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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has had the philosophy of educating their members with a knowledge of God and His dealings with men ever since it was founded by Joseph Smith in 1830. During the nineteenth century, Church schools provided both secular and religious training, because the authorities felt that it was not wise to educate the head and neglect the heart. As the state gradually assumed the responsibility of secular education, supported by public taxation, the Church ceased to provide instruction in secular subjects except on the college level.

The Church, however, continued to provide a program of religious education for its young people. These Church operated schools, which are located in close proximity to many senior and junior high schools, are called seminaries. This Church-operated program is completely independent of the public school system and complies with the Constitutional requirement of separation of Church and State.1

The ultimate purpose of this Church-operated program is to provide an education that will promote man's utmost well-being, his joy and happiness, not only during his mortal life but for the eternities.2

---

2Ibid., pp. 2-3.
The seminary program of the Church had a very humble beginning in 1912. A seminary adjacent to the Granite High School accommodated approximately seventy students who desired to attend both schools to learn theology and historical subjects. Brother Yates, a young devoted church member, agreed to teach the students. He was a graduate in electrical and mechanical engineering and was already employed full-time, but worked his schedule around so that he would include both jobs in his daily activities. Two classes were held the first year with approximately seventy students.  

Since this humble beginning of seventy students, the program has increased to include over 110,000 students. The Church presently (1968) maintains 208 released-time classes in which young Latter-day Saint students receive daily religious instruction. The program is currently operated in forty-eight states, and in Mexico, and in Canada. During the school year 1968-1969, there will be, for the first time, seminaries in two foreign countries, Australia and England.

Currently, released time from regular high school classes for daily religious education is available in the states of Utah, Idaho, Arizona, and Wyoming and in Alberta, Canada. Parents may upon a written request release their children for one school period per day to participate in an organized program of religious instruction. The expense of this program is paid for by the Church, and all instructors in the full-time seminary program are fully certified.  

---


4 *Church Schools*, p. 11.
In Utah and in the immediate surrounding states, there are released-time seminaries grouped together to form districts in order to facilitate in-service training personnel. Each district has a coordinator who is responsible to the Department of Education to carry out the program of the Department.5

I. Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to survey the effectiveness of the coordinator in carrying out his responsibilities. Special emphasis was placed upon the coordinator's influence over the teachers placed under his jurisdiction.

Since the Seminary System was organized in 1912, the supervisor has played an important part. The supervisory position was established by the L.D.S. Department of Education for the primary purpose of supervising and evaluating the teachers, employed by the L.D.S. Department of Education, on their effectiveness. These supervisors were also expected to give aid and counsel to those seminary teachers who needed it. During the last ten years, this core of supervisors, or "coordinators" as they are now called, have grown considerably.

II. Delimitation

This study was delimited to the released-time seminary coordinators of the L.D.S. Department of Education, and to some of the seminary teachers under their direction.

5 Ibid., p. 9.
III. Research Design

Population.- The population with which this study was concerned was made up of the 551 seminary teachers who were employed by the Latter-day Saint Church on a full-time basis. The full-time teachers were under the direction of fourteen coordinators. All of these coordinators have been considered in this study.

Sampling.- The sample used in this study included 260 of the 551 seminary teachers employed on a full-time basis. It also included their fourteen full-time coordinators.

Source of data.- The 179 seminary teachers and fourteen coordinators evaluated the effectiveness of coordinators by responding to a questionnaire designed to supply information regarding five very important areas of coordinator work. The five areas are: Leadership, Classroom Visits, Teacher Conferences, Monthly Meetings, and Evaluation for Merit Rating.

IV. Importance of the Problem

Progress comes through critical evaluation of present methods and policies. We must never become complacent, or completely satisfied with things as they are. Most often there are better ways of doing things and it is with this thought in mind that this study is being researched.

The Department of Seminaries has formulated certain policies that they have worked out which they wish to be carried out. The coordinator has the responsibility to see to it that these five areas mentioned above are effectively implemented and carried out.
V. **Organization of Remaining Chapters**

Chapter two reviews the responsibilities of the coordinator as set forth by the Department of Religious Education, and as outlined in the available literature.

Chapter three is a tabulation of the information received from the questionnaire to which 179 of the 260 seminary teachers were asked to respond.

Chapter four is a consideration of the conclusions, implications, and recommendations which are based upon the evidence from the questionnaire and the review of coordinator responsibilities.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

THE EVOLUTION OF THE COORDINATOR AND HIS RESPONSIBILITIES

As the seminary program grew, it became necessary to choose a person to guide the program. This selected individual became known as the Commissioner of the Church Educational Program, and his chief concern was to provide direction to the system. It was his assignment and desire to visit all of the teachers during the school year for the primary purpose of helping them with their problems and of organizing an effective teaching program that would develop in students strong testimonies of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; he also was to work toward higher enrollment. Another very important responsibility was to interview new prospective seminary teachers and then place them in a district where they were needed and where they would be most effective.

As the system grew and expanded, it became more apparent that the commissioner needed aid. As the commissioner's assignment became more administrative, two assistants, called Supervisors, were appointed to aid him. At this time the title of the Commissioner of Education was changed to President of Seminaries and Institutes.

This office of supervisors continued in effect for many years. During these years we find these supervisors busily engaged in numerous duties. President A. Theodore Tuttle, member of the First Council of
Seventy of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, was a supervisor under the direction of William E. Berrett. In a letter to the author he gave a short summary of his duties as a supervisor:

When I first became a supervisor, our duties were to do classroom supervision. We attempted to visit every seminary teacher in the states of Utah, Idaho, Arizona and one or two in Wyoming. We attended also the monthly meetings of the faculties in the various areas or regions. It was our responsibility to interview prospective teachers. We attended the seminary conventions which were held in the various regions. In addition to this, we had the regular administrative duties of the office in Provo.  

It was during the time that A. Theodore Tuttle was a supervisor that the Coordinator emerged as an important leader within the seminary system of the Church. Again quoting Tuttle:

As the system grew and expanded, and the early morning program became so extensive and widespread, it became more and more impossible to do the detailed supervision which should be done. . . When we called Area Coordinators in Rexburg, Logan, Salt Lake City, Provo, Southern Utah, Carbon, Arizona, and other areas, it resulted in alleviating much of the detail of actual classroom supervision from our responsibilities and placed it in the hands of the coordinators. We still continued to do some of this but not as extensively. As the program continued to grow, more and more of our duties became administrative rather than supervisory, though the title all the years that I served remained the same.

Shortly after the release of A. Theodore Tuttle, the Department of L.D.S. Seminaries changed the title of Supervisors to Assistant Administrators of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion. These men, under the direction of William E. Berrett, travel throughout the Church in connection with their assignment relative to the seminary and institute program. They provide counsel and direction for seminary and institute

---


7Ibid.
personnel. They also interview applicants for teaching positions in addition to multiple administrative duties.\footnote{Church Schools, p. 8.}

The Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes has assigned to the seminary coordinators certain responsibilities and duties in fulfillment of their assignments. It was the intention of the writer to research the coordinator-teacher relationship in five areas of responsibility which were assigned to them by this Department.

I. Leadership

The coordinator is expected to know the rules of good leadership. He must realize that leadership is a force which can initiate, guide, maintain, and stimulate action and activities among people. Generally speaking, the Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes selects individuals who it feels will utilize this kind of leadership, and who will accomplish the goals and purposes of the seminary program.

The Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes has not set forth in writing the characteristics, qualifications, and responsibilities expected of a coordinator. Most of these details have been orally transmitted through meetings and workshops. Because of similarities in the qualifications of seminary coordinators and those of supervisors in the secular field, it was the desire of the writer to explore the field of secular education to discover some leadership qualities of supervisors and to examine how they may be helpful to seminary coordinators.
Jane Franseth, in her book, *Supervision As Leadership*, lists several qualities of a successful supervisor, and her thoughts can be summarized as follows: (1) A successful supervisor is democratic. A person who is democratic and has great respect for the dignity, worth, and integrity of all people. He also provides an environment in which people are encouraged to utilize their imagination in creative and constructive ways. Teachers under such conditions will be more apt to respect the creativity and individuality of his students. (2) A successful supervisor is "people-oriented." This kind of a leader is not defensive; thus allowing him to accept opinions from others even though these opinions may at times be hostile. People-oriented leaders will have the support of those they lead, because concern and sympathy for people rather than things demands respect and love. (3) A successful supervisor is able to see situations as others do. Once a leader understands that others may not see the world as he sees it, as Franseth points out, he has made a move to solve many problems:

We need to understand that other people can honestly see the world as composed differently than we do. Each man's ideas come from the ground of his own experience. Instead of clashing head on, we can usually get further by listening attentively to the one who differs from us, trying, as we listen, to reconstruct, inside ourselves, how it might look from inside the other person, given his experience, motives, etc. Then, maybe, looking again, we may be able to see the world enough like he sees it to understand and appreciate the particular form of his integrity. This is what it means to try to understand another person.9

(4) A supervisor practices group-centered leadership. It is important

for the leader to encourage people to talk about the things they are
doing and to provide an environment of self-expression in a supportive
situation. A leader who listens can effectively elicit meaningful
participation. (5) A successful leader is well informed. It is
impossible to be expert in all fields but one should be thoroughly
familiar in the field to which one is assigned. (6) A successful leader
helps others use their energy creatively. Creative people are those
who are always trying to invent better methods of doing things.
They are also very imaginative and resourceful. "If leaders have
vision and aspirations to lead creatively, their responsibilities
provide the challenge through which their aspirations and experiences
may be realized."10

To these qualities may be added several others, for the
demands of the modern day coordinator are great and he must possess as
many qualities as are known, in order to be an effective leader. The
following list of qualifications compiled by Ordway Tead, is interesting
and suggestive for the administration to follow when facing the problem
of choosing a coordinator:

1. Physical and nervous energy
2. A sense of purpose and direction
3. Enthusiasm
4. Friendliness and affection
5. Integrity
6. Technical mastery
7. Decisiveness
8. Intelligence
9. Teaching skill
10. Faith11

10Ibid., p. 2.

Leadership, then, requires characteristics that transcend the ordinary—characteristics that inspire others, for as Tead observes:

The good leader rescues our lives from boredom and apathy. And in this more ultimate guise than leadership is often conceived, the leader helps his followers to a desirable and desired self-transcendence, a rising above the ordinary and routine in personal meaningfulness and sense of significance. He may well elevate purposes which may seem proesy to their inwardly poetic or otherwise important potential. He unifies meaning and significance in living and working or in the familiar verse: He redeems our lives from destruction—the destruction of futility and aimlessness.12

II. Classroom Visits

Marshall Burton, coordinator of Teacher Training and Placement for the L.D.S. Department of Seminaries, has been working during 1968 to combine all of the responsibilities and duties of the coordinator. In his first draft of the released-time coordinator’s handbook we find some specific duties and responsibilities that are expected of the coordinator as he visits the classroom to observe.

The coordinator is expected to visit the classroom as often as possible, spending several complete periods with each teacher. He may choose to visit with the teacher several periods in one day, one period on several consecutive days, or one period at stated intervals throughout the year.

The coordinator is also expected to have a consultation with each teacher after each visit or series of visits. This, of course, will be an excellent way for the teacher and the coordinator to exchange ideas and become better acquainted with each other's philosophy of religious education.

---

The coordinator should make a written record or evaluation of each classroom visit using a form provided by the Department. These forms should be made in duplicate so that the coordinator can leave one copy with the teacher. If the teacher doesn't object and is not placed under obvious pressure by the writing of the coordinator, the coordinator may fill the form out during the class session.13

The coordinator should never enter the classroom with the intent to criticize or rebuke the teacher, or change established workable classroom patterns. Such a negative approach would create a conflict between the teacher and the coordinator, eventually resulting alienation from one another. The coordinator may enter the classroom and leave after the period is over without saying anything, such a visit being classified as an inspection. Today the trend is away from this type of inspection and more toward communication between teacher and coordinator. The coordinator should have in mind as he enters the classroom to observe and to gain new ideas from the visit, ideas which may be of value to other teachers with whom he works. Charles W. Boardman emphasizes this point in the following manner:

Observation may contribute as greatly to the growth of the supervisor as it does to the growth of the teachers. It will furnish him with an opportunity to study methods and principles of instruction in operation and to improve his knowledge of the details of successful procedures in classroom method and management. It will also offer him an opportunity to study the effect of other supervisory activities and furnishes him with a basis for evaluating many aspects of the general program for improvement in the school through observing their influence upon the work in the classroom.14

This type of classroom observation should be welcomed by the teacher. When a proper rapport exists between the coordinator and the teacher, the teacher will never feel that the coordinator is intruding into his territory and creating an unnecessary hardship.

III. Teacher Conferences

The coordinator is expected to hold periodic conferences with his teachers, especially after each classroom observance. This consultation period should allow sufficient time for the teacher and the coordinator to exchange views without unnecessary stress. The department is also very desirous that the atmosphere between the teacher and the coordinator be friendly and that a critical atmosphere during these consultations be avoided.

The coordinator should listen carefully and work so as to emphasize the teacher’s strengths. Then as the teacher gains confidence he will feel more free to discuss his weaknesses with his coordinator.15

Callis R. Harms has written an excellent article on the positive and negative approach in supervision. Since the Department is inclined toward the positive approach as mentioned above, a summary of Dr. Harms’ article will be given.

The coordinator who criticizes will find that the teacher almost inevitably interprets the criticism to be of himself rather than his teaching. He will immediately begin to defend and rationalize his teaching. Another result of the negative approach is that the teacher will not necessarily change the methods which have been criticized, but rather he will most likely shun the supervisor who criticizes.

The positive approach requires the coordinator to look for things that can be praised, supported, and reinforced. There are several important results to consider with this kind of an approach. First, the teacher feels good about what he has done and most likely he will try to improve where he is weak, thereby becoming a more effective teacher. Second, the good feeling for recognition of quality work will strengthen the rapport that has developed between the teacher and the coordinator. Finally, the teacher will be more willing to open up and ask for advice and counsel to strengthen his weaknesses.

Callis R. Harms lists two rules that are important to follow:

Rule #1. Look for and recognize, warmly and sincerely, the positive in teacher behavior. Avoid the tendency to criticize.

Rule #2. If you must be critical of someone, make certain that the criticism is accompanied by reassurance of his acceptance as an individual and competence in other areas.\(^{16}\)

If a coordinator will follow the positive approach he will become a better and a more influential person with the teachers under his direction, because this approach has been recognized for a long time to be the most effective.

A coordinator should also realize that he does not usually have final answers to problems. He may have suggestions and ideas that will help the teacher; but to pose as a final authority may shut the door of communication.\(^{17}\)

It is very important to the final outcome of a conference that there be a mutual respect and a two-way flow of ideas. This belief is

\(^{16}\)Callis R. Harms, Working with Individuals: the Positive and Negative in Supervision (Unpublished article).

\(^{17}\)Burton, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 42.
supported by the following statement:

An individual conference is (or should be) a meeting between two persons equally interested in improving a situation. The views and facts of each party are necessary to complete the picture. Exchange of facts and ideas is focused on problem-solving and not on one of the persons in the conference. 18

Fransesth aptly expressed this same idea when she said, "No matter what the topic, an individual conference is usually successful only when it contributes to the solution of problems or the accomplishment of goals which the teachers consider important." 19

As the coordinator leaves the teacher after a classroom observance conference, a written summary of topics discussed should be left with the teacher. The Department is desirous that all of their coordinators follow this rule, so that future conferences will run smoothly and that coordinators may avoid repetitions of past problems. The summary also serves as a log to check progress in weak teaching areas already covered in previous conferences.

