

8404788

**Ponder, Frederick Douglas**

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PHYSICAL  
EDUCATION TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN NORTH CAROLINA

*Middle Tennessee State University*

D.A. 1983

Unlversity  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1983

by

Ponder, Frederick Douglas

All Rights Reserved

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE  
PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER PREPARATION  
PROGRAMS IN NORTH CAROLINA

Frederick D. Ponder

A dissertation presented to the  
Graduate Faculty of Middle Tennessee State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree Doctor of Arts

December, 1983

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE  
PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER PREPARATION  
PROGRAMS IN NORTH CAROLINA

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

Paul D. McCallan  
Major Professor

Martha H. Whaley  
Committee Member

Charles W. Babb  
Committee Member

G. D. Perry  
Head of the Department of Health, Physical Education,  
Recreation and Safety

Mary Martin  
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE  
PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER PREPARATION  
PROGRAMS IN NORTH CAROLINA

Frederick D. Ponder

The population used in this study was taken from the ten selected four-year public and private institutions in North Carolina. The total population of the ten institutions which participated included male and female physical education administrators, faculty, and librarians, making a total of fifty individuals. Data were collected by using the visitation-interview and the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card questionnaire. The investigator administered the score card at each of the institutions involved.

The public institutions as a group ranked the aspects of developing undergraduate professional preparation programs for physical education teachers as follows: first, Indoor Facilities and last, Library-Audio Visual Aids.

Private institutions collectively ranked Curriculum Policies and Practices first and Library-Audio Visual Aids last as the aspect for developing undergraduate teachers.

It was noted that respondents in public institutions gave highest priority to Indoor Facilities, whereas those

Frederick D. Ponder

in the private institutions gave highest priority to Curriculum Policies and Practices. Both groups, however, gave lowest priority to Library-Audio Visual Aids.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deep appreciation to all those who have read all or part of the dissertation. Their helpful suggestions have led to clarification and conciseness.

I specifically would like to thank Dr. Martha Morehead, Augusta M. Austin, and the late Charles Thomas Austin who offered advice at various stages.

To my wife, Zelda R. Ponder, and family, Fredia D. Ponder, and Reginald R. Ponder. I am appreciative of their patience, skills, and thoughtfulness in helping me make this possible.

## Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables . . . . .	v
List of Appendixes . . . . .	vi
 Chapter	
1. Statement of the Problem . . . . .	1
The Purpose of the Study . . . . .	4
Implications for Use in Teaching . . . . .	6
Definitions of Terms . . . . .	7
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	8
Questions to Be Answered . . . . .	10
2. Review of Related Literature . . . . .	12
Studies in Undergraduate Physical Education Professional Preparation . . . . .	20
Summary . . . . .	43
3. Methods and Procedures . . . . .	46
Sample . . . . .	46
Instrument . . . . .	49
Permission to Use the Instrument . . . . .	51
Collection of Data . . . . .	52
Procedures . . . . .	54

Chapter	Page
4. Analysis of the Data . . . . .	56
Total Public and Private Institutional Scores . . . . .	57
Area I: General Institutional and Departmental Practices . . . . .	58
Area II: Staff Standards . . . . .	65
Area III: Curriculum Policies and Practices . . . . .	73
Area IV: The Teaching Act . . . . .	79
Area V: Service Program and Extended Curriculum . . . . .	84
Area VI: Student Services . . . . .	89
Area VII: Library Audio-Visual . . . . .	94
Area VIII: Supplies and Equipment . . . . .	100
Area IX: Indoor Facilities . . . . .	104
Area X: Outdoor Facilities . . . . .	109
Summary of Table 11 . . . . .	114
Area Rank Order by Private and Public Institutions . . . . .	123
5. Summary, Results, and Recommendations . . . . .	125
Summary . . . . .	125
Results . . . . .	126
Recommendations . . . . .	128
Appendixes . . . . .	132
Bibliography . . . . .	190



## Tables

Table	Page
1. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area I: General Institutional and Departmental Practices . . . . .	64
2. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area II: Staff Standards . . .	72
3. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area III: Curriculum Policies and Practices . . . . .	78
4. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area IV: The Teaching Act . .	83
5. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area V: Service Program and Extended Curriculum . . . . .	88
6. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area VI: Student Services . .	93
7. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area VII: Library Audio-Visual . . . . .	98

Table	Page
8. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area VIII: Supplies and Equipment . . . . .	103
9. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area IX: Indoor Facilities . . . . .	108
10. Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Area X: Outdoor Facilities . . . . .	113
11. Mean Scores by Selected Administrators, Faculty, and Institutions in North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card . . . . .	120

## Appendixes

Appendix	Page
A. Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education . . . . .	133
B. Permission Letter to Use Instrument . . . . .	184
C. Request for Visitation-Interview . . . . .	186
D. Reply Postal Card . . . . .	188

## CHAPTER ONE

### Statement of the Problem

Considerable research has been done concerning physical education professional preparation programs. Generally these studies assume that teacher preparation programs in institutions of higher learning change with time and the increasing complexities of modern life. Greyson Daughtrey, however, has found that actual curriculum changes in physical education teacher preparation programs have not kept pace with educational objectives.<sup>1</sup> In some cases, as he pointed out, educators have shown a remarkable ability to resist new knowledge and to ignore research findings. He observed that in certain respects educators' resistance to innovations' proven value seemed to indicate a belief that it is easier for students to modify their minds than for schools to change their requirements.<sup>2</sup> Daughtrey's discussion underscored the need for frequent evaluation of teacher preparation programs in physical education in light of expanding knowledge and current research findings so that

---

<sup>1</sup>Greyson Daughtrey, Effective Teaching in Physical Education (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1973), p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

critical areas may be identified and assessed. Many physical education departments, on the basis of such evaluative evidence, discovered a need to redefine their traditional goals and objectives and to plan for the achievement of these by finding new ways to effectuate comprehensive and systematic planning constructs for their physical education teacher preparation programs.

Because it was the responsibility of those educators in professional preparation programs to prepare prospective physical education teachers well in all respects, institutions with teacher preparation programs in physical education must be concerned with effectiveness in teaching, in curriculum design, in policies, and in practices. In short, the goals and objectives of these programs must be such that lead to the improvement of teaching and learning.<sup>3</sup> Well-trained and competent teachers are essential if physical education programs are to be successful. Thus, it is imperative that teacher training institutions continuously evaluate their programs.

As education in general has faced austere budget and public scrutiny, the discipline of physical education needed to justify its inclusion in the total education program--a fact that has given additional impetus to the need for

---

<sup>3</sup>R. Colbert and I. W. Epps, Curriculum Innovations in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Service to Education, Inc., 1975), p. 1.

evaluating and updating professional preparation programs in physical education. Justification for a physical education program has been that the program's contribution was essential to the fullest possible development of each student who participated in it. A well-trained teacher has been the key opening the door to that justification.

In his discussion of the matter, Daughtrey has observed, "As physical education programs approach the twenty-first century, many problems remain unsolved."<sup>4</sup> Certainly, the problem areas in physical education teacher preparation programs can be identified through sound evaluative studies so that productive change could occur to the benefit of all concerned as we move into the new century.

William Trow's observation that the psychological approach to problems of learning involved the analysis and measurement of the product had bearing upon the subject of this discussion--the need for evaluative studies of teacher preparation programs among institutions engaged in professional preparation.<sup>5</sup> In addressing this problem, this dissertation has been a study that offered evaluative analysis and measurement of ten undergraduate physical

---

<sup>4</sup>Shelby Brightwell, "Organizational Structure: An Academic Focus," Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (June 1982), 11.

<sup>5</sup>J. F. Williams and C. L. Brownell, The Administration of Health Education and Physical Education (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1959), p. 17.

education teacher preparation programs in predominantly black, four-year public and private institutions of higher education in North Carolina. With its use of a uniform structure of evaluation among the ten institutions selected, this study has provided comparison of these ten programs, served as a resource and guide to both pre-service teachers and in-service professional personnel in future planning, made recommendations for improvement of basic accepted standards, and encouraged frequent evaluations of physical education teacher preparation programs of these and other institutions.

#### The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation was to compare status and scope of the undergraduate professional preparation programs for teachers in physical education in the ten selected predominantly black public and private colleges and universities in North Carolina. A particular feature of this study was to compare programs in these institutions by using the Bookwalter-Dollgener score card.

Several years ago, a seminar in higher education in physical education was introduced in the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation at Indiana University. The senior author, Dr. Karl W. Bookwalter, was assigned, as director of the seminar, to develop a checklist and score card for evaluating undergraduate professional programs in

physical education for teachers. Studies by Townes, Kerr, and Sauter were used as references, along with the literature in the field, to set up standards for undergraduate professional physical education programs. These standards were changed to items for a score card with possible weight. After criticism and editing, the first edition of a Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Programs in Physical Education was published by Karl W. Bookwalter in 1962 at Bloomington, Indiana.<sup>6</sup>

Robert J. Dollgener undertook the task to validate the Karl W. Bookwalter Score Card. Dollgener found that the score card was valid, reliable, and objective for its purpose. As a result of his study on the score card, Dollgener became co-author of the revised score card.<sup>7</sup>

From the present study, the results of the survey made using the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card will enable the administrators and faculty of the selected colleges and universities in North Carolina to evaluate more concretely the undergraduate professional preparation programs for physical education teachers.

---

<sup>6</sup>Karl W. Bookwalter, A Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education, 1st ed. (Bloomington, Indiana, 1962), p. 54.

<sup>7</sup>Robert J. Dollgener, "A Critical Appraisal of a Selected Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Physical Education Programs in Indiana," Diss. Indiana Univ., 1965, p. 305.



### Implications for Use in Teaching

The profession of physical education has grown in many ways since its beginning in the early twentieth century. This growth has been manifested in the professional preparation of teachers, curricula development, staff standards, and increased facilities. As a result of this study, data presented can be used for evaluation of undergraduate professional teacher preparation programs in physical education. Further, this information can provide essential guidelines for changes that may be needed. Listed are some implications for use of this study:

1. As a result of data presented in this study, the undergraduate professional preparation programs should be periodically updated and standards evaluated.
2. At the institutions studied, information gathered can provide a basis for monitoring learning in specific professional preparation programs for physical education teachers.
3. This data can provide each teacher with new and untapped sources of information for program development in the field of physical education.
4. Results gathered in this study can serve teachers in curriculum design and pre-service development where strength is needed.
5. This data can serve as useful and vital guidelines in preparing concepts, principles, and standards for faculty

development and program implementation in the field of physical education.

6. At the institutions studied, information gathered can enhance the student-teacher evaluation process.

7. At the institutions studied, information gathered can serve as a guideline to show where strengths and weaknesses appear in the program.

### Definitions of Terms

In this study the following terms will be used as defined and listed:

Certification. Certification is a procedure for authorizing the bearer of a certificate to perform specific services in the public or private schools of a particular state.<sup>8</sup>

Curriculum-program. A curriculum or program in this study refers to a fixed series of studies required, as in a college or university, for graduation or qualification in a major field of study.

Teacher preparation. In this study professional teacher preparation will refer to a program designed to prepare individuals for teaching physical education in schools.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Lucien B. Kinney, Certification in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Company, 1964), p. 4.

<sup>9</sup>Arthur A. Essingler, "AAHPER Professional Preparation Conference NEA Center," Washington, D.C., American Journal for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (1962), 23.

Private institution. For this study private institution will refer to a four-year, degree-granting institution of higher education basically funded by a church, private donations, and other agencies in North Carolina.

Public institution. In this study public institution will refer to a four-year, degree-granting institution of higher education primarily funded by government legislation of taxes.

Undergraduate student. An undergraduate student referred to in this study is an individual who is enrolled in a four-year, degree-granting program at an institution of higher education.

Percent of attainment. The percent of attainment for this study will be the average of any group for percentage attainment sources.<sup>10</sup>

#### Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the selected undergraduate professional preparation programs for physical education teachers in public and private institutions of higher education in the state of North Carolina. Athletics, health, recreation, dance, and safety education were not

---

<sup>10</sup>Karl W. Bookwalter, and Carolyn W. Bookwalter, A Review of Thirty Years of Selected Research on Undergraduate Professional Education Programs in the United States, 4th ed. (Bloomington, Indiana, 1980), p. 12.

included because of the design of the evaluative instrument used.

There were five private and five public colleges and universities of higher education involved in this investigation. Participating institutions included: Barber Scotia College, Johnson C. Smith University, Livingstone College, Saint Augustine's College, Shaw University, Elizabeth State University, Fayetteville State University, North Carolina Central University, The Agriculture and Technical State University, and Winston-Salem State University. Furthermore, the study was limited to the specific areas contained in the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, comprised of ten basic areas, namely: I. General Institutional and Departmental Practices; II. Staff Standards; III. Curriculum Policies and Practices; IV. The Teaching Act; V. Service Program and Extended Curriculum; VI. Student Services; VII. Library-Audio Visual; VIII. Supplies and Equipment; IX. Indoor Facilities; and X. Outdoor Facilities.

Data were collected from personal interviews and visitation with the librarian, two faculty members, and two administrators from each institution of higher education involved in the survey questionnaires. The minimum duration for each interview-questionnaire was two hours.

### Questions to Be Answered

As a result of this investigation, the following questions have been answered in Chapters four and five of this dissertation:

1. Were public institutions proportionally different from private institutions on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card?

2. Which sub-areas were ranked first in percent of attainment for the public and private institutions on the score card?

3. Which area ranked last for the private and public institutions as reflected by the score card?

4. How many public institutions had percents of attainment below the 50.0 percent mark?

5. Was percentile rank of public institutions different from that of private institutions overall?

6. Did the faculty from public and private institutions differ as a group in any area?

7. How many of the sub-areas of the total members of private and public institutions had sub-area percents of attainment of 50.0 percent or above? How many had scores below 50.0 percent?

8. Was there a difference between general institutional and departmental practices and staff standards of public institution and private institution administrators?

9. Was the mean score from the private institution different from that of the public institution?

10. Was there a difference between public and private institutional student services programs?

11. Was there a difference between curriculum policies and practices of public institution administrators and those of private institution administrators?

12. Was there a difference between public and private institutions' service programs and extended curriculum?

13. Did faculty or administrators from public or private institutions differ on any areas of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card?

14. Was there a difference between the Teaching Act programs in the public and private institutions?

15. Was there a difference between Staff Standards of public and private institutions' administrators and faculty?

## CHAPTER TWO

### Review of Related Literature

Much of the literature related to this study was presented to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the role of the undergraduate professional preparation programs for physical education teachers in public and private institutions. A number of studies have been conducted concerning the teacher preparation program in physical education. For a long time it has been apparent that the progress of the profession and the quality of programs were directly related to the preparation of professional leadership.

For more than fifty years, leading educators have addressed issues pertinent to the preparation of physical education teachers. For example, on July 1, 1931, the Department of School Health and Physical Education of the National Education Association held a meeting in Los Angeles, California, to appoint a national committee to formulate a set of standards to be used in the evaluation of physical education teachers. Dr. Jay B. Nash, President of the National Education Association, appointed Mr. N. P. Neilson, Chief of the Division of Health and Physical Education,

California State Department of Education, to chair the committee.

N. P. Neilson expressed a general consensus that professional education in health and physical education was then in an experimental and flexible state of development.<sup>1</sup> Many institutions in the United States were claiming to prepare health and physical education teachers for the elementary and secondary schools. Their ability to prepare these teachers varied greatly. The problems encountered were extremely difficult to resolve. At this conference, however, standards with which to evaluate the ability of institutions to prepare teachers were implemented.

Seventeen years later, a conference sponsored by the American Institute at Jackson's Mill, West Virginia, in May, 1948, was called the National Conference on Undergraduate Professional Preparation for Health Education, Physical Education and Recreation. The purpose of the conference was to establish standards for undergraduate professional preparation programs in health, physical education, and recreation. Attention was given to developing guiding concepts and policies in professional preparation concerning staff, facilities and equipment,

---

<sup>1</sup>N. P. Neilson, "National Study of Professional Education in Health and Physical Education," National Committee Report on Standards, American Physical Education Association, Research Quarterly, 6 (December 1935), 48-88.



resource supplies, recruitment and guidance curricula, and teaching load; sponsoring and cooperating organizations of the local, state, regional and national levels; improving the professional status of personnel in health, physical education, and recreation; and developing methods for dissemination of the conference's recommendations to the profession.<sup>2</sup>

The Jackson's Mill Conference placed the burden on the teacher preparation institution to develop teachers who are masters of much knowledge and many skills. The conference members agreed that superior instruction was needed with excellent facilities and equipment and noted that of the unusually large numbers of colleges and universities which had entered the field all could not possibly have adequate staffs and facilities.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education served as one of the sponsoring agencies of the Jackson's Mill Conference. Its primary purpose was to improve the quality of teacher education. The American Association assumed the role of a voluntary accreditation agency, developed evaluation schedules for that function, and held a series of programs on the evaluation of teacher

---

<sup>2</sup>Carl A. Troester, Jr., "A History, Physical Education Professional Preparation in Health Education, Physical Education and Recreation," Report of National Conference (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1962), p. 132.

education to familiarize college representatives with the schedules. Evaluative criteria for rating professional programs in physical education were developed, and a number of institutions expressed willingness to have their programs rated.<sup>3</sup>

In discussing the history of physical education preparation programs, Carl A. Troester suggested that evaluative criteria, measurement and evaluation procedure direct attention to some systematic organization of educational functions. The starting point was twofold. First was the purpose of the educational program--that is, the outcomes desired for the individual and the group. The final worth of any educational program rested on this premise. Second was the process applied in achieving individual and group outcomes. Because all experience had influence, the score of the process was indeed large. For the applied fields, Troester explained a choice of two approaches was possible. Each approach had limitations, the first in the complicated individual and group, the second in the variable process and assumptions. When fullness of judgment was desired, the process approach was the only practicable procedure. One then could assume that the

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 133.

process, whatever it might be, would yield the desired outcome if properly applied.<sup>4</sup>

Since the goals of education in a democracy are determined by societal and individual needs; as Troester indicated, the program of professional preparation likewise changed its emphasis in order to be in harmony with the conditions of the day. Taking stock was important if the curriculum for teacher preparation were to be effective in terms of preparing a teacher to meet the challenges of the current situation and to harmonize such preparation with the total school effort. It was imperative that each subject area be concerned with how the instruction in that area met the needs of the student in the total educative process.

