 287 systems, or 3,723 schools enrolled. As of January 22, 1957 there were 314 systems, or 3,729 schools enrolled.7 (Indications were that the self-improvement program of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education would continue to grow in the number of participants.)

Authorization by the Commission on Research and Service was granted in 1956 to allow the Central Coordinating Committee to experiment with the

7"Enrollment In Cooperative Program In Elementary Education," Progress In Southern Elementary Schools, IV, No. 3 (January 31, 1957), 4.
development of standards of accreditation. The Central Coordinating Com-
mittee of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education voted at the
Richmond, Virginia annual meeting on December 2, 1957 to work toward
expanding its program of school improvement so as to include optional
accreditation of elementary school systems. The Commission on Research
and Service then recommended to the Association that the Cooperative Pro-
gram in Elementary Education be empowered to accredit elementary schools
through the various state committees, such accreditation to be based
upon the standards developed by the Cooperative Program. A motion grant-
ing the above was passed by the Association in Louisville, Kentucky on
December 4, 1958. The lack of clearly-defined standards and procedures
made it necessary that initial accreditation be postponed until the 1960
meeting of the Association.

At a workshop in Daytona Beach June 8 to 12, 1959 A Guide To The
Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools, which contains
standards for accreditation, was produced, and was printed in October,
1959. Pilot school groups used the Guide To The Evaluation And Accredi-
tation of Elementary Schools during the 1959-60 school session, and, in
accordance with procedures recommended, the first schools were
accredited at the December, 1960 meeting in Memphis.

Thus, at this point, the Cooperative Program offered two types of
membership: affiliation, which involved cooperative studies leading to

---

8Proceedings of the Sixty-third Annual Meeting (Atlanta: Southern
continuous improvement; and accreditation, which involved prior affiliation status, the meeting of standards, and the use of procedures of self-study as outlined in The Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools.

Objectives. The need for improving the quality of education at all levels stimulated the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to organize the Cooperative Study in Elementary Education. The study initially had four points of emphasis:

1. Gathering data on elementary education in the South and presenting it [sic] to the layman in concise, understandable terms

2. Developing suitable procedures and instruments for evaluating elementary schools

3. Improving the recruitment, selection, and education of elementary teachers, principals, and supervisors

4. Initiating a program of action designed to develop better elementary schools and to accelerate improvements in curriculum and teaching

School improvement on a continuing basis is the central purpose of all aspects of the Association's work with elementary schools of the South. The statement of beliefs expressed this characteristic as the foundation of the entire program.¹⁰

II. THE ACCREDITATION PROGRAM

In accordance with the authority granted the Cooperative Program

⁹Perry, op. cit., p. 104.
¹⁰Guide..., op. cit., p. 4.
in Elementary Education in December, 1958 by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Central Coordinating Committee approved *The Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools* in 1959. This Guide established design and procedure to be used by schools in seeking accreditation.

**Design.** The following were included in the plan for seeking accreditation:

1. Faculty participation in faculty study as members of the continuous improvement phase of the affiliation program.

2. Faculty planning, participation, and completion of a self-study, or evaluation of the school (or system). To be determined by the faculty in all known facets of school operation were:

   a. what is a desirable elementary school
   b. what is being done to make this school a desirable elementary school in accordance with the above
   c. what remains to be done, and in what priority, to make this school a desirable elementary school

On the basis of studies by the Commission on Research and Service, it was recommended that most work for school improvement could be grouped for convenience under one of the following areas:

   a. efforts having to do with establishing and clarifying purposes of the school and/or school system
   b. efforts having to do with the program for pupils
   c. efforts having to do with securing and retaining quality personnel and their growth in service
   d. efforts having to do with providing facilities and their care
   e. efforts having to do with school-community interaction
f. efforts having to do with coordination through administrative organization and procedures

All projects reported in the above six categories were to be reported on worksheets giving the following information:

a. statement of problem (project or effort)
b. status of problem at beginning of project
c. procedures in seeking improvement
d. provisions for evaluating the effectiveness of procedures for school improvement
e. improvements which have already been observed
f. difficulties which have been encountered in the project
g. suggestions from the visiting committee

3. Meeting (or exceeding) of minimal quantitative and qualitative standards as adopted by the Central Coordinating Committee. (State standards and accreditation by the State were made a prerequisite to regional accreditation.)

4. Visitation by a committee to review the findings of the study, review the application of standards to the school, and make suggestions for further action.

Procedural requirements. Procedure was established as seven basic steps:

---

11 Ibid., p. 18.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid., pp. 37-46.
14 Ibid., pp. 34-36.
1. Participate in the affiliation program for at least one year. Report local school improvement programs to the State Elementary Committee.

2. Determine readiness for accreditation involving the application of standards to the school seeking accreditation as an indication of practical readiness.

3. File a statement of intent and organize for self-study. The governing school board is requested to give permission for the school seeking accreditation, and a consultant is to be selected to help guide the study.

4. Conduct a self-study. The use of the design discussed previously and the final application of standards are of concern at this point.

5. Provide for a visiting committee. The committee's purpose is to review the findings of the self-study, study the school in reference to standards, and make suggestions for further improvement.

6. Formulate plans for school improvement and designate priorities.

7. File data on status and plans for improvement with the state accrediting committee.\(^{15}\)

On the basis of data supplied by the school and the visiting committee, the state elementary committee may recommend to the Central Coordinating Committee of the Cooperative Program that a school be

\(^{15}\)Ibid., pp. 8-29.
accredited. The Central Coordinating Committee may then recommend to
the Commission on Research and Service, the Executive Committee, and the
Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools those schools which
they have accredited in order that the Association may place the accredited
units on an approved list to be published annually by the Association.¹⁶

III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Elementary schools and school leaders in Louisiana have partici-
cipated in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools' study and program for improving elementary education since its
inception. J. B. Robertson and Thomas R. Landry attended the early
meetings. The Louisiana Elementary Committee was active through the
entire period. When accreditation of elementary schools was offered,
schools of Ouachita and Winn Parishes made pilot studies for system-wide
accreditation; Ponchatoula Elementary School in Tangipahoa Parish, D. F.
Huddle Elementary School and Lakeside Elementary School in Rapides
Parish made individual school studies.

Innumerable problems during the pilot studies were encountered,
due to the absence of precedent for such a program of evaluation of
elementary schools, and the uncertainty caused by late distribution of
the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools. The
complexities of structuring the brief indicated design, and the necessity

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 30-31.
of completing the study in less-than-recommended time added to the complexity of the study. Schools completing the procedure in the second year, 1960-61, were able to pace the work in a more advantageous manner.

The variation in studies, the indication of possible lack of structure and definiteness, and problems encountered in using the method suggested for reporting, as well as concerns expressed by members of visiting committees indicated that an evaluation of the procedure used by the eighteen schools accredited as of December, 1961 was needed.

In accordance with these concerns, evaluative questionnaires were developed and sent to 231 faculty participants in the studies, to thirty-one administrators of these faculty groups, and to sixty-four members of visiting committees. Of these, 90.2 per cent were returned (97.4 per cent faculty participants, 93.5 per cent administrators, and 62.5 per cent visiting committee members). These questionnaires were used in the body of the present dissertation.

The purposes of this dissertation were:

1. To evaluate the quantitative standards set for accreditation of elementary schools
   a. to investigate adequacy of the standards
   b. to determine practicality of the standards
   c. to investigate the effect of standards in assisting schools to secure materials, equipment, other tangible items listed as required

2. To evaluate the effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument for in-service growth
   a. to investigate the stimulation of professional reading by teachers as a result of the study
b. to investigate the stimulation of cooperative planning as a result of the study

c. to investigate the extent of furtherance of understanding of the entire school program

3. To evaluate the effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process

a. to investigate the extent of teacher awareness of change in classroom practices as a result of the study

b. to investigate the extent of teacher awareness of change in children's behavior as a result of the study

4. To evaluate the required procedure for self-study

a. to investigate the adequacy of its structure (direction)

b. to investigate the completeness of its coverage

c. to investigate the reasonableness of its requirements in terms of teacher time and effort required

d. to investigate whether the procedure reflects the school situation as viewed by the participants

The remainder of this dissertation concerned itself with the tabulation, classification, grouping and interpretation of responses from each of the groups named above under the four major headings. The majority of responses were objective, but comments, as indicated, were invited. Each chapter dealing with a major aspect of evaluation as stated was summarized individually. Chapter VI, Recapitulation and Implications, was concerned with interpretations of the findings.
CHAPTER II

EVALUATION OF QUANTITATIVE STANDARDS

Regional standards which were adopted by the Central Coordinating Committee of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education were the result of three years of careful study by many people. Principles which guided the development of the standards referred to adequacy, flexibility, continued improvement, and periodic re-evaluation.¹

Questionnaires to participants in the study are included as part of this dissertation as Appendices A, B, and C. Part I of the questionnaire, consisting of fifteen questions, was designed to secure an evaluation of quantitative standards to determine their adequacy, their practicality, and their effect in assisting schools to secure materials, equipment, and other tangible items. The questions and responses of Part I of the questionnaire follow.

Recipients of the questionnaire were furnished individual copies of the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools for direct reference purposes in answering questions. Pages 37-46 of the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools, included as Appendix D of this dissertation, refer to the standards for accreditation of elementary schools by the Southern Association of Colleges and

I. EVALUATION OF STANDARDS BY ADMINISTRATORS

Twenty-nine administrators responded to the questionnaire: three parish superintendents, six supervisors, three consultants to participating faculties, and seventeen principals.

The number of responses by administrators to objective-type questions related to the evaluation of standards for accreditation of elementary schools by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education is shown in Table I, page 31 of this dissertation. The percentage of responses to these questions by administrators is shown in Table II, page 32 of this dissertation.

The study was concerned with responses to individual questions and comments as indicated.

1. Do the major topical headings (Items I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XI) include all facets of elementary school operation?

   Yes - 26
   No - 2
   No response - 1

2. If your answer to question one is no, please indicate what you found to be omitted.

   One person indicated "bus, lunchroom and janitorial services," while the second said, "Something special should be included about democratic values, evils of Communism."

3. Which of the major topical headings (Items I to XI) are unnecessary in the evaluation of an elementary school?
Items listed once each were Item IX, physical facilities; Item X, inter-school athletic competition; Item XI-A-3, money-raising activities of schools. Item VIII, a recommendation on school size, was mentioned twice. A comment on Item II indicated "...should be on individual school basis and not on system basis."

4. Do the standards lend themselves toward establishing a more desirable school situation?
   Yes - 29
   No - 0

5. Do the standards stimulate cooperative faculty action that might not occur otherwise?
   Yes - 29
   No - 0
   One person qualified the question by striking out the words "that might not occur otherwise."

6. Are the standards sufficiently high to provide a challenge to a school faculty?
   Yes - 29
   No - 0
   One comment was "...except possibly new schools, or they might accept some old schools with inadequate facilities." Another was, "Too many options for some schools, but on the whole standards are high in light of conditions existing in most schools."

7. In accordance with the principles upon which the standards were developed (Guide, p. 37), are the standards within reasonable achievement?
   Yes - 29
   No - 0
One comment was added: "for individual schools."

8. Is the standard on staff (Guide, pp. 42-44) practical?

Yes - 29
No - 0

Comments included, "Necessary for seeking excellence," and, "Problem: bridging gap between available qualified teachers and mounting enrollments."

9. If the answer to question eight is no, indicate which item (s) is (are) not.

None answered no, but two comments were made: "...but under some conditions an exception might be made," and, "Items A, B, C, and D should have provisions for termination after length of time of alternate provisions."

10. Is the standard on class membership (Guide, p. 44) practical of attainment for desirable class membership?

Yes - 26
No - 2
No response - 1

11. If the answer to question ten is no, indicate why not.

Although only two answered no, several comments were offered: "Should be worked on a pupil-teacher ratio for the whole school rather than each classroom"; "Necessary for seeking excellence, but difficult because of rapid increase in enrollments"; "Should be more flexible - limits may be too high"; "Teacher shortage and need for more classrooms growing at a rate which poses a problem to solve with present tax structure"; "In B, change forty pupils to read thirty-five"; "Maximum for all primary classes should be thirty"; "Maximum for all intermediate and upper grade classes should be thirty-five with three-fourths having thirty
12. Did compliance with Standard X, Inter-school Athletic Competition, help or hinder the school program? Comment.

   Help - 23    Hinder - 1    No response - 5

   Comments were of the following types: seven indicated the school did not have inter-scholastic athletic competition before; one indicated this standard would relieve community pressure for such; one indicated that emphasis on games disrupted the school program; one indicated it made little or no difference; two indicated this to be no problem in elementary schools, grades 1-6; one indicated that the physical education program should take care of elementary pupils' physical activities.


   Help - 24    Hinder - 3    No response - 2

   Comments were of the following types: five indicated parish school boards had assumed, or were assuming, more responsibility for adequate support; three indicated there was now less money for purchase of teaching supplies and materials of instruction; two indicated little change; one indicated teachers should direct their energies toward professional activities and teaching; and one indicated the standard was meaningless.

14. Did you receive requests for material or tangible assistance as a result of the school meeting standards? If so, check below in which general category or categories.

   Yes - 16    No - 2    No response - 11
Numbers of requests indicated were as follows:

21 - professional literature  
21 - resource materials  
20 - tangible items for science  
20 - supervisory assistance  
19 - tangible apparatus for mathematics  
18 - library books  
18 - maps, globes, charts  
15 - physical education equipment  
11 - class size adjustment  
10 - allowance for purchasing materials for class

"Other" items listed included: two indicated building repainted and/or floors tiled; two could not determine if requests resulted from the study; two indicated additional library materials and/or centralized library; one indicated playground work; one indicated a bus-loading shed; and one stated that the self-study assisted in the selection of needed materials to the extent that requests were granted.

15. Indicate below by checking your rating of the standards:

0  - low
0  - fair
2  - average
18 - moderately high
9  - high

II. EVALUATION OF STANDARDS BY FACULTY PARTICIPANTS

As was the case with administrators, faculty participants were furnished individual copies of the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools for reference in answering questions. Questions were the same except that number fourteen was reworded to apply to the individual teacher. The questionnaire sent to faculty participants is included as Appendix B of this dissertation.
The number of responses by faculty participants to objective-type questions related to the evaluation of standards for the accreditation of elementary schools in the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education is shown in Table I, page 31 of this dissertation. The percentage of responses to these questions by faculty participants is shown in Table II, page 32 of this dissertation.

Individual responses and comments were as follows:

1. Do the major topical headings (Items I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XI) include all facets of elementary school operation?

   Yes - 218  
   No - 4  
   No response - 3

2. If your answer to question one is no, please indicate what you found to be omitted.

   Two faculty participants indicated "teaching of democratic values and patriotism," and two indicated "bus, janitorial, and special services."

3. Which of the major topical headings (Items I to XI) are unnecessary in the evaluation of an elementary school?

   Seven faculty participants indicated Item X, inter-school athletic competition; two indicated Item III-c should provide for re-evaluation at five-year intervals rather than three years; one indicated Item I, school improvement requirements, Item III, initial and subsequent accreditation, and Item VI, length of school term and employment; one indicated Item VIII, school size (recommendation).

4. Do the standards lend themselves toward establishing a more desirable school situation?
5. Do the standards stimulate cooperative faculty action that might not occur otherwise?
   Yes - 22\(\frac{1}{4}\)  No - 1

6. Are the standards sufficiently high to provide a challenge to a school faculty?
   Yes - 22\(\frac{1}{4}\)  No - 1

7. In accordance with the principles upon which the standards were developed (Guide, p. 37), are the standards within reasonable achievement?
   Yes - 220  No - 0  No response - 5

8. Is the standard on staff (Guide, pp. 42-44) practical?
   Yes - 222  No - 1  No response - 2

9. If the answer to question eight is no, indicate which item (s) is (are) not.

   Comments were: "Item E - secretarial help. With enforcement more and better supervision could be given"; "A-1, all teachers should have a degree before being hired"; "V, A-2, B-2 - teachers and principals should be required to seek additional formal training or other valuable educational experiences every three or four years"; "Consideration should be given to providing a full-time instructional materials person in schools with fewer than fifteen teachers."

10. Is the standard on class membership (Guide, p. 44) practical of attainment for desirable class membership?
    Yes - 198  No - 26  No response - 1
11. If the answer to question ten is no, indicate why not.

Of the indications given: eleven said that twenty-five pupils as recommended per class was more desirable than the requirement; three were concerned over financial costs; three felt smaller classes were desirable in the primary grades; two indicated problems were caused by an army air base and its transient population; two were concerned about teacher allotments to schools; one was concerned about lack of classroom space; one was concerned about the availability of teachers; and one indicated the upper grade limit was too high.

12. Did the compliance with Standard X, Inter-School Athletic Competition, help or hinder the school program? Comment.

Help - 185  Hinder - 9  No response - 31

Twenty-four of the comments indicated compliance with the standard made the physical education program more effective; eleven commented that the elementary school child was not ready for inter-school competitive athletics; six indicated the program did not exist before the study; six indicated no effect; four said the question was not applicable; four indicated athletics used too much school time; three indicated "both"; one said the varsity pattern teaches good sportsmanship; one said children enjoy competitive sports; one said schools should not be limited by the standards; and one indicated "not able to answer."


Help - 181  Hinder - 5  No response - 39
Twenty persons commented in support of the standards; six indicated there was less money for teaching materials and supplies; five indicated this was not a practice prior to the study; four indicated the school boards had helped; three indicated school programs were now more purposeful, of an educational nature; and one expressed fear of outside groups now furnishing the money attempting to control classroom activity.

14. Did you receive material or tangible assistance as a result of your school meeting standards? If so, check below in which general category or categories.

Yes - 171  No - 13  Indication not given - 41

Frequency of checking of items was as follows:

176 - professional literature
158 - supervisory assistance
148 - resource materials
140 - library books
135 - tangible items for science
130 - maps, globes, charts
114 - tangible apparatus for mathematics
104 - physical education equipment
82 - class size adjustment
65 - allowance for purchasing materials for your class
9 - other. This included tiled floors, rewiring, new textbooks, centralized library, librarian, redecorated building, professional book shelf, a woman physical education teacher for girls, increased materials allowance, record players, flag, and art materials.

15. Indicate below by checking your rating of the standards.

0 - low
3 - fair
22 - average
99 - moderately high
92 - high

Nine did not indicate a rating.
III. EVALUATION OF STANDARDS BY MEMBERS OF VISITING COMMITTEES

Members of visiting committees were furnished a Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools for reference in answering questions. Questions were the same as asked faculty participants and administrators, except that number fourteen was reworded to apply to the visiting committee member. The questionnaire sent members of visiting committees is included as Appendix C of this dissertation.

The number of responses by members of visiting committees to objective-type questions related to the evaluation of standards for the accreditation of elementary schools in the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education is shown in Table I, page 31 of this dissertation. The percentage of responses to these questions by members of visiting committees is shown in Table II, page 32 of this dissertation.

Individual responses and comments were as follows:

1. Do the major topical headings (Items I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XI) include all facets of elementary school operation?

   Yes - 38
   No - 2

2. If your answer to question one is no, please indicate what you found to be omitted.

   Responses were "school-community relationships," and "the lunch-room and janitorial service."