The basic rule followed by the department in regards to classroom visits and teacher conferences, is that the coordinator must not make the teacher feel that his professional training and integrity is ignored or threatened. 20 If the teacher is to accept advice, he must have evidence that the advice is sound:


19 Fransesth, op. cit., p. 87.

Discussions which involve evaluation of a person's actions should be calculated to foster that person's self-confidence. Co-operative evaluation by teacher and supervisor is more fruitful than unilateral evaluation by the supervisor. The effective supervisor does not tell the teacher what to do. He may give his opinion, based on the best information he has, but he knows it is not wise for the teacher to follow his advice unless the teacher believes on good evidence that it is good advice.

IV. Monthly Faculty Meetings

One night each month during the school year, the coordinator was to hold a district faculty meeting. This meeting was to be cooperatively planned by the coordinator and his principals and teachers. Some districts are utilizing faculty committees who are responsible for planning this meeting. The Seminary Department definitely feels that this monthly meeting should be cooperatively planned in order to make the meeting as effective as possible.

The Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes was very desirous that these meetings provide an excellent opportunity to discuss teaching problems, and that teachers receive instruction and inspiration from both the central administrative staff and smaller group activities and brainstorming according to subject area. They feel if the meetings are thus organized to carry out this program, the teacher will gain new insights into his teaching and his profession.

In the secular program, meetings are also important to upgrade and train teachers. Both the secular and religious educational systems are concerned with the improvement of instruction. There are numerous purposes why these meetings should be conducted. Listed below are

22Burton, op. cit., pp. 43-44.
twelve general purposes that are desirable objectives for teachers' meetings:

1. To reach an agreement as to the philosophy that governs the group's goals.
2. To unify the efforts of the entire educational staff.
3. To improve old practices.
4. To discover problems for special study.
5. To carry on special projects for the improvement of instruction.
6. To plan the integration of newly adopted practices into the standard program.
7. To explore the value of standard supervisory activities and administrative policies.
8. To study community-school relations.
9. To develop morale.
10. To discover and utilize special talent.
11. To exemplify good group action.
12. To inspire teachers' professional enthusiasm.  

The coordinator should screen this list to select the purposes that can be implemented advantageously in the local schools and which he has ability and competence to direct. It is obvious that teachers' meetings held for these purposes will require careful planning on the part of the coordinator in charge.  

"The time, length, and place of teachers' meetings should vary according to the purpose of the meeting and the distances teachers must go to attend."  

When a teacher has to travel a great distance in order to attend a faculty meeting and other teachers have to take time out of their busy schedules to attend a faculty meeting, then the meeting should be well organized so that the desired results will be realized. 

Ayer lists some of the results that may be reasonably expected from teachers' meetings:

---

1. An awareness by teachers of problems and of needs
and a stimulated desire to learn how to solve the former and
to satisfy the latter. Teachers should get some immediate
help, but better still, they should get increased power
to help themselves.
2. Increased knowledge gained from others with common
interests.
3. Sympathetic appreciation publicly expressed by the
supervisor.
4. Understanding of possibilities for unusual success along
lines of which one has peculiar gifts, and both encouragement
and help in achieving it.
5. A wider outlook, leading to better understanding of
the contributions that one's work can make to the larger
educational program.
6. Appreciation of dependence upon and obligations to
one's fellow teachers in achieving the ends for which the
school is maintained.
7. An increased will to grow—and to keep on growing,
with some knowledge of how that is possible.
8. Better professional attitudes.
9. A program of continuously improving education for
children.26

V. Evaluation for Merit Rating

Another important responsibility of the coordinator, as
outlined by the department, is that of merit rating. They felt that
merit rating should provide stimulation for better teaching and reward
outstanding teaching.

The department feels that the coordinator should visit each
teacher frequently enough to make a fair evaluation, and that each
teacher should know that he is being evaluated. Also, each teacher
should be notified as to what rating he has received by the coordinator.
The coordinator should sit down with his teachers and come to a mutual
agreement and understanding of the final evaluation, which evaluation
should be as objective as possible.

26 Ibid., pp. 81-83.
The coordinator should keep all rating information strictly confidential. He will also remember that the success of this program does not rest upon the shoulders of the few outstanding teachers but on the dedicated brethren who make fine contributions each day. The coordinator should realize that each teacher needs to feel that his contribution is worthwhile and appreciated.27

The Seminary Department was very desirous that an objective evaluation be made of their teachers. At the present, this evaluation is inclined to be more subjective, but an experimental objective merit rating will be initiated in 1968-69 in one of the districts. If this program proves to be successful, it will be used by all seminary districts in the Church.

In the field of secular education we find this same philosophy concerning merit rating. However, there is one aspect of merit rating in secular education which differs, and that is whether a teacher should have an increase in salary because of a superior rating. In most studies concerning merit ratings in secular education there have been negative results concerning a higher salary for a high merit rating. The American School Board Journal in one of its articles states that past experiences indicates merit rating tends to destroy professionalism. The article goes on to say that teachers will hesitate at sharing ideas and growing together, and that jealousy and suspicion will tend to replace the co-operative team approach.28


In the same article the position of the NEA regarding the use of subjective methods of judging the quality of teaching performance in setting teachers' salaries is defined:

Use of subjective methods of judging the quality of teaching performance in setting teachers' salaries has a deleterious effect on the educational process. The meaning of such judgments (commonly known as Merit Ratings) creates dissension which upsets the school. It destroys professional relationships and morale, causes strife between teachers and administrators, and leads to deterioration in the quality of education. Plans which tie teachers' salaries to such subjective ratings are to be vigorously condemned.\(^{29}\)

At present, most of the few school systems which have plans for teacher evaluation do not seem to have enough confidence in the accuracy of the evaluations to use them as a basis for determining the amount of the teacher's salary. Recent studies have shown that less than half of the school systems of the cities of the United States are attempting to rate teachers on the quality of services rendered, but that only a few of these school systems use these ratings as a basis for determining teachers' salaries.\(^{30}\)

It would be wise to obtain the rating of several judges, particularly if the teacher's salary is to be based upon the rating, and if other decisions of moment are to be based upon the rating.

"These several judgments could then be combined and the composite rating of the teacher be determined by the superintendent or his representative."\(^{31}\)

If ever a group of teachers actually could agree on and set up a local set of standards for judging merit which they themselves could operate, it perhaps would be possible to carry out a merit-rating program. This would mean that the staff would have to come to a

\(^{29}\text{Ibid.}, \text{ p. 28.}\)


\(^{31}\text{Ibid.}, \text{ p. 189.}\)
common agreement on a framework of principles and practices within which merit ratings could be given, even though precise measurements of factors might not always be possible.\(^{32}\)

**Conclusion**

From these five areas there will be questions formulated, the answers of which will help us better understand how effective the coordinator is and whether he is fulfilling his responsibilities as outlined by the Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes. The full-time seminary teachers and coordinators were requested to respond to a questionnaire seeking to explore the effectiveness of the coordinator-teacher relationship. Many of the questions used are taken from a questionnaire formulated by U. Carlisle Hunsaker,\(^{33}\) who has conducted a similar study.


CHAPTER III

RESEARCH RESULTS

I. Introduction

This study has been conducted for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the coordinator in the performance of his responsibilities as outlined by the Latter-day Saint Seminary System. Another criteria used in this study was standards established by experts in the field of public school supervision.

Data gathered in sampling 260 of the 551 released-time seminary teachers and fourteen of the fourteen released-time coordinators will be presented in this chapter. These men were asked to respond to a questionnaire designed to determine the effectiveness of the coordinator in fulfilling his responsibilities in five areas: leadership, classroom visits, teacher conferences, monthly meetings, and evaluation for merit rating.

The 260 seminary teachers were selected by a stratified random sampling and the fourteen coordinators represents the entire population of Seminary coordinators. These fourteen coordinators or districts were all released-time. The term "released-time" can be defined as a seminary program in which students are allowed to leave high school for one period per school day in order to receive religious instruction. Most of the seminaries in this study conduct seminary classes all day, and all of the teachers chosen for this
study were employed on a full-time basis as seminary teachers.