As Troester pointed out, appraisal and fact-finding were basic to the evaluative process as applied to professional teacher preparation. Changes were often indicated. He emphasized that evaluation was not achieved until suggested changes were made and in turn evaluated in terms of desired results or goals. Thus, evaluation offered a continuous outlet for faculty study groups and at the same time provided an opportunity for professional improvement. Particularly pertinent to evaluation of physical education professional preparation was Troester's

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 104.

list of some basic problems which needed to be studied by each physical education department:

1. What kind of student is attracted to or enrolled in programs of teacher preparation? Is this the kind of student who will be a credit to the profession and to the college or university from which he graduates? Will he be able to meet challenges, solve problems, and grow professionally? Will he be a leader in some particular situation? Does he have a flair for teaching? Is he emotionally mature?
2. What is expected of the teacher in this field of specialization? What skills, understandings, and general competencies does he need? Has some type of a careful job analysis been made?
3. What is the outcome of the appraisal of graduates by school administrators and department chairmen in terms of all the facets of professional ability as an educator and subject matter specialist?
4. What type of schools employ students upon graduation? What kind of jobs are the graduates filling after ten or twenty years?
5. What are the needs as they exist today for people in the profession? What effect might the current trends in the profession have upon the kinds of people needed for the next five to ten years?
6. What content in the curriculum prepares the student for the job opportunities which exist? What content in the curriculum appears to have no specific or definite purpose? What content in the curriculum provides for general cultural education, general professional education, subject area specialization, comprehension, and a potential for growth and development?
7. What changes have been made in the basic instructional curriculum in the past ten years? When was the last change made? What studies are underway now in terms of curriculum analysis or content? How often are course outlines revised? Have studies been made to determine gaps of omissions as well as duplication of content? Has the proliferation of courses or content been

allowed? Do courses challenge students in an intellectual manner?

8. What does the instruction accomplish? Is it effective in terms of recognized goals? What are faculty strengths as well as weaknesses? How do mature graduates evaluate it?
9. What steps have been taken to improve facilities, library, research, professional growth of staff, provision of teaching materials, counseling, and other aspects of professional preparation concerned with instruction?<sup>5</sup>

Public and private physical education undergraduate teacher programs in North Carolina would be assured of steady improvement if the philosophy of evaluation suggested by Troester's questions were accepted wholeheartedly by administrators and teachers both in concept and in action.

In other pertinent research, John E. Nixon and Ann E. Jewett recorded very effectively the meaning of education measurement and evaluation:

Measurement is the collection of information upon which a decision is based; evaluation is the use of measurements for making decisions. In the context of temporary education, evaluation is a dynamic decision making process focusing on changes in pupil behavior, i.e., learning. This process involves (1) collecting suitable data (measurement), (2) judging the value of these data according to some standard, and (3) making decisions based on these data and the alternative courses of action available. The ultimate function of evaluation is to facilitate rational decisions in an effort to improve student learning.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 105.

<sup>6</sup>John E. Nixon and Ann E. Jewett, An Introduction to Physical Education (Philadelphia: Saunders College, 1980), p. 402.

The process described applied not only to undergraduate professional preparation programs for physical education teachers, but other programs where teacher preparation was considered the ultimate goal.

Another study tangentially related to physical education preparation programs was that of The Cooperative Study in Teacher Education, sponsored by the American Council on Education. This study was an examination of procedures and conditions conducive to continuous teacher education. The study pointed out that schools made the most progress when there was a conscious effort by the faculty to become more democratic. The most successful programs start with problems which the teachers believed important. Teachers and administrators worked together most effectively when they worked on problems in personnel and materials. Although national standards had not fully been realized, further efforts were being made to seek out desirable practices for teacher education institutions. This study emphasized that professional preparation should be the responsibility of the college or university as a whole. The education of teachers and leaders should be the concern of the entire educational institution. However, immediate responsibility for professional preparation should be centered in a department or in an interdepartmental committee or council. The entire institution should demonstrate a willingness to cooperate in this enterprise.

All the appropriate facilities of the college community should be utilized to provide the variety of educational experiences upon which students base understandings, knowledges, and appreciations. When there was cooperation among members of all departments, the students gained an increased appreciation of the interrelatedness of all learning experiences.<sup>7</sup>

Studies in Undergraduate Physical Education  
Professional Preparation

The research of Ben W. Miller in 1964 reflected the focus upon high quality as a top priority in undergraduate physical education teacher preparation programs.

Miller observed that professional preparation programs must receive top priority because of societal demands for excellence in modern teaching techniques and skills. Miller also indicated that teacher education may be improved if the profession achieves and maintains its proper perspective in efforts to utilize general standards identified as essential for quality undergraduate professional preparation programs for physical education teachers.<sup>8</sup>

In another study devoted to specialized aspects of the professional preparation in physical education, Hal A.

---

<sup>7</sup>Troester, p. 22.

<sup>8</sup>Ben W. Miller, "Priority in the Quest for Quality," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 35 (May 1964), 32.

Lawson reported that a professional studies program in physical education could be conveniently described in relation to its two fundamental areas of specialization. The two areas of specialization suggested were (1) policy studies and program planning and (2) applied motor learning techniques. Applied motor learning entailed a microscopic emphasis. The interest in this area resided in learning modes that could be directed and/or facilitated by professionals as they work with individuals or groups. Included were applied aspects of how people learn and the development application and study of technologies which facilitate learning. The area of policy studies and program planning was designed primarily to develop basic concepts and curriculum structures.<sup>9</sup> Lawson noted that, as society grew more complex, so did college teaching. The growth of knowledge in the nineteenth century meant that a single teacher was no longer capable of conducting every course in the curriculum. When fields of study developed rapidly, teachers were trained and hired in more and more specialized areas. Teacher preparation in elementary and in secondary education became a major focus of higher education. College teachers were still the ones who trained others to teach in public and private institutions of higher learning. Who

---

<sup>9</sup>Hal A. Lawson, "Professional Studies Program in Graduate Physical Education," Quest (Monograph 28, Summer 1977), 67-74.



could teach a complex subject better than the one who understood it best? Lawson observed that these attitudes were risky, but accurate, until some people began to specialize in college and university-level instruction itself, just as others concentrated in physics and engineering. As more people entered this growing and diverse field, more was learned about teaching at this level. So much was learned that it was no longer true that good teachers could not be trained.<sup>10</sup>

In his examination of undergraduate professional preparation in physical education, Herman Weinberg pointed out that the most effective professional physical education program prepared teachers so that they might create and provide developmentally meaningful movement experiences for students from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. Such a program also attempted to help teachers acquire new modes of behavior whereby they could function in a completely flexible and open manner and to recognize that today's knowledge might not be appropriate for the solution of tomorrow's problems. The strength of this program was predicated upon a presentation of distinctly different subject matter. This approach attempted to facilitate the personal and professional growth of the students in addition to helping them acquire the technical skills of teaching.

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 74.

Weinberg suggested that evaluation was an on-going process in the professional physical education program. He offered the following procedure: faculty and students should formally evaluate each experience at the end of each semester. Informal evaluation should be more frequent as students consulted with individual faculty and the program director regarding their perceptions of the quality of program instruction. Each year, total program evaluations should be completed. This process generally should take place in the spring so that program revisions, if warranted, could be made the next fall. Public school teachers and supervisors should be invited to participate in program evaluations. In some years, attempts should be made via mail surveys to evaluate the program. Weinberg pointed out that program graduates, principals, and physical education supervisors had participated in many of these studies.<sup>11</sup>

In his critical study of Scandinavian programs, Richard Polidoro presented significant information about the status of professional preparation programs of physical education teachers in three Scandinavian countries: Norway, Sweden, and Denmark in 1976. According to Polidoro, the purpose of this investigation was to assess the present scope and

---

<sup>11</sup>Herman Weinberg, Focus on Undergraduate Personal Professional Preparation in Physical Education (U.S. Education Resource Information Center: ERIC Document ED 164 661, 1978), p. 11.

nature of teacher training practices in three countries with particular emphasis on: (a) the function, types, and details of programs currently in operation; (b) student selection and retention criteria and procedures; (c) curricular requirements and standards leading toward certification for teaching physical education in the public elementary and secondary schools; and (d) career placement and follow-up services provided by the teacher training institution. Polidoro stated that the primary function of each of the three institutions was that of training prospective physical education teachers for teaching careers within either the "folkskole" (elementary school) or the "gymnasierskole" (secondary school) or both. It was notable that the certification programs in each of the three institutions utilized a variety of teaching techniques including traditional lecture courses, individual and group sessions, as well as independent study opportunities. Flexibility in student selection, of course, was also provided. Polidoro raised several questions, a major research question in teacher education concerning the issue of how best to design, develop, and validate teacher preparation strategies that can be used to produce effective classroom teachers.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Richard J. Polidoro, "Professional Preparation Programs of Physical Education Teachers in Norway, Sweden and Denmark," Research Quarterly, 48, No. 3 (October 1977), 640-649.

Other studies dealt with specific facets of teacher preparation in physical education programs. For example, in her study of the roles of in-service educators and their students, prospective educators, Judy Pace found that future teachers' attitudes toward the roles of teachers changed over time. At the teacher preparation level, the two key positions were those of the faculty members and the role of the prospective teacher. Studies relating to the socialization process in teacher preparation indicated that the views of prospective teachers changed throughout the professional program and grew to be similar to those of the professors. A further study of teacher educators and future teachers in the secondary physical education field showed that both groups defined the subroles of the teacher as instructor, interpersonal interactant, planner, professional member of a school staff, and program manager. A major difference in the way prospective teachers and faculty members viewed the role was that teachers showed more consensus than the students. The students had a tendency to view all competencies as of great and equal importance, and the faculty rated the subrole of instructors as more important than interpersonal interactant, while students ranked interpersonal competence as slightly more important. Teacher educators in teacher education programs need to formally assist the student in developing the teacher-role definition

by describing the best role of the physical education teacher and by teaching according to the model.<sup>13</sup>

Finding in their study that students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness in physical education programs were excellent indicators of undergraduate professional preparation, William W. Colvin and Elmo S. Roundy, in their research, developed an instrument for evaluation of teaching effectiveness which was pertinent at all levels of education. The demands of patrons and administrators for more accountability on the part of teachers greatly stimulated interest in this area. Among the most effective methods of evaluation was student ratings. There was, indeed, evidence to indicate that pupils made a more valid assessment of the competency of their teachers than did either peers or administrators. Numerous instruments for student evaluation of teacher effectiveness had been developed. These instruments were structured, however, to assess concept learning only and seemed somewhat limited in their use in physical education activity courses. Colvin and Roundy have developed an instrument designed specifically for the

---

<sup>13</sup>Judy Pace, Role Definitions of College Faculty and Prospective Physical Educators (Detroit, Michigan: AAHPER Conference, United States Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 193 216-80, 1980), p. 441.

evaluation of teacher competence in physical education activity courses.<sup>14</sup>

Calvin and Roundy's instrument included twelve items relating to the evaluation of student development. Three of the four developmental objectives were (1) sufficient emphasis on drills and skill development, (2) consistent improvement in skills taught, and (3) development of the skill necessary to participate in an activity on one's own. Organic development objectives were (1) an increase in muscular strength and endurance, (2) an increase in cardiovascular endurance, and (3) development of the strength and endurance necessary to participate in activities effectively. Interpretative area development objectives were (1) development of rules and strategy of play, (2) stimulation of analysis and thought about the activity, and (3) participation in the activity as correct judgments and decisions are made. Development in the affective area are (1) stimulation of interest in the activity, (2) participation in the activity after the course is completed, and (3) enhancement of self-confidence as a result of attending the class.<sup>15</sup> These areas of development for student evaluation of

---

<sup>14</sup>William W. Calvin and Elmo S. Roundy, "An Instrument for Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Physical Education Activity Courses," Research Quarterly, 47, No. 2 (May 1976), 296-298.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 298.

teaching effectiveness in physical education courses represented essential concepts of learning and preparation in physical education.

In their study "Evaluating Curriculum Fit with Class Ability," Meribeth Gettinger and Mary Alice White have found that student evaluation appeared to be a valid and feasible method of assessing teacher effectiveness. The instrument development was an effective tool to accomplish this purpose in physical education courses. These investigators noted two important concepts: (1) individual differences in learning rate are well documented in education psychology; and (2) individual children vary in the amount of time they need to master an instructional unit and in the size or number of units they are able to master in a particular time. Gettinger and White pointed out that these principles also apply in physical education classes. Traditionally, pupils were allowed a fixed amount of time to learn a particular task. The result was variation in the achievement level attained, with the amount learned per unit of time taken as a measure of learning time. To evaluate curriculum fit with class ability, Gettinger and White examined the magnitude of individual differences in size and number of instructional subunits read, as well as number of repetitions of the unit required to achieve a criterion of the level of performance. Because pupils do vary greatly in their learning rates, there had been much interest in

measuring learning rates within some context of school learning. Two aspects of a pupil's learning were usually differentially examined--time and amount learned.<sup>16</sup>

One example of a study of physical education programs for men at selected colleges in a particular state was that of James R. Jones, who evaluated the physical education program for men in selected colleges and universities in Colorado. Jones used the Neilson-Commer-Griffin score card. In order to collect sufficient data, Jones combined the results of two other studies completed using the same evaluation instrument. Jones' conclusion upon the finished study was that the professional preparation of physical education instructors by the Colorado colleges and universities was above average for the institutions involved in the study.<sup>17</sup>

Educators have made many attempts to improve the quality of professional preparation in physical education through studies, surveys, research, projects, national conferences and accreditation plans. Among these efforts have been those of researchers who have evaluated specific

---

<sup>16</sup>Maribeth Gettlinger and Mary Alice White, "Evaluating Curriculum Fit with Class Ability," Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, No. 3 (1980), 338.

<sup>17</sup>James R. Jones, "An Evaluation of the Physical Education Program for Men in Selected Colleges and Universities and an Appraisal of the Score Card Employed," Diss. Michigan Univ., 1967, p. 57.



programs in physical education teacher preparation and who have reported in scholarly documents their findings. Significant among these researchers have been Karl W. Bookwalter and Carolyn W. Bookwalter.

According to the Bookwalters, Ross Townes was one of the first to evaluate physical education for men in Negro colleges in the United States.<sup>18</sup> A check list was constructed from findings in the literature of the discipline which was documented and submitted to a jury of twelve authorities in the field. The investigator visited and interviewed department heads in 26 Negro colleges located in 11 southern states. All of the schools studied were accredited. One hundred percent of the schools had an established curriculum of professional education in physical education. Ninety-six percent were members of athletic conferences. All schools required a "C" average of graduates. Thirty-two percent of the faculty had only a baccalaureate degree. Seven percent of the enrollees were majoring in physical education. The faculty in these departments ranged from two to ten with an average of five.

---

<sup>18</sup>Karl W. Bookwalter and Carolyn W. Bookwalter, A Review of Thirty Years of Selected Research on Undergraduate Professional Physical Education Programs in the United States, 4th ed. (Bloomington, Indiana, 1980), p. 2.

Staffs were found to be inadequate, but curricula were less desirable.<sup>19</sup>

In another study in the 1950's, Robert W. Kerr evaluated nine institutions involving five states in New England. He used a check list based upon the standards revealed in the current literature in the field and validated by a jury. He found that private institutions tend to have better library facilities for programs and better professional preparation programs than did the state-supported institutions.<sup>20</sup> Further, he found a general tendency for indoor facilities to be the weakest area. He concluded his study with specific recommendations for each institution.<sup>21</sup>

In similar research, Waldo Sauter, using his own check list, has analyzed the undergraduate professional programs in institutions in Indiana. His check list was derived from previously validated check lists or score cards and reputable related physical education publications. A jury

---

<sup>19</sup>Ross Townes, "A Study of Professional Education in Physical Education in Selected Negro Colleges," Diss. Indiana Univ., 1950, p. 147.