3. Which of the major topical headings (Items I to XI) are unnecessary in the evaluation of an elementary school?
Five persons indicated "none;" one indicated Item I (school improvement programs), Item II (procedural requirements), Item III (initial and subsequent accreditation), and Item VI (length of school term and employment); one suggested combining Item III (initial and subsequent accreditation) with Item II (procedural requirements); one suggested deleting Item III (initial and subsequent accreditation); and one indicated Item IX (physical facilities).

4. Do the standards lend themselves toward establishing a more desirable school situation?
   Yes - 40        No - 0

5. Do the standards stimulate cooperative faculty action that might not occur otherwise?
   Yes - 40        No - 0

6. Are the standards sufficiently high to provide a challenge to a school faculty?
   Yes - 40        No - 0

Two comments were offered: "IX should include emphasis on toilet facilities, cleanliness, etc.," and, "Number X should prohibit competitive athletics, grades 1-8, on an inter-school basis."

7. In accordance with the principles upon which the standards were developed (Guide, p. 37), are the standards within reasonable achievement?
   Yes - 38        No - 0        No response - 2

One comment was offered: "Some are not under the control of the faculty."
8. Is the standard on staff (Guide, pp. 42-44) practical?

Yes - 35

This comment was offered: "A standard recommending continued education for teachers (in-service or college) regardless of degrees, would strengthen the profession."

9. If the answer to question eight is no, indicate which item(s) is (are) not.

Four persons questioned Section F (secretarial help); three questioned Section D (librarian or instructional materials person), while one indicated the standard was too low; two wished to add to Section B as requirement for elementary training and a minimum of five years elementary teaching experience for elementary principals; two questioned Section C (release time for principals for supervision); one questioned Section E (certification of special staff); one questioned Section A-2 (exception authorized for certified non-degree teacher).

10. Is the standard on class membership (Guide, p. 44) practical of attainment for desirable class membership?

Yes - 35

11. If the answer to question ten is no, indicate why not.

Four persons endorsed the recommendations rather than the standards; two cited finances as a deterrent; one indicated that no class should exceed thirty-five; one cited availability of classroom space as a deterrent; and one said the method of state allotment of teachers prevented attainment.
12. Did compliance with Standard X, Inter-school Athletic Competition, help or hinder the school program? Comment.

   Help - 32   Hinder - 1   No response - 7

Four persons said that elementary children were not ready for inter-school competitive athletics; four indicated that the physical education program was more effective because of the standard; two said none existed before the study; two indicated athletics used too much school time; one indicated seventh and eighth grade children should be allowed to participate; one said, "neither;" one indicated the standard should be extended to help all schools in the state; and one said, "It is hard to give up something that many people like."


   Help - 36   Hinder - 1   No response - 3

Nine persons made comments in favor of the standard; two indicated concern over loss of funds to purchase teaching supplies and materials; two indicated school boards helped; two indicated this made the public more aware of school needs; one indicated fund raising was not a practice prior to the study; and one indicated the standard needed clarification.

14. Was there evidence of teachers having received material or tangible assistance as a result of the school meeting standards? If so, check below in which general category or categories.

   Yes - 24   No - 1   No response - 15

Frequency of indications of evidence of assistance was as follows:
32 - professional literature
30 - resource materials
28 - library books
27 - supervisory assistance
23 - maps, globes, charts
22 - tangible items for science
17 - tangible apparatus for mathematics
16 - class size adjustments
14 - physical education equipment
8 - allowance for purchasing materials for class
4 - other. This included audio-visual aids, floors tiled, painting, centralized library, librarian added to staff, principal received released time for supervision, art materials.

15. Indicate below by checking your rating of the standards.

- 0 - low
- 1 - fair
- 5 - average
- 19 - moderately high
- 11 - high

One person did not indicate a rating. A note was added: "I do not think that number one (page 37) should state 'an adequate school program'—I'm wondering if number three and the term 'excellence' would be more effective if 'excellent' was substituted for 'adequate' in number one."

IV. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Questions one through fifteen in this chapter were used to secure evaluative data on the standards as established and listed in the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools. The purpose of this summary was to bring together the responses of the administrators, faculty participants, and members of visiting committees to each question.

\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 37-46.
Table I indicates the number of responses in each category to objective questions one, four, five, six, seven, eight, ten, twelve, and thirteen. Table II indicates the per cent of responses in each category to the same questions.

An exceptionally high degree of agreement by administrators, faculty participants, and visiting committee members that standards are adequate was revealed by the comparison of responses to questions one, four, five, and six as indicated in Tables I and II. Answer to question two actually listed topical headings intended for inclusion in those already listed in the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools. Deletions listed in question three were suggestions for clarification of the statement of standards to separate procedure from basic standards, rather than deletion of topical headings as called for in the question.

There was no indication that the standards were not within reasonable achievement when considered in accordance with the principles upon which they were developed. Administrators and faculty participants were almost unanimous in agreement that the standard on staff was practical, while members of visiting committees questioned technical points, indicated a desire to strengthen existing standards. All groups agreed in similar percentages that the standard on class memberships was practical of attainment, and indicated in comments that recommendations were more desirable than standards. There was close agreement that compliance with Standard X helped the school athletic program. Visiting committee members were stronger in support of Standard XI, Financial Support, while direct
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 column "yes" means help; column "no" means hinder
TABLE II
PER CENT OF RESPONSES BY ALL RESPONDENTS TO OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS
FOR EVALUATING STANDARDS OF THE COOPERATIVE
PROGRAM IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12(^1)</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13(^1)</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)column "yes" means help; column "no" means hinder
opposition by administrators was more pronounced.

Table III shows the number and per cent of responses to items of assistance as a result of the school meeting standards, as indicated in question fourteen. It was noted that eight of the ten items were indicated as requested by over fifty per cent of the administrators. Over fifty per cent of the faculty participants indicated they received assistance with seven of the ten items. Over fifty per cent of the visiting committee members indicated evidence of assistance with six of the ten items listed. The three groups of respondents agreed in the "other" items listed, such as painting, floors tiled, centralized library, librarian, etc.

Table IV shows the number and per cent of all respondents rating standards of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education on the basis of a five-point scale. While none assigned a rating of low, all groups assigned a median and most frequent rating of moderately high. The range of ratings by administrators was from average to high; by faculty participants and visiting committee members, from fair to high. In each instance the rating of high was second in frequency to that of moderately high.
### TABLE III

**NUMBER AND PER CENT OF RESPONSES BY ALL RESPONDENTS INDICATING ITEMS OF ASSISTANCE RECEIVED AS A RESULT OF THE SCHOOL MEETING STANDARDS OF THE COOPERATIVE PROGRAM IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional literature</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory assistance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource materials</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible apparatus for mathematics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible items for science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps, globes, charts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size adjustment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education equipment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for purchasing materials for class</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Faculty Participants</td>
<td>Visiting Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Rating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

EVALUATION OF THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF IN-SERVICE GROWTH

The unique design of the self-study used in the elementary schools indicated an unusual amount of original planning and reporting to be necessary for its successful completion. There were indications of considerable professional activity, which raised questions leading to the effects of the study other than as a simple evaluative instrument.

Part two of the study was concerned with the evaluation of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth. It was considered that in-service growth would be an outcome of the study if sufficient professional activity was involved. Questions sixteen through twenty-six were concerned with this in terms of stimulation of professional reading, stimulation of cooperative planning, and furtherance of understanding of the entire school program. Questionnaires are included as part of this dissertation as Appendices A, B, and C.

I. EVALUATION OF THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF IN-SERVICE GROWTH BY ADMINISTRATORS

Administrators were asked to indicate whether there was evidence to support the statements as listed. The number of responses by administrators to statements related to the evaluation of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth is shown in Table V, page 43 of this dissertation. The per cent of responses by administrators to
these statements is shown in Table VI, page 44 of this dissertation. The following responses were indicated:

16. The self-study assisted the faculty in its consideration of what a desirable elementary school is.
   Yes - 29  No - 0

17. The self-study helped teachers visualize the total school program more effectively.
   Yes - 29  No - 0

18. The self-study stimulated professional reading.
   Yes - 29  No - 0

19. The self-study stimulated teachers to do further academic work.
   Yes - 25  No - 4

20. The self-study assisted teachers in identifying their strengths and weaknesses.
   Yes - 28  Unknown - 1

21. The self-study stimulated cooperation on the part of the faculty.
   Yes - 29  No - 0

22. The self-study stimulated teachers to share ideas and/or teaching experiences.
   Yes - 29  No - 0

23. The self-study stimulated teachers to assume leadership responsibilities.
   Yes - 26  No - 0  No response - 3
24. The self-study stimulated teachers to develop better working relations.
   Yes - 28  No - 0  No response - 1

25. The self-study assisted teachers in working toward the solution of their teaching problems.
   Yes - 29  No - 0

26. Indicate below by checking your rating of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth.
   0 - poor
   0 - fair
   2 - average
   12 - above average
   15 - excellent

II. EVALUATION OF THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF IN-SERVICE GROWTH BY FACULTY PARTICIPANTS

The faculty participants in the self-studies were asked to answer questions which paralleled the statements given to administrators. The questionnaire sent to faculty participants is included as Appendix B.

The number of responses by faculty participants to questions related to the evaluation of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth is shown in Table V, page 43 of this dissertation. The per cent of responses by faculty participants to these questions is shown in Table VI, page 44 of this dissertation. The following responses were indicated:

16. Did the self-study assist you in your consideration of what a desirable elementary school is?
   Yes - 224  No - 1
17. Did the self-study assist you in visualizing the total school program?
   Yes - 223
   No - 1
   No response - 1

18. Did the self-study cause you to do additional professional reading?
   Yes - 224
   No - 1

19. Did the self-study cause you to do additional work in an academic field?
   Yes - 126
   No - 91
   No response - 8

20. Did the self-study assist you in identifying strengths and weaknesses as a teacher?
   Yes - 220
   No - 5

21. Did the self-study cause you to seek cooperation of other faculty members?
   Yes - 220
   No - 4
   No response - 1

22. Did the self-study cause you to share your teaching experiences with other teachers?
   Yes - 218
   No - 7

23. Did the self-study cause you to assume leadership responsibilities in turn with other faculty members?
   Yes - 211
   No - 13
   No response - 1

24. Did the self-study improve the working relations of the faculty?
   Yes - 219
   No - 3
   No response - 3

25. Did the self-study help you in working toward the solution
26. Indicate below by checking your rating of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth.

- 0 = poor
- 1 = fair
- 2 = average
- 123 = above average
- 78 = excellent
- 2 = no rating

III. EVALUATION OF THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF IN-SERVICE GROWTH BY MEMBERS OF VISITING COMMITTEES

Members of visiting committees were asked to indicate whether there was evidence to support the statements listed. The questionnaire sent to members of visiting committees is included as Appendix C.

The number of responses by members of visiting committees to statements related to the evaluation of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth is shown in Table V, page 43 of this dissertation. The per cent of responses by members of visiting committees to these statements is shown in Table VI, page 44 of this dissertation. The responses were as follows:

16. The self-study assisted the faculty in its consideration of what a desirable elementary school is.

Yes - 40
No - 0

17. The self-study helped teachers visualize the total school program more effectively.

Yes - 40
No - 0
18. The self-study stimulated professional reading.
Yes - 40  No - 0

19. The self-study stimulated teachers to do further academic work.
Yes - 31  No - 2  No response - 7

20. The self-study assisted teachers in identifying their strengths and weaknesses.
Yes - 39  No - 0  No response - 1

21. The self-study stimulated cooperation on the part of the faculty.
Yes - 40  No - 0

22. The self-study stimulated teachers to share ideas and/or teaching experiences.
Yes - 40  No - 0

23. The self-study stimulated teachers to assume leadership responsibilities.
Yes - 39  No - 1

24. The self-study stimulated teachers to develop better working relations.
Yes - 40  No - 0

25. The self-study assisted teachers in working toward the solution of their teaching problems.
Yes - 39  No - 0  No response - 1

26. Indicate below by checking your rating of the self-study
as an instrument of in-service growth.

0 = poor
0 = fair
1 = average
2 - above average
18 = excellent

IV. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Questions sixteen through twenty-six were used in this chapter to evaluate the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth. The purpose of this summary was to bring together the responses of administrators, faculty participants, and visiting committee members to the individual questions.

Table V shows the number of responses to questions sixteen through twenty-five by all respondents, while Table VI shows the per cent of responses to the same questions by all respondents.

Respondents were almost unanimous in indicating the self-study assisted teachers in their consideration of what is a desirable elementary school, and in the visualization of the total school program.

The respondents were almost unanimous in indicating the self-study caused teachers to do additional professional reading. Over half of the faculty participants indicated the self-study caused them to do additional work in an academic field.

Respondents indicated the self-study to be excellent as an instrument for assisting teachers to identify strengths and weaknesses, seek cooperation of other faculty members, share experiences with other teachers, and improve working relations of the faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VI

PER CENT OF RESPONSES BY ALL RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONS FOR EVALUATING THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF IN-SERVICE GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership responsibilities were assumed in turn with other faculty members to a very high degree in making the self-study. The self-study was very successful in assisting teachers in working toward the solution of some of their teaching problems.

Table VII shows the number and the per cent of all respondents rating the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth on the basis of a five-point scale. None assigned a rating of low. Administrators assigned a median and most frequent rating of excellent, while faculty participants and members of visiting committees assigned a median and most frequent rating of above average. The range of ratings by administrators was from average to excellent, while for faculty participants and members of visiting committees it was from fair to excellent. Second in frequency of mention by administrators was the rating of above average, while faculty participants and members of visiting committees assigned a second frequency rating of excellent.
TABLE VII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ALL RESPONDENTS RATING THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF IN-SERVICE GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership responsibilities were assumed in turn with other faculty members to a very high degree in making the self-study. The self-study was very successful in assisting teachers in working toward the solution of some of their teaching problems.

Table VII shows the number and the per cent of all respondents rating the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth on the basis of a five-point scale. None assigned a rating of low. Administrators assigned a median and most frequent rating of excellent, while faculty participants and members of visiting committees assigned a median and most frequent rating of above average. The range of ratings by administrators was from average to excellent, while for faculty participants and members of visiting committees it was from fair to excellent. Second in frequency of mention by administrators was the rating of above average, while faculty participants and members of visiting committees assigned a second frequency rating of excellent.
TABLE VII
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ALL RESPONDENTS RATING THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF IN-SERVICE GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Rating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR IMPROVING THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS

Efforts toward improving the school situation must result in an improved and more desirable teaching-learning process. School evaluation, in essence, seeks to determine the effectiveness of a given school situation in changing pupil behavior.

Part three of the study concerned itself with changes in classroom practices by teachers and changes in students as a result of the self-study. Selected items of change were listed in each category. Questionnaires are included as Appendices A, B, and C.

I. EVALUATION OF THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR IMPROVING THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS BY ADMINISTRATORS

Administrators were asked to indicate whether the self-study caused teachers to change classroom practices and whether there was change in students. These changes were to be identified. The instrument was then assigned an over-all rating as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process.

The number and per cent of responses by administrators indicating the self-study caused teachers to change certain of their classroom practices is shown in Table VIII, page 53 of this dissertation. The number and per cent of responses by administrators indicating change in students is shown in Table IX, page 55 of this dissertation. The
responses to questions were as follows:

27. Did the self-study cause teachers to change any of their classroom practices? If yes, check below in which general area.

Yes - 16  No - 0  No response - 13

The frequency by which each item was checked was as follows:

24 - planning practices
24 - experimentation with new ways of working with children
23 - organization of work
23 - use of audio-visual aids
23 - classroom environment
23 - method of teaching a given subject
22 - classroom routine
22 - use of library
10 - discipline

Other items indicated were: identification of teaching problems; perception of individual abilities and needs of children and subsequent efforts to challenge them; and child-study techniques.

28. Did the self-study cause any change in the students? If yes, check below in which general area.

Yes - 12  No - 0  No response - 17

The frequency by which each item was checked was as follows:

22 - children became more at ease with classroom visitors
18 - children showed greater interest in specific areas studied
18 - children read more library books
18 - children showed more self-control
18 - children showed growth in knowledge, attitudes, understanding
17 - children were more aware of their objectives
17 - children brought appropriate materials to school
16 - children learned to evaluate more effectively
13 - children showed improvement by actual test results
12 - children showed greater respect for one another

Three administrators indicated that children showed more interest and pride in their school.

29. Indicate below by checking your rating of the effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning
II. EVALUATION OF THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR IMPROVING THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS BY FACULTY PARTICIPANTS

Faculty participants in the self-studies were asked to indicate changes that occurred in their classroom practices and in their students. These changes were to be identified in listed categories. The self-study was then to be given an over-all rating as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process.

The number and per cent of responses by teacher participants indicating the self-study caused them to change certain classroom practices is shown in Table VIII, page 53 of this dissertation. The number and per cent of responses by teacher participants indicating the self-study caused change in students is shown in Table IX, page 55 of this dissertation. The responses to questions were as follows:

27. Did the self-study cause you to change any of your classroom practices? If so, check below in which general area.

Yes - 147  
No - 10  
No response - 68

The frequency by which each item was checked was as follows:

155 - experimentation with new ways of working with children
130 - organization of work
127 - use of audio-visual aids
126 - use of library
123 - planning practices  
106 - method of teaching a given subject  
92 - classroom environment  
88 - classroom routine  
38 - discipline  

Other practices indicated were: increased use of community resources; study made teacher more conscious of individual needs of students; study caused faculty to evaluate and improve practices.

28. Did the self-study cause any changes in your students? If yes, check below in which general area.

Yes - 139   No - 21   No response - 65

The frequency by which each item was checked was as follows:

148 - children became more at ease with classroom visitors  
128 - children read more library books  
122 - children brought appropriate materials to school  
116 - children showed greater interest in specific areas studied  
114 - children showed growth in knowledge, attitudes, understanding  
94 - children were more aware of their objectives  
93 - children showed greater respect for one another  
85 - children showed more self-control  
83 - children showed improvement by actual test results  
83 - children learned to evaluate more effectively  

Other items indicated were: more pride in school; better rapport in pupil-teacher-parent relationship.

29. Indicate below by checking your rating of the effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process.

0 - not effective  
21 - moderately effective  
75 - effective  
117 - very effective  
11 - exceptionally effective  
1 - no rating indicated
III. EVALUATION OF THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR IMPROVING THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS BY MEMBERS OF VISITING COMMITTEES

Members of visiting committees were asked to indicate whether the self-study caused teachers to change classroom practices and whether change had taken place in students. There was an indication given that this was difficult to judge, because members of those committees made but one visit, at the end of the study. However, the indications were that these items were in evidence.

The number and per cent of responses by members of visiting committees indicating the self-study caused teachers to change certain classroom practices is shown in Table VIII, page 53 of this dissertation. The number and per cent of responses by members of visiting committees indicating the self-study caused certain changes in children is shown in Table IX, page 55 of this dissertation. The responses were as follows:

27. Did the self-study cause teachers to change any of their classroom practices? If yes, check below in which general area.