II. Construction and use of the Questionnaire

A good part of these questions were taken from a questionnaire constructed by U. Carlisle Hunsaker, who has made a similar study.\textsuperscript{34} All of the questions have been carefully selected in order to provide the seminary teachers and coordinators with positive and definite statements concerning their evaluation of the coordinators' effectiveness. The seminary teachers and the coordinators rated the coordinator's effectiveness on a five-point scale ranging from inferior to superior. In the questionnaire, the rating scale appeared as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator's performance is</td>
<td>inferior</td>
<td>is moving toward average performance</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>is moving toward superior performance</td>
<td>superior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six sections in the questionnaire appeared in the following order: (1) General information, (2) leadership, (3) classroom visits, (4) teacher conferences, (5) monthly meetings, and (6) evaluation for merit rating.

III. General Information

The questionnaire requested information whether the teacher was an instructor or a teacher-principal. It was revealed from the

\textsuperscript{34}Ibid.
information that eighty-three or 46.37 per cent were instructors and ninety or 50.28 per cent were teacher-principals, which gives us an excellent cross section of answers.

Teaching experience of participants: It is important for the coordinator to know the teaching experience of his teachers, because the more teaching experience a teacher has had the less help he will need from his coordinator. Table 1 on page 25 indicates the number of years of teaching experience of those teachers who participated in this study.

As Table 1 indicates, eighty-two, or 45.81 per cent of the teachers who participated in the study had three or fewer years of teaching experience. All of the coordinators had more than six years of teaching experience, which should make them qualified to give aid to the younger and less experienced teachers.

IV. Leadership

It was learned from the available literature in the field of teacher supervision that the coordinators should be cognizant of the more recently discovered principles of leadership and to become efficient in applying them. The questionnaire was designed to ascertain the seminary teacher's and coordinator's evaluation of leadership ability. Table 2 on pages 26-27 is a tabulation of these responses.

In the appraisal of coordinators' leadership ability, it is found that the majority of responses are in the "moving toward superior" or "superior" classification on the rating scale. It seems apparent, therefore, that the respondents were satisfied with the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 years or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

179 13 100.00 100.00
### TABLE 2

**APPRAISAL OF SEMINARY COORDINATORS' LEADERSHIP ABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of Leadership</th>
<th>Inferior No.</th>
<th>Inferior Per Cent</th>
<th>Moving Toward Average No.</th>
<th>Moving Toward Average Per Cent</th>
<th>Average No.</th>
<th>Average Per Cent</th>
<th>Moving Toward Superior No.</th>
<th>Moving Toward Superior Per Cent</th>
<th>Superior No.</th>
<th>Superior Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator seldom uses criticism as means of motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator accords fair, equal and friendly treatment to all his teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator takes special interest in young and beginning teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator maintains same standards which he sets for teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>59.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator gives evidence of desire to continue to develop professionally and as a person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator remembers and acts upon suggestion made by teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator understands problems unique to your area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34.64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator does not favor some teacher over others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator gives evidence of his respect for teachers professional training</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38.55</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>51.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of Leadership</th>
<th>Inferior</th>
<th>Moving Toward Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Moving Toward</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator displays genuine desire to receive suggestions and ideas from teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34.98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator encourages desire to experiment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator provides opportunities for teacher to work together as a team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator meets problems with contagious calmness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator recognizes and admits his own mistakes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator is an effective attentive listener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator has ability to effectively and clearly convey his own thoughts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator has the confidence of his teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leadership abilities of the coordinators. However, there were a significant number of responses in the range from inferior to average in relation to certain principles of leadership that should be noted.

The responses in Table 3, indicates those areas of leadership where definite signs of weakness were noted. Both the number and percentage along with the principle of leadership is listed in the range of inferior to average.

### TABLE 3

**SEMINARY TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF COORDINATOR LEADERSHIP WEAKNESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle of Leadership</th>
<th>Number and per cent of seminary teacher and their coordinators who rated their coordinators performance as being in the range of inferior to average.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator seldom uses criticism as means of motivation.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator takes special interest in young and beginning teachers.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator does not favor some teachers over others.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator provides opportunities for teachers to work together as a team.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 3 indicates, the coordinator is weak in the following areas: (1) not taking special interest in young and beginning teachers, (2) favoring some teachers over others, and (3) not providing opportunities for teachers to work together as a team. Since these weaknesses will hinder team work and esprit de corps among the teachers, it will also have a negative effect upon the objectives of the department. When it is remembered that team work plays an important part of the success of the program, the material in Table 3 becomes worthy of consideration.

V. Classroom Visits

Frequency of classroom visits.— One of the most important responsibilities of the coordinator is classroom visits. The more often a coordinator visits a teacher the more accurate he will be in his evaluation of this teacher. The seminary teachers and the coordinators were asked to indicate the number of classroom visits made during the year. Table 4 is a tabulation of these visits.

The department has not specified a certain number of visits, but they have stated that the coordinator should visit often enough to give a fair evaluation of the teachers under their jurisdiction. There is a general disagreement both in the Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes and in the field of secular education of how many times a coordinator and a supervisor should make a visit to the classroom. However, it seems apparent from a consideration of the available information that one to four visits a year are not enough to evaluate the teacher. As Table 4 on page 30 indicates, 113 or 63.13 per cent of the 179 teachers, and six or 46.15 per cent of the
coordinators who responded indicated that visits were made only one
to four times during the school year. According to the most recent
annual report there are 551 full-time seminary teachers and fourteen
coordinators in the seminary system. When one considers that each
coordinator has approximately forty teachers under his direction one
can better understand why the teachers are not visited more often.
There is also the geographical setting one must take into considera-
tion, because some coordinators must travel great distances in order
to visit their teachers. Unlike the supervisor in the public
school system, the coordinator has many other responsibilities besides
the five coordinator-teacher areas covered in this study. It is,
therefore, very important that this area should be taken under a
thorough consideration, in order to make it possible for the coordinator
to make more visits.

TABLE 4
NUMBER OF CLASSROOM VISITS MADE BY COORDINATORS DURING THE
1967-1968 SCHOOL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.00 100.00
Since the salary of seminary teachers is determined by merit rating, it is extremely important that due consideration be given to the problem of how frequently coordinators should visit their assigned teachers.

**Duration of classroom visits.**—Table 5 is a compilation of the responses which indicated the duration of the classroom visits made by the coordinators.

**TABLE 5**

DURATION OF SEMINARY COORDINATOR'S CLASSROOM VISITS
DURING 1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Coordinators</th>
<th>Per Cent of Teachers</th>
<th>Per Cent of Coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one period</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Period</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Periods</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>30.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Day</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 5 indicates, 110 or 61.24 per cent of the 179 teachers, and six or 46.15 per cent of the coordinators (two coordinators left it blank) who responded stated that the duration of their coordinator's classroom visit was one period or less. This information is significant because in Table 4, we learned that the majority of the teachers were
only visited one to four times per school year, and that these visits became a determining factor for salary increases. Even under the most ideal conditions it is extremely difficult to evaluate a teacher, and when a teacher is evaluated on the basis of one to four short visits per year, it appears that much of the evaluation is subjective guess work.

Duration and frequency of classroom visits can be explored in order to determine whether there is a correlation between them. An attempt was made to accomplish this, the results of which appear in Table 6 on page 33.

Table 6 illustrates that when the frequency of visits per year increases the duration of these visits also increases. This information seem to indicate that the coordinator is perhaps concerned with those teachers who are in the most need of help, hence forced to neglect the majority of teachers assigned to him.