<sup>20</sup>The findings reported in this present dissertation are similar to those of Kerr in this area.

<sup>21</sup>Robert W. Kerr, "The Status of Undergraduate Professional Preparation on Physical Education for Men in New England Colleges and Universities," Diss. Indiana Univ., 1955, p. 305.

of ten authorities in the field weighted the items, and item scores were derived. Twenty-one institutions having undergraduate professional preparation programs in physical education were visited and scored. The institutions that Sauter visited varied greatly in their ratings--large schools were found to be superior to small schools; state-supported schools outrated private schools; and universities outrated colleges--all on the average total score. Much variability was found among schools rated highest, generally. Regarding curricula, the offerings in techniques (activities) rated lowest. Professional facilities rated lower than was desirable. Placement and follow-up procedures were quite inadequate as a rule. Facilities in general were rated lowest. The mean of attainment on the total score was 64.7 percent. State-supported institutions, universities, and the large schools ranked relatively highest.<sup>22</sup>

Another researcher, Robert J. Dollgener, as a student in a seminar on higher education in physical education, undertook to validate the Bookwalter Score Card. Dollgener's study was the first to analyze statistically the findings concerning Indiana institutions based upon the

---

<sup>22</sup>Waldo Sauter, "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education for Men in Selected Colleges and Universities in Indiana," Diss. Indiana Univ., 1957, p. 234.

score card. Dollgener concluded that the Bookwalter Score Card was valid, reliable, and objective for its purpose. Internal consistency was found to be .661 (.706 according to the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula). An objectivity index of 95 percent was determined. Dollgener's findings compared favorably with the previous study by Sauter, who utilized a check list. The mean of attainment indicated poor programs occurred within institutions that had small enrollments, that were privately supported, that had a liberal arts focus, and that had only a department of physical education. All fifteen institutions evaluated had some strong areas and some weak ones. The Teaching Act (Area IV) ranked lowest in the ten areas on the score card. Curriculum Policies (Area III) were rather uniform, due in part to state certification policies.<sup>23</sup>

As a result of his appraisal of the Bookwalter Score Card, Dollgener became co-author of the revised edition of the Bookwalter Score Card. This score card contained essential standards for rating undergraduate professional programs in physical education, and has gone through several editions.

Using the second edition of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card for evaluative purposes in the 1960's, Michael W.

---

<sup>23</sup>Robert J. Dollgener, "A Critical Appraisal of a Selected Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Physical Education Programs in Indiana," Diss. Indiana Univ., 1956, p. 304.

Livingston's investigation was designed to evaluate eight state-supported institutions of Alabama. Livingston found that universities came closest to meeting the score card standards and that institutions with large enrollments generally made the highest scores. In this study, Library Audio-Visual (Area VII) ranked highest in attainment among the areas, while the Indoor Facilities (Area IX) ranked the lowest. Livingston determined the objectivity to be .945. One hundred percent of possible points was obtained on ten items, while four items had less than 10 percent attained on them. He found a general tendency that public universities with large enrollments made higher scores than did smaller universities.<sup>24</sup>

Another researcher who used the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card in the 1960's was Majorie Ann Price who evaluated eighteen institutions in Missouri. She was the only one to evaluate both men's and women's programs, analyzing them separately and then as a group. Price found Missouri institutions varied definitely as to the quality of their undergraduate programs. Some were discovered to be unqualified to offer a professional program. Men's programs tended to be slightly higher in attainment than did the

---

<sup>24</sup>Michael W. Livingston, "An Evaluation and Analysis of Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education for Men in State Colleges and Universities of Alabama," Diss. Alabama Univ., 1967, p. 262.

women's programs. She found, too, that smaller, privately-supported, liberal arts institutions tended to have the poorest programs, while state-supported teachers' colleges more nearly met the standards of the score card. Accreditation was usually based upon the institution as a whole. The Teaching Act (Area IIV) rated first in attainment, while Indoor Facilities (Area IX) rated last. Staff Standards (Area II) best indicated good programs in undergraduate professional preparation in physical education.<sup>25</sup>

Alfred Marion Reece's investigation using the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card was designed to evaluate 26 institutions in Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia. These institutions were randomly selected from an enrollment of coeducational institutions offering an undergraduate major in physical education. Reece's study showed the area of highest attainment was the Teaching Act (Area IV). Indoor Facilities (Area IX) was found to rank lowest of the ten areas. The Supplies and Equipment (Area VIII) rating was found to be the best single indicator of a good program. Reece concluded that institutions having enrollments of 10,000 or more students, having a school or college of physical education, maintained by public funds, and

---

<sup>25</sup>Majorie Ann Price, "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education in Missouri Colleges and Universities," Diss. Missouri Univ., 1968, p. 204.

nationally accredited by NCATE most nearly met the standards of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card used in this investigation.<sup>26</sup>

Also using the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Douglas C. Wiseman did a detailed interpretive study of professional physical education programs. He evaluated 17 institutions in New England which offered an undergraduate major in physical education. Twelve of these institutions were state supported, and 5 were privately supported. Those institutions with large enrollments tended to attain higher scores than did institutions with lower enrollments. Ten institutions with schools or colleges of physical education averaged higher mean scores than did the 7 institutions with only departments of physical education. He found the highest correlation between the area and total score was .898 for the Service Program (Area V). The lowest was in Curriculum (Area III) with a correlation of .253 which was thought to be due to the state and national controls in this area. The area with the highest attainment was the Indoor

---

<sup>26</sup>Alfred Marion Reece, "A Critical Evaluation of Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education in Selected Coeducational Institutions in Kentucky, Tennessee and West Virginia," Diss. Indiana Univ., 1969, p. 353.

Facilities (Area IX). The lowest sub-area in attainment was Housing for Students (Area VI).<sup>27</sup>

William M. McClain employed the third edition of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card to evaluate the undergraduate professional preparation physical education program in 16 institutions in North Carolina. He found that Library Audio-Visual (Area VII) had the highest mean percent of attainment score, and Indoor Facilities (Area IX) had the lowest mean percent of attainment. He also found that state-supported institutions tended to have higher attainment than did privately-supported institutions. The institutions as a group were found to rank slightly above average when compared to the national norms.<sup>28</sup>

Edward C. Hanes limited his study to the evaluation of 7 state-supported institutions in Kentucky, using the third edition of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card. He reevaluated a few of the institutions evaluated by Reece two years earlier. Six of the institutions were universities, and one was a liberal arts college. All institutions had mean scores higher than the average of the national study.

---

<sup>27</sup>Douglas C. Wiseman, "A Critical Evaluation of Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education in Selected Colleges and Universities for Men and Women in New England," Diss. Indiana Univ., 1970, p. 255.

<sup>28</sup>William C. McClain, "An Evaluation and Analysis of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education for Men in Colleges and Universities of North Carolina," Diss. Alabama Univ., 1971, p. 309.



The area with the highest attainment was Supplies and Equipment (Area VIII), while the area with the lowest attainment was General Institutional and Departmental Practices (Area I). One institution had 100 percent attainment on ten sub-areas, and a second institution had 100 percent attainment on six areas different from the first. Institutions with larger enrollments tended to attain higher scores than did institutions with lower enrollments.<sup>29</sup>

Also using the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Nancy Charlene Scott's investigation was designed to evaluate the status of the undergraduate professional program in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University. She found that Library Audio-Visual (Area VII) had the highest national percentile level, and the Teaching Act (Area V) had the lowest. She also found that Library Audio-Visual (Area VII) ranked first in percent of attainment. The lowest percent of attainment was Student Services (Area VI).<sup>30</sup>

Also using the third edition of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Harry C. Stille evaluated five

---

<sup>29</sup>Edward C. Hanes, "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education for State Supported Institutions of Higher Education in Kentucky," Diss. Indiana Univ., 1971, p. 78.

<sup>30</sup>Nancy C. Scott, "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Program in Physical Education at Middle Tennessee State University," Diss. Middle Tennessee State Univ., 1973, p. 45.

state-supported institutions and 9 privately-supported institutions in South Carolina as to their professional physical education programs for men and women. Stille gave quite a complete coverage of the literature on professional preparation for physical education teachers. Among the institutions that Stille evaluated were 10 colleges classified as liberal arts, 3 as universities, and 1 as a teachers' college. Six institutions had less than 999 students enrolled, 7 had enrollments between 1,000 and 4,999, while 1 institution had an enrollment of over 10,000. Four institutions were predominantly black, and 10 were predominantly white. All but one institution was coeducational. The exception enrolled only males. Public-supported institutions tended to have better programs than did the private institutions. Universities tended to be better than liberal arts colleges. Institutions with large enrollments tended to have better programs than did those with small enrollments. Predominantly white institutions tended to be better than predominantly black institutions.<sup>31</sup>

In Stille's research, the examined area that ranked highest was that of Library Audio-Visual (Area VIII) which included general features, library services, books and pamphlets, periodicals and annuals, as well as general

---

<sup>31</sup>Harry C. Stille, "A Comparison of the Undergraduate Professional Physical Education Programs in Colleges and Universities in South Carolina," Diss. Alabama Univ., 1974, p. 249.

audio-visual aids, instructional materials, equipment, and facilities. Outdoor Facilities (Area X) ranked the lowest. Area X includes general features, facilities for service and professional technique courses, intramural facilities, and intercollegiate athletics. As a whole he found, too, the public institutions tend to have a larger economical base of support than the private institutions.<sup>32</sup>

In his study using the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card in the mid-1970's, Kampee Suriyasasin evaluated 7 selected educational institutions of comparable size of enrollments (approximately 5,000 to 10,000 enrollment) in Tennessee. These institutions were selected to represent the eastern, middle, and western sections of the state. The raw total scores and area scores for each of these institutions were changed to national percentile equivalents and placed in rank order. Profiles on area attainments for each institution were set up to show its status. The score card results and recommendations for improvement of the institutions were sent to each institution evaluated.<sup>33</sup> Each institution was ranked according to the national Percentile Score taken from areas and sub-areas made on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 257.

<sup>33</sup>Kampee Suriyasasin, "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education in Selected Coeducational Institutions," Diss. Middle Tennessee State Univ., 1977, p. 185.

Card. These findings were compared to the national percentile equivalent.

Using the fourth edition of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, Idris Ahmad Nordin evaluated 2 large state universities' undergraduate professional physical education programs in Oregon. A comprehensive and systematic method was designed, involving a regrouping of sub-areas and items on the score card into the following methods of collecting data: (1) inspection and ratings of university catalogs, documents, handbooks, facilities, supplies, and equipment by at least three raters including the investigator; (2) personal interviews with physical education department chairmen, program directors or coordinators, library personnel, admission directors, housing officers, placement directors, and student health services personnel; and (3) the administration of two questionnaires--one to the physical education faculty and another to the senior physical education students at each university. The questions for the questionnaires were adapted from the score card, primarily to obtain qualitative data.<sup>34</sup>

Ten of the previous doctoral studies reviewed in this chapter have been dependent upon some edition of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card. This research was another

---

<sup>34</sup>Idris Ahmad Nordin, "A Survey of the States of Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education in State Universities in Oregon," Diss. Oregon Univ., 1978, p. 147.

indication of the significance and value of this evaluative instrument in assessing teacher preparation programs in physical education and of its pertinence to the present study.

Note should be taken, however, of the research of Willie G. Shaw who in research used a modification of the instrument employed by Joseph Oxendine in a similar study in 1972. Shaw's research was designed to provide a description of the general education requirements in physical education for selected private, predominantly black, four-year colleges and universities in Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia. Fourteen of 15 invited colleges and universities agreed to participate in the investigation. The visitation-interview technique, along with a questionnaire, was used to obtain the data. These visitation interviews were carried on exclusively with department chairmen who also completed the questionnaire.

Shaw found that physical education classes were offered and required by all participating institutions, and that students might be excused from required physical education for a variety of reasons, the most prevalent of these being medical reasons. He found the trend to be that a student must take one year of physical education before graduation. Credit toward graduation was given by all 14 schools for required physical education. Eight of the 14 institutions did not require any specific physical education

course to meet the requirement of general education. Shaw also found that coeducational courses were not offered in 8 of the 14 institutions, the remaining 6 institutions offered coeducational courses, with 1 of the 6 requiring them. Thirteen institutions used the letter grading system which was consistent with that used in other school curricula.<sup>35</sup>

### Summary

This chapter has provided a review of pertinent historical and philosophical reports as well as a survey of the most authoritative literature bearing upon the nature of research in teacher preparation programs in physical education. References to historical conferences offered insight as to early and developing concern with physical education teacher preparation and means of improving it. Historical and philosophical information and concepts such as those presented by William Troester gave understanding of the nature of the problem of comprehensive evaluation of physical education teacher preparation programs. A review of other articles and essays by scholars in the field provided additional insight to undergraduate professional

---

<sup>35</sup>Willie G. Shaw, "A Description of General Education Requirements in Physical Education for Selected Private Predominantly Black Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia," Diss. Middle Tennessee State Univ., 1975, p. 15.

preparation in physical education and to overall quality in such programs in general as well as to the role definitions of teachers and prospective teachers to teaching effectiveness, to curriculum fit, and to the evaluation of a specific program in particular. These scholarly selections suggested the need for evaluative studies in physical education teacher preparation programs.

The examination in this chapter of a sampling of doctoral studies relative to evaluation of selected professional preparation programs in physical education provides a basis for validation of this present study. Evidence of the prevalent use of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card as the instrument in these evaluative studies was impressive. All but four of the studies examined in this chapter used some form of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card as the principal instrument for supplying data in their evaluative surveys. As Stephen Isaac and William B. Michael have indicated, such a survey has been the most widely used technique in education and the behavioral sciences for the collection of data.<sup>36</sup> With such ample documentation as that provided in doctoral studies and in the historical literature as to the validity and reliability of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card, this investigator has

---

<sup>36</sup>Stephen Isaac and William B. Michael, Handbook in Research and Evaluation (San Diego: Edits Publishers, 1981), p. 128.

chosen the fourth edition of this instrument for use in the present evaluative study of physical education teacher preparation programs in 10 selected predominantly black institutions.



## CHAPTER THREE

### Methods and Procedures

#### Sample

The ten North Carolina coeducational institutions selected for this study were chosen because of similarity in size, resources, and student enrollment. These ten selected public and private institutions represent the east, west, south, and north geographical areas of North Carolina. A brief description of each participating institution follows:

1. Barber Scotia College is located in Concord, North Carolina. Barber Scotia College is an accredited, four-year, coeducational liberal arts institution. Historically related to the United Presbyterian Church in the United States. Barber College was founded in 1867 as Scotia Seminary, a preparatory school for young Negro women. Enrollment is approximately 600 students.<sup>1</sup>
2. Johnson C. Smith University is located in Charlotte, North Carolina, and is a private, historically, Black, coeducational, liberal arts institution founded by the Presbyterian Church, USA. Enrollment is 1400 students.<sup>2</sup>
3. Livingstone College is located in Salisbury, North Carolina. Livingstone College was founded by the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church in 1879 and

---

<sup>1</sup>National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, Washington, D.C., Profile of the Historically and Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities, 11 (1982), 1-30.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

remains under its auspices. The institution consists of two schools: an undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences, and a graduate school of theology, Hood Theological Seminary. Enrollment is approximately 950 students.<sup>3</sup>

4. Saint Augustine's College is located in Raleigh, North Carolina. It was founded in 1867, committed to providing the highest quality education possible for its some 1650 students. The College is closely associated with the Protestant Episcopal Church and seeks to develop the highest ethical and moral values in its students. The College offers degrees in 31 distinct disciplines and emphasizes student preparation for graduate studies and careers in professions.<sup>4</sup>
5. Shaw University is located in Raleigh, North Carolina. Shaw is a private, independent, four-year undergraduate institution located in a highly industrialized geographic area of North Carolina. The mission of Shaw University is to make available post secondary education opportunities to the economically, socially, and educationally deprived minorities who have a desire and potential to succeed in college, but have been traditionally unable to acquire a college education. Enrollment is approximately 750 students.<sup>5</sup>
6. Elizabeth City State University is located in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, and was founded in 1891 as a Normal School and began operations in January, 1892. As an undergraduate institution with a graduate residence center through which graduate degrees may be earned, the university has an interracial, international faculty of 125 teaching 1500 students from wide-ranging geographic and ethnic origins.<sup>6</sup>
7. Fayetteville State University is located in Fayetteville, North Carolina. Fayetteville State

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

University has grown from a one-building school to a campus of 36 buildings on 156 acres. Of the 145 faculty providing instruction to a 2,490 multi-ethnic clientele on the main campus, 63 percent hold doctorate degrees.<sup>7</sup>

8. North Carolina A & T State University is located in Greensboro, North Carolina. The North Carolina Agriculture and Technical State University has occupied a unique role in efforts to provide higher education for citizens of the state since 1891. The college operated in Raleigh until it moved to Greensboro in 1893 after that city donated \$11,000 in cash and 14 acres of land for a campus. The University is a thriving educational complex with seven schools, including a graduate school, a student body of 5,500 and a budget of more than \$23 million.<sup>8</sup>
9. North Carolina Central University is located in Durham, North Carolina. North Carolina Central University provides a comprehensive educational program at the undergraduate, graduate, and first professional degree level for the 5,000 students it enrolls. NCCU's administration and faculty maintain the principles established by the late Dr. James E. Shepard, who founded the school in 1910 and served as its first president until 1947. NCCU was the first state-supported liberal arts college for black people.<sup>9</sup>
10. Winston-Salem State University is located in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Winston-Salem State University was founded in 1892 as Slater Industrial Academy. Winston-Salem State University is accredited, four year, coeducational, state-supported, liberal arts institution. The University offers the degrees of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, and bachelor of science in applied science through its Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Applied Arts and Sciences,

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

Education, and Nursing. The average enrollment is approximately 2,200 students.<sup>10</sup>

### Instrument

The Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card was selected as the instrument for the following reasons:

1. This instrument was limited to an investigation of undergraduate professional preparation for physical education teacher programs.