Yes - 20  No - 0  No response - 20

The frequency by which each item was checked was as follows:

26 - use of audio-visual aids
23 - use of library
20 - classroom environment
20 - method of teaching a given subject
19 - experimentation with new ways of working with children
19 - organization of work
19 - planning practices
15 - classroom routine
7 - discipline

28. Did the self-study cause any change in the students? If
yes, check below in which general area.

Yes - 19  No - 0  No response - 21

The frequency by which each item was checked was as follows:

22 - children became more at ease with classroom visitors
20 - children brought appropriate materials to school
19 - children were more aware of their objectives
18 - children showed greater interest in specific areas studied
15 - children read more library books
15 - children showed growth in knowledge, attitudes, understanding
14 - children learned to evaluate more effectively
13 - children showed greater respect for one another
11 - children showed more self-control
 9 - children showed improvement by actual test results
Another change indicated was, "children developed the desire to continue."

29. Indicate below by checking your rating of the effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process.

 0 - not effective
 3 - moderately effective
11 - effective
22 - very effective
 3 - exceptionally effective
 1 - no rating indicated

IV. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Questions twenty-seven, twenty-eight, and twenty-nine were used in this study to evaluate the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process. The purpose of this summary was to bring together the responses of administrators, faculty participants, and visiting committee members to the individual questions.

Table VIII indicates the number and per cent of responses by all
TABLE VIII

NUMBER AND PER CENT RESPONSES BY ALL RESPONDENTS INDICATING THE SELF-STUDY CAUSED CERTAIN CHANGES IN CLASSROOM PRACTICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom routine</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of teaching a given subject</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning practices</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of work</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of audio-visual aids</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation with new ways of working with children</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of library</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participants indicating the self-study caused certain changes in classroom practices by teachers. Only one item of change was indicated by less than seventy-five per cent of the administrators. While only one item of change was indicated by less than thirty-nine per cent, five of the nine items of change were checked by over fifty-four per cent of the faculty participants. Over fifty per cent of the members of visiting committees indicated changes in four of the nine items, assigning one less than 37.5 per cent response.

In each instance, fewer respondents indicated change in discipline as noted. Significantly high rates of response were given items related to teaching practices conducive to more effective instruction.

Table IX indicates the number and per cent of responses by all participants indicating the self-study caused certain changes in students. Over fifty-five per cent of administrators indicated the self-study caused changes in students in eight of ten listed means. Over fifty per cent of the faculty participants indicated changes in students in five of the ten listed means. Members of visiting committees did not indicate change in students as readily: over forty-five per cent indicated change in four of the ten means.

In each instance, the change most frequently noted was that children became more at ease with classroom visitors. The lowest frequency of change mentioned by faculty participants and members of visiting committees was that children showed improvement by actual test results. Faculty participants gave as low an indication that children learned to evaluate more effectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children showed greater interest in specific areas studied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children brought appropriate materials to school</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children read more library books</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children became more at ease with classroom visitors</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children showed more self-control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children showed improvement by actual test results</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children showed growth in knowledge, attitudes, understanding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children showed greater respect for one another</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children were more aware of their objectives</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned to evaluate more effectively</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table X indicates the number and per cent of all respondents rating the self-study on the basis of a five-point scale as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process. None assigned a rating of not effective. Ratings by administrators ranged from effective to exceptionally effective; by faculty participants and members of visiting committees from moderately effective to exceptionally effective. In each instance, respondents assigned a median and most frequent rating of very effective. Second in frequency by administrators was a rating of exceptionally effective, while faculty participants and members of visiting committees assigned a second frequency of effective.
### TABLE X

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF ALL RESPONDENTS RATING THE SELF-STUDY AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR IMPROVING THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th></th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionally Effective</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Rating Given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

EVALUATION OF THE PROCEDURE FOR SELF-STUDY

The evaluation of a school should be carried out by those persons who are most concerned with the school situation and know most about it. The self-study process used by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education is based upon this principle. The school faculty is given the responsibility for planning, structuring, and participating in a unique design of self-study for which only broad, general directions are outlined.

Part four of the study was concerned with the procedures for self-study as stated in the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools. The study concerned itself with evaluation of the definiteness, or direction, of structure, as well as completeness of coverage. The reasonableness of the requirements in terms of time and effort required of teachers was considered, as was the degree to which the procedure reflected the true school situation. Questionnaires are included as Appendices A, B, and C of this dissertation.

I. EVALUATION OF THE PROCEDURES FOR SELF-STUDY BY ADMINISTRATORS

Attention of administrators was called to the procedure outlined

in the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools.\textsuperscript{2}

The number of responses by administrators to objective questions related to evaluation of the procedure for self-study is shown in Table XI, page 73 of this dissertation. The per cent of responses by administrators to these questions is shown in Table XII, page 75. Responses to questions were as follows:

30. Is the procedure for seeking accreditation clearly outlined? Comment.

Yes - 24
No - 3
No response - 2

Comments indicated by four administrators that the procedure was clear "after considerable study;" five commented that it was not clear; two indicated help was needed to start. One comment read, "It was hard to get started. After State Department help and explanation we moved along without any trouble."

31. Is the continuous improvement program requirement of procedure practical? Comment.

Yes - 27
No - 1
No response - 1

Comments offered were all favorable. One recommendation was made by two persons that re-evaluation be at five-year intervals rather than three years. Typical of comments was,"A continuous evaluation program is the only type of evaluation - where progress in phases of the school program as a whole can be shown."

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.
32. Is there practical value in having a visiting committee as required? Comment.

Yes - 27  No - 1  No response - 1

Fifteen favorable comments were offered, such as, "Having outside people visit school and study the faculty report creates an incentive to do a good job of self-evaluation. Comments by visiting committee has greater weight with local school board than comments of local people."

33. Should accreditation be directed at the individual school or at the school system? Comment.

School - 26  System - 1  No response - 2

Seventeen comments were offered in favor of individual school accreditation, with indication that emphasis needs to be placed at the individual school level on meeting accreditation program standards.

34. Are the suggested approaches to study of the six major areas (Guide, pp. 19-25) sufficient? Comment.

Yes - 24  No - 4  No response - 1

Most of the eleven comments indicated a need for more clarification of these major areas.

35. Was an excessively long period of time used by the faculty in orientation to the study? Comment.

Yes - 10  No - 18  No response - 1

Thirteen comments were offered, of which three were concerned with the excessive time used. Typical of other comments was, "Orientation to the study is extremely important. The principal should be wise in
determining when sufficient orientation to the study has been reached."
Another, "We made a schedule and followed it."

36. Do the six major areas (purpose, program, personnel, facilities, school-community interaction, and coordination) include all aspects of elementary school endeavors? If no, what was omitted?

Yes - 28
No - 1

The omission indicated was, "Something should be included about democratic values and evils of Communism." Four comments included satisfaction with the completeness of coverage.

37. Which of the six areas should not be considered in evaluating an elementary school?

Comments indicated all were necessary, and one administrator added, "...but more detail should be required or expected in the program area."

38. In accordance with the recommended plan of planning the program seeking accreditation through a three-year period (one year affiliation study, one year planning and beginning evaluative study, and one year completing the self-study and visitation), are the requirements for teacher time and effort excessive? Comment.

Yes - 5
No - 23
No response - 1

"Teachers seemed willing to give of their time," commented one. Another commented, "It does require a great amount of the faculty's time but the values received are well worth the effort for teachers who are truly interested in their school."
39. Did the self-study infringe on teacher time that could otherwise have been spent in a more effective manner in improving instruction? Comment.

Yes - 1  
No - 26  
No response - 2

One indication was, "...more planning was evident during the study than before." Another said, "The self-study required more time than usual but paid off in improvement of instruction."

40. Did the self-study cause teachers to devote time and effort to professional considerations that they otherwise would not have? Comment.

Yes - 29  
No - 0

The six comments indicated professional reading and leadership roles of teachers required time that would not otherwise have been devoted by teachers.

41. Does the self-study center attention on desirable features of an elementary school?

Yes - 26  
No - 0  
No response - 1

42. Does the self-study center attention on problems needing effort in the school?

Yes - 29  
No - 0

43. Does the self-study help in formulating a plan of action toward improvement?

Yes - 29  
No - 0

44. Does the self-study identify an area, or areas, of needed
attention in classes?

Yes - 29  
No - 0

45. Indicate below by checking your rating of the degree to which the report of the self-study helps reflect the true school situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>poor reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>fair reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>average reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>above average reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>excellent reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. EVALUATION OF THE PROCEDURES FOR SELF-STUDY BY FACULTY PARTICIPANTS

Faculty participants in the self-studies were in a key position to evaluate the required procedure, having personally experienced it. Their numerous comments indicated careful consideration. The number of responses by faculty participants to objective questions related to evaluating the procedure for self-study is shown in Table XI, page 73 of this dissertation. The per cent of responses by faculty members to these questions is shown in Table XII, page 75. Responses to questions were as follows:

30. Is the procedure for seeking accreditation clearly outlined?

Comment.

Yes - 211  
No - 14

Fifteen comments supported the indication that the procedure was clearly outlined, while six comments indicated considerable study was needed, and two indicated help in starting was needed. Ten comments were concerned with lack of clarity, and a recommendation by two faculty participants was made that visual-aids should be developed as an aid to starting the self-study.
31. Is the continuous improvement program requirement of procedure practical? Comment.

Yes - 215     No - 5     No response - 5

All comments favored the continuous improvement program.
Indicative of the comments was the statement, "Not only is it practical, it is necessary. A spurt and then stagnation is of no value."
Another, "There should not be the feeling of a teaching job ever being fully completed."

32. Is there practical value in having a visiting committee as required? Comment.

Yes - 207     No - 17     No response - 1

Of the fifty comments, forty-six were positive, such as, "It helps to crystalize the work the faculty has undertaken. Visiting committees should be composed of trained specialists." Another typical indication was, "A visiting committee can be more objective in its judgment." Negative comments included, "It is not a natural situation. There should be some way of checking but not this way." And, "This was the weak point, but I don't have the solution."

33. Should accreditation be directed at the individual school or at the school system? Comment.

School - 173     System - 50     No response - 2

Fifty comments were offered, of which forty supported individual school accreditation. The majority indicated the individual school to be the proper agency at which accreditation should be attempted. To
the contrary, one commented, "The whole system should be so proficient that it may be in a position to seek accreditation as a whole rather than a few schools in the system." Another, "Due to organization and supervision on a parish level it seems practical that accreditation be directed at the entire system." Finally, "The accreditation of only a few individual schools would not result in an over-all improvement in the whole school system."

34. Are the suggested approaches to study of the six major areas (Guide, pp. 19-25) sufficient? Comment.

Yes - 221  No - 1  No response - 3

All comments were favorable, such as, "These major areas give approaches for continuous growth as well as for us to see our needs."

35. Was an excessively long period of time used by the faculty in orientation to the study? Comment.

Yes - 110  No - 112  No response - 3

Of thirty-two comments, a willingness and necessity of spending time in orientation were expressed by twenty-eight faculty participants. One indicated, "There was a great deal of time spent by the faculty but we did not feel that the study was too long." Another indicated, "One semester needed to orientate study."

36. Do the six areas (purpose, program, personnel, facilities, school-community interaction, and coordination) include all aspects of elementary school endeavors? If no, what was omitted?

Yes - 223  No - 1  No response - 1

The omission indicated was "more on citizenship in a democracy."
37. Which of the six areas should not be considered in evaluating an elementary school?

Most comments indicated "all should be considered." Exceptions were: four faculty participants indicated coordination could be eliminated or coordinated with other areas; two indicated school-community interaction; and one indicated purposes.

38. In accordance with the recommended plan of planning the program seeking accreditation through a three-year period (one year affiliation study, one year planning and beginning evaluative self-study, and one year completing the self-study and visitation), are the requirements for teacher time and effort excessive? Comment.

Yes - 92  No - 125  No response - 8

Twenty-five of the thirty-six comments were in support of a three-year study plan as reasonable in demand on teacher time and effort. One commented, "If a study is started on a scheduled time and progresses on a planned schedule, time and effort are not excessive." Another termed the plan "not excessive but adequate." A caution was expressed: "If one is not careful, more emphasis and importance will be placed on the seeking of accreditation rather than on the needs of the children."

39. Did the self-study infringe on time you otherwise would have spent in a more effective manner improving your teaching? Comment.

Yes - 67  No - 152  No response - 6

Typical of the comments was, "The self-study is about the most effective manner of improving teaching that I know." Another indicated, "the long range benefit outweighed the immediate neglect." And, "The
time would have been spent for personal benefits that probably would have had nothing to do with improvement." Nine comments indicated excessive time demands on the teacher, and six wrote to the effect that "...the study required too much writing work not especially necessary to good evaluation or to good teaching."

40. Did the self-study cause you to devote time and effort to professional considerations that you otherwise would not have? Comment.

Yes - 214
No - 11

While only two faculty participants indicated in comments to the effect that "time devoted to the self-study could have been used to more specific planning on the level which I teach," thirty indicated enthusiasm. One such expression was, "I was brought in direct contact with every other phase of the school program. A feeling of togetherness inspired me to work harder in the profession." Another said, "As a result of the self-study, the faculty seems to be more mindful of professional consideration."

41. Does the self-study center attention on desirable features of an elementary school?

Yes - 222
No - 3

42. Does the self-study center attention on problems needing effort in the school?

Yes - 224
No - 1

43. Does the self-study help in formulating a plan of action toward improvement?

Yes - 224
No - 1
44. Does the self-study identify an area, or areas, of needed attention in your class?

Yes - 210  No - 12  No response - 3

45. Indicate below by checking your rating of the degree to which the report of the self-study helps reflect the true school situation.

0 = poor reflection  5 = fair reflection  122 = above average reflection  52 = excellent reflection  1 = no rating

III. EVALUATION OF THE PROCEDURE FOR SELF-STUDY BY MEMBERS OF VISITING COMMITTEES

The attention of members of visiting committees was called to the procedure outlined in the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools. The numbers of responses by members of visiting committees to questions related to evaluating the procedure for self-study is shown in Table XI, page 73 of this dissertation. The per cent of responses by members of visiting committees to these questions is shown in Table XII, page 75. Responses to questions were as follows:

30. Is the procedure for seeking accreditation clearly outlined?
Comment.

Yes - 34  No - 5  No response - 1

In addition to five comments that procedure was not clear, three

3Ibid.
indicated outside help was needed. The majority of comments offered indicated that some clarification would help.

31. Is the continuous improvement program requirement of procedure practical? Comment.

Yes - 39  No - 0  No response - 1

All five comments were favorable, indicated such as, "This provides stimulation to the faculty by making them aware of projects for improving their school."

32. Is there practical value in having a visiting committee as required? Comment.

Yes - 39  No - 1

Twelve favorable comments were offered. Included was, "It is not only good for the school being evaluated, it is good for the committee." The caution was expressed, "Under present procedure the committee must evaluate and observe the first half-day when all the school is tense. Their evaluation is on first impressions, that proved to be unsound in the final analysis. The true situation was not evident until the second day."

33. Should school accreditation be directed at the individual school or the school system? Comment.

School - 31  School system - 8  No response - 1

The majority of the twenty comments offered supported individual school accreditation. However, four indicated both should be involved. One indicated system accreditation to be something for the future.

34. Are the suggested approaches to study of the six major areas

Yes - 37  No - 2  No response - 1

Of four comments, one suggested, "If several of the best studies were available, it would help. I'm not suggesting that we conform to one way."

35. Was an excessively long period of time used by the faculty in orientation to the study? Comment.

Yes - 7  No - 26  No response - 7

Comments were made indicating the importance of taking adequate time for orientation to such a study.

36. Do the six areas (purpose, program, personnel, facilities, school-community interaction, and coordination) include all aspects of elementary school endeavors? If no, what was omitted?

Yes - 39  No - 0  No response - 1

There were no omissions listed.

37. Which of the six areas should not be considered in evaluating an elementary school?

Two members of visiting committees indicated faculties should not be held responsible for facilities, and one indicated coordination. This comment was of interest: "There seems to be some misunderstanding about facilities. One superintendent during a reviewing committee report asked 'How much is enough?' Possibly this should be reviewed by the local administration before."

38. In accordance with the recommended plan of planning the program seeking accreditation through a three-year period (one year
affiliation study, one year planning and beginning evaluative self-study, and one year completing the self-study and visitation), are the requirements for teacher time and effort excessive? Comment.

Yes - 3  
No - 36  
No response - 1

Three persons suggested two years as sufficient time. The remainder of comments were such as, "Since all facets of the study are closely related to the improvement of instruction, teachers are justified in devoting all time possible to the study."

39. Did the self-study infringe on teacher time that could have been spent in a more effective manner in improving instruction? Comment.

Yes - 3  
No - 34  
No response - 3

Indicative of most comments was, "There is always something else which we think we might have done, but would we have done it? The self-study led to action." And, "...many schools lack necessary leadership to use more effective means of improving instruction." One member indicated, "Actually it appeared that teacher time was better utilized in school improvement."

40. Did the self-study cause teachers to devote time and effort to professional considerations that they otherwise would not have? Comment.

Yes - 38  
No - 1  
No response - 1

Of seven comments the typical idea was that, "As a group study it involved more teachers in more study than would have otherwise been done."

41. Does the self-study center attention on desirable features
of an elementary school?

Yes - 39  
No - 0  
No response - 1

42. Does the self-study center attention on problems needing effort in the school?

Yes - 40  
No - 0

43. Does the self-study help in formulating a plan of action toward improvement?

Yes - 40  
No - 0

44. Does the self-study identify an area, or areas, of needed attention in class?

Yes - 40  
No - 0

45. Indicate below by checking your rating of the degree to which the report of the self-study helps reflect the true school situation:

0 - poor reflection
1 - fair reflection
9 - average reflection
24 - above average reflection
5 - excellent reflection
1 - no response

IV. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Questions thirty through forty-five were used in this study to evaluate the required procedure for self-study. The purpose of this summary was to bring together the responses of administrators, faculty participants, and members of visiting committees to the individual questions.

Table XI shows the number of responses to the objective questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1"yes" indicates individual school; "no" indicates school system
evaluating the required procedure by all respondents. Table XII shows the per cent of responses to these questions by all respondents.

Faculty participants indicated to a higher degree than administrators or members of visiting committees that the procedure for seeking accreditation was clearly outlined and that the suggested approaches to study of the six major areas was sufficient. All respondents agreed to a very high degree that the continuous improvement program requirement of procedure was practical. A higher percentage of faculty participants than administrators or members of visiting committees indicated no practical value in having a visiting committee.

Administrators strongly favored accreditation directed at the individual school. Slightly over three-fourths of the faculty participants and members of visiting committees favored accreditation directed at the individual school instead of at the school system.

There was very high agreement by all respondents that the six areas (purpose, program, personnel, facilities, school-community interaction, and coordination) included all aspects of elementary school endeavor.