The seminary teachers and the coordinators were asked to evaluate whether or not, in their opinion, the coordinator observed their teaching often and long enough to become adequately acquainted with their work. The results were that ninety-eight or 54.75 per cent of the teachers rated their coordinator's performance as being in the range of inferior to average, and the coordinators had eight or 61.53 per cent in the range of "moving toward superior performance" to "superior" performance. From these results it appears that there is a coordinator-teacher gap in regards to what is considered a superior classroom visit. When one takes into account the fact that the salary of seminary teachers is determined by these classroom visits, it would appear that the teachers deserve a more thorough evaluation.
## TABLE 6

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DURATION AND FREQUENCY OF COORDINATORS

### CLASSROOM VISITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of visits</th>
<th>Less than one period</th>
<th>One period</th>
<th>Two periods</th>
<th>Half day</th>
<th>All day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.61</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Teacher Conferences

Frequency of teacher conferences.-- In Table 7 we find a tabulation of the frequency of teacher conferences held by the coordinators with their teachers.

TABLE 7

FREQUENCY OF COORDINATOR-TEACHER CONFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Coordinators</th>
<th>Per Cent Teachers</th>
<th>Per Cent Coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54.19</td>
<td>53.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.08</td>
<td>46.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 indicates that only ninety-seven or 54.19 per cent of the 179 seminary teachers who responded have a conference with their coordinator during each of his visits. The table also indicates that only seven or 53.85 per cent of the coordinators do not hold a conference with their teachers every time they make a visit. When the term conference is used it means that there is a private meeting between the coordinator and the teacher during which ideas, problems, and related matter are being discussed. A private conference is extremely important in order to make a meaningful visit.
Duration of teacher conferences.—Table 8 indicates the duration of teacher conferences.

TABLE 8
DURATION OF COORDINATOR—TEACHER CONFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One hour</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty-five minutes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty minutes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen minutes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than fifteen minutes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were sixty-seven teachers or 37.43 per cent of the teachers who responded that the conference was fifteen minutes or less. It seems that such a short conference would be questioned by the department. A conference is an excellent means to become better acquainted with the other person's philosophy of education and also of the problems confronting both teacher and coordinator. In Table 9 on page 36 there is additional information that is pertinent. The responses received deals with the general effectiveness by which the coordinators are evaluated.

As we study Table 9, it appears that the teachers and the coordinators are generally satisfied with the performance of their
### Table 9

**EVALUATION OF COORDINATORS' PERFORMANCE DURING TEACHER CONFERENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inferior</th>
<th>Moving Toward Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Moving Toward Superior</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator displays interest in ideas and suggestions or teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator does as much listening as talking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator gives evidence of having carefully observed teacher in classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator allows enough time for conference</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator asks for teacher evaluation of conference</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator instills a quest for continual professional growth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator allows teacher to feel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator keeps a record of conferences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conferences. However, 122 or 68.16 per cent of the teachers, and eleven or 54.61 per cent of the coordinators indicated that the teachers were not being given adequate opportunity to participate in the evaluation of the effectiveness of these conferences. Since the conference should be a joint enterprise according to the department, the expressed dissatisfaction becomes significant.

Table 10 on page 38 is an attempt to determine whether there is a correlation between the length of observational visits and the length of teacher conferences. It is difficult to actually determine the effectiveness of duration on teacher conferences, but we can receive an impression of how the teachers feel about it. As we study Table 10, it appears that as the duration of the conference is shortened the evaluation of the conferences becomes also lower.

VII. Monthly Meetings

Each month the coordinator has the responsibility of conducting a faculty meeting which should primarily be devoted to ideas and problems of teaching. The questionnaire gave the respondents an opportunity to respond to questions that were constructed for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the coordinator in carrying out this responsibility. The questions were constructed to adhere to the wishes of the Department, as to what they considered as important.

Table 11 on page 39 manifests a general satisfaction on the part of the seminary teachers and coordinators as to the value of their monthly meetings. The primary purpose of the monthly meeting, as was stated previously, is to gain new ideas and to solve problems. When the respondents were asked to indicate the value of monthly
### TABLE 10

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DURATION AND LENGTH OF TEACHER CONFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Evaluation of Teacher Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>2 2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>1 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 minutes</td>
<td>2 11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of effective faculty Meetings</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings are planned cooperatively by coordinator and teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings deal primarily with problems related to teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings are well organized and effectively conducted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher gains ideas from meetings which are of value in improving their performance as teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are made to feel welcome at the meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meetings as a means of improving their teaching, they reported that the results were excellent. From a total of 179 seminary teachers, 131 or 73.18 per cent evaluated the meetings to be either "superior" or "moving toward superior", and from a total of thirteen coordinators, ten or 76.02 per cent evaluated the meetings to be either "superior" or "moving toward superior". The data seem to indicate that there is almost a perfect correlation between the coordinators and the teachers on the evaluation of the meeting, and since this is the primary objective of the meeting, the responses become quite meaningful.

Earlier in this study a reference was made to the fact that some districts are so large as to make it very difficult for the coordinator to make an appropriate number of visits during the school year. Since some teachers have to travel quite a distance in order to attend their monthly faculty meetings, an attempt was made to determine whether the distance he had to travel had an influence on his evaluation of the meeting. Information to this effect is found in Table 12 on page 41.

It appears from the information in Table 12 that there is no significant bearing on the evaluation of the meeting upon the respondents within the first three categories. However, those teachers who have to travel between fifty-one and one-hundred miles seem to give lower evaluations. It is very possible that they expect to receive more ideas from their meetings due to greater travel distance.

VIII. Evaluation for Merit Rating

The questionnaire requested information pertinent to the consistency and fairness of past teacher evaluations for merit rating.
TABLE 12
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISTANCE TRAVELED AND TEACHER COORDINATOR REACTION TO FACULTY MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Traveling Specified distances</th>
<th>Number and per cent of seminary teachers who evaluated faculty meetings to be in the inferior to average classification.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10 miles</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 25 miles</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50 miles</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 100 miles</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 100 miles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data pertinent to this question is found in Table 13 on page 42.

In the group where the teachers have worked under five to seven coordinators, it was discovered that three of 33.33 per cent of the seminary teachers indicated that the rating had been consistent, while one, or 11.11 per cent indicated that they had not been rated consistently by their various coordinators. It was also revealed that five, or 55.56 per cent didn't know whether they had been rated consistently or not. In this same group we also found that two or 22.22 per cent felt that this had not been done fairly. Five or 55.56 per cent indicated that they didn't know if they had received a fair evaluation. Eighty-one or 45.25 per cent of the seminary teachers indicated that
TABLE 13
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NUMBER OF COORDINATORS THE TEACHERS HAVE WORKED UNDER AND
CONSISTENCY AND FAIRNESS OF EVALUATIONS

| Number of Coordinators worked with |一致性和公平性 | | | |教师评价 | | | |一致性和公平性 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| 1 | 11 | 20.00 | 5 | 9.09 | 17 | 30.91 | 31 | 56.36 | 1 | 1.82 | 15 | 12.27 |
| 2 | 30 | 43.48 | 7 | 10.14 | 31 | 44.93 | 42 | 60.81 | 5 | 7.10 | 19 | 27.55 |
| 3 | 18 | 60.00 | 6 | 20.00 | 5 | 16.67 | 22 | 73.33 | 3 | 10.00 | 5 | 16.67 |
| 4 | 4 | 33.33 | 3 | 25.00 | 5 | 41.67 | 8 | 66.67 | 2 | 16.67 | 2 | 16.67 |
| 5-7 | 3 | 33.33 | 1 | 11.11 | 5 | 55.56 | 2 | 22.22 | 2 | 22.22 | 5 | 55.56 |
| 6-10 | 1 | 100.00 | | | | | | | | | |

注：若教师分别在不同类型的工作环境中工作，它们的评价一致性可能有所不同。
they were not sufficiently informed of the yearly evaluation and rating submitted by their coordinators to the Department. Two, or 15.38 of the coordinators indicated that their teachers were not sufficiently informed of the yearly evaluation and rating submitted by them to the Department.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Summary

1. Need for the study. - The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has always emphasized the need for religious education. It has been the philosophy of the Church to never be satisfied with present methods, but to experiment and develop better and more effective ways of presenting the gospel to the people.