2. The instrument had been validated and was reliable for evaluating professional physical education preparation programs.

3. The Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card had been used in several doctoral studies by authorities in the field.

4. The Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card was developed by renowned researchers in the field. (Score card can be bound in Appendix A.)

5. The Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card covered the following areas and sub-areas in evaluating undergraduate professional programs in physical education:

- I. General Institutional and Departmental Practices
  - A. General Policies
  - B. Professional Affiliations and Accreditation
  - C. Admissions
  - D. General Departmental Practices

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

- II. Staff Standards
  - A. Number
  - B. Qualifications in Their Major Field
  - C. Experience
  - D. Teaching Load
  - E. Professional Status
  
- III. Curriculum Policies and Practices
  - A. General Education
  - B. Foundation Sciences
  - C. General Professional Education
  - D. Special Professional Theory
  - E. Special Professional Techniques
  
- IV. The Teaching Act
  - A. Personality of the Instructors
  - B. Planning
  - C. Teaching Techniques
  - D. Evaluation
  
- V. Service Program and Extended Curriculum
  - A. Service Program
  - B. Intramural Program
  - C. Intercollegiate Athletics
  - D. Recreational Activities
  
- VI. Student Services
  - A. Recruitment, Selection, Guidance and Counseling
  - B. Health Services
  - C. Housing for Students
  - D. Placement
  - E. Follow-Up and In-Service Education
  
- VII. Library Audio-Visual
  - A. Library
    - 1. General Features
    - 2. Library Books and Pamphlets

3. Books and Pamphlets
4. Periodicals and Annuals

B. Audio-Visual Aids

1. General Features
2. Instructional Materials
3. Equipment and Facilities

VIII. Supplies and Equipment

- A. General Features
- B. Supplies
- C. Equipment

IX. Indoor Facilities

- A. General Features
- B. Administrative
- C. Instructional-Recreational
- D. Service

X. Outdoor Facilities

- A. General Features
- B. Facilities for Service and Professional  
Gechnique Courses
- C. Intramural Facilities
- D. Intercollegiate Athletic Facilities

Permission to Use the Instrument

The investigator called and wrote to Dr. Karl Book-walter and to Dr. Robert Dollgener asking permission to use their score card in this study. Permission was granted, and additional information which was of great assistance in this study was received. A letter of approval is found in Appendix B.

### Collection of Data

Recognizing the limited responses returned through mailed questionnaires as compared to other data-collecting methods, the investigator decided to employ the visitation-interview technique with this questionnaire to assure maximal return. The investigator contacted each institution by letter and by telephone for permission to interview. These letters were sent to the chairmen of the physical education departments. Along with each letter a self-addressed, stamped postal card for reply was enclosed so that an appointment for a visitation-interview could be scheduled during the months of November and December (see Appendix C).

Upon approval of the visitation-interview by the chairman of the department, another letter was sent and a telephone call was made to confirm the time, date, and site of the visit as well as to secure the agreement. Visitations were confirmed by all institutions involved by December 7, 1982.

A sample of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card was mailed to the chairman of the department in order to provide him an opportunity to examine the instrument and become familiar with it before the investigator made his visit. It also allowed the participant(s) ample time to secure valuable information not immediately attainable upon the site visitation.

The visitation-interview questionnaire was conducted with the chairman of the physical education department, the physical education coordinator of student teachers, two selected members of the physical education faculty, and one representative from the library staff of each cooperating institution.

Each visitation consisted of a two-hour meeting with the designated persons involved in the study. During these meetings, the instrument was discussed and questions answered concerning the survey questionnaire. Immediately following the interview, each completed questionnaire was coded to aid in identification. The code used was the name of the institution and a number one through five to indicate the individual's position. One represented the chairman of the department; 2, the physical education coordinator of student teachers; 3, the physical education faculty-male; 4, the physical education faculty-female (where no female was available a male was used); and 5 represented the librarian or the designated person from the library staff.

The format for each interview was as follows: the respondent read each score card item and indicated the most appropriate choice in the space provided to the right of each item. The assignment of score card values for each item was made on the basis of the alternative selected by the respondent. The total point value of each item was listed at the end of each item on the questionnaire.



### Procedures

Analysis of data included the ten areas and sub-areas of the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card. Area scores were computed from questionnaire items to obtain the total score of each institution. Point values were recorded for each item on the score card. The total of the sub-area scores equaled the area score. Each sub-area scored divided by the possible points for the area times 100 gave a percentage. The total sub-area scores were converted to percentage points by dividing each total by the points possible for that area. The area percentage scores were used to indicate the rank order of each institution.

The average percentage points for each institution were computed by adding the four institutional representative earned points in each sub-area of the score card. This total was divided by the number of responses then multiplied by the total points possible and divided by the total possible points in the sub-area to obtain the average percentage of each sub-area.

A comparison was made of the total sub-area points by obtaining the area percentage points to show rank order of areas by private and public institutions. Tables 1 through 11 were developed and utilized in order to ascertain what, if any, short-range program improvements were needed. The investigator utilized the percentages for each institution.

Recommendations were made for those public and private institutions which have a percentage score below the mean score of 50.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Analysis of the Data

This study was designed to evaluate and compare the status of only professional undergraduate physical education teacher preparation programs in predominantly black, four-year public and private institutions of higher education in North Carolina. The Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card (fourth edition) along with the personal visitation-interview were utilized for collecting data. Five public and five private institutions in the state of North Carolina agreed to participate in the survey. Personnel in each of the participating institutions involved in this study included the chairman of the physical education department, the physical education coordinator of student teachers, two selected professional members of the physical education faculty, and one representative from the library staff.

As Stephen Isaac and William B. Michael have pointed out, surveys are the most widely used technique in education and in the behavioral sciences for the collection of data. Surveys are a means of gathering information that describes the nature and extent of a specific set of data ranging from physical counts and frequencies to attitudes and opinions.

This information in turn can be used to answer questions that have been raised, to solve problems that have been observed, to assess needs and set goals, to determine whether or not specific objectives have been met, to establish baselines against which future comparisons can be made, to analyze trends across time, and generally to describe what exists, in what amount, and in what context.<sup>1</sup> In light of these statements, the data were analyzed and discussed in terms of evaluative comparison in the status of only undergraduate physical education teacher professional preparation programs in predominantly black, four-year institutions in the state of North Carolina.

#### Total Public and Private Institutional Scores

The total points earned and mean scores obtained from responses of administrators and faculty members in these North Carolina institutions on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card in each of the areas and sub-areas I through X were derived by the following procedures: the total possible points in each area and sub-area were doubled. This procedure was used because the responses of administrators in total points earned were treated as a group, and the responses of faculty members in total

---

<sup>1</sup>Stephen Isaac and William B. Michael, Handbook in Research and Evaluation (San Diego: Edits Publishers, 1981), p. 128.

points earned were also treated as a group. Grouping was a good method for making comparison as it can be used for showing similarities and differences.

In Table 1, the total number of possible points in Area I was 160. The total earned points were obtained in the administrators' column by adding the total sub-area points earned in each column. The administrators' mean score was obtained by adding the total sub-area points earned in each column and dividing by the number of responses. This procedure was used in each of the remaining categories in areas and sub-areas I through X to obtain the total earned points of administrators, faculty, and the overall mean scores made on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card.

Area I: General Institutional and  
Departmental Practices

Table 1 will show the results of the survey of the public and private institutions as these results relate to the sub-areas of General Policies, Professional Affiliations and Accreditation, Admissions and General Departmental Practices.

General Policies was the category that involved well-formulated statements of institutional aims, objectives, and philosophy which have been published and were readily available to students, faculty, departments, and schools. In this area, standards of measurement included the

requirement that each student maintain at least a "C" average and earn a minimum number of 120 credit hours for graduation. Other standards were that departments and students be represented in institutional policy making and that definite policy on salary, promotion, leaves, and tenure exist and be readily accessible.

### Private Institutions

The total points given by administrators and faculty members for private institutions in Area I: General Institutional and Departmental Practices will be discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

General Policies. In Area I, the private institution with the highest earned points given by administrators in General Policies was that of Shaw University. The responses of Livingstone College administrators scored the lowest total earned points in this category. The range of responses of administrators in the 5 private institutions in regard to policies and practices was 39-30, a difference of 9 points which indicated that the administrators and faculty in the private institutions were compatible in general policies and practices. In the sub-area of General Policies, Shaw University faculty responses scored highest in total earned points. There was a range of 9 points; thus, the responses from private institutions were compatible, and the total earned points reflected no common differences in

this area. Only a 2-point difference existed between the responses of one institution's administrators and faculty in total points earned; all others show a difference of only 1 point.

Professional Affiliations and Accreditation. In this sub-area of Professional Affiliation and Accreditation, the standard of measurement required that the institution be an accredited member of a recognized association of higher education and be approved by the state department of education for training physical education teachers in public schools. The administrator and faculty responses at Saint Augustine's College gave the highest earned points in Affiliation and Accreditation with identical scores for both groups. The lowest total earned points were given in responses of administrators and faculty of Livingstone College. It was observed that the total earned points by responses of administrators and faculty were in harmony with the required standards in this sub-area. Further, there were 3 private institutions with identical scores in this category, indicating a strong consistency.

Admissions. In the sub-area of Admissions Policy, the standard of measurement was the requirement that each student have a record of graduation from an accredited high school, pass entrance examination, pass English and health examinations, and have an intelligence quotient that met a given standard. In the Admissions Policy sub-area, the

responses of Shaw University administrators and faculty presented the highest total earned points, and Johnson C. Smith University administrators presented the lowest total earned points. Saint Augustine's College faculty had the lowest total earned points of responses in this sub-area. Three institutions had identical scores in the Admissions Policy sub-area given in responses of faculty and administrators, thus indicating a common agreement.

General Departmental Practices. The responses of faculty and administrators at Shaw University gave the highest total earned points in Departmental Practices. Saint Augustine's College administrators and faculty scored this category the lowest in terms of its contribution to the total development of professional preparation programs.

#### Public Institutions

In Table 1, the survey of Public Institutions regarding Area I reflected that the administrators and faculty of North Carolina Central presented the highest total earned points in General Policies. Fayetteville State University in responses of administrators scored the lowest total earned points in the same sub-area. The range of responses for public administrators in General Policies and Practices is 41-35, a difference of six points. The responses of The Agriculture and Technical State University faculty gave the lowest total earned points in the sub-area of General



Policies, thus also indicating a range of difference of 6 points.

Professional Affiliations and Accreditation. In the Professional Affiliation sub-area, the responses of administrators and faculty members of both Fayetteville State University and North Carolina Central University tied with the highest total earned points of the public institutions. The responses of the faculty of Elizabeth City State University rendered the lowest total earned points. A range of 24-21 points made by responses of the faculty indicated a close similarity in Professional Affiliation and Accreditation in these public institutions.

Admissions. The responses of Winston-Salem State University administrators gave the highest total earned points in Admissions. The responses of the administrators of North Carolina Central University gave the lowest total earned points in the same sub-area. In 2 public institutions, Winston-Salem State University and Fayetteville State University, the responses of faculty rendered the highest total earned points in Admissions, while the responses of Elizabeth City State University faculty rendered the lowest total earned points in this sub-area. It was noted that the faculty of Fayetteville State University rated Admissions Policies higher than the administrators, offering almost a 10-point spread, while the responses of administrators and faculty from other public institutions were more in

agreement with the policies and practices in their departments and schools.

General Departmental Practices. The highest responses were rendered by the faculty and administrators of Winston-Salem State University in the General Departmental Practices sub-area, and the responses of administrators of The Agriculture and Technical University rendered the lowest points in the same sub-area. The responses of faculty members of North Carolina Central University rendered the lowest points in Departmental Practices.

#### Synopsis of Area I

The earned scores of public and private institutions indicated similarity of institutional and departmental policies and practices in these institutions. The total earned points of all 5 private institutions rendered a mean of 12, and the total earned points of all 5 public institutions rendered a mean of 126. This statistic was an indication that General Institutional and Departmental Practices, and the sub-area categories were closely compatible in practices in all public and private institutions.

Table 1

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area I: General Institutional and  
Departmental Practices

Private Institutions											
		<u>Barber Scotia</u>		<u>J.C. Smith</u>		<u>Livingstone</u>		<u>St. Augustine</u>		<u>Shaw</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area I											
General Policies	48	32	32	37	35	30	31	33	32	39	40
Prof. Affiliation	24	22	22	23	24	21	22	24	24	24	24
Admission	44	30	30	22	30	30	30	22	22	40	37
Dept. Practices	44	32	32	38	33	33	35	25	28	40	38
Totals	(160)	116	116	120	122	114	118	104	106	143	139
Public Institutions											
		<u>A &amp; T State</u>		<u>Elizabeth City</u>		<u>Fayetteville</u>		<u>N.C. Central</u>		<u>Winston-Salem</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area I											
General Policies	48	37	33	38	38	35	39	41	39	39	36
Prof. Affiliation	24	22	24	22	20	24	24	24	24	21	24
Admission	44	26	30	27	26	27	38	25	30	32	38
Dept. Practices	44	24	39	35	35	34	36	32	30	38	41
Totals	(160)	109	126	122	119	120	137	122	133	130	139

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F. refers to Faculty, and total possible points are given in parentheses.

## Area II: Staff Standards

Table 2 shows the result of the survey of public and private institutions as they relate to area and sub-areas of Staff Standards. Basically, Staff Standards was an area concerned with Number, Qualifications in Their Major Field, Teaching Load, and Professional Status. Departmental staffing standards required that adequate numbers of full-time staff members were assigned to the instructional curriculum for the continuous development of the professional physical education program. These standards allocated adequate time for administrative responsibilities and duties, the requirement that all teachers on the staff hold at least the Master's degree, and were stimulated to advance systematically by graduate study and travel. Twenty-five percent of the staff must hold the earned doctorate. The department head must hold a doctorate in the major field and have 3 years of successful teaching experience.

In experience, the instructional members must have taught in their field of concentration on the elementary or secondary level. Professional teachers were required to have taught at least 3 years in the area of their specialization. Consultants and supervising teachers must possess a minimum of 5 years of successful teaching experience at the level and in the subject which they

supervise. A planned program of in-service training for staff members was required at all levels.

The Teaching Load for each instructor must be adequate enough to permit proper preparation and teaching; extra-curricular duties were assigned to equalize staff responsibilities. Administrative responsibilities, academic advising, personal counseling, research, and committee duties were considered in determining load.

Professional staff members were required to affiliate with state and national organizations. Teachers must attend, hold offices, and contribute to meetings and conventions of professional organizations. The professional staff must participate regularly in publications and research. Within the department staff members were given salaries, rank, and tenure equitable to their training and experience.

#### Private Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for private institutions in Area II: Staff Standards will be discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

Number. In Area II the private institution with the highest earned points given by administrators was Shaw University in Staff Number, which involved adequate full-time members assigned to the instructional curriculum for professional physical education teacher program. The

responses of administrators from Saint Augustine's College scored the fewest total earned points in this category. The faculty of Johnson C. Smith University gave the highest number of earned points in Staff Number. The faculty of Barber Scotia College offered the fewest earned points in the same area. No private institution made scores below the mean in relationship to Staff Number and professional practices, indicating that these institutions as a group were meeting the required standards.

Qualifications in Their Major Field. In the sub-area Qualifications of Teachers in Their Major Field, the standard of measurement required that the teachers hold at least the Master's degree in the field of instructional duties. The responses of administrators at Johnson C. Smith University offered the highest number of earned points. The lowest number of earned points was obtained by responses from administrators of Livingstone College in Qualifications of Teachers. Shaw University's faculty rendered the highest points in the same sub-area, and Livingstone College faculty offered the fewest points.

Experience. In Experience, the responses of administrators and faculty of Saint Augustine's College offered the highest number of earned points as a group of all the private institutions. The administrators of Johnson C. Smith University presented the lowest number of earned

points, and Barber Scotia College faculty gave the fewest earned points from responses in this sub-area.

Teaching Load. The administrators of Shaw University offered the highest total earned points in Teaching Load standards, involving properly balanced administrative duties, academic teaching loads, and extracurricular activities assigned so as to equalize the staff responsibilities. The faculty members of Saint Augustine's College gave the highest total earned points in the Teaching Load standards. The responses of Barber Scotia College administrators and faculty obtained the least number of earned points in the Teaching Load standards among the 5 private institutions. The Teaching Load sub-area was very important in the development and improvement of teachers for public and private institutions.