Indication that excessively long periods of time were used by the faculty in orientation to the study was expressed by almost half of the faculty participants. Over one-third of the administrators indicated orientation periods were excessively long. Approximately one-sixth of the members of visiting committees were uncertain and a like number indicated excessive time was used. Approximately forty per cent of the faculty participants considered the three-year plan of seeking accreditation excessive in requirements for teacher time and effort. One-sixth
TABLE XII

PER CENT OF RESPONSES BY ALL RESPONDENTS TO OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS
EVALUATING THE PROCEDURE FOR SELF-STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1"yes" indicates individual school; "no" indicates school system.
of the administrators agreed this plan was excessive in requirements for teacher time and effort, but only about seven per cent of the members of visiting committees agreed that it was excessive. Almost thirty per cent of the faculty participants indicated the self-study infringed on time they otherwise would have spent in a more effective manner improving their teaching. Few administrators and members of visiting committees agreed with the faculty participants on this point. All respondents indicated very strong agreement that the self-study caused teachers to devote time and effort to professional considerations that they otherwise would not have.

Respondents were almost unanimous in agreement that the self-study centered attention on desirable features of an elementary school and on problems needing effort in the school. They similarly agreed that the self-study helped in formulating a plan of action towards improvement, and identified areas of needed attention in classes.

Table XIII shows the number and per cent of all respondents rating the self-study report as a reflection of the true school situation. None assigned a rating of poor. Ratings by administrators ranged from average reflection to excellent reflection. Ratings by faculty participants and members of visiting committees ranged from fair reflection to excellent reflection. All respondents assigned above average reflection as the median and most frequent rating. Administrators and faculty participants assigned the rating of excellent reflection as second highest frequency, while members of visiting committees assigned the rating of average reflection as second highest.
### Table XIII

**Number and Per Cent of All Respondents Rating the Self-Study Report as a Reflection of the True School Situation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty Participants</th>
<th></th>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Reflection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Reflection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Reflection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Reflection</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Reflection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Rating Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VI

RECAPITULATION AND IMPLICATIONS

The Cooperative Program in Elementary Education of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools established its purpose as the improvement of elementary education in the southern region. The accreditation program for elementary schools is a special service, developed after several years of affiliated self-improvement study programs. To receive accredited status, in addition to a minimum period of participation in the affiliation program, a school must participate in a self-study program of evaluation, meet specified standards, agree to a continuous program of improvement, and have a visiting committee recommend approval of the self-study by the State Elementary Committee.

Eighteen Louisiana Elementary Schools were granted accredited status in December, 1961.1 Response to the questionnaire reflects an abundance of worthwhile professional experiences on the part of the faculty, administrators, and members of committees visiting these schools. The high percentage (90.2 per cent) of returned questionnaires indicated the strong feeling of support for the evaluation of the accreditation program.

I. RECAPITULATION

This study dealt with an evaluation of the procedure required for accreditation of elementary schools by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. It was concerned with the specific aspects of each of four parts of the evaluation of this required procedure.

**Evaluation of quantitative standards.** Information was sought regarding three aspects of evaluation of quantitative standards of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education.

In reference to these, respondents expressed:

1. A very high degree of satisfaction that standards were adequate, by indicating that standards\(^2\)

   a. were inclusive of all facets of elementary school operation (95.9 per cent)

   b. helped establish a more desirable school situation (100 per cent)

   c. stimulated cooperative faculty action that might not occur otherwise (99.7 per cent)

   d. were sufficiently high to provide a challenge to a school faculty (99.7 per cent)

2. A high degree of satisfaction that standards were practical, by indicating that standards

   a. were reasonable of achievement (97.6 per cent)

   b. were practical in reference to staff requirements (97.3 per cent)

   c. were practical of attainment for desirable class membership (99.1 per cent)

\(^2\)Percentages indicate per cent of all respondents reporting.
d. helped the school program through compliance with Standard X, which pertains to inter-school athletic competition (61.7 per cent)

e. helped the school program through compliance with Standard XI, which pertains to financial support (82.0 per cent)

3. A high degree of satisfaction that standards assisted schools in securing listed items, by indicating requests for:

   a. professional literature (77.9 per cent)
   b. supervisory assistance (70.0 per cent)
   c. resource materials (67.7 per cent)
   d. library books (63.2 per cent)
   e. tangible apparatus for mathematics (51.0 per cent)
   f. tangible items for science (60.1 per cent)
   g. maps, globes, charts (58.1 per cent)
   h. class size adjustment (36.4 per cent)
   i. physical education equipment (45.2 per cent)
   j. allowance for purchasing materials for class (28.2 per cent)

Of all respondents:

none rated the standards low
1.4 per cent (4) rated the standards fair
9.9 per cent (29) rated the standards average
46.2 per cent (136) rated the standards moderately high
39.1 per cent (115) rated the standards high
3.4 per cent (10) indicated no rating

The median and most frequent rating was moderately high.

3%Percentages indicate per cent of all respondents reporting.
Evaluation of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth. Information was sought regarding three aspects of evaluation of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth.

In reference to these, respondents indicated:

1. Extensive stimulation of professional reading by teachers as a result of the self-study, by citing the

   a. direct stimulation of professional reading (99.7 per cent)

   b. stimulation of teachers to do further academic work (61.8 per cent)

2. A very high degree of stimulation of cooperative planning as a result of the self-study, by showing that it

   a. assisted teachers in identifying their strengths and weaknesses (97.5 per cent)

   b. stimulated cooperation on the part of the faculty (98.3 per cent)

   c. stimulated teachers to share ideas and/or teaching experiences (97.6 per cent)

   d. stimulated teachers to assume leadership responsibilities (94.0 per cent)

   e. stimulated teachers to develop better working relations (97.7 per cent)

   f. assisted teachers in working toward the solution of their problems (96.0 per cent)

3. An exceptionally high degree of satisfaction that the self-study had furthered the understanding of the entire school program, by

\[\text{Percentages indicate per cent of all respondents reporting.}\]
indicating that the self-study\(^5\)

a. assisted the faculty in its consideration of what a desirable elementary school is (99.7 per cent)

b. helped teachers visualize the total school program more effectively (99.3 per cent)

Of all respondents, in rating the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth,

none rated it poor
9.7 per cent (2) rated it fair
9.5 per cent (28) rated it average
52.4 per cent (154) rated it above average
36.4 per cent (107) rated it excellent
1.0 per cent (3) assigned it no rating

The median and most frequent rating was above average.

**Evaluation of the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process.** To be of value, evaluation should contribute to a more effective teaching-learning situation. Two aspects of this phase of the evaluation of the study were considered.

Respondents indicated the self-study caused:

1. Considerable change in classroom practices, as noted in the general areas of

   a. classroom routine (42.5 per cent)
   b. classroom environment (42.5 per cent)
   c. discipline (24.2 per cent)
   d. method of teaching a given subject (50.7 per cent)

\(^5\)Percentages indicate per cent of all respondents reporting.
e. planning practices (56.4 per cent)

f. organization of work (58.4 per cent)

g. use of audio-visual aids (59.8 per cent)

h. experimentation with new ways of working with children (67.3 per cent)

i. use of library (58.1 per cent)

2. Considerable change in the students, as noted in these general areas:

   a. children showed greater interest in specific areas studied (51.7 per cent)

   b. children brought appropriate materials to school (54.1 per cent)

   c. children read more library books (54.7 per cent)

   d. children became more at ease with classroom visitors (65.3 per cent)

   e. children showed more self-control (38.8 per cent)

   f. children showed improvement by actual test results (35.7 per cent)

   g. children showed growth in knowledge, attitudes, understanding (50.0 per cent)

   h. children showed greater respect for one another (40.1 per cent)

   i. children were more aware of their objectives (44.2 per cent)

   j. children learned to evaluate more effectively (38.4 per cent)

Of all respondents, in rating the self-study as an instrument

---

6Percentages indicate per cent of all respondents reporting.
for improving the teaching-learning process:

- none rated it not effective
- 8.2 per cent (24) rated it moderately effective
- 30.2 per cent (89) rated it effective
- 53.4 per cent (157) rated it very effective
- 6.8 per cent (20) rated it exceptionally effective
- 1.4 per cent (4) assigned no rating

The median and most frequent rating was very effective.

**Evaluation of the procedure.** Information related to four aspects of procedure was sought for the evaluation of procedures stated in the *Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools*.

In reference to these, respondents expressed:

1. A high degree of satisfaction that the self-study was adequate in structure, by indicating that
   
   a. the procedure for seeking accreditation was clearly outlined (92.5 per cent)
   
   b. the continuous improvement program requirement of procedure was practical (97.6 per cent)
   
   c. the requirement of having a visiting committee was of practical value (92.8 per cent)
   
   d. the suggested approaches to study of the six major areas (*Guide*, pp. 19-25) were sufficient (95.9 per cent)

2. A high degree of satisfaction that the coverage of the self-study was complete, by indicating that

   a. the six areas (purpose, program, personnel, facilities, school-community interaction, and coordination) included all aspects of elementary school endeavors (95.2 per cent)

   b. the evaluation should be directed at the individual school in preference to the school system (78.2 per cent)

3. A concern that the self-study required considerable teacher
time and effort, by indicating that

a. the faculty used an excessively long period of time in orientation to the study (43.2 per cent)

b. the recommended plan for a three-year study seeking accreditation was excessive in requirements of teacher time and effort (34.0 per cent)

c. the self-study did infringe on teacher time that could otherwise have been spent in a more effective manner in improving instruction (24.1 per cent)

d. the self-study caused teachers to devote time and effort to professional considerations that they otherwise would not have (95.5 per cent)

4. A very high indication that the self-study procedure reflected the school situation by indicating the self-study

a. centered attention on desirable features of an elementary school (98.3 per cent)

b. centered attention on problems needing effort in the school (99.7 per cent)

c. helped in formulating a plan of action toward improvement (99.7 per cent)

d. helped identify an area, or areas, of needed attention in classes (94.9 per cent)

Of all respondents, in rating the degree to which the report of the self-study helped reflect the true school situation:

none rated it poor
2.0 per cent (6) rated it fair
19.4 per cent (57) rated it average
56.8 per cent (167) rated it above average
31.1 per cent (62) rated it excellent
.7 per cent (2) assigned no rating

The median and most frequent rating was above average.
II. IMPLICATIONS

The accreditation process of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education has functioned for two years on the basis of standards and self-study evaluative procedures that were unique in elementary education. The experiences of administrators, faculty and visiting committee members of accredited schools were a valid source of information from which to draw for the evaluation of the procedure of accreditation.

From the responses of these participants in the program, the following implications seem justified:

1. In accordance with the expression of satisfaction that standards are adequate, practical, and of assistance to schools in securing desirable items, it would appear that
   a. the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education could reasonably continue to administer standards as established with minor clarifications and changes
   b. the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education might give consideration to gradual upward revision of standards as circumstances warrant.

2. In accordance with the very strong indications of value of the self-study design as an instrument of in-service growth of teachers, it would appear that
   a. teachers have reached the state of professional readiness for accepting and using a unique, flexibly structured design of school evaluation
   b. teachers have accepted the responsibilities for planning, structuring, and carrying out professional studies and school evaluations

3. In accordance with the indications of numerous changes in
classroom practices, it would appear that the centering of attention and efforts on teaching practices and faculty-selected problems of concern would result in effective and significant change.

4. In accordance with the indications of numerous changes in children as a result of the self-study, it would appear that the interest developed within the faculty in evaluation of teaching practices had direct carry-over in making children conscious of the need for constant evaluation and improvement.

5. In accordance with the indications of adequacy of the structure, completeness of coverage, and excellence of reflection of the school situation, it would appear that

a. the basic design and procedure of accreditation of elementary schools by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education are sound and could continue to be used effectively in the present form

b. the numerous reports of the amount of time involved in the study for purposes of orientation indicate that clarification of the Guide To The Evaluation And Accreditation Of Elementary Schools should be considered

c. the reports of confusion involved in the beginning of the study indicate that more effective and clearer aids for starting the self-study should be developed

6. In accordance with the favorable responses indicated throughout the study and the high degree of agreement by the three groups responding to the questionnaires

a. careful consideration should be given to maintain the...
highly recognized qualities of

1) standards
2) value as an instrument of in-service growth
3) value as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process
4) design

b. careful consideration should be given that changes which are outlined in the constitution of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools adopted in December, 1961 are used to advantage in further developing the elementary accreditation program as an integral part of the Association's program.

7. In accordance with the responses indicated in favor of the continuous improvement aspect of the standards, it appears that attention should be given to make this aspect of the program effective, acceptable, workable, and in keeping with the philosophy of the procedure for initial accreditation.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Questionnaire to Administrators of Elementary Schools Participating in the Accreditation Program for Elementary Schools, Cooperative Program, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

Please indicate your position:

Superintendent
Supervisor
Consultant to participating faculty
Principal

I. Standards

Standards for elementary school accreditation are stated in the Guide to the Evaluation and Accreditation of Elementary Schools on pages 37-45. A copy of this Guide is enclosed for your convenience as a reference for answering the following questions:

1. Do the major topical headings (items I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XI) include all facets of elementary school operation?

2. If your answer to question one is no, please indicate what you found to be omitted.

3. Which of the major topical headings (items I to XI) are unnecessary in the evaluation of an elementary school?

4. Do the standards lend themselves toward establishing a more desirable school situation?

5. Do the standards stimulate cooperative faculty action that might not occur otherwise?

6. Are the standards sufficiently high to provide a challenge to a school faculty?

7. In accordance with the principles upon which the standards were developed (Guide, p. 37), are the standards within reasonable achievement?
8. Is the standard on staff (Guide, pp. 42-44) practical?

Yes or No

9. If the answer to question eight is no, indicate which item(s) is (are) not.

Yes or No

10. Is the standard on class membership (Guide, p. 44), practical of attainment for desirable class membership?

Yes or No

11. If the answer to question ten is no, indicate why not.

Help or Hinder

12. Did compliance with Standard X, Inter-School Athletic Competition, help or hinder the school program? Comment:

Help or Hinder

13. Did compliance with Standard XI, Financial Support, help or hinder the school program? Comment:

Yes or No

14. Did you receive requests for material or tangible assistance as a result of the school meeting standards? If so, check below in which general category or categories:

professional literature
supervisory assistance
resource materials
library books
tangible apparatus for mathematics
tangible items for science
maps, globes, charts
class size adjustment
physical education equipment
allowance for purchasing materials for class
other (please indicate what)

Yes or No

15. Indicate below by checking your rating of the standards:
II. In-Service Growth

As an administrator of an elementary school faculty seeking accreditation in the Cooperative Program of the Southern Association, and/or in your examination of the study presented the Visiting Committee, please indicate whether there was evidence of the following:

Yes or No 16. The self-study assisted the faculty in its consideration of what a desirable elementary school is.

Yes or No 17. The self-study helped teachers visualize the total school program more effectively.

Yes or No 18. The self-study stimulated professional reading.

Yes or No 19. The self-study stimulated teachers to do further academic work.

Yes or No 20. The self-study assisted teachers in identifying their strengths and weaknesses.

Yes or No 21. The self-study stimulated cooperation on the part of the faculty.

Yes or No 22. The self-study stimulated teachers to share ideas and/or teaching experiences.

Yes or No 23. The self-study stimulated teachers to assume leadership responsibilities.

Yes or No 24. The self-study stimulated teachers to develop better working relations.

Yes or No 25. The self-study assisted teachers in working toward the solution of their teaching problems.

26. Indicate below by checking your rating of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth:

[ ] low
[ ] fair
[ ] average
[ ] moderately high
[ ] high
III. Improving teaching-learning processes

Yes or No 27. Did the self-study cause teachers to change any of their classroom practices? If yes, check below in which general area:

- classroom routine
- classroom environment
- discipline
- method of teaching a given subject
- planning practices
- organization of work
- use of audio-visual aids
- experimentation with new ways of working with children
- use of library
- other (specify) __________________________

Yes or No 28. Did the self-study cause any change in the students? If yes, check below in which general area:

- children showed greater interest in specific areas studied
- children brought appropriate materials to school
- children read more library books
- children became more at ease with classroom visitors
- children showed more self-control
- children showed improvement by actual test results
- children showed growth in knowledge, attitudes, understanding
- children showed greater respect for one another
- children were more aware of their objectives
- children learned to evaluate more effectively
- other (specify) __________________________

29. Indicate below by checking your rating of the effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process:

- poor
- fair
- average
- above average
- excellent
IV. Procedure

The procedure for seeking accreditation is indicated in the Guide, pages 8-29, and is indicated in seven steps.

30. Is the procedure for seeking accreditation clearly outlined? Comment: __________________

31. Is the continuous improvement program requirement of procedure practical? Comment: __________________

32. Is there practical value in having a visiting committee as required? Comment: __________________

33. Should accreditation be directed at the Individual school or at the school system? Comment: __________________

34. Are the suggested approaches to study of the six major areas (Guide, pp. 19-25) sufficient? Comment: __________________

35. Was an excessively long period of time used by the faculty in orientation to the study? Comment: __________________

36. Do the six areas (purpose, program, personnel, facilities, school-community interaction, and coordination) include all aspects of elementary school endeavors? If no, what was omitted? __________________
37. Which of the six areas should not be considered in evaluating an elementary school? ______________

Yes or No

38. In accordance with the recommended plan of planning the program seeking accreditation through a three-year period (one year affiliation study, one year planning and beginning evaluative self-study, and one year completing the self-study and visitation), are the requirements for teacher time and effort excessive? Comment: ______________

Yes or No

39. Did the self-study infringe on teacher time that could otherwise have been spent in a more effective manner in improving instruction? Comment: ______________

Yes or No

40. Did the self-study cause teachers to devote time and effort to professional considerations that they otherwise would not have? Comment: ______________

Yes or No

41. Does the self-study center attention on desirable features of an elementary school?

Yes or No

42. Does the self-study center attention on problems needing effort in the school?

Yes or No

43. Does the self-study help in formulating a plan of action toward improvement?

Yes or No

44. Does the self-study identify an area, or areas, of needed attention in classes?

45. Indicate below by checking your rating of the degree to which the report of the self-study helps reflect the true school situation:

- poor reflection
- fair reflection
- average reflection
- above average reflection
- excellent reflection
APPENDIX B

Questionnaire to Faculty Participants in the Accreditation Program for Elementary Schools, Cooperative Program, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

I. Standards

Standards for elementary school accreditation are stated in the Guide to the Evaluation and Accreditation of Elementary Schools on pages 37-46. A copy of this Guide is enclosed for your convenience as a reference for answering the following questions:

1. Do the major topical headings (items I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XI) include all facets of elementary school operation?

2. If your answer to question one is no, please indicate what you found to be omitted.

3. Which of the major topical headings (items I to XI) are necessary in the evaluation of an elementary school?

4. Do the standards lend themselves toward establishing a more desirable school situation?

5. Do the standards stimulate cooperative faculty action that might not occur otherwise?

6. Are the standards sufficiently high to provide a challenge to a school faculty?

7. In accordance with the principles upon which the standards were developed (Guide, p. 37), are the standards within reasonable achievement?

8. Is the standard on staff (Guide, pp. 42-44) practical?

9. If the answer to question eight is no, indicate which item (s) is (are) not.
10. Is the standard on class membership (Guide, p. 44) practical of attainment for desirable class membership?