When the seminary program of the Church was established in 1912, there was only one part-time seminary teacher in the Church. Today, there are over 500 full-time seminary teachers employed by the Church. To make this program become better, a seminary teacher training program has been organized. This program along with the merit rating system were designed for the primary purpose of upgrading the teaching.

The position of coordinator emerged approximately ten years ago, as a leadership position within the seminary system. The chief objective of the coordinator was to coordinate the complete seminary program within a designated district. Some of his responsibilities were as follows: (1) Responsibility to stake boards of education,
(2) Budget preparation in behalf of all the seminaries in his assigned
area, (3) Keeping all stake boards informed of what is going on in the seminary district pertaining to the seminary program, (4) Constantly alert for proposed public school building programs on the high school and 9th grade levels, (5) Responsible for all the reports of all the seminaries in his area, (6) Responsible for placing and dismissing of teachers within his district and the selection of principals, (7) Must become acquainted with public school officials and their programs, (8) Become thoroughly acquainted with the whole curriculum program of the Department, (9) Insure that the Seminary District Student Leadership Program is fully organized and functioning properly, (10) Responsible for assisting the boards by informing them of needs and suggesting plans and procedures that will be effective in getting students enrolled in seminary, (11) Knowing and applying traits of a good leader (12) Visit all of his teachers several times during the year for the purpose of classroom observation, (13) Hold a conference with each teacher after each classroom observation, (14) Conduct and plan a monthly faculty meeting, (15) Make an evaluation of each teacher for merit rating each year.35

It is clearly manifested here that the coordinator has many responsibilities that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the program of the department. In view of the desire, on the part of Church leaders, that all personnel involved in the operation of the Seminary Program function in an effective and efficient manner, the need for this study seemed apparent.

---

35Burton, op. cit., pp. 2-56.
2. Purpose of the study.— The purpose of this study was to study the effectiveness of the coordinator in carrying out his responsibilities. The five areas of responsibilities that were covered in this study had to do with the coordinator's direct influence over the teachers placed under his jurisdiction.

Due to the fact that the coordinator has so many administrative responsibilities in addition to his classroom responsibilities, a study seemed plausible in order to determine whether this had a serious effect upon his classroom responsibilities. Special consideration was given to the performance of the coordinators in the areas of leadership, classroom visits, teacher conferences, conducting of monthly faculty meetings, and evaluation for merit rating.

3. Method of research.— After having reviewed the responsibilities and expectations of the Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes with regard to coordinator's teacher supervision responsibilities, a questionnaire was prepared that would give both the coordinators and the seminary teachers an opportunity to evaluate this area. There was a total of 551 full-time seminary teachers of which 260 were chosen to participate in the study. These teachers were chosen randomly from the full-time seminaries of the Church. All of the fourteen full-time seminary coordinators were included in the study. A return of 179 or 68.85 per cent of the teachers and thirteen or 92.06 per cent of the coordinators' questionnaires were received.
II. Summary of Findings

1. Eighty-two or 45.81 per cent of the participating seminary teachers have had three or less years of teaching experience. All of the coordinators had more than six years of teaching experience.

2. In evaluating the leadership ability of their coordinators, fifty-six or 31.82 per cent of the participating seminary teachers indicated a need for coordinators to improve in the matter of taking special interest in young and beginning teachers; five or 38.46 per cent of the coordinators also indicated a need in this same area. Forty-six or 25.73 per cent of the seminary teachers indicated that there was also a need for coordinators to provide opportunities for teachers to work together as a team; nine or 69.23 per cent of the coordinators indicated that there was a need for them to improve in the area of providing opportunities for their teachers to work together as a team.

3. Relative to the matter of classroom visits, it was reported that 113 or 63.13 per cent of the seminary teachers were visited by their coordinators from one to four times during the school year. Of the coordinators, six or 46.15 per cent indicated in the questionnaire that only one to four visits were made by them during the school year.

4. The questionnaires revealed that the duration of the coordinators' visits ranged from one day to less than one period. The teachers indicated that 110 or 61.24 per cent had visits that lasted one period of less. The coordinators indicated that six or 46.15 per cent (two coordinators left it blank) visited the teachers for one
period or less.

5. In response to the question whether the coordinators observed their teaching often and long enough, it was discovered that ninety-eight or 54.75 per cent of the teachers were of the opinion that their coordinator should visit them more often and for longer periods of time. The coordinators were of the opinion that their visits were often and long enough. It was revealed that eight or 61.53 per cent of the coordinators felt that their performance appeared in the range of "moving toward superior performance" to "superior" performance.

6. In evaluating the frequency of teacher-coordinator conferences, it was discovered that ninety-seven or 54.19 per cent always had a conference following each of the visits to the classroom. Sixty-one or 46.15 per cent indicated that a private conference was usually held with their coordinator. The coordinators indicated in their response that seven or 53.85 per cent always held a private conference after each visit with their teachers, and six or 46.15 per cent indicated that usually a private conference was held.

7. The questionnaires revealed that sixty-seven or 37.43 per cent of the teachers reported that the duration of the conference with their coordinators was fifteen minutes or less.

8. The study revealed that 122 or 68.16 per cent of the teachers felt that they were not being given adequate opportunity to participate in the evaluation of the effectiveness of these conferences. Eleven or 84.61 per cent of the coordinators also indicated that the teachers were not given this opportunity.
9. In evaluating the effectiveness of monthly faculty meetings, it was discovered that 131 or 73.18 per cent of the seminary teachers evaluated the meetings to be either "superior" or "moving toward superior". Ten or 76.92 per cent of the coordinators also evaluated the meetings to be either "superior" or "moving toward superior."

10. The findings of this study reveal that a high percentage of seminary teachers do not know what their yearly evaluations and ratings are, and that they would like to be better informed on this matter.

III. Conclusions

The results of this study are now listed as follows:

1. Teaching experience. - In the seminary system, 46 per cent of the teachers have only one to three years of teaching experience. This presents a real challenge to the coordinator who is assigned to give aid and ideas to all of his teachers, with special attention to the new and inexperienced teachers. With as many administrative responsibilities plus the high number of teachers under his jurisdiction, his job becomes an enormous task.

2. Leadership. - The study revealed that the seminary teachers were generally satisfied with the leadership traits of their coordinators. However, according to the teachers and the coordinators, there is a weakness in the areas of taking special interest in young and beginning teachers, and for coordinators to provide opportunities for teachers to work together as a team.
It is very possible that the chief cause for this weakness is due to the fact that the coordinators are overloaded with so many administrative responsibilities that they can only concentrate their efforts on teachers that are having serious teaching problems.

3. **Frequency and duration of classroom visits.**—There was a general feeling among the seminary teachers that they were not visited enough and that the visits were too short. The responses from the coordinators indicated that the teachers were visited often enough and that the duration of these visits was sufficient. When one takes into consideration that a teacher is evaluated for merit rating from these visits then this weakness becomes even more critical.

4. **Frequency and duration of teacher conferences.**—Seminary teachers are entitled to a private conference after each visit and then to have the opportunity to participate in an evaluation of the effectiveness of that conference.

5. **Monthly meetings.**—It may be concluded that the majority of the seminary teachers and the coordinators were very satisfied with their monthly faculty meetings.

6. **Evaluation for merit rating.**—This study revealed that there is a great need for the coordinators to inform their seminary teachers of their yearly evaluations and ratings submitted by them to the Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes. It would also be of great benefit to the department, coordinators, and to the seminary teachers that a uniform evaluation and rating format be adopted, in order to develop a more consistent rating by coordinators.
IV. Recommendations

As a result of this study the following recommendations are made:

For Further Study

1. In view of all the administrative responsibilities of the coordinator, it is recommended that a study be made on how the coordinator can be of more service to the teachers in the classroom, especially the young and inexperienced teachers.

2. It is also recommended that the Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes make a study to determine how many times and how long the visits of the coordinators should last. This study would also become significant when one realizes that there is an opposite point of view in this regard among teachers and coordinators.