Professional Status. The responses from administrators of Johnson C. Smith University and Shaw University gave identical high total earned points in the sub-area Professional Status. Items which were of particular interest in the Professional Status were affiliation of staff members in state and national professional organizations, participation of staff members in community and campus activities, and professional staff participation regularly in publications and research. The fewest number of earned points was given by Livingstone College and by Barber Scotia College with identical totals from

administrators in the Professional Status standards. The responses of faculty at Saint Augustine's College offered the highest score in the sub-area; Professional Status among the faculty of the private institutions and the faculty of Barber Scotia College scored the lowest in this area.

### Public Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for public institutions in Area II: Staff Standards will be discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

Number. In Area II the public institutions with the highest total earned points in Staff Number given by the administrators was Winston-Salem State University. The lowest earned points were given by the administrators of The Agriculture and Technical State University, while the faculty members of that institution gave the highest total earned points among the faculty members of the five selected public institutions. Elizabeth City State University and Fayetteville State University faculties achieved identically in departmental staffing practices.

Qualifications in Their Major Field. Within the sub-area Qualifications of Teachers in Their Major Field were the administrators of North Carolina Central University who scored the highest total earned points among the public institutions' administrators. The administrators of The Agriculture and Technical State University gave the least



number of total earned points for administrators of public institutions. The faculties of Fayetteville State University and North Carolina Central University tied with identical total earned points given by faculty. Elizabeth City State University's faculty scored the least number of points among faculty members in sub-area Qualifications of Teachers.

Experience. In the Experience standards category, North Carolina Central administrators gave the highest total earned points, and The Agriculture and Technical State University administrators gave the least number of earned points for the same standards. The responses of Elizabeth City State University and North Carolina Central University faculties scored the least number of total earned points in the Experience of Teaching standard. These responses were identical and carried the same point value. The faculty of Winston-Salem State University and Fayetteville State University also tied in giving total earned points in the Experience standards category.

Teaching Load. In the Teaching Load standards sub-area the responses of administrators at North Carolina Central University presented the highest total earned points, and the administrators of The Agriculture and Technical State University offered the least number of earned points in the same sub-area. The responses of the faculty of Elizabeth City State University rendered the highest number of total

earned points, and the responses of the faculty of Fayetteville State University gave the least number of total earned points in the sub-area Teaching Load standards.

Professional Status. The responses of administrators of North Carolina Central University gave the highest total number of earned points of the public institutions in Professional Status standards, and The Agriculture and Technical State University administrators tallied the least number of points in that category. However, The Agriculture and Technical State University faculty presented the highest number of total earned points among the public institutions' faculty. The responses of the faculty of North Carolina Central University gave the least number of earned points in this category.

#### Synopsis of Area II

In a comparative analysis, the public and private institutions' total earned points were above the mean in Area II. Further, it was reflected in Table 2 that the private and public institutions were compatible and that trends appeared to be in harmony with the stated standards. The total earned points made by the private and public institutions collectively reflected similarity in practices among these institutions.

Table 2

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area II: Staff Standards

Private Institutions											
		<u>Barber Scotia</u>		<u>J. C. Smith</u>		<u>Livingstone</u>		<u>St. Augustine</u>		<u>Shaw</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area II											
Number	60	23	23	29	46	27	40	17	24	32	39
Qual. Major	44	31	31	33	30	14	26	30	30	31	37
Experience	40	26	26	21	35	34	27	36	36	34	36
Teaching Load	52	26	26	44	37	35	34	35	46	45	42
Prof. Status	44	<u>23</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>31</u>
Totals	(240)	<u>127</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>176</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>185</u>
Public Institutions											
		<u>A &amp; T State</u>		<u>Elizabeth City</u>		<u>Fayetteville</u>		<u>N.C. Central</u>		<u>Winston-Salem</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area II											
Number	60	35	47	42	42	44	42	48	44	52	46
Qual. Major	44	21	31	29	30	37	38	40	38	38	31
Experience	40	23	32	28	29	38	33	38	29	33	33
Teaching Load	52	29	43	49	44	36	33	51	39	43	42
Prof. Status	44	<u>28</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>30</u>
Totals	(240)	<u>136</u>	<u>188</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>184</u>	<u>174</u>	<u>215</u>	<u>198</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>182</u>

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F. refers to Faculty, and total possible points are given in parentheses.

Area III: Curriculum Policies  
and Practices

Table 3 shows the results of the survey of private and public institutions as they relate to sub-areas: General Education, Foundation Sciences, General Professional Education, Special Professional Theory, and Special Professional Techniques.

General Education standards recommend that 50 or more semester hours be devoted to general education and that courses in communication skills total at least 6 or more semester hours. They also recommend at least 9 semester hours of social sciences, 9 semester hours of humanities, 9 semester hours of natural and physical sciences or mathematics. The Foundation Science Skills course requirements were from 12 to 20 semester hours in the following: Anatomy, Applied Anatomy, and Physiology and Physiology of Exercise. The General Professional Education requirements were minimally the following: Education and Psychology, 18 hours; Student Teaching, 6 semester hours; Principles of Education, Methods of Teaching, Introduction to Teaching, and Psychology of Learning are course requirements. Special Professional Theory required at least 14 semester hours in theory courses. Special Professional Techniques required at least 32 semester hours in technical skill courses.

### Private Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for private institutions in Area III: Curriculum Policies and Practices will be discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

General Education. In Area III the private institutions with the highest total number of earned points given by administrators was Shaw University in General Education, and Livingstone College administrators gave the least number of points in the category General Education Practices. The responses of the faculty of Johnson C. Smith University were ranked highest in the sub-area General Educational standards for the private institutions, and Barber Scotia College received the lowest number of total earned points in this category.

Foundation Sciences. In the sub-area Foundation Sciences the responses of the administrators of Shaw University were highest, and the faculty and administrators of Barber Scotia College were the lowest. Johnson C. Smith University's faculty gave the highest number of total earned points in the Science category. It was noted that administrators and faculty were in accord in the Foundation Sciences standard.

General Professional Education. The total earned points of the private institutions in this study in the area of General Professional Education were relatively similar,

and the professional trends and practices appeared to be in harmony with the standards. Shaw University's administrators gave the highest number of total earned points in General Professional Education, and Livingstone College and Barber Scotia administrators gave the lowest number of total earned points. Saint Augustine's faculty gave the highest and Barber Scotia gave the lowest total earned points in General Professional Education.

Special Professional Theory. In the Professional Theory standards the responses of the administrators of Livingstone College, Johnson C. Smith University, and Saint Augustine's College scored the highest number of total earned points, respectively. Also, in the same category Saint Augustine's College faculty scored the highest among the faculty in the private institutions. In the same area the administrators and faculty at Barber Scotia College scored the lowest numbers of total earned points.

Special Professional Techniques. The Special Professional Techniques standards scores in total earned points in each of the private institutions were relatively close. Saint Augustine's College had the widest margin of points among the private institutions. The responses from administrators of Shaw University gave the highest total earned points in Special Professional Techniques. The fewest number of earned points was given by administrators at Livingstone College. The responses of faculty at Saint

Augustine's College offered the highest score in the sub-area Special Professional Techniques, and the fewest number of earned points was given by Livingstone College faculty members.

### Public Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for public institutions in Area III: Curriculum Policies and Practices will be discussed in relationship to sub-area.

General Education. In Area III the institution with the highest number of earned points in sub-area General Educational standards was Fayetteville State University according to responses of administrators. The responses of administrators of Elizabeth City State University gave the least number of total earned points in that same sub-area. The faculty giving the highest number of earned points in General Education standards was Elizabeth City State University, and the faculty giving the lowest number of total points was the faculty of North Carolina Central University.

Foundation Sciences. The administrators of North Carolina Central University scored the highest points of all 5 public institutions in the area of Foundation Sciences, and the faculty of the same institution gave the least amount of points among faculty of the public institutions.

Responses of North Carolina Central University administrators and faculty presented the highest total number of earned points in General Professional Educational standards for the public institutions. The remaining institutions had relatively similar total number of earned points in this category.

Special Professional Theory. In the sub-area Special Professional Theory among public institutions, administrators and faculty presented scores that were extremely compact and illustrated similarity of curriculum policies and practices in these institutions. The administrators and faculty of Fayetteville State scored the highest total number of earned points, and the administrators and faculty of Winston-Salem State scored the least number in Special Professional Theory.

Special Professional Techniques. In Special Professional Techniques sub-area the administrators and faculty of The Agriculture and Technical University gave the highest earned points among the public institutions. The responses of the administrators and faculty of Winston-Salem State University tallied the lowest in this category.

### Synopsis of Area III

These public and private institutions all presented a total number of earned points above the mean in Area III: Curriculum Policies and Practices. These institutions were in harmony with trends and practices.



Table 3

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area III: Curriculum Policies and Practices

Private Institutions											
		<u>Barber Scotia</u>		<u>J. C. Smith</u>		<u>Livingstone</u>		<u>St. Augustine</u>		<u>Shaw</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area III											
Gen. Education	56	32	32	34	41	27	36	31	40	41	38
Found. Sciences	36	12	14	16	28	15	17	18	22	28	25
Gen. Prof. Educ.	44	28	28	32	34	28	29	32	40	36	38
Special Theory	60	36	36	52	58	52	57	51	60	47	53
Prof. Techniques	64	49	49	59	57	42	38	52	63	62	60
Totals	(260)	157	159	193	218	164	177	184	225	214	214
Public Institutions											
		<u>A &amp; T State</u>		<u>Elizabeth City</u>		<u>Fayetteville</u>		<u>N.C. Central</u>		<u>Winston-Salem</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area III											
Gen. Education	56	28	34	25	35	40	30	39	22	35	27
Found. Sciences	36	21	26	28	27	29	24	32	21	29	28
Gen. Prof. Educ.	44	24	32	32	34	36	36	42	40	40	30
Special Theory	60	48	51	51	51	58	54	55	52	45	49
Prof. Techniques	64	63	62	49	55	55	55	61	56	44	48
Totals	(260)	184	205	185	202	218	199	229	191	193	182

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F. refers to Faculty, and total possible points are given in parentheses.

#### Area IV: The Teaching Act

Table 4 shows the results of the responses of private and public institutions as they related to The Teaching Act (Area IV). The major concerns in the sub-areas include Personality of the Instructors, Planning, Teaching Techniques, and Evaluation.

##### Private Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for private institutions in Area IV: The Teaching Act will be discussed in relationship to sub-area.

Personality of the Instructors. The responses of Saint Augustine's College administrators and faculty tallied the highest score above the mean for both groups of faculty and administrators in the sub-area Personality of the Instructors. Responses of Livingstone College's faculty and administrators offered the least number of earned points in the same sub-area. The remaining private institutions presented a number of earned points ranging from 31-35 in the Personality standards.

Planning. The responses of Barber Scotia College administrators and faculty scored the highest number of earned points in Planning, and Saint Augustine's College administrators and faculty scored the least number of earned points in the same sub-area. In Table 4, sub-area Planning showed a range of only a 3-point margin between private institutions' total points.

Teaching Techniques. The responses of Shaw University's administrators and faculty offered the highest number of earned points in Teaching Techniques, and the responses of Livingstone College offered the least number of earned points. However, the widest point margin in the same sub-area was that of 5 points between two institutions. Two institutions had an identical number of earned points, and 1 had a 3-point margin. This margin spread indicated the compactness in Teaching Techniques for all private institutions in this category.

Evaluation. The responses of administrators and faculty at Shaw University gave the highest score for both groups in the Evaluation sub-area. Barber Scotia's administrators and faculty presented the least number of points in the same sub-area. The total earned points in the Evaluation sub-area were compact and reflected close relationships in practice among the private institutions.

#### Public Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for public institutions in Area IV: The Teaching Act will be discussed in relationship to sub-area.

Personality of the Instructors. In Area IV, the public institution with the highest score in Personality of the Instructors was Winston-Salem State University's administrators. The responses of administrators at

Elizabeth City State scored the least number of points in the same category. The Agriculture and Technical State University's faculty gave the highest score among faculty members. Fayetteville State's faculty gave the least points in Personality of the Instructors.

Planning. The Agriculture and Technical University administrators and faculty scored the highest earned points for all public institutions. The responses of Winston-Salem State University administrators presented the least number of points in the Planning sub-area. Elizabeth City State and Fayetteville State faculty gave lower scores than those of the other public institutions in the same sub-area.

Teaching Techniques. The same institutions made the highest number of earned points in Teaching Techniques as given by administrators. The responses of Winston-Salem's faculty scored highest in the category of Teaching Techniques, and Elizabeth City State's faculty rendered the least number of points in the same sub-area.

Evaluation. Winston-Salem State and Fayetteville State's administrators scored the highest earned points in the Evaluative practices, and The Agriculture and Technical State University's administrators presented the least points in the same area. The faculty members of Winston-Salem State presented the highest score and Elizabeth City State faculty presented the least number of points for the sub-area of Evaluation.

Synopsis of Area IV

These public and private institutions, according to the total earned points, were compatible in many categories, namely, Personality of the Instructor, Planning, Teaching Techniques, and Evaluation.

Table 4

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area IV: The Teaching Act

Private Institutions											
		<u>Barber Scotia</u>		<u>J. C. Smith</u>		<u>Livingstone</u>		<u>St. Augustine</u>		<u>Shaw</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area IV											
Inst. Personality	40	31	31	32	35	27	28	38	37	34	35
Planning	36	36	36	33	32	33	30	32	30	35	33
Teaching Tech.	70	47	47	50	55	44	41	49	45	55	55
Evaluation	34	<u>23</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>30</u>
Totals	(180)	<u>137</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>149</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>155</u>
Public Institutions											
		<u>A &amp; T State</u>		<u>Elizabeth City</u>		<u>Fayetteville</u>		<u>N.C. Central</u>		<u>Winston-Salem</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area IV											
Inst. Personality	40	32	37	29	30	39	29	37	33	40	32
Planning	36	36	35	34	30	34	30	34	33	30	32
Teaching Tech.	70	53	62	47	44	57	53	54	50	52	57
Evaluation	34	<u>22</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>29</u>
Totals	(180)	<u>139</u>	<u>161</u>	<u>136</u>	<u>128</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>150</u>

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F. refers to Faculty, and total possible points are given in parentheses.

Area V: Service Program and  
Extended Curriculum

Table 5 reflects the results of the survey of the private and public institutions as they relate to the area and sub-areas of Service Program and Extended Curriculum. Included in this sub-area were Service Program, Intramural Program, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Recreational Activities.

Private Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for private institutions in Area V: Service Program and Extended Curriculum will be discussed in relationship to sub-area.

Service Program. In the Service Program sub-area the responses of administrators and faculty at Shaw University presented the highest earned points of the private institutions. In the same sub-area, Livingstone College's administrators and faculty rendered the least number of points for both groups. In Table 5 the widest point margin was the 3 points between administrators and faculty in the Service Program sub-area.

Intramural Program. The Intramural Program sub-area was rated highest by the responses of Shaw University faculty and administrators. In the same sub-area, Livingstone College administrators and faculty rated this sub-area the lowest among the private institutions.

Intercollegiate Athletics. In the Intercollegiate Athletics Program sub-area the responses of administrators and faculty at Saint Augustine's College presented the highest earned points of the private institutions. In the same sub-area, Barber Scotia College's administrator and faculty gave the least number of points for both groups, which is an indication of the limitations of their total athletic program.

Recreational Activities. The highest responses were given by Shaw University administrators and faculty in the Recreational Activities sub-area, and the lowest responses were given by the administrators and faculty of Barber Scotia College. The remaining institutions were relatively close in their responses to the category of Recreational Activities Practices.

#### Public Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for public institutions in Area V: Service Program and Extended Curriculum will be discussed in relationship to sub-area.

Service Program. The responses of The Agriculture and Technical University administrators presented the highest score among the public institutions in Student Service Program. In the same sub-area, Elizabeth City State's administrators rated this category the lowest among public



institutions, and the faculty from the same institutions rated student service programs the highest among public institutions. However, the total earned points margin of all public institutions was so small in this sub-area that they appeared to be in agreement.

Intramural Program. The Intramural Program sub-area was scored highest by the responses of Fayetteville State's administrators. Elizabeth City State's administrators and faculty rated the same sub-area lowest among public institutions. The responses of faculty at North Carolina Central and The Agriculture and Technical University presented the same earned points in the sub-area Intramurals which was the highest.

Intercollegiate Athletics. The responses of administrators at The Agriculture and Technical University and Fayetteville State gave the highest total earned points in Intercollegiate Athletics. The responses of the administrators and faculty of Elizabeth City State University gave the lowest total earned points in the same sub-area. All total earned points were relatively close in the public institutions in terms of athletic programs.

Recreational Activities. The highest responses were made by administrators at Winston-Salem State in Recreational Activities sub-area, and the administrators at Elizabeth City State scored this sub-area the lowest. However, the faculty of the same institution scored this

sub-area the highest among the public institutions. The public institutions are compatible in their trends and practices in this sub-area.