11. If the answer to question ten is no, indicate why not: ______________________________________

Help or Hinder
(Circle One)

12. Did compliance with Standard X, Inter-School Athletic Competition, help or hinder the school program? Comment: _______________________________

Help or Hinder

13. Did compliance with Standard XI, Financial Support, help or hinder the school program? Comment: _______________________________

Yes or No

14. Did you receive material or tangible assistance as a result of your school meeting standards? If so, check below in which general category or categories:

- professional literature
- supervisory assistance
- resource materials
- library books
- tangible apparatus for mathematics
- tangible items for science
- maps, globes, charts
- class size adjustment
- physical education equipment
- allowance for purchasing materials for your class
- other (please indicate what) ___________________

15. Indicate below by checking your rating of the standards:

- low
- fair
- average
- moderately high
- high
II. In-Service Growth

Yes or No 16. Did the self-study assist you in your consideration of what a desirable elementary school is?

Yes or No 17. Did the self-study assist you in visualizing the total school program?

Yes or No 18. Did the self-study cause you to do additional professional reading?

Yes or No 19. Did the self-study cause you to do additional work in an academic field?

Yes or No 20. Did the self-study assist you in identifying strengths and weaknesses as a teacher?

Yes or No 21. Did the self-study cause you to seek cooperation of other faculty members?

Yes or No 22. Did the self-study cause you to share your teaching experiences with other teachers?

Yes or No 23. Did the self-study cause you to assume leadership responsibilities in turn with other faculty members?

Yes or No 24. Did the self-study improve the working relations of the faculty?

Yes or No 25. Did the self-study help you in working toward the solution of any of your teaching problems?

26. Indicate below by checking your rating of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth:

- poor
- fair
- average
- above average
- excellent

III. Improving teaching-learning processes

Yes or No 27. Did the self-study cause you to change any of your classroom practices? If yes, check below in which general area:
classroom routine
classroom environment
discipline
method of teaching a given subject
planning practices
organization of work
use of audio-visual aids
experimentation with new ways of working with children
use of library
other (specify)

Yes or No

28. Did the self-study cause any changes in your students? If yes, check below in which general area:

- children showed greater interest in specific areas studied
- children brought appropriate materials to school
- children read more library books
- children became more at ease with classroom visitors
- children showed more self-control
- children showed improvement by actual test results
- children showed growth in knowledge, attitudes, understanding
- children showed greater respect for one another
- children were more aware of their objectives
- children learned to evaluate more effectively
- other (specify)

29. Indicate below by checking your rating of the effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process:

- not effective
- moderately effective
- effective
- very effective
- exceptionally effective

IV. Procedure

The procedure for seeking accreditation is indicated in the Guide, pages 8-29, and is indicated in seven steps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes or No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Is the procedure for seeking accreditation clearly outlined?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. Is the continuous improvement program requirement practical?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Is there practical value in having a visiting committee required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or System</td>
<td>33. Should accreditation be directed at the individual school or at the school system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. Are the suggested approaches to study of the six major areas (Guide, pp. 19-25) sufficient?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Was an excessively long period of time used by the faculty in orientation to the study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36. Do the six areas (purpose, program, personnel, facilities, school-community interaction, and coordination) include all aspects of elementary school endeavors? If no, what was omitted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37. Which of the six areas should not be considered in evaluating an elementary school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. In accordance with the recommended plan of planning the program seeking accreditation through a three-year period (one year affiliation study, one year planning and beginning evaluative self-study, and one year completing the self-study and visitation), are the requirements for teacher time and effort excessive?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39. Did the self-study infringe on time you otherwise would have spent in a more effective manner improving your teaching?</td>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40. Did the self-study cause you to devote time and effort to professional considerations that you otherwise would not have?</td>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41. Does the self-study center attention on desirable features of an elementary school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. Does the self-study center attention on problems needing effort in the school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43. Does the self-study help in formulating a plan of action toward improvement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44. Does the self-study identify an area, or areas, of needed attention in your class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Indicate below by checking your rating of the degree to which the report of the self-study helps reflect the true school situation:

- [ ] poor reflection
- [ ] fair reflection
- [ ] average reflection
- [ ] above average reflection
- [ ] excellent reflection
Questionnaire to Visiting Committees of Elementary Schools Participating in the Accreditation Program for Elementary Schools, Cooperative Program, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

I. Standards

Standards for elementary school accreditation are stated in the Guide to the Evaluation and Accreditation of Elementary Schools on pages 37-46. A copy of this Guide is enclosed for your convenience as a reference for answering the following questions:

Yes or No (Circle One)

1. Do the major topical headings (items I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XI) include all facets of elementary school operation?

2. If your answer to question one is no, please indicate what you found to be omitted. _______________

3. Which of the major topical headings (items I to XI) are unnecessary in the evaluation of an elementary school? __________________________________________

Yes or No

4. Do the standards lend themselves toward establishing a more desirable school situation?

Yes or No

5. Do the standards stimulate cooperative faculty action that might not occur otherwise?

Yes or No

6. Are the standards sufficiently high to provide a challenge to a school faculty?

Yes or No

7. In accordance with the principles upon which the standards were developed (Guide, p. 37), are the standards within reasonable achievement?

Yes or No

8. Is the standard on staff (Guide, pp. 42-44) practical?

9. If the answer to question eight is no, indicate which item (s) is (are) not. ________________________
10. Is the standard on class membership (Guide, p. 44) practical of attainment for desirable class membership?

11. If the answer to question ten is no, indicate why not: ____________________________

12. Did compliance with Standard X, Inter-School Athletic Competition, help or hinder the school program? Comment: ________________________________

13. Did compliance with Standard XI, Financial Support, help or hinder the school program? Comment: ________________________________

14. Was there evidence of teachers having received material or tangible assistance as a result of the school meeting standards? If so, check below in which general category or categories:

- professional literature
- supervisory assistance
- resource materials
- library books
- tangible apparatus for mathematics
- tangible items for science
- maps, globes, charts
- class size adjustment
- physical education equipment
- allowance for purchasing materials for class
- other (please indicate what) ____________________

15. Indicate below by checking your rating of the standards:

- low
- fair
- average
- moderately high
- high
II. In-Service Growth

As a member of a Visiting Committee of an elementary school faculty seeking accreditation in the Cooperative Program of the Southern Association, and/or in your examination of the study presented the visiting committee, please indicate whether there was evidence of the following:

Yes or No 16. The self-study assisted the faculty in its consideration of what a desirable elementary school is.

Yes or No 17. The self-study helped teachers visualize the total school program more effectively.

Yes or No 18. The self-study stimulated professional reading.

Yes or No 19. The self-study stimulated teachers to do further academic work.

Yes or No 20. The self-study assisted teachers in identifying their strengths and weaknesses.

Yes or No 21. The self-study stimulated cooperation on the part of the faculty.

Yes or No 22. The self-study stimulated teachers to share ideas and/or teaching experiences.

Yes or No 23. The self-study stimulated teachers to assume leadership responsibilities.

Yes or No 24. The self-study stimulated teachers to develop better working relations.

Yes or No 25. The self-study assisted teachers in working toward the solution of their teaching problems.

26. Indicate below by checking your rating of the self-study as an instrument of in-service growth:

___poor
___fair
___average
___above average
___excellent
III. Improving teaching-learning processes

Yes or No 27. Did the self-study cause teachers to change any of their classroom practices? If yes, check below in which general area:

- classroom routine
- classroom environment
- discipline
- method of teaching a given subject
- planning practices
- organization of work
- use of audio-visual aids
- experimentation with new ways of working with children
- use of library
- other (specify) ________________________________


Yes or No 28. Did the self-study cause any change in the students? If yes, check below in which general area:

- children showed greater interest in specific areas studied
- children brought appropriate materials to school
- children read more library books
- children became more at ease with classroom visitors
- children showed more self-control
- children showed improvement by actual test results
- children showed growth in knowledge, attitudes, understanding
- children showed greater respect for one another
- children were more aware of their objectives
- children learned to evaluate more effectively
- other (specify) ________________________________


29. Indicate below by checking your rating of the effectiveness of the self-study as an instrument for improving the teaching-learning process:

- not effective
- moderately effective
- effective
- very effective
- exceptionally effective
IV. Procedure

The procedure for seeking accreditation is indicated in the Guide, pages 8-29, and is indicated in seven steps.

Yes or No 30. Is the procedure for seeking accreditation clearly outlined? Comment: ________________________________

Yes or No 31. Is the continuous improvement program requirement of procedure practical? Comment: ________________________________

Yes or No 32. Is there practical value in having a visiting committee as required? Comment: ________________________________

School or System 33. Should accreditation be directed at the individual school or at the school system? Comment: ________________________________

Yes or No 34. Are the suggested approaches to study of the six major areas (Guide, pp. 19-25) sufficient? Comment: ________________________________

Yes or No 35. Was an excessively long period of time used by the faculty in orientation to the study? Comment: ________________________________

Yes or No 36. Do the six areas (purpose, program, personnel, facilities, school-community interaction, and coordination) include all aspects of elementary school endeavors? If no, what was omitted? ________________________________

37. Which of the six areas should not be considered in evaluating an elementary school? ________________________________

Yes or No 38. In accordance with the recommended plan of planning the program seeking accreditation through a three-year period (one year affiliation study, one year planning and beginning evaluative self-study, and one
year completing the self-study and visitation) are the requirements for teacher time and effort excessive? Comment: ________________________________

Yes or No 39. Did the self-study infringe on teacher time that could otherwise have been spent in a more effective manner in improving instruction? Comment: ________________________________

Yes or No 40. Did the self-study cause teachers to devote time and effort to professional considerations that they otherwise would not have? Comment: ________________________________

Yes or No 41. Does the self-study center attention on desirable features of an elementary school?

Yes or No 42. Does the self-study center attention on problems needing effort in the school?

Yes or No 43. Does the self-study help in formulating a plan of action toward improvement?

Yes or No 44. Does the self-study identify an area, or areas, of needed attention in classes?

45. Indicate below by checking your rating of the degree to which the report of the self-study helps reflect the true school situation:

- poor reflection
- fair reflection
- average reflection
- above average reflection
- excellent reflection
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On December 4, 1958, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools empowered its Cooperative Program in Elementary Education to offer an accrediting service to its affiliated elementary schools in addition to the school improvement services which have been available since 1953. The action took place at the sixty-third annual meeting of the Association which was held in Louisville, Kentucky.

At the same meeting the Central Coordinating Committee of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education stated its intention to delay the authorized accreditation of elementary schools until December of 1960 and to devote the intervening time to (1) revising standards, (2) improving procedures, (3) developing materials, and (4) training the leadership necessary to put regional elementary school accreditation into effect. Subsequently, the four major tasks were studied in a regional work conference at Daytona Beach, Florida, June 8-12, 1959, in conjunction with the Southern States Work Conference, an organization having long-standing ties with the Association's effort to improve elementary schools.

This publication, which replaces a mimeographed handbook, is one result of the regional work conference. It is intended to provide information to staffs of school systems interested in seeking accreditation of their elementary schools by the Association's Cooperative Program in Elementary Education. It should be especially helpful to persons who will be involved in the accrediting process in the near future: local staff members, members of boards of education, consultants, chairmen and members of
visiting committees, and the various State Elementary Committees of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education.

The bulletin contains background information regarding the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and its Cooperative Program in Elementary Education, and a step-by-step discussion of the actions involved in initial and continuing accreditation of elementary schools. The appendix includes detailed suggestions regarding visiting committees, regional standards for accreditation, fee schedules, and a roster of the participants in the Daytona Beach Work Conference.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is a regional educational agency, founded in 1895, which accredits public and private schools in eleven southern states. Its territory includes the states of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. By agreement with the other regional accrediting associations in the nation, it also accredits American schools in Latin America except for those in the Panama Canal Zone. Membership in the Association is sought on a voluntary basis. The attainment of membership certifies that the member institution has met the standards established by the Association.

The Association functions through four standing committees: the Executive Committee, the Commission on Secondary Schools, the Commission on Colleges and Universities, and the Commission on Research and Service. All actions of these committees are subject to review by the entire membership at the annual business meeting of the Association. Of the four committees, the ones dealing with secondary schools and colleges have direct responsibility for the accreditation of institutions. Institutions accredited by the Commissions become members of the Association when approved for membership by the Association.

The Association's Cooperative Program in Elementary Education is under the sponsorship of the Commission on Research and
Service. The duties of the Commission on Research and Service, as set forth in the Constitution, are to study accrediting policies of the Association, to study notable procedures of administering programs of studies, and to stimulate experimentation.

Policies of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education are determined by its Central Coordinating Committee which consists of the eleven state chairmen, two representatives of the Commission on Research and Service, two members-at-large, and the immediate-past regional chairman. Its executive committee consists of the chairman of the Central Coordinating Committee, the immediate-past chairman, the secretary, a representative of the Commission on Research and Service, and a member-at-large.

Elementary schools are to be accredited by the Central Coordinating Committee of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education according to standards and procedures developed by this committee. State Elementary Committees will submit recommendations to the Central Coordinating Committee of the Cooperative Program and the Central Coordinating Committee will, in turn, recommend to the Commission on Research and Service, the Executive Committee, and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, schools which the Central Coordinating Committee has accredited, in order that the Association may place such schools on an approved list to be published annually by the Association. During 1959 and 1960 a special Study Committee of the Association will give consideration to the program of accreditation and/or approval of elementary schools. The Study Committee will make recommendations regarding organizational patterns and relationships within the Association and will give special attention to
the implications which the future program would have for system­
wide evaluation procedures.

The Cooperative Program in Elementary Education

The Cooperative Program in Elementary Education, sponsored by
the Commission on Research and Service, is a program designed to
improve the elementary schools of the South, along with improve­
ment of secondary schools and colleges. It is unique in that no
other regional accrediting agency has concerned itself, thus far,
with elementary schools, although there are indications that
interest is growing in several of the regional associations.

The Association's elementary school activities began in 1946,
when the Commission on Research and Service voted unanimously to
devote its efforts to the problems of the elementary school and
the education of its teachers.

With the approval and assistance of the Association, the
cooperation of other agencies in the South, and a grant-in-aid
from the General Education Board, the Cooperative Study in Ele­
mentary Education was begun in 1948. The regional study which
included Oklahoma and Arkansas in addition to the eleven states
comprising the Association worked for three years in fact-find­
ing, developing evaluative materials and other publications,
organizing groups for action, and focusing attention upon the
critical needs of elementary schools during the post-World War II
days. At the conclusion of the Cooperative Study in 1951, the
Commission on Research and Service was designated as an interim
committee to consider any continuing relationship which the
Association might have with elementary schools. During the year
of interim study it was agreed by elementary school leaders and Association leaders that continuing regional action for the improvement of elementary schools was desirable and should be fostered; therefore, the proposal which later established the affiliated Cooperative Program in Elementary Education was prepared.

The Cooperative Program in Elementary Education is characterized by the following beliefs:

1. That elementary school improvement can be fostered best by stimulating and assisting schools to undertake or continue local school improvement programs.
2. That such school improvement programs should be centered upon problems identified through local self-studies.
3. That cooperative self-evaluations, based on the use of a systematic guide or procedure, are the best means of identifying areas of the school program in need of improvement and of unifying the forces of the school and the larger community.
4. That all schools can improve regardless of past achievements and that the door to affiliation should not be closed to any school or school system willing to work toward improvement, share practices, and contribute to the strengthening of state and regional activities.
5. That improvement is most likely to take place when all the schools within an administrative unit participate in the Cooperative Program on a system-wide basis, but that in special cases the initiative of individual faculties should be recognized and encouraged by allowing them individual school membership in the Program.
6. That two types of membership in the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education, affiliated and accredited, should be available to elementary schools, provided that school improvement on a continuing basis is clearly seen as the central purpose of all aspects of the Association's work with the elementary schools of the South.

During the six years of its existence, the Cooperative Program has stimulated and assisted its member schools in keeping with the basic beliefs of the Program. It has functioned through the activities of its regional and state committees.
On all levels, it has focused attention upon the needs and accomplishments of elementary schools. Its services have included regional, state, and district workshops and conferences; regional and state newsletters and other publications; consultative services; and the sponsoring of a program on elementary education each year at the annual meeting of the Association. Simultaneously, the Central Coordinating Committee sought ways to improve its services on state and regional levels. As a result, a coordinator for the Program was employed on a part-time basis in 1954 and on a full-time basis each year since 1955.

The Association's work in the field of elementary education has been well received by elementary school leaders and by Association leaders in general. In 1958-59, four hundred eighty-six (486) school systems in eleven states affiliated their elementary schools with the Association through membership in the Cooperative Program. The systems contained 4,316 elementary schools with an enrollment of 1,913,351 pupils; thus, the improvement program during that year had immediate significance for one of every three or four children enrolled in elementary schools of the South, plus an indirect or potential influence on other schools through its work to improve the conditions which affect all elementary schools.

Relationship Between Affiliation and Accreditation

Affiliation and accreditation are terms used for convenience to indicate two types of membership in the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education. School systems which are members of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education but are not accredited
are referred to as "affiliated" systems. Affiliated status will continue to be available to elementary schools in school systems which wish to participate in the Cooperative Program for the improvement of their elementary schools but do not wish to seek "accredited" status, either from choice or lack of adequate resources. School systems which are members of the Cooperative Program and have met the Program's requirements for accredited status are referred to as "accredited". Both types of systems are identified with the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The latter type of system is accredited by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education and approved by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

These designations may seem awkward, but within the Association the word "accreditation" is almost synonymous with membership; and although elementary schools can be members of the Association's Cooperative Program, their membership in the Association itself must await a change in the constitution of the Association. However, constitutional barrier does not prevent the offering of an accrediting service to elementary schools.

All members of the Cooperative Program, affiliated and accredited, participate in the regional school improvement program on a continuing basis. A school system can be an active participant in the school improvement program without being accredited, but a school system can not be accredited, regardless of its resources, unless it engages in a continuing program of school improvement as a part of the Cooperative Program. Requirements for school improvement activities and continued growth are incorporated as major features in the standards and procedures for accrediting.
elementary schools.

The willingness of the Cooperative Program to offer an accrediting service to its member schools is based upon the assumption that the attainment of quantitative and qualitative standards can be recognized through the accrediting process without losing sight of the value of conducting carefully planned programs of continuous school improvement.
CHAPTER II

STEPS IN SEEKING INITIAL ACCREDITATION

The work of the Association and its Cooperative Program in Elementary Education includes more than the accreditation of schools. Developing standards to give direction to the profession and to the public and administering those standards to give recognition to schools which meet them, are regarded as essential; however, accreditation is only one of the means through which the Association achieves its broad purpose: the improvement of education in the South through leadership and cooperative effort.

The general concept of accreditation itself has changed considerably during recent years and the changes have been in accord with the belief that (1) an accrediting agency has a responsibility for the improvement of schools which it accredits, and (2) schools should not be accredited unless they demonstrate a potential for continuing growth as indicated by the manner in which they organize and conduct programs for school improvement.

The Cooperative Program's concept of accreditation includes, of course, the official act of conferring accredited status on school systems which have met its qualitative and quantitative standards with major attention being given to qualitative standards and to assisting accredited school systems to improve. The accrediting process, if it is to realize its potential, must assist schools to achieve, recognize achievement as measured by standards, and stimulate and recognize continuing growth and achievement. When this is attained, accrediting agencies and the schools
accredited by them will be professional in the highest sense and will merit and receive support from the profession and the public.