Implementation

1. In view of the significance of the classroom visit as a coordinator function, it is recommended that the necessary adjustments be made in the number of teachers assigned to be supervised by coordinators, and also the amount of administrative work, in order to make the coordinator more efficient in his direct supervision of his assigned teachers.

2. It is recommended that the coordinators hold a private conference with each of their teachers after each visit, and that the teacher be allowed to participate in the evaluation of that conference.

3. Under present conditions, the seminary coordinator carries too heavy a load to provide him with adequate time to properly evaluate the teachers he works with. It is, therefore, recommended that either
his work load be reduced or his responsibility of teacher rating be eliminated.

4. It is recommended that coordinators give to their seminary teachers a yearly evaluation and rating as would be submitted to the department.

5. It is recommended that the Department of L.D.S. Seminaries and Institutes create an uniform evaluation and rating format that would develop a more consistent rating among the coordinators.
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APPENDIX
TO: Full-Time Coordinators

SUBJECT: A Study of the LDS Seminary Coordinator Program

Dear Brethren:

Carl Olsen, one of our full-time Seminary teachers, is making a study of our coordinator program. Since we feel that this study will be of value to our department, we will appreciate if you would respond honestly to this questionnaire and mail it back as soon as possible.

This questionnaire has also been mailed to teachers under your jurisdiction. This information can be very useful in our coordinator workshops this summer.

Sincerely your brother,

/s/ Wm. E. Berrett

William E. Berrett
Administrator

WEB:cc:kj

P.S. You need not sign the questionnaire
THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS
CHURCH SCHOOLS
Department of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion
B-346 Smoot Administration Building
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84601

February 12, 1968

TO: Seminary Teachers

SUBJECT: A Study of the LDS Seminary Coordinator Program

Dear Brethren:

Carl Olsen, one of our full-time Seminary teachers, is making a study of our coordinator program. Since we feel that this study will be of value to our Department, we will appreciate if you would respond honestly to this questionnaire and mail it back as soon as possible.

This information will be very useful in our coordinator workshops this summer.

Sincerely your brother,

/s/ Wm. E. Berrett

William E. Berrett
Administrator

WEB: cc: kj

P.S. You need not sign the questionnaire.
I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of your Seminary district. _______________________________________________________________________

2. Number of teachers in your district. _______________________________________________________________________

3. Check the blank that indicates your present Educational Assignment.
   ___1. Full-time Teacher       ___2. Teacher-Principal

4. Check the blank that describes your teaching experience in the Seminary system.
   ___1. 1 year       ___4. 4 years       ___7. 10-14 years
   ___2. 2 years       ___5. 5 years       ___8. 15-29 years
   ___3. 3 years       ___6. 6-9 years       ___9. 30 yrs more

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Wherever you see the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 at the side of a statement, will you please evaluate your coordinator's performance of the principle involved by CIRCLING the most appropriate number. Your evaluation should be based upon the following keys:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your coordinator's performance is inferior</td>
<td>Your coordinator is moving to average performance</td>
<td>Your coordinator's performance is average</td>
<td>Your coordinator is moving to superior performance</td>
<td>Your coordinator's performance is superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other specific instructions will be given for the portions of the questionnaire which do not lend themselves to this type of evaluation.

II. LEADERSHIP

1 2 3 4 5 5. Your coordinator seldom uses criticism as a means of motivating you to improve your work.

1 2 3 4 5 6. Your coordinator accords fair, equal and friendly treatment to all his teachers.

1 2 3 4 5 7. Your coordinator took a special interest in you as a young and beginning teacher in order to help you make a satisfactory adjustment to your work.
8. Your coordinator maintains the same standards which he sets for his teachers in professional courtesy, promptness in meeting obligations, and efficiency in the performance of work.

9. Your coordinator gives evidence of a desire to continue to grow both as a person and in his ability to discharge his professional duties.

10. Your coordinator remembers and acts upon suggestions made by you as a teacher.

11. Your coordinator seems to understand the problems you are dealing with which are unique to the area in which you work.

12. Your coordinator does not have a few trusted cronies in your district whom he seems to favor over the other teachers.

13. Your coordinator associates with you in a manner which gives evidence of his respect for your professional training.

14. Your coordinator displays a genuine desire to receive suggestions and ideas from his teachers regarding teaching and other problems related to seminary work.

15. Your coordinator encourages a desire on the part of his teachers to experiment with new methods and ideas.

16. Your coordinator provides opportunities for the teachers in your district to work together as a team on common problems.

17. Your coordinator meets crises and problems with a contagious calmness so that others feel at ease in his presence.

18. Your coordinator recognizes and admits his own mistakes.

19. You regard your coordinator as an effective, attentive listener.

20. Your coordinator has the ability to effectively and clearly convey his own thoughts.

21. You have enough confidence in your coordinator to ask him for help with all of your problems relating to your seminary work.

III. CLASSROOM VISITS

22. How many times during the school year does your coordinator observe your teaching?
   ____1. 1-2 times    ____3. 5-6 times    ____9-10 times
   ____2. 3-4 times    ____4. 7-8 times
23. Check the blank which indicates the duration of most of your coordinator's visits to your classroom.
   ____1. less than one period
   ____2. one period
   ____3. two periods (more than one period, less than two periods)
   ____4. half a day
   ____5. all day

1 2 3 4 5  24. Your coordinator does not try to dominate the class while he is visiting.

1 2 3 4 5  25. Your coordinator observes your teaching often enough and long enough to adequately acquaint himself with the methods and procedures you use as a teacher.

1 2 3 4 5  26. As far as you are able to determine, your coordinator is equally acquainted with all of your teachers and the work they are going.

27. Do you mind if your coordinator takes notes during classroom observation?
   _____ Yes _____ No _____ Indifferent

28. Would you like to have your coordinator give you a written evaluation after each classroom observance?
   _____ Yes _____ No _____ Indifferent

IV. TEACHER CONFERENCES

29. Your coordinator holds a conference with you after observing your teaching. (Check one.)
   _____1. always _____2. usually _____3. seldom _____4. never

30. Check the blank which indicates the duration of most of these conferences.
   _____1. 1 hour
   _____2. 45 minutes
   _____3. 30 minutes
   _____4. 15 minutes
   _____5. less than 15 minutes

1 2 3 4 5  31. During teacher conferences, your coordinator displays a genuine interest in your ideas and suggestions.

1 2 3 4 5  32. Your coordinator does as much listening as talking during these conferences.

1 2 3 4 5  33. Your coordinator gives evidence of having carefully observed the procedures and methods you used in the class which he observed.

1 2 3 4 5  34. Your coordinator allows enough time for these conferences so that he does not appear to be rushed.

1 2 3 4 5  35. Your coordinator asks for your evaluation of the conferences he holds with you.
36. You receive encouragement to continue in your quest for professional growth from these conferences.

37. Your coordinator establishes the atmosphere in these conferences which enables you to feel at ease.

38. Your coordinator keeps a record of the conferences he holds with you so as to avoid repetition and to achieve a certain amount of continuity in his work with you.

V. MONTHLY MEETINGS

39. Are your monthly meetings held at the same location?
   Yes  No

40. How many miles do you travel to attend your district meetings?
   (one way)
   1. 0-10 miles
   2. 11-25 miles
   3. 26-50 miles
   4. 51-100 miles
   5. over 100 miles

41. Your district meetings are usually planned cooperatively by your coordinator and his teachers.

42. Your district meetings deal primarily with questions and problems related to teaching.

43. Your district meetings are well organized and effectively conducted.

44. You usually gain experience and ideas from your district meetings which are of value to you in improving your work as a teacher.

45. Your coordinator makes you feel welcome and at home when you attend your monthly district meetings.

VI. EVALUATION FOR MERIT RATING

46. How many coordinators have you worked under?
   1. 1
   2. 2
   3. 3
   4. 4
   5. 5-7
   6. 6-10

47. Have you been rated consistently by the different coordinators?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Don't know

48. Have you been evaluated fairly over the years for merit rating?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Don't know

49. Do you feel that your present coordinator is treating and evaluating you fairly?
50. Do you feel that the coordinator can be both an evaluator and a helper?