#### Synopsis of Area V

In comparison, the public and private institutions' total earned points were relatively compact, and all institutions earned total points above the mean in Services and Curriculum Practice. Table 5 sub-area earned points were very closely related between administrators and faculty in the public and private institutions.

Table 5

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area V: Service Program and Extended Curriculum

Private Institutions											
		<u>Barber Scotia</u>		<u>J. C. Smith</u>		<u>Livingstone</u>		<u>St. Augustine</u>		<u>Shaw</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area V											
Service Program	60	49	48	55	52	44	43	49	46	58	55
Intramural Prog.	52	38	40	35	41	26	18	40	41	50	45
Athletics	40	8	9	22	29	27	24	38	34	36	30
Recreational Act.	28	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>28</u>
Totals	(180)	102	104	129	139	114	99	150	157	172	158
Public Institutions											
		<u>A &amp; T State</u>		<u>Elizabeth City</u>		<u>Fayetteville</u>		<u>N.C. Central</u>		<u>Winston-Salem</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area V											
Service Program	60	55	54	46	55	49	53	48	54	50	49
Intramural Prog.	52	39	40	17	34	43	35	38	40	33	37
Athletics	40	36	31	21	30	36	32	31	31	34	38
Recreational Act.	28	<u>18</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>20</u>
Totals	(180)	148	142	97	140	151	137	141	143	142	144

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F. refers to Faculty, and total possible points are given in parentheses.

### Area VI: Student Services

In like manner, Table 6 shows the results of the survey of private and public institutions as these results relate to the sub-areas of Recruitment, Selection, Guidance and Counseling, Health Services, Housing for Students, Placement, and Follow-Up and In-Service Education.

#### Private Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for private institutions in Area VI: Student Services were discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

Recruitment, Selection, Guidance and Counseling. The responses of the administrators at Barber Scotia College presented the highest total earned points in Recruitment, Selection, Guidance and Counseling practices. Johnson C. Smith's administrators rated the same category lowest of the private institutions. The faculty members at Shaw University rendered the highest totals in the sub-areas mentioned above, and the faculty of Livingstone College scored this sub-area the lowest among the faculties of private institutions.

Health Services. In Health Services, Shaw University's administrators rated this sub-area highest, and Johnson C. Smith's administrators rated it last. The responses of Saint Augustine's College faculty scored Health Services last.

Housing for Students. Saint Augustine's College faculty and administrators gave Housing for Students the highest earned points of all administrators and faculty members among the private institutions. Several institutions' administrators tied in rating Housing for Students lowest among administrators. Faculty members at Livingstone College gave Housing Services the lowest score of the other institutions.

Placement. Shaw University's administrators presented the highest earned points in Placement Services, and the administrators and faculty at Livingstone College rendered the least amount of points. The responses of administrators at Johnson C. Smith presented the highest earned points in the sub-area Placement Services.

Follow-Up and In-Service Education. The responses of administrators and faculty at Johnson C. Smith University rendered the highest score above the mean for both faculty and administrators in Follow-Up and In-Service Education.

#### Public Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty members for public institutions in Area VI: Student Services were discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

Recruitment, Selection, Guidance and Counseling. In Area VI the public institution with the highest rating given by administrators in Recruitment, Selection, Guidance and

Counseling was North Carolina Central University. The responses of faculty at Elizabeth City State University rated the highest points in the same category. The responses of faculty and administrators at The Agriculture and Technical University rendered the least amount of points in this sub-area.

Health Services. The highest responses were given by the administrators at North Carolina Central in the Health Services sub-area, while the responses presented by the administrators at Winston-Salem University were the lowest in the sub-area.

Housing for Students. The administrators of Winston-Salem State University scored Housing Services highest of the public institutions, and the administrators at Fayetteville State University ranked this area last. The public institution with the highest responses was The Agriculture and Technical State University. The faculty of Winston-Salem State University rated Housing Services last.

Placement. North Carolina Central University's administrators rated Placement first among the public institutions, and The Agriculture and Technical State University rated this sub-area last among this group. The faculty of Fayetteville State University rated Placement first, and the faculty of Elizabeth City State University rated this sub-area last among the public institutions.

Follow-Up and In-Service Education. In the sub-area Follow-Up and In-Service Education, the responses of administrators at Fayetteville State University gave the highest score above the mean for public institution administrators, and Elizabeth City State University administrators presented the least amount of total points earned in this sub-area. The faculty of North Carolina Central University gave the most points among the public institutions. The Agriculture and Technical University faculty earned the least amount of total points earned in the sub-area Follow-Up and In-Service Education.

#### Synopsis of Area VI

These private and public institutions are similar in practices and are in harmony with the idea that recruitment, guidance, counseling, health services, housing practices, and follow-up as well as in-service programs make a worthwhile contribution to the development of professional preparation programs in physical education.

Table 6

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area VI: Student Services

Private Institutions											
		<u>Barber Scotia</u>		<u>J. C. Smith</u>		<u>Livingstone</u>		<u>St. Augustine</u>		<u>Shaw</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area VI											
Recruitment	40	36	36	30	32	34	30	35	36	35	39
Health Service	72	52	52	40	55	64	45	46	56	66	51
Housing	28	10	10	11	16	10	7	21	26	16	16
Placement	40	35	35	31	40	23	19	31	32	38	36
Follow-Up	60	<u>41</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>51</u>
Totals	(120)	174	174	169	198	181	132	179	202	207	193
Public Institutions											
		<u>A &amp; T State</u>		<u>Elizabeth City</u>		<u>Fayetteville</u>		<u>N.C. Central</u>		<u>Winston-Salem</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area VI											
Recruitment	40	25	29	35	37	36	31	28	34	31	36
Health Service	72	51	52	50	57	60	49	65	51	45	62
Housing	28	15	17	9	14	7	14	17	15	18	8
Placement	40	29	34	34	29	36	40	39	32	32	34
Follow-Up	60	<u>35</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>40</u>
Totals	(120)	156	169	162	177	189	178	207	177	163	180

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F. refers to Faculty, and total possible points are given in parentheses.



### Area VII: Library Audio-Visual

Table 7 shows the results of the survey of public and private institutions as they relate to General Features, Library Service, Books and Pamphlets, Periodicals, and Annuals. Other sub-areas include Audio-Visual Aids, General Features, Instructional Materials, Equipment and Facilities. There were no separate Health, Physical Education and Recreation departmental libraries in the selected institutions; thus, Area VII section of the questionnaire was completed by the librarian of each participating institution.

#### Private Institutions

The total points earned by librarians for private institutions in Area VII: Library Audio-Visual were discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

General Features. The responses of librarians at Johnson C. Smith University and Shaw University rendered the highest total earned points in General Library Features. Barber Scotia College and Livingstone College presented the lowest points in the same sub-area.

Library Services. The responses of librarians of Saint Augustine's College and Shaw University presented the highest earned points in Library Services. Barber Scotia College, Johnson C. Smith University, and Livingstone College rendered Library Services last in earned points.

Books and Pamphlets. Johnson C. Smith University and Shaw University's librarians rendered a tie in total earned points in Books and Pamphlets as the highest sub-area. The responses of the librarian at Barber Scotia College rendered sub-area Books and Pamphlets last in earned points.

Periodicals and Annuals. The responses of the librarian at Shaw University ranked the highest earned points in the sub-area Periodicals and Annuals, and Barber Scotia College rendered this sub-area last in points earned.

Audio-Visual General Features. The responses of librarians at Saint Augustine's College and Shaw University presented the highest total earned points in the sub-area General Library Features, while 3 other private institutions ranked the same sub-area last in total points earned.

Instructional Materials. The librarian of Shaw University ranked the highest total earned points in sub-area Instructional Materials. Two institutions ranked the same sub-area last in total earned points.

Equipment and Facilities. The responses of the librarian at Saint Augustine's College presented the highest earned points in the sub-area Equipment and Facilities. The responses of the librarian at Barber Scotia College ranked this sub-area last in total points earned.

### Public Institutions

The total earned points by librarians for public institutions in Area VII: Library Audio-Visual will be discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

General Features. The responses of the librarian at North Carolina Central University and Elizabeth City State University presented the highest total earned points in the sub-area General Library Features. The other public institutions' librarians presented identical low earned points in the same sub-area.

Library Services. The responses of librarians at North Carolina Central University and Elizabeth City State University presented the highest earned points in sub-area Library Service. The Agriculture and Technical State University rated the same sub-area last in total earned points.

Books and Pamphlets. The responses of Fayetteville State University librarian presented the lowest earned points in this sub-area. The librarian at North Carolina Central University rendered the highest earned points in Books and Pamphlets.

Periodicals and Annuals. The responses of the librarian at Elizabeth City State University presented the highest earned points in sub-area Periodicals and Annuals. The Agriculture and Technical State University rated the same sub-area last in earned total points.

Audio-Visual General Features. Winston-Salem State University librarian rated this sub-area last in total earned points. The librarian of The Agriculture and Technical State University presented the highest earned points in sub-area Audio-Visual General Features. These institutions' earned points were in sequential order.

Instructional Materials. The responses of the librarian of North Carolina Central University presented the highest earned points in this sub-area. Three institutions rated the sub-area Institutional Materials lowest in earned total points. These 3 institutions tied for total point value.

Equipment and Facilities. The highest earned total points in this sub-area were from Elizabeth City State University librarian. The responses of the librarian at Fayetteville State University rated the lowest earned points in Equipment and Facilities.

#### Synopsis of Area VII

The public and private institutions are in agreement that Library Audio-Visual aid programs make a significant contribution to the overall development of the undergraduate professional programs in physical education.

Table 7

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area VII: Library Audio-Visual

		Private Institutions				
		<u>Barber Scotia</u> Librarian	<u>J. C. Smith</u> Librarian	<u>Livingstone</u> Librarian	<u>St. Augustine</u> Librarian	<u>Shaw</u> Librarian
Sub-areas to Area VII						
A. Library						
1. Gen. Features	15	12	15	12	14	15
2. Library Serv.	8	7	7	7	8	8
3. Books & Pamph.	17	9	16	14	15	16
4. Periodicals	14	5	8	8	9	10
B. Audio-Visual						
1. Gen. Features	10	6	6	6	10	10
2. Inst. Materials	10	6	9	6	9	10
3. Equip. & Facil.	16	8	14	12	16	14
Totals	(90)	53	75	65	81	83
		Public Institutions				
		<u>A &amp; T State</u> Librarian	<u>Elizabeth City</u> Librarian	<u>Fayetteville</u> Librarian	<u>N.C. Central</u> Librarian	<u>Winston-Salem</u> Librarian
Sub-areas to Area VII						
A. Library						
1. Gen. Features	15	10	13	10	13	10
2. Library Serv.	8	5	8	7	8	7
3. Books & Pamph.	17	12	16	8	17	16
4. Periodicals	14	8	14	10	9	10
B. Audio-Visual						
1. Gen. Features	10	9	8	8	7	6

Table 7 (continued)

		Public Institutions				
		<u>A &amp; T State</u> Librarian	<u>Elizabeth City</u> Librarian	<u>Fayetteville</u> Librarian	<u>N.C. Central</u> Librarian	<u>Winston-Salem</u> Librarian
2.	Inst. Materials	10    7	5	5	8	5
3.	Equip. & Facil.	16 <u>10</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>
Totals		(90)    61	<u>79</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>64</u>

Note: Librarian completed this sectionnaire, and total possible points are given in parentheses.

### Area VIII: Supplies and Equipment

Table 8 shows the results of the survey of public and private institutions in relationship to General Practices, Supplies and Equipment.

#### Private Institutions

The total points earned by faculty and administrators of private institutions in Area VIII: Supplies and Equipment will be discussed in sub-areas.

General Practices. The responses of administrators at Johnson C. Smith University rendered the highest earned points in General Practices. The faculty of Livingstone College presented the lowest earned points in this category. The highest total points earned by faculty were rendered by Shaw University; the administrators at Barber Scotia College rendered the lowest score in these same practices.

Supplies. In the Supplies category the responses of administrators at Johnson C. Smith University rendered the highest score, and Livingstone College faculty rated the same category lowest. The responses of administrators of Barber Scotia College presented the lowest earned points in the Supplies sub-area. Saint Augustine's College faculty scored this sub-area highest among the private institutions.

Equipment. The responses of administrators and faculty at Shaw University presented the highest earned points in the private institutions in Equipment practices. The

administrators of Saint Augustine's and the faculty of Livingstone College presented the lowest total earned points in Equipment practices sub-area.

#### Public Institutions

The total points earned by administrators and faculty members of public institutions in Area VIII: Supplies and Equipment will be discussed in sub-areas.

General Practices. The administrators at both Winston-Salem University and Fayetteville State University presented the highest total earned points in General Practices. The responses of administrators at The Agriculture and Technical University scored the category lowest, and the faculty from the same institutions scored the sub-area highest among faculty members.

Supplies. In the Supplies category, the responses of administrators at North Carolina Central University rendered the highest earned points of the public institutions. In the same sub-area the administrators of Winston-Salem State University made the least amount of points. The responses of faculty at Fayetteville State University rendered the lowest earned points in Supplies sub-area. The responses of faculty at Elizabeth City State University presented the highest total earned points among the faculty members of the public institutions.



Equipment. The highest responses were presented by administrators at The Agriculture and Technical University in Equipment practices, and the administrators of Winston-Salem State University rendered the least amount of points. The responses of faculty at Elizabeth State University presented the highest total earned points for faculty members of all the public institutions.

#### Synopsis of Area VIII

In the scoring by private institutions' faculty members, only one institution scored slightly below the mean which indicated some improvement was necessary in the sub-area Supplies and Equipment. No public institutions earned points below the mean.

Table 8

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area VIII: Supplies and Equipment

Private Institutions											
		<u>Barber Scotia</u>		<u>J. C. Smith</u>		<u>Livingstone</u>		<u>St. Augustine</u>		<u>Shaw</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area VIII											
General Pract.	26	14	14	24	19	18	12	20	21	22	22
Supplies	58	35	35	49	47	36	23	42	47	47	45
Equipment	76	38	38	58	54	34	28	31	37	64	65
Totals	(100)	89	89	131	120	88	63	93	105	133	132
Public Institutions											
		<u>A &amp; T State</u>		<u>Elizabeth City</u>		<u>Fayetteville</u>		<u>N.C. Central</u>		<u>Winston-Salem</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area VIII											
General Pract.	26	13	22	17	21	19	21	18	16	19	21
Supplies	58	48	50	45	55	46	46	52	51	38	51
Equipment	76	63	64	57	67	49	45	48	54	35	58
Totals	(160)	124	136	119	143	114	112	118	121	92	130

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F refers to Faculty, and total possible points are given in parentheses.

### Area IX: Indoor Facilities

In like manner, Table 9 shows the results of the survey of the public and private institutions concerning the area and sub-areas: General Features, Administrative Practices, Instructional, Recreational and Services.

#### Private Institutions

The total points earned by administrators and faculty members of private institutions in Area IX: Indoor Facilities will be discussed in sub-areas.

General Features. The responses of administrators at Shaw University and Livingstone College rendered the highest total earned points in General Features (Area IX), Indoor Facilities for the private institutions. Saint Augustine's College administrators presented the lowest earned points in the same sub-area. The faculty of Johnson C. Smith University and Shaw University both rated the General Features sub-area highest of the private institutions. The faculty of Livingstone College rated General Features lowest.

Administrative. The Administrative sub-area was rated by the administrators of Johnson C. Smith University highest among the administrators. The administration of Saint Augustine's College rendered this category the lowest earned points among the sub-area. The responses of faculty at Barber Scotia College rendered the highest total earned points in Administrative Practices sub-area. Livingstone

College faculty rated this category lowest in earned points.

Instructional-Recreational. The responses of administrators and faculty at Shaw University presented the Instructional-Recreational sub-area the highest earned points in the private institutions. The responses of administrators at Saint Augustine's College rated this sub-area the lowest. The responses of faculty members of Livingstone College presented Administrative Practices sub-area the least number of earned points for faculty members in the private institutions.

Service. In the Service sub-area the administrators and faculty of Barber Scotia College presented the highest earned points. The administrators of Saint Augustine's College rendered the lowest total earned points in the Service program category. The faculty of Livingstone College presented the least number of points for faculty members in the Service sub-area.

### Public Institutions

The total points earned by administrators and faculty members of public institutions in Area IX: Indoor Facilities will be discussed in sub-areas.

General Features. In Area IX the public institution with the highest total earned points in General Indoor Features was the administrators and faculty at Elizabeth

City State University. The responses of faculty and administrators of North Carolina Central rendered the lowest earned points in this sub-area.

Administrative. In Administrative practices, the responses of administrators of Elizabeth City State University presented the highest total earned points among the administrators of public institutions. The administrators of Winston-Salem State University and The Agriculture and Technical State University rendered the lowest total points earned in the same category. Two institutions' faculties and administrators tied for total earned points in General Features; both were high for Administrative practices category.

Instructional-Recreational. In responses to the Instructional-Recreational program sub-area the administrators of The Agriculture and Technical University rendered the highest earned points of the public institutions. In the same sub-area North Carolina University administrators and faculty presented the lowest total earned points in the same category.