This publication is intended to help local school personnel visualize the accrediting process as envisioned by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education. Seven steps in seeking initial accreditation are presented for that purpose in this chapter.

STEP ONE: PARTICIPATE IN THE AFFILIATION PROGRAM FOR AT LEAST ONE YEAR

The first step to be taken in seeking accredited status for elementary schools is to affiliate with the Association through membership in the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education. Application forms for affiliation can be obtained by writing to the Association's headquarters at the address shown on the cover of this bulletin.

Participation in the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education will give the personnel of a school system an opportunity to learn more about the regional elementary program and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, to become familiar with the operation of their State Elementary Committee, and to increase their skill in planning and conducting school improvement projects. Also, readiness to undertake a self-study can be developed and a beginning can be made on the self-study.

Participation in the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education does not require a school system to undertake a new, that is, additional, improvement project; however, a system that has not been conducting an organized improvement program must begin
to do so in order to become an affiliated system. An affiliated system must submit an annual report of its plans for school improvement to its State Elementary Committee. School improvement projects are to be chosen locally.

Stated simply, affiliation means that a school system is engaged in a well-organized, professionally conducted program of continuing school improvement, is willing to share the results of its projects, and participates in state and regional activities sponsored by the Association's Cooperative Program in Elementary Education. State and regional committees render assistance in conducting school improvement programs and work in various ways to improve the status of elementary schools and the resources available to them.

Reporting Local School Improvement Programs to State Elementary Committees

Certificates of affiliation with the Association are issued only to schools that submit acceptable plans for school improvement to their State Elementary Committee. The plans are reported on forms supplied by State Committees and usually are submitted in the fall of each year. Progress reports are made in the spring if, and as, requested by State Committees.

A school improvement program can consist of one or several projects. Whenever possible, each improvement project should be reported separately on separate forms. For uniformity in reporting, each project should be stated as an effort to solve a problem.
The following types of information will usually be expected regarding each project in a school's program for school improvement:

1. statement of problem
2. status of problem at beginning of study
3. description of procedures to be used for improvement
4. description of provisions to evaluate the effectiveness of procedures
5. designation of leadership responsibilities
6. resources to be used
7. provisions for time (meetings)

Some State Elementary Committees require each affiliated school to submit a report on each of its projects in the spring of each year. In such cases, if a project has been completed, the report will include an evaluation of the project. If a project has not been completed, the report will consist of a description of (1) improvements which have been made, (2) difficulties encountered, and (3) contemplated changes in procedures.

STEP TWO: DETERMINE READINESS FOR ACCREDITATION

The accrediting process, especially that part of it which precedes initial accreditation, can be a valuable experience for all participants. Increased unity of purpose, sharper perception of strengths and needs, insight into how needs can be met, heightened public confidence, and increased willingness to support the schools should result.

No decision to seek accreditation should be taken, however, until after the administrative staff, board members, teachers, and members of the community (1) are familiar with the purposes of accreditation, the requirements for initial and continuing accreditation, and the costs involved, and (2) have indicated a clear desire to have their schools accredited.
The attitude of the total staff toward the year of self-study is of especial importance. If the members of the staff perceive of the self-study as an opportunity to learn more about their schools and a challenge to their professional pride and ability, it will be a profitable undertaking. If the self-study is perceived as a chore to be performed because of administrative edict or Association requirements, it will be burdensome, and very little that is lastingly good can be expected of the performance. At best, a systematic self-study of a system of elementary schools requires sustained effort, and difficulties are certain to be encountered; conditions should be as favorable as possible before it is undertaken.

The responsibility for developing readiness to seek accreditation rests squarely on the leadership of the administrative staff of a school system. It is assumed that the required year of membership in the Association's Cooperative Program will provide an opportunity to gain considerable information. This publication is another source. Unofficial contacts with members of the State Elementary Committee and with personnel from systems that have gone through the accrediting process should help school personnel to gather the information needed to make a decision as to whether or not to seek accreditation at a particular time. After obtaining all available facts and considering them carefully, the local administration makes its decision.

**STEP THREE: FILE STATEMENT OF INTENT AND ORGANIZE FOR SELF-STUDY**

The third step in the accreditation process includes the filing of a statement of intent and the organizing of school
personnel for self-study.

Statement of Intent

As soon as the administration has decided to seek elementary school accreditation, the governing board of the system should adopt a resolution which states this intention. A copy of the statement of intent should be mailed to the chairman of the State Elementary Committee for action by the State Accrediting Committee, which is a sub-committee charged with handling all matters relating to accreditation. The statement of intent should be made not later than April 15 of the school year preceding the year of systematic self-study.

Preliminary Conference

Upon receipt of a system's statement of intention to seek accreditation, the Accrediting Committee will arrange for a representative to confer at local expense with representatives of the school system.

The purpose of the preliminary conference will be to review the requirements for initial and continuing accreditation, to judge the readiness of the system to seek accredited status for its elementary schools, and to begin the selection of a consultant.

Selection of Consultant

Each school system shall secure the services of a consultant who will act as advisor to the system during the self-study. The expenses involved in securing the services of such consultant shall be paid by the local school system. The selection of the
consultant is a joint responsibility of the local administration and the Accrediting Committee, but the person selected must be approved in writing by the Chairman of the Accrediting Committee. The consultant shall be a person who is familiar with the Association's affiliation program and its program of accreditation, as well as a person who is recognized as having competence in the field of elementary education.

Organizing for Self-Study

For purposes of accrediting, the procedures for self-study call for intensive study by a large group, and for work-study experiences with a visiting committee. To clarify terminology, the local group will be referred to hereafter in this publication as the Local Committee for Elementary School Improvement, although in many systems such groups are referred to as steering or planning committees.

The consultant shall advise with the administrative head of the system and secure through him a local committee for elementary school improvement, if an acceptable committee of this type does not exist. The composition and size of the local committee shall be left largely to the discretion of the chief administrator of the school system and the consultant, but it is suggested that such a committee include principals, teachers, supervisors, board members, and patrons or representatives of citizen advisory groups.

Function of Local Committee

The Local Committee for Elementary School Improvement is the liaison group between the consultant and the school system during
the self-study. The committee also has a continuing responsibility for leadership in the system's school improvement program following initial accreditation.

During the self-study the local committee will be responsible for identifying and reporting all that is being done, and needs to be done, for elementary school improvement in the system. This will, of course, necessitate identifying those things which are being done by each individual school unit. In meeting this part of its responsibility, the local committee should exercise leadership in developing among all faculties an understanding of procedures which individual schools are to follow.

Another, and very important, aspect of the local committee's function is to identify and report efforts which are being made on a system-wide basis, and by the system's administration, for improving the educational opportunities of all elementary children in the system. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that system-wide efforts which have implications for elementary school children are considered to be of extreme importance.

Specific suggestions regarding the forms for the local committee's report to the visiting committee are found elsewhere in this publication.

In addition, the Local Committee for Elementary School Improvement is responsible for making arrangements to facilitate the work of the visiting committee before and during its work in the system and for gathering local data regarding standards.

STEP FOUR: CONDUCT A SELF-STUDY

The next requirement for the accreditation of a school or school system is to conduct a self-study according to the plan
suggested in the paragraphs that follow.

Introduction

A major requirement for accreditation is that a system engage in a year of comprehensive self-study of the status and needs of its elementary schools, with the assistance of an approved consultant, and using procedures recommended by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education.

The self-study should begin at least one full year before a visiting committee arrives. Usually this minimum time will extend from March or April of one year to the corresponding time a year later; therefore, the "year of self-study" should not be interpreted as meaning a school year. Furthermore, a year will not be sufficient ordinarily unless readiness for the self-study has been developed, a consultant secured, and a local committee for elementary school improvement organized. These preliminary matters should be dealt with in the fall, and the study begun in force as soon after Christmas as possible.

Although a system can complete the preparatory steps and begin the self-study during its required year of membership in the Cooperative Program, it is recommended that systems without previous participation in the Cooperative Program observe the following time schedule: (1) a year of participation in the school improvement program; (2) a second year in which the study is organized and begun; and (3) a third year in which the self-study is completed and the system is visited by a committee.
Gathering Data on Standards

At several points, with varying degrees of thoroughness perhaps, a school system will want to measure itself against the other standards for elementary school accreditation. An assessment should be made locally before a statement of intent is filed with the State Accrediting Committee. Another informal assessment is made during the preliminary conference with a representative of the Accrediting Committee, before a consultant is selected.

Detailed information regarding the extent to which the system and each school within the system meet the standards will need to be gathered by the Local Committee on Elementary School Improvement and by faculties. These data are to be (1) recorded on forms supplied by the Cooperative Program; (2) made available to the visiting committee; and (3) supplied to the State Accrediting Committee by October 15 preceding initial accreditation.

An early and exact assessment of the system's status in regard to standards may give desirable direction to some of the system's efforts during participation in the improvement program or during the year of self-study, particularly in the areas of coordination and school-community interaction.

Conducting the Self-Study

The recommended procedures for self-study consist primarily of identifying and recording current efforts to bring about school improvement, identifying other areas of need, planning additional improvement projects, and establishing priorities.

Pilot studies conducted by the Association's Commission on
Research and Service have revealed that most work for school improvement can be grouped for convenience under one of the following major areas:

1. efforts having to do with establishing and clarifying purposes of the school and/or school system
2. efforts having to do with the program for pupils
3. efforts having to do with securing and retaining quality personnel and their growth in service
4. efforts having to do with providing facilities and their care
5. efforts having to do with school-community interaction
6. efforts having to do with coordination through administrative organization and procedures

The local system will be expected (1) to determine through the use of evaluative study guides and professional literature what it considers to be a desirable situation in each of the six major areas; (2) to identify specific efforts being made to improve each of the areas; and (3) to develop plans for additional efforts as the need for them is recognized during the self-study.

All projects are to be reported on worksheets prepared by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education. The worksheet will require the following types of information on each current school improvement project:

1. statement of problem (project or effort)
2. status of problem at beginning of project
3. procedures in seeking improvement
4. provisions for evaluating the effectiveness of procedures for school improvement
5. improvements which have already been observed
6. difficulties which have been encountered in the project
7. suggestions from the visiting committee

Needed projects that are identified but not begun during the year of self-study should be reported on the forms used for reporting "plans for school improvement" as described earlier on
Current and planned projects for school improvement will be of two varieties: system-wide and individual school. Each faculty will be responsible for reporting the efforts of its school. The system's Local Committee on Elementary School Improvement will be responsible for identifying and reporting the efforts which are being made or planned on a system-wide level. Individual school reports should include projects undertaken by individual teachers or group of teachers, if different from total school projects. The same principle applies to system-wide efforts in relation to specialized central office personnel and their projects.

Substantial evidence of school improvement activity should be accumulated and presented in a manner so that it can be appraised readily by a visiting committee. Although worksheets for recording such information will be available, and are to be used, personnel in the school system should use their ingenuity in providing such additional documentation as can be verified by a subsequent visiting committee.

Suggested approaches to study of the six major areas. Two of the many approaches to the study of the six major areas are presented in the paragraphs that follow.

Use of Publications

Before school personnel attempt to identify special efforts toward improvement, they will probably find it valuable to examine and use such publications as *Evaluating the Elementary School*, page 11 of this bulletin.
Looking at Your School, and Good Schools for Children.\(^1\) Publications of this nature are considered by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education as valuable resource materials but their use, while recommended, is not required for accreditation. The selection of publications, the extent to which they will be used, and how they will be used, are matters to be determined by the personnel of each school system working with the consultant.

Regardless of the assistance which printed materials may render in giving direction to personnel in identifying needs and planning school improvement projects, the Local Committee on Elementary School Improvement is charged with the responsibility of following the reporting procedures as outlined in this bulletin.

**B. Use of Leading Questions**

Leading questions of the types ordinarily found in evaluative guides are given below to aid in visualizing how school personnel can study each of the major areas of the educational program.

**Purposes.** Identification and acceptance of specific purposes give direction to the entire educational enterprise. School personnel, therefore, might respond to such questions as the following as they seek to determine what progress they have made toward agreement on goals:

\(^1\)The publications listed above can be obtained from the Association's office.
1. Have we determined the educational needs of the people residing in our district?
2. Have we identified values or value patterns that are considered desirable in child growth and development?
3. What responsibility have we accepted for bringing about desirable changes in values or value patterns?
4. Who makes the decisions about the directions of our school enterprise?
5. Have we sought agreement on the kind of a person who makes the fullest contribution to our society?

The honest facing of such questions should help a study group identify those things which they feel have meaning and purpose for them and should make others aware of the more important efforts they are making in relation to what they want their educational enterprise to accomplish.

Program. The elementary school includes all opportunities for activities and experiences in which the school is responsible, for guiding the growth and development of children, and for contributing to the improvement of the quality of living in the community. Faculties will want to enumerate the efforts being made to insure an affirmative answer to the questions which follow:

Does the program provide value-rich situations based upon:

1. The knowledge of children to be taught?
   (a) What information does the school have about the children?
   (b) How was this information secured?
   (c) How was this information used to plan an effective learning program?

2. Understanding and emphasis upon the important elements of a good instructional program?
   (a) What provisions are made for developing basic skills?
   (b) Is the school meeting needs and broadening interests?
(c) Are provisions made for fostering personal and community health and safety?
(d) What provisions are made for teaching wise use of resources?
(e) Is the school developing democratic citizens?

3. Good organization of the opportunities for learning?
(a) Is the school providing a balanced program of learning experiences?
(b) Is the school providing for flexibility in learning experiences?
(c) Is the school grouping children?
(d) Is the school providing for exceptional children?
(e) Is the school using special teachers?
(f) Is the school releasing time for classroom teachers?

4. Good teaching, including effective use of activities and materials, and a functional program of evaluation?
(a) Does the program provide for teacher-pupil planning?
(b) Does the program provide for making use of a variety of learning experiences and homework?
(c) Does the program provide for evaluation of pupil progress?

Personnel. This term should be interpreted to include all the professional and non-professional personnel employed by the school, such as classroom teachers, custodians, bus drivers, cafeteria workers, supervisors, special teachers, principals, nurses, secretaries, and others. Questions such as the following may help school personnel assess the local situation:

1. Professional personnel
(a) Do all professional personnel meet the legal requirements for the position held?
(b) Are all professional personnel competent, alert, conscientious, and emotionally stable?
(c) What is the status of the relationship among the professional personnel?

2. Non-professional personnel
(a) What contribution to the total school
program is made by each group?
(b) Are all non-professional personnel qualified for the positions held?

3. Miscellaneous questions

(a) Is there a program of inservice training?
(b) Does the school have policies for the selection and retention of competent personnel?
(c) Is there evidence of good relationship between teacher-child-home-administration?

Facilities. Any material things which contribute to effective learning are classified as facilities. They include buildings, grounds, and equipment, transportation facilities, instructional materials, and custodial supplies and materials. In the self-study, school personnel might consider such questions as the following:

1. How adequate are the school site, the buildings, the equipment, and the supplies?
2. Are all facilities used as effectively as possible?
3. What improvements would increase the effectiveness of the school program?

Community-school interaction. Community-school interaction is a two-way process whereby the community creates, supports, and modifies the school program, and the school in turn serves the community through organized programs providing for the intellectual, physical, social, emotional, and spiritual growth of children, youth, and adults.

The following questions are suggested as an aid to school personnel wishing to study the interaction between the school and the community which it serves:

1. How do school programs help teachers understand the community?
2. How do school programs help children use community
resources -- human, institutional, and natural?

3. How do school personnel work with organized parent groups and other community groups for school improvement?

4. How do school personnel work with individuals or groups which attempt to exert pressure upon schools?

5. How does the school recognize and provide for differences in religious and ethnic background?

6. How do community drives for money affect the school program?

7. How do community mores affect school curricula?

8. How does the community use the school plant, instructional materials, and staff?

9. How do organized community groups give financial support, other than by taxes, to the schools?

Coordination. The concept of coordination is one of the most essential elements in a system-wide program of school improvement. The degree to which all personnel in the elementary schools within a system coordinate their efforts will determine the degree of success that can be realized on a system-wide basis. Coordination comes about through cooperative effort and careful planning by all personnel concerned. In examining the kind and quality of coordination present in a school system, the local group may find the following questions helpful:

1. What provisions are made through administrative policies and procedures to utilize the full resources of the school and community in improving the school?

2. What provisions are made for reviewing and revising administrative policies from time to time?

3. What provisions are made for utilizing the suggestions of school personnel and lay persons when studying and revising administrative policies?

4. What efforts are being made from the system level to coordinate inservice education activities?

5. What provisions are being made to provide effective and current instructional materials?
6. What efforts are being made to coordinate curricular and co-curricular activities?
7. What provisions are made to coordinate the overall objectives towards which the schools are working?
8. What efforts are made to give direction to organizations interested in the school programs?

The summary of the information from the worksheets. The data entered on the worksheets must be summarized by the faculty at the school level and by the Local School Improvement Committee at the system level prior to the coming of the visiting committee.

A. At the School Level

Each faculty must list the efforts which it is making to improve in each of the six areas. In the area of program, efforts may be listed such as follows:

1. to improve the basic skills program in the elementary school
2. to adapt the instructional program to the individual needs of each child
3. to improve the school's total library program

In addition, each faculty must identify the problems or projects selected for future study.

B. System-wide Efforts

Efforts of a broader nature which encompass central office staff and all of the schools should also be summarized. These data should cover the six areas mentioned above and should give particular emphasis to administrative and supervisory efforts which are made and areas where additional study is needed.
STEP FIVE: PROVIDE FOR A VISITING COMMITTEE

Making provision for a special committee to visit the school or school system is the fifth step in the accreditation process.

Selecting Members

Not later than three months prior to the date that the system is to be visited, the chairman and other members of the visiting committee should be selected and notified. The steps that should be taken in appointing this committee are as follows:

1. The chief administrator of the system notifies the chairman of the State Accrediting Committee of the tentative dates for which the visiting committee is to be requested.
2. The State Accrediting Committee chairman will then appoint a person to serve as chairman of the visiting committee.
3. The appointed chairman of the visiting committee, the chief administrator, and the consultant will (a) confer regarding the size of the visiting committee and the length of its visit, (b) jointly decide on those items, and (c) select the other members of the visiting committee, subject to the approval of the State Accrediting Committee.

Preparing for the Visit

In preparation for the visit to the school system, the following actions are taken:

1. The chairman organizes the visiting committee and makes sub-committee assignments. All members of the visiting committee should be invited with the understanding they will be present for the entire length of the visitation.
2. The chairman of the visiting committee notifies the local committee of the sub-committee assignments at least two weeks prior to the visitation.
3. The local committee mails the complete report of the findings of the self-study, together with pertinent background information about the school system to each member of the visiting committee. Any special materials that relate to sub-committee assignments and which are not included in the general report, should be mailed to the appropriate persons. All materials should be received by members of the visiting
committee at least one week prior to their visit.

4. The local committee and the consultant have the responsibility for seeing that the role of the visiting committee is understood by all local personnel prior to the committee's visit. The local committee instructs the local staff as to the general procedures that will be followed by the visiting committee and calls attention to the fact that no special recognition should be given to visitors as they observe in classrooms.