_____Yes  _____No  _____Don't know

1 2 3 4 5 51. Do you feel that you are sufficiently informed of the yearly evaluation and rating submitted by your coordinator to the Department of Education?

PLEASE, COMMENT ON ANY SECTION
I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of your Seminary District. ____________________________

2. Number of teachers in your district. ____________________________

3. Check the blank that describes your teaching experience in the Seminary system.

   1. 1 year  4. 4 years
   2. 2 years  5. 5 years
   3. 3 years  6. 6 years
   7. 7-8 years
   8. 9-10 years
   9. 10-15 years

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Wherever you see the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 at the side of a statement, will you please evaluate your performance as a coordinator of the principle involved by CIRCLING the most appropriate number. Your evaluation should be based upon the following key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My performance is inferior</td>
<td>My performance is average</td>
<td>My performance is superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am moving toward average performance</td>
<td>I am moving toward superior performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other specific instructions will be given for the portions of the questionnaire which do not lend themselves to this type of evaluation.

II. LEADERSHIP

1 2 3 4 5. I seldom use criticism as a means of motivating my teachers to improve their work.

1 2 3 4 5. I accord fair, equal and friendly treatment to all my teachers.

1 2 3 4 5. I always take a special interest in my young and beginning teacher in order to help him make a satisfactory adjustment to his work.

1 2 3 4 5. I maintain the same standards which I set for my teachers in professional courtesy, promptness in meeting obligations and efficiency in the performance of work.

1 2 3 4 5. I give evidence of a desire to continue to grow both as a person and in my ability to discharge my professional duties.

1 2 3 4 5. I remember and act upon suggestions made by my teachers.

1 2 3 4 5. I understand the problems which are unique to the area which any of my teachers work.
12345 12. I do not have a few trusted cronies in my district whom I favor over the other teachers.

12345 13. I associate with my teachers in a manner which gives evidence of respect for their professional training.

12345 14. I display a genuine desire to receive suggestions and ideas from my teachers regarding teaching and other problems related to seminary work.

12345 15. I encourage a desire on the part of my teachers to experiment with new methods and ideas.

12345 16. I provide opportunities for the teachers in my district to work together as a team on common problems.

12345 17. I meet crises and problems with a contagious calmness so that others feel at ease in my presence.

12345 18. I recognize and admit my own mistakes.

12345 19. I consider myself as an effective, attentive listener.

12345 20. I have the ability to effectively and clearly convey my own thoughts.

12345 21. My teachers have enough confidence in me to ask me for help with all of their problems relating to their seminary work.

III. CLASSROOM VISITS

12345 22. I visit the classroom of my teachers at least: (to observe teaching)
   ____1. 1-2 times  ____3. 5-6 times  ____5. 9-10 times
   ____2. 3-4 times  ____4. 7-8 times

23. Check the blank which indicates the duration of most of your visits to your classroom
   ____1. less than one period
   ____2. one period
   ____3. two periods (more than one period, less than two periods)
   ____4. half a day
   ____5. all day

12345 24. I do not try to dominate the class while I am visiting.

12345 25. I always observe my teachers often enough and long enough to adequately acquaint myself with their methods and procedures they use as teachers.

12345 26. As far as I am able to determine, I am equally acquainted with all of my teachers and the work they are doing.
27. Do I mind taking notes during classroom observation?
   _____Yes  _____No  _____Indifferent

28. Would you like to give your teachers a written evaluation after each
    classroom observance?
   _____Yes  _____No  _____Indifferent

IV. TEACHER CONFERENCES

29. I hold a conference with my teachers after having observed them
    teach. (Check one)
   _____1. always  _____2. usually  _____3. seldom  _____4. never

30. The duration of most of these conferences is:
   _____1. 1 hour  _____2. 45 minutes  _____3. 30 minutes  _____4. 15 minutes
   _____5. less than 15 minutes

31. During teacher conferences, I display a genuine interest in
    their ideas and suggestions.

32. I, as a coordinator, do just as much listening as talking during
    these conferences.

33. I give evidence of having carefully observed the procedures
    and methods used in the class which I have observed.

34. I allow enough time for these conferences so that I do
    not appear to be rushed.

35. I ask for their evaluation of the conferences I hold with
    them.

36. My teachers receive encouragement to continue in their
    quest for professional growth from these conferences.

37. I establish the atmosphere in these conferences which
    enables them to feel at ease.

38. I keep a record of the conferences I hold with my
    teachers so as to avoid repetition and to achieve a
    certain amount of continuity in my work with them.

V. MONTHLY MEETINGS

39. Are your monthly meetings held at the same location?
   _____1. Yes  _____2. No

40. How many miles do you travel to attend your district meetings? (one way)
   _____1. 0-10 miles  _____2. 11-25 miles  _____3. 26-50 miles
   _____4. 51-100 miles  _____5. over 100 miles
12345 41. My district meetings are usually planned cooperatively by my teachers and myself.

12345 42. My district meetings deal primarily with questions and problems related to teaching.

12345 43. My district meetings are well organized and effectively conducted.

12345 44. My teachers usually gain experience and ideas from our district meetings which are of value to them in improving their work as teachers.

12345 45. I make my teachers feel welcome and at home when they attend their monthly district meetings.

VI. EVALUATION FOR MERIT RATING

46. How many coordinators have you worked under?

   1. 1  4. 4
   2. 2  5. 5-7
   3. 3  6. 6-10

47. Were you rated consistently by the different coordinators?

   1. Yes  2. No  3. Don't know

48. Were you evaluated fairly over the years for merit rating?

   1. Yes  2. No  3. Don't know

12345 51. Do you feel that you are sufficiently informing your teachers of the yearly evaluation and rating submitted by you to the Department of Education?

PLEASE, COMMENT ON ANY SECTION
A STUDY OF THE L.D.S. COORDINATOR PROGRAM

An Abstract
Of a Thesis
Presented to the
Department of Religious Education
Brigham Young University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Carl J. Olsen, Jr.
May 1969
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis was to study the effectiveness of the coordinator in the L.D.S. Seminary in carrying out his responsibilities. Special emphasis was placed upon the coordinator's influence over the teachers placed under his jurisdiction.

I. Findings

1. Fifty-six or 31 per cent of the participating seminary teachers indicated a need for coordinators to improve in the matter of taking special interest in young and beginning teachers.

2. Sixty-three per cent of the seminary teachers were visited by their coordinators from one to four times during the school year.

3. The duration of 61 per cent of the teacher conferences was one period or less.

4. Forty-six per cent of the responding teachers indicated that their coordinators always held a private conference with them after each classroom visit.

5. Thirty-seven per cent of the teachers reported that the duration of the conferences with their coordinators was fifteen minutes or less.

II. Conclusions

1. Seminary teachers were generally satisfied with leadership ability of their coordinators.
2. The majority of seminary teachers were not visited often enough or long enough to develop the kind of relationship that should characterize such classroom visits.

3. Seminary teachers are entitled to have a private conference after each classroom visit and then to have the opportunity to participate in an evaluation of the effectiveness of that conference.

4. The seminary teachers need to be better informed of their yearly evaluations and ratings submitted by the coordinators of the department.

III. Recommendations

1. In view of all the administrative responsibilities of the coordinator, it is recommended that a study be made on how the coordinator can be of more service to the teachers in the classroom, especially the young and inexperienced ones.

2. In view of the significance of the classroom visit as a coordinator function, it is recommended that the necessary adjustments be made in the number of teachers assigned to be supervised by coordinators, and also the amount of administrative work, in order to make the coordinator more efficient in his direct supervision of his assigned teachers.

3. Under present conditions, the seminary coordinator carries too heavy a load to provide him with adequate time to properly evaluate the teachers he works with. It is, therefore, recommended that either his work load be reduced, or his responsibility of teacher rating be eliminated.
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