Service. The responses of administrators of The Agriculture and Technical State University presented the highest earned points in the Service program sub-area. The highest total points given by faculty was at Winston-Salem University. The administrators and faculty of Fayetteville

State University rendered the lowest earned points in the sub-area Service programs.

Synopsis of Area IX

Both the public and private institutions agreed that General Indoor Facilities and Features, Administrative Practices, Instructional-Recreational Activities, and Service Programs were essential tools in the development of professional preparation programs for physical education teachers. Two faculty members from the public and private institutions scored earned points slightly below the mean, and one administrator from the public institution scored one point below the mean.

Table 9

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area IX: Indoor Facilities

Private Institutions											
		<u>Barber Scotia</u>		<u>J. C. Smith</u>		<u>Livingstone</u>		<u>St. Augustine</u>		<u>Shaw</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area IX											
General Features	26	17	17	20	21	21	14	13	16	21	21
Administrative	46	35	37	42	43	35	26	24	32	33	34
Instruc.-Rec.	84	27	27	44	38	39	26	18	28	64	58
Service	64	55	56	40	47	37	32	30	35	43	43
Totals	(220)	134	137	146	142	132	98	85	111	161	166
Public Institutions											
		<u>A &amp; T State</u>		<u>Elizabeth City</u>		<u>Fayetteville</u>		<u>N.C. Central</u>		<u>Winston-Salem</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area IX											
General Features	26	21	18	24	23	20	21	18	15	21	22
Administrative	46	33	32	44	42	37	42	43	35	33	40
Instruc.-Rec.	84	57	56	55	64	38	23	25	22	44	45
Service	64	48	42	40	49	38	23	42	40	46	50
Totals	(220)	159	148	163	178	133	109	128	112	144	157

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F. refers to Faculty, and total possible points are given in parentheses.

### Area X: Outdoor Facilities

Table 10 shows the results of the responses of private and public institutions as they relate to Outdoor Facilities (Area X). The major concerns in the sub-areas include: General Features, Facilities, Intramural Facilities, and Athletic Facilities.

#### Private Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty for private and public institutions in Area X: Outdoor Facilities will be discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

General Features. In the General Features category the responses of administrators and faculty members at Johnson C. Smith University presented the highest earned points of the private institutions. In the same sub-area, Barber Scotia College administrators and faculty rendered the lowest earned points. The other administrators and faculty earned points were relatively compact.

Facilities for Service and Professional Technique Courses. The responses of administrators of Johnson C. Smith University presented the highest earned points in the sub-area, Facilities for Service and Professional Technique Courses. In the same sub-area the faculty and administrators of Barber Scotia College rated this category lowest in earned points.



Intramural Facilities. The responses of faculty and administrators of Johnson C. Smith University presented the highest earned points in Intramural Facilities. In the same sub-area Saint Augustine's College faculty and administrators presented the lowest total earned points.

Intercollegiate Athletic Facilities. In the Intercollegiate Athletic Facilities category the responses of administrators and faculty members of Johnson C. Smith University tallied the highest earned points in private institutions. The lowest responses were given by Barber Scotia College administrators and faculty.

#### Public Institutions

The total points earned for administrators and faculty for public institutions in Area X: Outdoor Facilities will be discussed in relationship to sub-areas.

General Features. The responses of administrators of Fayetteville State University rendered the highest earned points in Outdoor Facilities--General Features. The administrators of North Carolina Central University rated this category lowest among administrators. The responses of faculty members of Winston-Salem State University presented the highest earned points among faculty members. The Agriculture and Technical State University's faculty rated the same sub-area lowest among faculty members in public institutions.

Facilities for Services and Professional Technique Courses. The responses of administrators and faculty of Winston-Salem State University rendered the highest earned points in the sub-area mentioned above. The responses of administrators of Elizabeth City State University presented the lowest earned points. Fayetteville State University's faculty rated the sub-area Facilities for Service and Professional Technique Courses last.

Intramural Facilities. In the sub-area Intramural Facilities, the responses of faculty and administrators of Winston-Salem State University both presented the highest total earned points, and the administrators of North Carolina Central University rendered the lowest total earned points. The Agriculture and Technical State University's faculty presented the lowest earned points in Intramural Facilities.

Intercollegiate Athletic Facilities. The responses of administrators and faculty members of Winston-Salem State University presented the highest earned total points in sub-area Intercollegiate Athletic Facilities. Fayetteville State University's administrators rendered the lowest earned points in the sub-area mentioned above. Faculty responses of administrators and faculty members presented the highest earned total points in sub-area Intercollegiate Athletic Facilities. Fayetteville State University's administrators rendered the lowest earned points in the sub-area mentioned

above. Faculty responses from The Agriculture and Technical State University, Fayetteville State University, and North Carolina Central University rendered the lowest total earned points between faculty members in the public institutions.

#### Synopsis of Area X

The private institutions had 2 faculty members and 2 administrators to render total earned points slightly below the mean in Area X: Outdoor Facilities. The public institutions had 2 administrators to present total earned points below the mean in the same category. Two faculty members and 4 administrators in the private and public institutions ranked Area X (Outdoor Facilities) last, suggesting that this category was least essential to the development of undergraduate professional preparation programs for physical education teachers.

Table 10

Total Points Earned by Selected Administrators and Faculty in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card,  
Area X: Outdoor Facilities

Private Institutions											
		<u>Barber Scotia</u>		<u>J. D. Smith</u>		<u>Livingstone</u>		<u>St. Augustine</u>		<u>Shaw</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area X											
General Features	46	23	23	39	30	28	24	27	27	32	27
Facilities	54	24	24	39	35	34	26	32	37	38	41
Intramural Facil.	36	18	18	26	29	20	14	14	14	24	24
Athletic Facil.	44	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>17</u>
Totals	(180)	76	76	139	132	109	81	87	93	122	109
Public Institutions											
		<u>A &amp; T State</u>		<u>Elizabeth City</u>		<u>Fayetteville</u>		<u>N.C. Central</u>		<u>Winston-Salem</u>	
		A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.	A.	F.
Sub-areas to Area X											
General Features	46	27	19	28	35	31	37	26	36	30	41
Facilities	54	25	31	24	40	28	30	28	44	41	45
Intramural Facil.	36	17	17	13	27	17	19	8	20	24	27
Athletic Facil.	44	<u>27</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>39</u>
Totals	(180)	96	104	87	135	93	113	89	127	135	152

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F. refers to Faculty, and total possible points are given in parentheses.

### Summary of Table 11

Table 11 shows the mean scores of each of the public and private institutions as these scores relate to Area I, General Institutional and Departmental Practices; Area II, Staff Standards; Area III, Curriculum Policies and Practices; Area IV, The Teaching Act; Area V, Service Program and Extended Curriculum; Area VI, Student Services; Area VII, Library Audio-Visual; Area VIII, Supplies and Equipment; Area IX, Indoor Facilities; and Area X, Outdoor Facilities.

#### Private Institutions

Pertinent to each institution, the overall highest and lowest mean scores as given in each area by administrators and faculty were presented.

In Area I, General Institutional and Departmental Practices, Shaw University faculty and administrators rendered the highest mean score in this category. The lowest mean score rendered in the same area was that of the administrators and faculty at Saint Augustine's College.

In Area II, Staff Standards, the faculty and administrators of Shaw University presented the highest mean score in the category, while the faculty and administrators of Barber Scotia College rated the same category the lowest.

In Area III, Curriculum Policies and Practices was rated highest by the administrators of Shaw University. The faculty of Saint Augustine's College rated the same area

highest. The lowest rating in this area was given by the faculty and administrators of Barber Scotia College.

In Area IV, The Teaching Act, the faculty and administrators of Shaw University rendered the highest mean score. The lowest mean was presented by administrators and faculty of Livingstone College.

In Area V, The Service Program and Extended Curriculum was rated highest by Shaw University faculty and administrators. The lowest ratings were given by administrators of Barber Scotia and the faculty of Livingstone College.

In Area VI, Student Services, the highest mean was presented by the administrators of Shaw and the faculty of Johnson C. Smith University and Saint Augustine's College. The lowest mean was rendered by the administrators of Johnson C. Smith University and the faculty of Livingstone College.

In Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, the librarians of Saint Augustine's College and Shaw University tied in giving the highest mean score. The lowest mean score was given by Barber Scotia College's librarian.

In Area VIII, Supplies and Equipment, the administrators of Johnson C. Smith University presented the highest mean score, and the faculty of Shaw offered the lowest mean score. The same category was rated lowest by the faculty and administrators of Livingstone College.

In Area IX, Indoor Facilities was rated highest by the administrators and faculty of Shaw University. The lowest mean was that given by the administrators of Saint Augustine's College. The faculty that rendered the lowest mean was that of Livingstone College.

In Area X, Outdoor Facilities, the administrators and faculty of Johnson C. Smith rendered the highest mean score. The lowest mean was given by the faculty and administrators of Barber Scotia College.

#### Public Institutions

Pertinent to each institution, the overall highest and lowest mean scores as given in each area by administrators and faculty were presented.

In Area I, General Institutional and Departmental Practices, the administrators and faculty of Winston-Salem State University rendered the highest mean score among the public institutions. The administrators of The Agriculture and Technical State University rendered the lowest mean score. The faculty of Elizabeth City State University rendered the lowest mean for faculty.

In Area II, Staff Standards, the faculty and administrators of North Carolina Central University presented the highest mean. The administrators of The Agriculture and Technical State University presented the lowest mean score.

The faculty of Elizabeth City State University and Fayetteville State University rendered the lowest mean.

In Area III, Curriculum Policies and Practices was rated highest by the administrators of North Carolina Central University. The Agriculture and Technical State University faculty rendered the highest mean, and the faculty of Winston-Salem State University rendered the lowest mean.

In Area IV, The Teaching Act, the administrators of Fayetteville State University presented the highest mean among administrators. The Agriculture and Technical State University faculty rendered the highest mean among faculty. The lowest mean was rendered by the administrators and faculty of Elizabeth City State University.

In Area V, Service Program and Extended Curriculum, the responses of administrators of Fayetteville State University rendered the highest mean, and those of the faculty of the same institution rendered the lowest mean. The highest mean scores were presented by the faculties of The Agriculture and Technical State University, North Carolina Central University, and Winston-Salem State University. The administrators of Elizabeth City State University rendered the lowest mean.

In Area VI, Student Services, the responses of administrators of North Carolina Central University earned the highest mean, and those of the administrators and



faculty of The Agriculture and Technical State University earned the lowest mean. The faculty of Fayetteville State University and Winston-Salem State University rendered identical high mean scores.

In Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, the librarians of Elizabeth City State and North Carolina Central University presented the two highest mean scores. The Agriculture and Technical State University librarian rendered the lowest mean in this area.

In Area VIII, Supplies and Equipment, the administrators of The Agriculture and Technical State University presented the highest mean, and the responses of the faculty of Elizabeth City State University presented the highest mean for faculty. The responses of administrators of Winston-Salem State University gave the lowest mean in this area. The responses of the faculty of Fayetteville State University presented the lowest mean of all the faculties in the public institutions.

In Area IX, Indoor Facilities, the responses of the faculty and of administrators of Elizabeth City State University presented the highest mean, and the responses of administrators at North Carolina Central University earned the lowest mean in this category. The responses of faculty of Fayetteville State University presented the lowest mean in this area.

In Area X, Outdoor Facilities, the responses of the faculty and administrators of Winston-Salem University presented the highest mean, and the responses of the faculty of The Agriculture and Technical State University rendered the lowest mean in Outdoor Facilities. The administrators of Elizabeth City State University and North Carolina Central University presented the two lowest mean scores.

### Synopsis of Areas

In Area I, General Institutional and Departmental Practices, the private institutions scored a mean of 31, and the public institutions scored a mean of 32.

In Area II, Staff Standards, the private institutions scored a mean of 31, and the public institutions scored a mean of 37.

In Area III, Curriculum Policies and Practices, the private institutions scored a mean of 38, and the public institutions scored a mean of 40.

In Area IV, The Teaching Act, the public institutions scored a mean of 30, and the private institutions scored a mean of 36.

In Area V, Service Program and Extended Curriculum, the public institutions scored a mean of 35, and the private institutions scored a mean of 34.

In Area VI, Student Services, the public institutions scored a mean of 36, and the private institutions scored a mean of 36.

Table 11

Mean Scores by Selected Administrators, Faculty, and Institutions in  
North Carolina on the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card

Private Institutions																
Area	Barber Scotia			J. C. Smith			Livingstone			St. Augustine			Shaw			Mean
	A.	F.	I.	A.	F.	I.	A.	F.	I.	A.	F.	I.	A.	F.	I.	
1. Gen. Inst. & Dept.	29	29	29	30	31	31	29	30	30	26	27	27	36	35	36	31
2. Staff Standards	25	25	25	32	35	34	27	30	29	29	34	32	35	37	36	31
3. Curriculum Policies	31	32	32	39	44	42	33	35	34	37	45	41	43	43	43	38
4. Teaching Act	34	34	34	37	38	38	33	31	32	37	35	36	39	39	39	36
5. Ser. Pro. & Extend. Curr.	26	26	26	32	35	34	29	25	27	38	39	39	43	40	42	34
6. Student Services	35	35	35	34	40	37	36	26	31	36	40	38	41	39	40	36
7. Library Audio-Visual	8	8	8	11	11	11	9	9	9	12	12	12	12	12	12	10
8. Supplies & Equipment	30	30	30	44	40	42	29	21	25	31	35	33	44	44	44	35
9. Indoor Facil.	34	34	34	37	36	37	33	25	29	21	28	25	40	42	41	33
10. Outdoor Facil.	19	19	19	35	33	34	27	20	24	22	23	23	31	27	29	32

Table 11 (continued)

Public Institutions																
Area	A & T State			Elizabeth City			Fayetteville			N.C. Central			Winston-Salem			Mean
	A.	F.	I.	A.	F.	I.	A.	F.	I.	A.	F.	I.	A.	F.	I.	
1. Gen. Inst. & Dept.	27	32	30	30	30	30	30	34	32	31	33	32	33	35	34	32
2. Staff Standards	27	38	33	35	35	35	37	35	36	43	40	42	39	36	38	37
3. Curriculum Policies	37	41	39	37	40	39	44	40	42	46	38	42	39	36	38	40
4. Teaching Act	35	40	38	34	32	33	41	34	38	38	36	37	39	38	39	30
5. Ser. Pro. & Extend. Curr.	37	36	37	24	35	30	38	34	36	35	36	36	36	36	36	35
6. Student Services	31	34	33	32	35	34	39	36	38	41	35	38	33	36	35	36
7. Library Audio-Visual	9	9	9	11	11	11	8	8	8	11	11	11	9	9	9	10
8. Supplies & Equipment	41	45	43	40	48	44	38	37	38	39	40	40	30	43	37	40
9. Indoor Facil.	40	37	39	41	45	43	33	27	30	32	38	30	36	39	38	44
10. Outdoor Facil.	24	26	25	22	34	28	23	28	26	22	32	27	34	38	36	36

Note: A. refers to Administrators, F. refers to Faculty, and I. refers to Institutions.

In Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, the public institutions scored a mean of 10, and the private institutions scored a mean of 10.

In Area VIII, Supplies and Equipment, the private institutions scored a mean of 35, and the public institutions scored a mean of 40.

In Area IX, Indoor Facilities, the private institutions scored a mean of 33, and the public institutions scored a mean of 44.

In Area X, Outdoor Facilities, the private institutions scored a mean of 32, and the public institutions presented a mean of 36.

These public and private institutions showed strong similarities in the following areas: Area I, General Institutional and Departmental Practices; Area III, Curriculum Policies and Practices; Area V, Service Program and Extended Curriculum; Area VI, Student Services; Area VII, Library Audio-Visual; and Area X, Outdoor Facilities. Further, the public and private institutions showed moderate similarity in the following areas: Area II, Staff Standards; Area IV, The Teaching Act; Area VIII, Supplies and Equipment; and Area IX, Indoor Facilities. There were no strongly marked differences among these institutions in any area of the survey.

Area Rank Order by Private and  
Public Institutions

Private Institutions

The private institutions as a group ranked Area III, Curriculum Policies and Practices, first; Area IV, The Teaching Act, and Area VI, Student Services, second; Area VIII, Supplies and Equipment, third; Area V, Service Program and Extended Curriculum, fourth; Area IX, Indoor Facilities, fifth; Area X, Outdoor Facilities, sixth; Area I, General Institutional and Departmental Practices, and Area II, Staff Standards, seventh; and Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, last.

Public Institutions

The public institutions as a group ranked Area IX, Indoor Facilities, first; Area III, Curriculum Policies and Practices and Area VIII, Supplies and Equipment, second; Area II, Staff Standards, third; Area VI, Student Services and Area X, Outdoor Facilities, fourth; Area V, Service Program and Extended Curriculum, fifth; Area I, General Institutional and Departmental Practices, sixth; Area IV, The Teaching Act, seventh; and Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, last.