5. The local committee plans some means of orienting the visiting committee to the school system's philosophy, objectives, manner of operation, and organization. At this orientation meeting a representative of the State Accrediting Committee should plan to explain the purposes and procedures of the Association's Cooperative Program in Elementary Education.

STEP SIX: FORMULATE PLANS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND DESIGNATE PRIORITIES

After the visiting committee has departed, the local committee is expected to prepare and submit to the State Accrediting Committee a report of the system's plans for school improvement. The system-wide plans for school improvement should be based on the results of the self-study, the recommendations of the visiting committee, and the deliberations by the local committee on the previous findings and the visiting committee's recommendations. The report of the local committee should also include the plans of each individual elementary school in the system.

Priorities should be established in both types of plans for improvement: system-wide and individual school. Consideration of the following factors will be helpful in determining priorities:

1. a balance between immediate and long range programs for school improvement
2. the general attitude of the staff, special competencies of individuals, and their enthusiasm for various aspects of the program
3. the significance of the project in relation to the major school objectives
4. urgency from the viewpoint of administrators, school board, faculty, and parents, as well as urgency created by state, regional, and national programs
5. availability and accessibility of physical and human resources
6. community needs and community understanding of the total school program

Initial accreditation will be based in part on the judgment of the Accrediting Committee as to the adequacy of the plans; therefore, the short- and long-range plans should be comprehensive. Continuing accreditation will be based in part on the efforts which are made to put the plans for school improvement into effect and partly on the success of those efforts. Likewise, the plans should be realistic in that they call only (1) for improvements which the individual schools and the system can reasonably expect to make, and (2) for actions which they can commit themselves to take.

School improvement projects constitute a basic requirement for elementary school accreditation, and the requirement is continuing in nature. Full implications of this should have been determined before the decision to seek accreditation was made, but local personnel will want to review the implications of the requirement before submitting their plans.

STEP SEVEN: FILE DATA ON STATUS AND PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT WITH THE STATE ACCREDITING COMMITTEE

During the year of self-study, the local system shall gather data on all standards and record them properly. The data on
standards, a report of the self-study, and plans for school improvement are to be submitted on forms provided by the State Accrediting Committee to the chairman of that committee as soon as possible after the plans are developed or by a date specified by the State Accrediting Committee.
CHAPTER III

ACTION BY STATE AND REGIONAL COMMITTEES

State elementary accrediting committees will meet each fall, usually immediately after October 15, to consider applications for accreditation. At that time, members of the State Accrediting Committee will have six types of information to guide them in deciding which of the systems applying merit accredited status:

1. a complete copy of the self-study as prepared by the Local Committee on Elementary School Improvement prior to visitation, together with background material submitted to the visiting committee
2. a complete copy of the visiting committee's report to the local school system
3. data supplied by the local committee on the degree to which the system and schools met the standards for elementary school accreditation at the time of the visitation
4. a statement from the visiting committee regarding the adequacy of the self-study, plans for school improvement, and the other accreditation standards
5. a supplementary report on standards, filed by the local committee before October 15, which shows changes made since the previous spring
6. the professional knowledge of the school system possessed by members of the Accrediting Committee

After careful study of the data available for each system applying for accreditation status, the Committee will make a decision. If the decision is favorable, accreditation of the system will be recommended to the Central Coordinating Committee of the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education during the annual business meeting of the Association in December. Favorable action on the recommendation will result in accreditation of the system.

The Central Coordinating Committee will then recommend to the Commission on Research and Service, the Executive Committee, and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools,
systems and/or schools which they have accredited in order that the Association may place the accredited units on an approved list to be published annually by the Association.
CHAPTER IV

CONTINUING ACCREDITATION

Following initial accreditation which takes place at the annual meeting of the Association in December, a report will be due by May 15 of each year thereafter or as determined by the State Accrediting Committee from both the local system and from each individual school in the system. The reports are to be submitted to the State Elementary Committee by a designated contact person on forms provided by the Association and will contain the following information:

1. progress in school improvement made in the school year then ending
2. analysis of unmet needs and plans for school improvement for the coming school year

An annual application which contains data on the standards must be filed with the chairman of the State Accrediting Committee by October 15 of each year, or at a time determined by that committee. If an accrediting committee chooses a date in the spring, a supplementary report showing changes affecting standards, must be filed by October 15. Annual dues should accompany the application.

The State Accrediting Committee will study the information contained in application forms and in the local committee's report of school improvement activities and then recommend to the Central Coordinating Committee that the system continue its accredited status, be advised, warned, or dropped.

At the end of each three years after initial accreditation, a special visiting committee representing the Association and
designated by the Accrediting Committee will meet with local representatives to review the progress which the school system has made during the preceding three years. As a result of this special visiting committee's report, appropriate action will be taken by the State Accrediting Committee; that is, the Committee will recommend that the school or system continue its accredited status, be advised, warned, or dropped. The State Accrediting Committee of the Association's Cooperative Program in Elementary Education may call for an interim evaluation by a visiting committee at any time conditions seem to warrant such action.
APPENDIX I

THE VISITING COMMITTEE AND ITS WORK

Although references have been made elsewhere in the bulletin to the visiting committee, this special section gives detailed information regarding its selection and its work. The information should be of value to local personnel and to members of visiting committees.

Accrediting procedures call for a visiting committee representing the Association's Cooperative Program in Elementary Education to (1) review the findings of the Local Committee for Elementary School Improvement; (2) study the system's elementary schools in reference to standards; and (3) make suggestions for further improvement.

Selection

The chairman of the visiting committee is appointed by the State Accrediting Committee. Other members of the visiting committee are chosen by the designated chairman, the consultant, and the administrative head of the system, subject to the approval of the State Accrediting Committee. Invitations to serve on the visiting committee will be extended by the chairman of the State Accrediting Committee.

The size of the visiting committee and the length of its visit will vary according to the size and complexity of the system; however, the minimum size will be three persons. Whenever a committee of this size is used, its membership shall consist of an elementary school principal or superintendent, an elementary...
classroom teacher, and an instructional supervisor whose responsibility includes the elementary grades. State Department of Education personnel are included in the latter category. As the size of the visiting committee increases, care should be exercised to maintain a balance among the above categories; in addition, persons in elementary education in teacher education institutions and representatives of secondary schools accredited by the Association should be included. Whenever possible, the membership of visiting committees should be from systems whose elementary schools are accredited by the Cooperative Program.

Work of the Committee Prior to Visiting the System

The visiting committee should receive the report of the self-study from the Local Committee on School Improvement early enough to allow the visiting group to study the contents carefully and to make a complete assessment of its comprehensiveness prior to the actual visit. Before the visit, too, the chairman should advise the members of their tentative sub-committee assignments and remind each of them to take with him when the committee visits the system the self-study materials furnished by the Local Committee on School Improvement.

Work of the Committee While Visiting the Local System

The committee members perform the following functions during their stay in the local school system:

1. Meet to review and clarify the purpose of the visiting committee in terms of Association policy; and to review any instruments of evaluation to be used.
2. Participate in an orientation session during which the Local Committee presents the detailed self-study.
3. Meet for organization
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a. Review sub-committee assignments for reporting on major areas:

(1) purposes
(2) program
(3) personnel
(4) facilities
(5) coordination
(6) school and community interaction

b. Organize sub-committees for school visitation

c. Plan for the organization of reports

d. Plan joint meetings with Local Committee on Elementary School Improvement

e. Plan additional meetings of the visiting committee as needed

f. Set up schedule for

(1) visiting in schools
(2) submitting individual reports on the six areas to the chairman of the six area committees
(3) area sub-committees to consolidate reports
(4) total visiting committee to approve area committee reports
(5) presenting report of the visiting committee to the Local Committee

4. Visit in schools to evaluate self-study; conduct individual conferences with teachers and lay people; inspect school plant, examine reports and records; and look for evidences to support statements made in report of self-study and data on standards submitted by the local committee.

5. Formulate and approve the final report, including recommendations for improvement; and decide whether to place stamp of approval on the self-study and to certify regarding standards.

6. Submit reports to

a. the Local Committee for Elementary School Improvement
b. the State Accrediting Committee
APPENDIX II

REGIONAL STANDARDS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ACCREDITATION

The value of accreditation as a means of improving schools depends largely on the degree to which the certifying agency is accepted by the public and the profession as a competent, professional organization. Confidence in an accrediting agency depends ultimately on the quality of its standards and the manner in which they are developed, administered, and revised.

Regional standards for elementary school accreditation are the result of three years of careful study by many people. The tentative standards developed early in 1957 have undergone several major revisions to produce the current standards. The standards were developed with the following principles in mind:

1. Standards should be both qualitative and quantitative. Standards when met should assure the possibility of an adequate school program at the time of initial accreditation.

2. Standards should be flexible enough to provide incentive at the time of initial accreditation to all the states in the region, which means that while schools in all states would meet regional requirements, additional local requirements might be determined by State Elementary Committees.

3. Standards should point the direction to excellence on a continuing basis. Today's excellence should not be allowed to become tomorrow's mediocrity in terms of a school's possibilities.

4. Standards should require evidence periodically that a system is moving toward the achievement of the goals which it has set for itself. No system should expect to have its elementary schools accredited from year to year unless it can furnish concrete evidence of achievement beyond the level at which the school was last approved.

5. Standards should be applicable to both the individual schools within a system and to the school system as a comprehensive unit; thus, although each school within a system should meet minimum requirements before the system is accredited, accreditation should not be limited to an additive process, but should give full
consideration to all the factors in the system which influence schools.

The purpose of all standards, as well as the procedures for accrediting schools, is to improve the quality of elementary schools. The standards listed as minimum requirements shall be met as described herein by all schools for regional accreditation. The State Committee minimums may be higher in appropriate instances, but not lower than regional requirements.

The standards for accrediting elementary schools are as follows:

I. School Improvement Programs

A. Each system which wishes to have its elementary schools accredited by the Association's Cooperative Program in Elementary Education shall be active participants in the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education for at least one year immediately prior to its application for accreditation.

B. During the year of preparation, at the beginning of which the superintendent shall notify the Association's State Elementary Committee of the system's intention to seek accreditation, the faculties of the elementary schools within the system shall undertake, under the supervision of the State Elementary Committee, a systematic analysis of status and needs.

C. Following initial accreditation, each school system and each elementary school within the system shall engage in a continuing program of school improvement. Each improvement program shall meet the following requirements:

1. On the basis of the systematic analysis of status and needs, each school system and each elementary school within the system shall develop and report an annual plan to meet the identified needs of the children, the school, and the community which it serves.

2. Each annual school improvement plan shall include the following:
a. evidence that the problem which has been chosen is significant enough to justify the effort for improvement
b. a description of what the faculty intends to do to solve the problem which has been selected
c. a provision for evaluating the effectiveness of the faculty's efforts to solve the problem
d. designation of leadership responsibilities
e. a list of the resources which are to be used in solving the problem
f. a statement regarding the length, time, and frequency of the meetings to be devoted to the school improvement program
g. records of the changes resulting from the faculty's efforts
h. an annual report of the progress submitted through the office of the superintendent to the Southern Association's State Elementary Committee

D. System-wide provisions for the following shall be made:

1. adequate supervisory assistance for the coordination of the improvement program
2. resource materials needed for effective school improvement programs
3. consultative help needed for effective school improvement programs
4. time for professional study and school improvement which is in addition to and does not infringe upon the requirement for a minimum of 175 days of classroom instruction
5. representatives to participate in state and regional undertakings (Recommendation: budgetary support for participation in state and regional undertakings should be provided.)

II. Procedural Requirements

A. In order to be accredited by the Cooperative Program in Elementary Education, the system's elementary schools shall first meet the accreditation standards, if any, normally used in their state.

B. Accreditation of elementary schools shall be on a system-wide basis, including all elementary schools under one administrative unit. When, if for reasons which seem good and sufficient, an individual school with a minimum of seven teachers, exclusive of the principal, or a cluster of schools within an administrative unit wishes to apply for accreditation even though the system does not wish to apply for accreditation, or the system does not meet the initial
accreditation standards, the State Committee shall be empowered to accept or reject the application, provided:

1. that the school or schools shall meet all the standards for accreditation at the time of initial accreditation
2. that a conference shall be held with the superintendent to review the application for accreditation
3. that special care shall be taken to insure that other schools in the same administrative unit are not handicapped in achieving their purposes as a result of the aforementioned accreditation

III. Initial and Subsequent Accreditation

In order to provide opportunity for initial accreditation and incentive for growth, a period of time after initial accreditation is allowed each school system before it is expected to attain all requirements, subject to the following conditions:

A. At the time of Initial accreditation, at least three-fourths (75%) of the elementary schools within an administrative unit shall meet the standards and all of the schools within an administrative unit shall meet the school improvement requirement. State committees may add other general requirements for all schools.

B. As many as five schools, each of which has not more than six teachers, may be grouped and considered for accreditation purposes as one school unit.

C. At subsequent three-year intervals, substantial progress must be shown in removing deficiencies and improving quality. The State Elementary Committee will be the authority for determining the adequacy of progress.

IV. Program

A. Schools shall provide an instructional program designed (1) to develop each child as an individual and as a socially sensitive participant in group living, and (2) to improve the quality of living in the community. Instructional programs which accomplish these purposes possess the following characteristics:

1. continuous, cooperative curriculum development
2. understanding of child-growth and development
3. continuous study of the teaching-learning process
4. utilization of current research
5. wise use of available resources (personnel, community, printed materials, and multisensory aids)
6. sensitivity to needs of the immediate community
7. participation by all concerned in continuous evaluation (teachers, pupils, supervisors, others in community)
8. flexibility in learning experiences based on individual differences (abilities, time and rate of learning, background of experiences, needs and interests)
9. appropriate scope and sequence in all experiences (daily, yearly, and total program)
10. balance among experiences in all areas of development (basic skills, health, physical education and safety, social living, and aesthetic activities)
11. administrative and supervisory practices and procedures consistent with the above

B. Such a program necessitates a curriculum that:

1. provides adequate learning experiences in:
   a. instructional areas
      (1) language arts
      (2) arithmetic
      (3) science
      (4) social studies
      (5) health, physical education, and safety
      (6) related arts
      (7) music
   b. wholesome school living

2. facilitates the development of:
   a. proficiency in needed skills:
      (1) reading well
      (2) writing legibly
      (3) spelling accurately
      (4) listening attentively
      (5) expressing ideas effectively and creatively
      (6) speaking clearly
      (7) thinking critically
      (8) figuring accurately
(9) observing carefully
(10) solving problems
(11) participating effectively in groups
(12) keeping healthy
(13) enjoying aesthetic experiences

b. Behavior based upon these values:

(1) honesty and integrity
(2) loyalty to democratic ideals and processes
(3) responsibility for one's own actions
(4) appreciation and desire for better things in our culture
(5) willingness to accept and effect desirable change
(6) respect and concern for others
(7) wise use of time, money, and natural resources
(8) understanding and accepting self and others

C. Such a program is implemented by:

1. Teacher-learning processes which involve:
   a. teacher-pupil planning
   b. use of variety of learning experiences and media
   c. evaluation of pupil progress
   d. adequate use and maintenance of records and other sources of data
   e. provision for individual differences
   f. acceptance of guidance responsibilities
   g. concern for the physical conditions, emotional climate, and social aspects of the learning environment in the total school program
   h. utilization of all available resources
   i. efficient use of time
   j. effective ways of working

2. Effective use of available services and agencies

V. Staff*

A. Teachers shall hold a bachelor's degree or degree

---

*A school will be considered as having met this standard (V) if it meets the requirements of Sections A & B and any three of the remaining four sections.
equivalent accepted by the State Department for certification, and a non-emergency state certificate for teaching in elementary schools. Exceptions will be made for:

1. a teacher who is within five years of mandatory retirement, but on his retirement the position must be filled with a fully qualified person;
2. a teacher who has a state elementary certificate based on less than a bachelor's degree so long as he is registered in a degree program and continues to progress toward graduation at the rate of six semester hours a year. However, if a qualified teacher resigns during the school year, there must be evidence of good intent when the emergency vacancy is filled with less than a fully qualified person.

(Recommendation: teachers should be encouraged to seek a fifth year of training.)

B. Principals shall hold a master's degree and the non-emergency state certificate required for elementary principals. Exceptions will be made for:

1. a principal who is within five years of mandatory retirement; but if a vacancy occurs in the meantime, or upon his retirement, the position must be filled with a fully qualified person;
2. a principal who holds a state elementary principal's certificate based on a bachelor's degree, provided he is registered in a master's degree program and continues to earn credits at the rate of six semester hours per year toward the degree.

(Recommendation: principals should be encouraged to seek additional formal training or other valuable educational experiences.)

C. Principals in schools with 7-11 full-time teachers shall have at least one-half of each school day free for supervision and other professional leadership responsibilities. In schools with 12 or more full-time teachers, they shall be full-time supervising principals.

D. Schools with 7-14 full-time teachers shall employ a part-time librarian or instructional materials person. Schools with fifteen (15) or more full-time teachers shall employ a full-time librarian or instructional materials person.
E. Each special service staff member shall be properly certified in his respective area.

F. At least half-time secretarial help shall be provided for schools with 7-11 full-time teachers. Schools with 12 or more full-time teachers shall have full-time secretarial help.

(Recommendation: schools with twenty (20) or more teachers should have additional secretarial help.)

VI. Length of School Term and Employment

The school year shall contain at least 175 days of classroom instruction.

(Recommendations: the teaching staff should be employed and compensated for ten months in order to provide time for professional study and cooperative planning; and the administrative and supervising staff should be employed and compensated for twelve months.)

VII. Class Membership

A. Three-fourths of the primary classes in each school shall have thirty (30) pupils or fewer in membership. No primary class shall exceed thirty-five (35) pupils in membership.

(Recommendations: twenty-five (25) pupils in class membership should be considered the desirable maximum for primary grades; no primary class should exceed twenty-five (25) pupils in membership.)

B. Three-fourths of the intermediate grades and upper grades shall have thirty-five (35) pupils or fewer in membership. No intermediate or upper-grade class shall exceed forty (40) pupils in membership.

(Recommendations: twenty-five (25) pupils in class membership should be considered the desirable maximum for intermediate grades; and no intermediate class should exceed twenty-five (25) in membership.)

VIII. School Size

No regional requirement

(Recommendations: no primary unit, K-3, should have an enrollment of less than 100 pupils except in isolated areas as defined by state department codes; no intermediate unit, or K-6 school, should have fewer than 175 pupils or more than 500 pupils; and as new schools are constructed, they should be planned
for maximum enrollments of approximately 600. Not
more than twenty-five per cent of all schools in a
system should have enrollments above 600 pupils.)

IX. Physical Facilities

A. Each new school site shall be at least five acres
in size, plus one acre for each 100 pupils, except
two acres will be the acceptable minimum for one or
two teacher schools. Exception may be made where
topography and lack of available land makes it
impossible to meet this standard fully.

B. No regional space requirement for classrooms

(Recommendation: classrooms should have 30 square
feet per child, exclusive of storage and toilet
areas; less than 24 square feet per child is
regarded as highly inadequate.)

X. Inter-School Athletic Competition

An inter-school competitive sports program among
elementary schools which is of a varsity pattern
with scheduled league games and a championship
shall not be permitted for grades 1-6, and such
a program is discouraged in grades 7-8 when these
grades are part of an elementary school. Schools
shall develop effective physical education pro­
grams for all pupils.

XI. Financial Support

A. There shall be evidence of financial support suf­
icient in amount to promote achievement of the
school's purpose. Approved budgetary procedures
shall be followed in the administration of the
school funds.

1. There shall be evidence that local and state
responsibility for adequate financial support
of the school is recognized and that reason­
able effort is being made to meet this
responsibility.

2. The records of all funds collected and disbursed
in connection with the operation of any part of
the school program shall be kept in accurate and
systematic form, properly safeguarded, and audited
at appropriate intervals.

3. Money raising activities of pupils and teachers
shall be rigorously restricted. Such activities
as are used shall be limited to those that have
recognized educational value. Equipment, mate­
rials, and services should be financed by
capital outlay or operating and maintenance funds rather than by funds raised at school.

B. Instructional Materials and Supplies

1. A minimum of $2.00 per pupil shall be budgeted and expended from school funds for library and other instructional materials. Special provisions shall be made for new schools.

(Recommendation: a minimum of $3.00 per pupil should be budgeted and expended from school funds for library and other instructional materials.)

2. There shall be evidence of an organized plan for determining the need for, the procurement of, and the getting into use of instructional materials.
APPENDIX III

SCHEDULE OF ACCREDITATION FEES

Annual accreditation fees are based on a combination of the number of elementary pupils in a system and the number of elementary schools. The fee schedule is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Elementary Pupils</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>$ 25.00 plus $4.00 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,000</td>
<td>$ 50.00 plus $4.00 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 to 5,000</td>
<td>$100.00 plus $4.00 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 to 10,000</td>
<td>$150.00 plus $4.00 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 to 15,000</td>
<td>$200.00 plus $4.00 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 to 20,000</td>
<td>$250.00 plus $4.00 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 to 25,000</td>
<td>$300.00 plus $4.00 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 to 30,000</td>
<td>$350.00 plus $4.00 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30,000</td>
<td>$375.00 plus $4.00 per school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affiliation fees for membership in the Association's Cooperative Program in Elementary Education are included in the accreditation fees. Affiliation fees for membership in the Cooperative Program, without accreditation, are one-half the amount charged for accreditation.
APPENDIX IV

MEMBERS OF THE DAYTONA BEACH WORK CONFERENCE

Official Representatives from the States

Jewel Askew, Supervisor
Savannah and Chatham County Schools
Savannah, Georgia

George Blassingame, Consultant
Division of School Accreditation
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas

Birdie Lee Bobo, Division of Classroom Teachers
Alabama Education Association
Birmingham, Alabama

C. J. Bordelon, Supervisor
Terrebonne Parish Schools
Houma, Louisiana

T. A. Carmichael, Director of Negro Education
State Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia

W. J. Castine, Principal
Bradley School
Columbia, South Carolina

Sara de Keni, Consultant
Elementary Education
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida

Sara Divine, Consultant
In-Service Teacher Education
State Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia

Elizabeth Donovan, Visiting Asst. Professor of Education
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

Guy Duncan, Director of Laboratory School
Livingston State College
Livingston, Alabama

Lucy Buckles Every, Supervisor of Instruction
Volusia County Schools
Daytona Beach, Florida

Charles Faulk, Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

E. Harold Fisher, State Supervisor of Elementary Schools, State Department of Education
Jackson, Mississippi

Carolin Foxworth, Principal
Lemira Elementary School
Sumter, South Carolina

Bernice Freeman, Supervisor
Troup County Schools
LaGrange, Georgia

Harry R. Graham, Jr.
Principal
Fredericksburg, Virginia

John C. Graves, Principal
Lake Elementary School
Jackson, Mississippi

Eleanor Green, Professor of Elementary Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Morrill Hall, Area Supervisor
State Department of Education
Zebulon, Georgia

D. L. Holly, Principal
Pate Elementary School
Darlington, South Carolina
George Hopkins, Director of
Teacher Education & Certification
State Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina

Thelma Jones, Principal
Beechwood School
Fort Mitchell, Kentucky

Louise Hunt, Supervisor
Weakley County Schools
Dresden, Tennessee

Thomas R. Landry, Director of Elementary Education
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Alberta Lowe, Professor of Elementary Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Roy Lowry, Superintendent
Washington County Schools
Plymouth, North Carolina

Catherine Lytle, Supervisor
Paris City Schools
Paris, Kentucky

Julia McGregor, Teacher
L. J. Bell School
Rockingham County Schools
Rockingham, North Carolina

Clyde McKee, Supervisor Emeritus State Elementary School
Jackson, Mississippi

Lessie Moore, Principal
Woodland Elementary School
Pineville, Louisiana

Julian Morse, General Supervisor of Schools
Baker County Schools
MacClenny, Florida

Mary Northcutt, Teacher
Breckenridge Training School
Morehead State College
Morehead, Kentucky

Carolyn Oxford, Teacher
Leon County Public Schools
Tallahassee, Florida

Lulu Palmer, Consultant
Division of Elementary Education, State Department of Education
Montgomery, Alabama

Ruth Peters
Instructional Supervisor
Valdosta City Schools
Valdosta, Georgia

William B. Royster, Chief Supervisor, Elementary Education, State Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina

Durell Ruffin, Coordinator Cooperative Program in Elementary Education
Atlanta, Georgia

Marjorie Sloan, Supervisor
Maury County Schools
Columbia, Tennessee

Claude A. Taylor, Assistant Director, Division of Instructional Service
State Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky

L. L. Terry, Supervisor
Winn Parish Schools
Winnfield, Louisiana

Lindsey O. Todd
Superintendent
Meridian Public Schools
Meridian, Mississippi
Additional Participants (Persons who participated in the work conference - at the request of the elementary group - when their schedule of activities in the Southern States Work Conference permitted them to attend sessions of the elementary group):

Cliff Hamilton  
State Department of Education  
Charleston, West Virginia

W. L. Pafford, Director  
Division of Field Services  
State Department of Education  
Atlanta, Georgia

Lucille Sessions, Supervisor  
Decatur City Schools  
Decatur, Georgia

Mildred Swearingen, Professor of Elementary Education  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida

R. Lee Thomas, Consultant  
State Department of Education  
Nashville, Tennessee
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LOUISIANA REPORT¹

Thomas R. Landry, Secretary

Following the Memphis meeting of the Southern Association, two parallel committees were organized in Louisiana - the Advisory Committee on Education and the Advisory Committee on Negro Elementary Education. To coordinate the efforts of the two committees, it was decided that the state supervisor of Negro education and the state supervisor of elementary education would hold membership on both committees. These committees met from time to time, acting always in an advisory capacity to the State Department of Education. Occasionally special sub-committees were appointed to do specific jobs, but these were discharged on completion of the immediate assignment. Membership on the committees was arranged on an overlapping basis with approximately one-third of the members being replaced each year beginning at the end of the second year.

During the summer of 1949 Louisiana entered actively into the regional program by having a representative at Daytona Beach and an observer during the closing sessions of the Tallahassee workshop. As soon as the evaluation guide was available in mimeographed form, the advisory committee members became thoroughly acquainted with the contents. They proceeded to acquaint administrators, supervisors, and teachers with the bulletin and the program. By the time the printed bulletins were available, sixteen "key" schools had been selected to experiment with the materials. These schools - eight public schools and one parochial school for white children and seven public schools for Negro children - began to use the criteria experimentally, with the assistance of the State Department of Education and the members of the two advisory committees. By May 15, 1950, the sixteen schools had completed their assigned task. To give continuity to the evaluation program, the committees invited thirty-four additional schools to use the evaluation materials at a more normal rate and to take as long as necessary to complete the program.

During the 1950-51 school year, the advisory committees rendered invaluable aid to the State Department of Education in furthering the evaluation program. Jointly with the State Department of Education, the advisory committees: (1) widely publicized self-evaluation as an in-service program through parish workshops and conferences at the colleges, personal appearances before school faculties, and through distribution of countless pieces of duplicated materials; (2) served as consultants to faculties using or wishing to use the Elementary Evaluative Criteria; and (3) organized and conducted visitations to those schools completing the use of the evaluative materials. As a result of this activity, the advisory committees and the State Department of Education report with pride the status of elementary school evaluation in Louisiana as follows: (1) twenty schools have used the evaluative materials and are now engaged in a follow-up program; (2) sixty-four schools are now using the materials as a guide for an in-service program; (3) fifty-one schools definitely plan to begin using the evaluation guide in 1951-52; and (4) seventy-five schools are exploring the possibility of using the materials in the near future.

Two other phases of the Cooperative Study received the attention of the Louisiana group. First, a concerted effort was made to locate and collect promising practices for local, state, and regional use. Second, one advisory committee inaugurated a teacher supply and demand study to supplement the program of the state-wide certification committee. The study was divided into four phases; namely, (1) the demand represented by the actual number of new teachers employed during 1949-50, (2) the supply represented by the number of teacher education students graduated and certified in the various areas and levels, (3) the reasons students give for choosing or not choosing teaching as a profession, and (4) suggestions found in professional literature for correcting the imbalance between teacher supply and demand.

The promising practices collected by the group have served a number of purposes. First, they have provided ideas which individual staff members could transmit to other schools throughout the State. Second, they have been used as source materials for a series of articles entitled "Promising Practices in Elementary Education in Louisiana" which appeared in the October and April issues of Louisiana Schools, official publication of the Louisiana Education Association. And third, they have provided materials for Louisiana's contribution to the regional bulletin entitled Promising Practices in Elementary Schools.

The teacher supply and demand study has been completed and the results have been published in a State Department of Education circular. A summary article appeared in a recent issue of The Boardman, official publication of the Louisiana School Boards Association. Reception of the study was so favorable that plans have been made to keep teacher supply and demand data current by means of a continuous study.
In addition to the foregoing activities, the Louisiana group has attempted to solve other problems of special significance. With the cooperation of the advisory committees, the Principals' Annual School Report has been completely revised. One group formulated new approval standards for elementary schools. One sub-committee is making a special study of the seventh and eighth grades. Work has been started on a school administrator's handbook to replace the present elementary and high school handbooks. In the planning stages also are several instructional guides for faculties or other groups wishing to study and make decisions concerning specific curriculum areas. A readiness bulletin is now in the early stages of production. The present time schedule calls for completion of these projects before or during the 1951-52 school year.

Louisiana was represented in the 1950 summer conferences and workshops of the Southern Association's Cooperative Study in Elementary Education by eleven persons at Daytona Beach and four in Nashville.

Each advisory committee is anxious for the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to continue its interest in elementary education. Regardless of the action taken by the Association at its meeting in St. Petersburg, each group plans to continue its work. The unanimous agreement on these two points should be sufficient evidence that the Cooperative Study in Elementary Education, as far as Louisiana is concerned, has been a tremendous success.
APPENDIX F

STATEMENT REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS TO THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Development of the Cooperative Study

During the past four years (1948-51) the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has sponsored through its Commission on Research and Service (formerly the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research) a southwide program for the improvement of elementary education. This program, called the Cooperative Study in Elementary Education, was financed in part by General Education Board grants which have now been terminated. Wider interest has been developed in a continued relationship of elementary schools to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. At the Association's annual meeting in December, 1951, the Commission on Research and Service was designated as an interim committee to foster continued interest in elementary education and to prepare a plan before the 1952 meeting for continued Association leadership in elementary education. In January, 1952, the Commission's Executive Committee appointed a Working Committee on Elementary Education to carry out this function.

At a meeting of the Working Committee on Elementary Education on March 22, 1952, consideration was given to several alternate proposals regarding the relationship of elementary schools to the Association. The Committee agreed on certain principles regarding the relationship and authorized the preparation of a tentative, more detailed proposal based on these principles. The proposal was submitted to the Working Committee for suggestions and revisions.

The tentative proposal subsequently was considered by a group representing state committees or other interested organizations in each of the eleven states in a three-day work session which met at Emory University May 29-31, 1952. It was agreed by all participants that continuing regional action for the improvement of elementary education is desirable and should be fostered. Furthermore, it was

---

agreed that many school systems would want to make contributions to and accept responsibilities in the regional program of elementary school improvement. The following statement was adopted by this group:

**General Nature of the Relationship**

The plan for a continuing relationship is based on a belief in the following general principles:

1. That all levels of education, including elementary, secondary, and higher, are equally important and should be closely related.

2. That the Southern Association's activities in elementary education should be primarily concerned with continuing to stimulate, coordinate, and service through a Central Coordinating Committee working with the Commission on Research and Service, the efforts of state committees which are planning improvement programs for elementary schools.

3. That the services of the Southern Association as described in "2" above should be financed by support from cooperating school systems.

4. That the services provided the cooperating school systems should be determined by the Central Coordinating Committee hereinafter described, and that the fees to be paid by the systems (see below) could be adjusted by the same Committee.

5. That elementary schools as individual units should not be accredited by the Southern Association.

6. That the Commission on Secondary Schools should be urged to give consideration to elementary schools in the accreditation of secondary schools through such actions as:

   a. The inclusion on each state committee of the Commission on Secondary Schools of one or more persons whose training, experience, and present position qualify such person or persons to represent the interests of elementary education.

   b. The participation of such persons in visiting committees carrying on evaluations for secondary school accreditation.
c. The use of a simple form for gathering elementary school data from all "feeder" schools when a secondary school applies for accreditation, or when a member secondary school's annual report is reviewed.

Regional Services to Cooperating School Systems

Some services will be provided the local school system, and many benefits will accrue from association with other cooperating schools in a regional program for the improvement of elementary education. Among the services which undoubtedly will be provided by the Central Coordinating Committee are:

1. A special newsletter on elementary education, one copy to be sent each elementary school in a cooperating school system.

2. Annual summer conferences for representatives of cooperating school systems.

3. One or more annual publications (proceedings of annual conferences, yearbooks, or whatever type of publication appears most desirable), one copy of each per every $20.00 of dues paid, to be sent each cooperating school system. Also one copy for each system which pays a fee of $10.00.

4. Inclusion of one or more sessions on elementary education at the annual Southern Association meeting.

5. Such consultative services to state committees as can be provided.

Responsibilities of Cooperating School Systems

School systems which decide to cooperate in the regional program will, by that action, accept certain responsibilities. Among the responsibilities they will assume are:

1. Paying the annual fees for participation (see schedule below).

2. Initiating a school improvement program within the local district, and furnishing the state committee with an occasional progress report.

3. Furnishing personnel to work with the state committees in developing a coordinated program of school improvement in the state.
4. Sharing promising practices with other cooperating school systems.

5. Helping in providing materials for and suggesting revisions of regional publications.

6. Sending representatives to state and regional workshops and conferences.

7. Cooperating in regional activities developed by the Central Coordinating Committee.

Fees From Cooperating School Systems

The following schedule of fees is based on the principle that payment of fees will be made by the cooperating school system for all its elementary schools. Any school system may become a cooperating school system by paying the appropriate fee and by accepting the responsibilities described previously. The recommended schedule is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Elementary School Pupils</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 to 1,000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 to 5,000</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 to 10,000</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 to 15,000</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 to 20,000</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 to 25,000</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 to 30,000</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 30,000</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures Of Funds

Funds available from the fees of cooperating school systems in each state are to be expended as follows:

1/3 to support the work of state committees
2/3 to support Southern Association services and activities sponsored by the Commission on Research and Service.

In general fiscal affairs are to be handled as follows:

1. All fees are to be paid into the central Association office on or before October 15 of each year, the first fee to be paid by October 15, 1953, and to cover the 1953-54 school year.
2. On or before October 31 of each year the central Association office will return to each designated state committee one-third of the total amount of fees paid during the preceding year by cooperating school systems of the respective state, less any unexpended balance for the preceding year as shown by the account to be made in accordance with (3) below.

3. On or before October 31 of each year the responsible officer of each state committee will turn into the central Association office an accounting for the expenditure of the funds returned to the committee the previous year. Copies of the report should be sent to cooperating school systems. The purpose for which these funds are expended will be determined by the state committee.

4. The fees received from cooperating school systems will be handled as a special account by the central Association office, this account to be audited annually along with those of all other Association funds. Copies of the audit will be provided the Commission on Research and Service and the Central Coordinating Committee.

5. The Commission on Research and Service shall consider and recommend to the Executive Committee of the Association the proposed budget of the Central Coordinating Committee, this budget to include an amount to support the central office of the Association.

6. The purpose now recognized for expenditure of funds derived from fees paid by cooperating school systems for elementary schools, include: (a) contribution towards support of the central staff and the central coordinating committee; (b) publications on elementary education; (c) expenses of planning the annual conferences on elementary education; (d) expenses of one or more sessions on elementary education at the annual Association convention. Expenditures of these funds will be authorized by the Central Coordinating Committee and approved by the Commission on Research and Service.

The State And Regional Organization

The Commission on Research and Service has continuing responsibility for the Association's relations to elementary education, and the Central Coordinating Committee is the liaison group for coordinating the work of the cooperating state committees with this Commission (and through it, with the work of the Association). More detailed suggestions regarding the regional organization for this
purpose follow:

1. The Central Coordinating Committee shall consist of 15 members as follows: the 11 chairman or designated representatives of the state committees; 2 representatives of the Commission on Research and Service elected by the Commission, one for a term of two years and one for a term of three years, and 2 members from the region at large elected by the other 13 members, one for a term of two years, and one for a term of three years. The elected members cannot succeed themselves. These 15 members will annually elect one of their members as chairman, who cannot succeed himself, and such other officers from their membership as needed.

2. If and when funds permit, a central staff member shall be employed on recommendation of the Central Coordinating Committee to work (full or part time, as funds permit) in accordance with policies agreed upon with the Commission on Research and Service, in the field of elementary education.

3. In the absence of adequate funds for the purpose described in (2), any funds available for consultative and coordinating services, shall be used to make possible such occasional services as authorized by the Central Coordinating Committee.

More detailed suggestions regarding the organization of state committees for liaison purposes are as follows:

1. As a means of officially initiating the state committee organization referred to herein, the Chairman of the Commission on Research and Service shall request the Commission member(s) in each state and its Department of Education to call together an appropriate group to decide how, in each case, the state Committee shall be reconstituted for the long-term program and activities included in other sections of this Statement. It is assumed that such reconstitution will be done in a fashion that will provide appropriate liaison with Association state committees and with previous state elementary committees.

2. Although the organization of the state committee is recognized to be a function of the committee itself, certain principles should be followed in all state committees for effective liaison with the Central Coordinating Committee:

   a. Some individual member of the state committee should be responsible for handling and accounting for funds received from central Association as derived from fees of cooperating school systems in the state.
b. The state committee should include representatives of cooperating school systems, the State Department of Education, the State Education Association and other state groups interested in elementary education.

c. The state committee should include at least one person from each of the three commissions of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

d. Provision should be made for both continuity and rotation of membership and offices on the committee.

e. The chairman of the committee, who may serve also as a member of the Central Coordinating Committee, should be elected by the Committee for a term of not more than two years and should not be eligible to succeed himself.
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