Rank Order of Private Institutions

Area III	38	1
Area IV	36	2.5
Area VI	36	2.5
Area VIII	35	3
Area V	34	4
Area IX	33	5
Area X	32	6
Area I	31	7.5
Area II	31	7.5
Area VII	10	8

Rank Order of Public Institutions

Area IX	44	1
Area III	40	2.5
Area VIII	40	2.5
Area II	37	3
Area VI	36	4.5
Area X	36	5
Area V	35	5
Area I	32	6
Area IV	30	7
Area VII	10	8

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Summary, Results, and Recommendations

#### Summary

This study was designed to evaluate and compare the status of the undergraduate professional preparation programs for physical education teachers of 5 selected public and 5 selected private institutions in North Carolina. These institutions are similar in size and in facilities. They are structured with sensitivity for the needs of persons from diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. The student populations in each institution have similar experiences and background training.

The Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card was selected as the evaluative instrument for this study because it had been validated and was reliable for evaluating undergraduate professional physical education preparation programs. The score card was used in personal visitation-interviews with 2 faculty members, 1 librarian, and 2 administrators at each institution. In these personal visitation-interviews, point value was assigned to each of the 318 items on the score card. The item scores were added to obtain the sub-area scores; the sub-area scores were added to obtain the area



scores; and, finally, the area and sub-area scores were added to obtain the institutional scores.

The total earned points (raw total) and area scores were converted to mean score equivalents. The area mean equivalents were scored to show comparisons between the public and private institution scores. Area and sub-areas were scored based on total earned points attained. In addition, rank order assigned to the public and private institutions was made apparent. A comparison using mean scores helped determine the need for short-range program improvement.

### Results

Within the limitations of this study and based on the data collected, the following results appear to be justified:

1. The overall institutional mean of public institutions was slightly higher than the overall mean made by the private institutions.

2. The faculty and administrators of the private institutions ranked Area III, Curriculum Policies and Practices, highest with a mean of 38 as related to the growth of undergraduate professional programs for physical education teachers.

3. The faculty and administrators of the public institutions also ranked Area III, Curriculum Policies and Practices, highest with a mean of 40.

4. The faculty and administrators of the private institutions ranked Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, the lowest with a mean of 10 as it relates to the professional preparation program for physical education teachers.

5. The faculty and administrators of the public institutions ranked Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, last with a mean of 10.

6. In Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, the librarian of 2 private institutions scored this sub-area one point below the mean.

7. In Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, the librarians of these private institutions scored this sub-area in sequential order below the mean.

8. In Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, the librarians of 2 public institutions scored this sub-area below the mean.

9. In Area VII, Library Audio-Visual, the librarians of these 5 public institutions scored this sub-area in sequential order.

10. In Area VIII, Supplies and Equipment, the faculty of 1 private institution scored this sub-area below the mean, and the overall score of the same institution was below the mean.

11. In Area IX, Indoor Facilities, the faculty and administrators of 1 private institution scored this sub-area slightly below the mean.

12. In Area X, Outdoor Facilities, the administrators of 2 public institutions scored this sub-area below the mean.

13. In Area X, Outdoor Facilities, the faculty and administrators scored this sub-area below the mean.

14. In Area X, Outdoor Facilities, the faculty and administrators of 2 private institutions scored this sub-area slightly below the mean.

15. The faculty and administrators of the public and private institutions rated 6 areas above the mean.

#### Recommendations

These recommendations are made only in regard to score card areas and sub-areas which had attainment scores below the established mean. Based on these findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. That periodic reevaluation be made in institutions similar in size, population, and economic status to ascertain the growth, development, and improvement in undergraduate professional preparation programs in physical education for teachers.

2. That the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card be used to conduct the reevaluation periodically.

3. That institutions in which the faculty and administrators scored the undergraduate professional preparation programs in physical education below the mean be reevaluated yearly.

A Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate  
Professional Programs in  
Physical Education

(Fourth Edition)

By

Karl W. Bookwalter  
Professor Emeritus  
Indiana University  
R.R. 1, Unionville, Indiana

Robert J. Dollgener  
Chairman, Department of  
Health and Physical Education  
Glenville State College  
Glenville, West Virginia

Edited by  
Carolyn W. Bookwalter

Bloomington, Indiana  
Copyright, 1976

**PLEASE NOTE:**

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

A score card for evaluating undergraduate professional  
programs in physical education. pg 130-131

Appendix A pg 134-183

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

## APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

BOOKWALTER-DOLLGENER SCORE CARD FOR EVALUATING  
UNDERGRADUATE PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS IN  
PHYSICAL EDUCATION

## APPENDIX B

### PERMISSION LETTER TO USE INSTRUMENT



Karl W. Bookwalter  
9815 East State Road 45  
Unionville, Indiana 47468  
812-332-5094

February 13, 1982

Mr. Frederick D. Ponder  
1004 West Fisher  
Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

Dear Mr. Ponder:

Your first letter (certified) finally arrived February 11. It had been misaddressed by the personnel at Indiana University. On February 12, your second copy addressed to Unionville arrived.

I am hereby acknowledging your letter of February 2, 1982, of which I received two copies. This letter will also verify your telephone call of February 9. You have my permission to use the 1976 edition of the Bookwalter-Dollgener A Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education and to duplicate any needed parts.

In response to your telephone call of February 9, you were sent a copy of the score card, a copy of A Review of Thirty Years of Selected Research on Undergraduate Professional Physical Education Programs in the United States, and two copies of the recording forms.

There is no charge for these materials. However, in return, I would like a copy of your raw data on a recording form. You may duplicate the recording forms as needed.

I will be very interested in learning about your evaluations. If I may be of further help, please feel free to call upon me.

If you see Dr. Ross Townes, please remember me to him.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Karl W. Bookwalter

Karl W. Bookwalter.

APPENDIX C

REQUEST FOR VISITATION-INTERVIEW

1004 West Fisher Street  
Salisbury, North Carolina 28144  
October 25, 1982

Dear

As a doctoral candidate, I am requesting your assistance in a project designated to assess common problems in physical education teacher preparation programs in the state of North Carolina.

I shall be using the Bookwalter-Dollgener Score Card as the evaluative instrument for this investigation. It was developed by renowned researchers and is valid and reliable for measuring undergraduate professional preparation for physical education teacher programs.

Should you agree to participate in this project it will be necessary to schedule an interview of approximately two hours with the designated persons. Your responses in the interview will be treated with confidentiality and professionalism.

If you are willing to take part in an interview, please use the enclosed self-addressed postal card in scheduling an appointment. I am desirous of completing the project during the month of November. I shall be most grateful for your assistance.

Thank you for your cooperation and valuable contribution to this project.

Sincerely,

Fred D. Ponder, Chairman  
Physical Education Department

Enclosure

APPENDIX D

REPLY POSTAL CARD

## Reply Card--Request for Visitation-Interview

Permission is (    ), is not (    ) granted for the  
visitation-interview.

Suggested date: Oct. \_\_\_\_\_ Nov. \_\_\_\_\_

Suggested hour: \_\_\_\_\_

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number: (    ) \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. Fred D. Ponder

1004 West Fisher Street

Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Bookwalter, Karl W., and Carolyn W. Bookwalter. A Review of Thirty Years of Selected Research on Undergraduate Professional Physical Education Programs in the United States. 4th ed. Bloomington, Indiana, 1980.
- Colbert, R., and I. W. Epps. Curriculum Innovation in Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, Inc., 1975.
- Daughtrey, Greyson. Effective Teaching in Physical Education. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1973.
- Gabrielson, M. Alexander, and Caswell M. Miles. Sports and Recreation Facilities: For School and Community. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.
- Hughes, William. The Administration of Physical Education. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1954.
- Isaac, Stephen, and William B. Michael. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Edits Publishers, 1981.
- Kinney, Lucien B. Certification in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. Profile of the Historically and Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities, 11. Washington, D.C., 1982.
- Nixon, John E., and Ann E. Jewett. An Introduction to Physical Education. Philadelphia: Saunders College, 1980.
- Snyder, Raymond Albert, and Harry Alexander Scott. Professional Preparation in Health, Physical Education and Recreation. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1954.
- Tawney, R. H. The Acquisitive Society. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1920.

Trow, William C. Educational Psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1950.

William, Jessie F., and C. L. Brownell. The Administration of Health Education and Physical Education. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1959.

### Periodicals

American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. Evaluation Standards and Guide in Health Education, Physical Education and Recreation Education, The Association, Washington, D.C. (1959), 31-32.

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. Evaluation Schedules in Physical Education and Health Education, The Association, Oneonta, N.Y. (1951).

Anderson, George. "Interrelationship Among Association Disciplines." Professional Preparation in Dance, Physical Education, Recreational Education, Safety Education and School Education, Special Task Force Report. American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (1974), 176-92.

Association of Colleges and Research Libraries. College and University Library Accreditation Standards, The Association, Chicago (1958), 46-48.

Bookwalter, Karl W. A Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education. Indiana University, Bloomington, 1962.

Bookwalter, Karl W., and Robert Dollgener. A Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education. Rev. ed. Diss. Indiana Univ., 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_. A Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education. 3rd ed. Diss. Indiana Univ., 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_. A Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education. 4th ed. Diss. Indiana Univ., 1976.

Brithtwell, Shelby D. "Organizational Structure: An Academic Focus." Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (June 1982), 11-12.



- Calvin, William, and Elmo Roundy. "An Instrument for Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Physical Education Activity Courses." Research Quarterly, 47, No. 2 (May 1976), 296-98.
- Essingler, Arthur. "Professional Preparation Conference." Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 33, No. 5 (May-June 1962), 20-21.
- Gettlinger, Maribeth, and Mary A. White. "Evaluating Curriculum Fit with Class Ability." Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, No. 3 (1980), 338-39.
- Grebner, Florence. "The Role of the Profession in Credentialing." Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 52, No. 6 (June 1982), 58-72.
- Griffin, Leon. "Who Is Accountable for the Student-Teacher, the Public Schools or the Universities?" Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 51, No. 4 (April 1980), 18-20.
- Jewett, Ann. "The Status of Physical Education Curriculum Theory." Quest, 32, No. 2 (Winter 1980), 166-67.
- Johnson, James. "College Teaching Toward 9 New Definitions." Quest, 25 (Winter 1976), 25-28.
- Kelley, Fred J. Improving College Instruction. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1951.
- Lawson, Hal. "Professional Studies Program in Graduate Physical Education." Quest, 28 (Summer 1977), 67-74.
- Madike, Francis. "Teacher Preparation and Student Achievement: An Experimental Comparison of Micro-teaching with a Traditional Approach." Journal of Education (1980), 866-74.
- Miller, Ben W. "Priority in the Quest for Quality," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 35 (May 1964), 32.
- Milograno, Vincent. "Physical Education Curriculum for the 1980s." Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 51, No. 7 (September 1980), 39-40.
- National Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. New Horizons for the Teaching Profession, NEA, Washington, D.C., 1961.

- National Conference. Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education, Health Education and Recreation, Athletic Institute, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, 1956.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Standards for Accreditation of Institutions and Programs for Teacher Education, The Council, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., 1971.
- National Education Association. Handbook for State and Local Associations. (1953-54), 346-48.
- Neilson, N. P. "National Study of Professional Education in Health and Physical Education." National Committee Report on Standards, American Physical Education Association. Research Quarterly, 6 (December 1935), 48-68.
- North Central Association Committee on the Preparation of High School Teachers in Colleges of Liberal Arts. Better Colleges--Better Teachers, Macmillan Company, New York City, 1944.
- Oermann, Karl. "Preparation in Physical Education: A Professional Field." Quest, 32 (Summer 1980), 28-52.
- Oregon Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation. Ed. Vernon Sprague. Teacher Education Standards in Physical Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1952.
- Pace, Judy. Role Definitions of College Faculty and Prospective Physical Educators. National Conference AAHPER. ERIC Document ED 193 216, 1980.
- Participants in National Conference. Equipment and Supplies for Athletics, Physical Education, and Recreation. Athletic Institute, Merchandise Mart, Recreation, Washington, D.C., 1960.
- Participants in National Facilities Conference. Planning Facilities for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Athletic Institute, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, 1956.
- Polidoro, Richard. "Professional Preparation Programs of Physical Education Teachers in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark." Research Quarterly, 48 (October 1977), 640-646.

- Powers, P. J. "Psycholotherapeutic Techniques in Education Inservice." Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 53, No. 6 (June 1982), 53-55.
- Professional Preparation Conference. Professional Preparation in Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Education, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Washington, D.C., 1962.
- Rothstein, A. L. "Curriculum, Teacher Behavior Patterns and Student Performance in Physical Education." Completed Research in Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 23 (1981), 88-89.
- Scott, Harry A., and Richard B. Westkaemper. From Program to Facilities in Physical Education, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1953, 483-85.
- Troester, Carl A., Jr. "A History of Physical Education." Professional Preparation in Health Education, Physical Education and Recreation Education, Report National Conference (1962), 159-62.
- Washington Conference Report. Intramural Sports for College Men and Women, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Washington, D.C. (1955), 34-36.
- Washington Conference Report. Physical Education for College Men and Women, Washington, D.C. (1958), 34-35.
- Weinberg, Herman. Focus on Undergraduate Personal/Professional Preparation in Physical Education. Report National Conference AAHPER. ERIC Document ED 164 461, 1978.

#### Unpublished Sources

- Buck, Charles R. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education in Oklahoma Colleges and Universities." Diss. Arkansas Univ., 1968.
- Buice, Mary. "A Scale for Evaluating the Undergraduate Professional Program in Physical Education." Diss. Texas Univ., 1951.
- Dollgener, Robert J. "A Critical Appraisal of a Selected Score Card for Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Physical Education Programs in Indiana." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1965.

- Errington, Joseph. "An Evaluation of Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education for Men in Canada." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1958.
- Gingerich, Roman. "An Evaluation of the Physical Education Service Programs for Men in the Church Related Senior Colleges and Universities of India." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1958.
- Hanes, Edward C. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education for State Supported Institutions of Higher Education in Kentucky." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1971.
- Jones, James R. "An Evaluation of the Physical Education Program for Men in Selected Colleges and Universities and an Appraisal of the Score Card Employed." Diss. Michigan Univ., 1967.
- Kerr, Robert W. "The Status of Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education for Men in New England Colleges and Universities." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1955.
- Kirchner, George Frederick. "An Evaluation of the Physical Education Service Programs for Men in the Senior Colleges and Universities of North Carolina with Respect to Specific Elements." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1953.
- Kirk, Robert Henry. "An Instrument for Evaluating College and University Health Service Programs." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1960.
- Krotee, Robert Quentin. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education for Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Maryland. Thesis Maryland Univ., 1979.
- Kruk, Katherine Ann. "An Evaluation of Undergraduate Physical Education Programs in Colleges and Universities in the State of Virginia. Thesis Maryland Univ., 1979.
- Livingston, Michael W. "An Evaluation and Analysis of Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education for Men in State Colleges and Universities of Alabama." Diss. Alabama Univ., 1967.
- McClain, William M. "An Evaluation and Analysis of the Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education for Men in Colleges and Universities of North Carolina." Diss. Alabama Univ., 1971.

- Moorehead, Isaac Thomas. "An Evaluation Study of the Undergraduate Program in Physical Education at Alabama State University, 1972-1973." Diss. Alabama Univ., 1973.
- Nordin, Idris Ahmad. "A Survey of the Status of Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education in State Universities in Oregon." Diss. Oregon Univ., 1978.
- Pribula, James G. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Programs in Physical Education for Selected Colleges and Universities in Pennsylvania." Diss. Maryland Univ., 1976.
- Price, Marjorie Ann. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education in Missouri Colleges and Universities." Diss. Missouri Univ., 1968.
- Reece, Alfred Marion. "A Critical Evaluation of Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education in Selected Coeducational Institutions in Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1969.
- Reeves, William Earl. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education in Selected Mississippi Colleges and Universities." Diss. Alabama Univ., 1970.
- Sauter, Waldo. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education for Men in Selected Colleges and Universities in Indiana." Indiana Univ., 1957.
- Scott, Nancy C. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Program in Physical Education at Middle Tennessee State University." Diss. Middle Tennessee State Univ., 1973.
- Shaw, Willie G. "A Description of General Education Requirements in Physical Education for Selected Private, Predominantly Black Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia." Diss. Middle Tennessee State Univ., 1975.
- Stille, Harry C. "A Comparison of the Undergraduate Professional Physical Education Programs in Colleges and Universities in South Carolina." Diss. Alabama Univ., 1974.

- Suriyasasin, Kampee. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Professional Preparation Programs in Physical Education in Selected Coeducational Institutions in Tennessee." Diss. Middle Tennessee State Univ., 1977.
- Townes, Ross. "A Study of Professional Education in Physical Education in Selected Negro Colleges." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1950.
- Wiseman, Douglas C. "A Critical Evaluation of Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education in Selected Colleges and Universities for Men and Women in New England." Diss. Indiana Univ., 1970.
- Wray, Beth. "An Analysis and Evaluation of Undergraduate Professional Preparation in Physical Education in Seventeen Institutions of Higher Learning in North Dakota and South Dakota." Diss., Kansas Univ., 1969.
- Yonce, Rubie Herlong. "A Critical Evaluation of Undergraduate Physical Education Programs of Professional Preparation in Selected Colleges and Universities in Georgia." Diss. South Carolina Univ., 1977.