

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TEAM TEACHING  
PROGRAM AT NEW PROVIDENCE JUNIOR  
HIGH SCHOOL IN CLARKSVILLE, TENNESSEE  
FROM MAY, 1966, UNTIL MAY, 1969**

**BY**

**JAMES LEE CROCKARELL**



THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TEAM TEACHING PROGRAM  
AT NEW PROVIDENCE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL  
IN CLARKSVILLE, TENNESSEE FROM  
MAY, 1966, UNTIL MAY, 1969

---

A Research Paper  
Presented to  
the Graduate Council of  
Austin Peay State University

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts  
in Education

---

by  
James Lee Crockarell

June, 1970

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Research Paper written by James Lee Crockarell entitled "The Development of A Team Teaching Program at New Providence Junior High School in Clarksville, Tennessee from May, 1966, Until May, 1969." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education.

  
Major Professor

Accepted for the Council:

  
Dean of the Graduate School

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. INITIAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT . . . . .	3
III. SCHOOL STRUCTURE . . . . .	6
IV. HISTORY OF THE TEAM TEACHING PROGRAM . . . . .	11
V. IMPLEMENTING THE PROGRAM . . . . .	17
VI. EVENTS THAT HELPED AND HINDERED THE PROGRAM . . . . .	24
VII. MEASURING THE RESULTS . . . . .	29
VIII. CONCLUSION . . . . .	33
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	35
APPENDIXES. . . . .	36
A. School Planning Laboratory Staff . . . . .	37
B. Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools Administration . . . . .	38
C. Planning Committees. . . . .	39
D. Consultants. . . . .	41
E. Workshops . . . . .	46
F. Visitations . . . . .	47
G. Staff Participants . . . . .	48
H. Student Evaluation . . . . .	49



## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the development of the team teaching program at New Providence Junior High School in Clarksville, Tennessee. This will be done by developing an organizational structure that includes the following five sections:

1. Background of the building and program.
2. School structure and how it was designed for team teaching.
3. History of the team teaching program.
4. Implementation of the program.
5. Specific events that helped and hindered the program.

This paper was written as a historical study of the team teaching program at New Providence from its start in 1966 until May, 1969. This three year period was chosen because it best illustrated the development of the program from its inception until team teaching was being used in all areas of the building.

Team teaching is a term that has been used in the last few years to describe a wide variety of educational situations. This term is used to describe the various cooperative planning, teaching, and organizational patterns in use at New Providence Junior High School. The paper

does not attempt to fit the New Providence program into any predetermined specific definition of the term "team teaching." However, generally speaking, team teaching herein refers to cooperative planning and teaching situations where two or more teachers work together to accomplish their goals in a manner that is superior to either teacher working alone.

## CHAPTER TWO

### INITIAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

New Providence Junior High School was the first school to be constructed as part of a fourteen million dollar building program begun in 1963 by the Clarksville-Montgomery County Quarterly Court. In addition to the junior high school, the program included construction of three new high schools and an elementary school.

When the building program was initially discussed, county leaders felt that it should be designed and developed in a way that would meet the current educational needs as well as prepare for future needs. It was felt that such a plan could best be developed through the use of an experienced school planning organization such as the University of Tennessee's School Planning Laboratory. This division of the University of Tennessee's College of Education offered consultative services to school systems in the areas of proper plant design, space relationship and organization, environmental control, and school furnishings. The staff of the laboratory had aided school systems throughout the southeast and midwest. The University of Tennessee has divided responsibility for school planning under the Ford Foundation with another facility located at Stanford University in California, with Dr.



Gilliland and his University of Tennessee staff working with school systems in the eastern part of the country.

After local government leaders approved use of the School Planning Laboratory, an extensive survey was made in the county to determine current needs and future growth trends. Using this survey the laboratory was able to develop a set of specifications that could be used as a guide by the architect for designing the building. A team approach, utilizing school board members, school administrators, staff, School Planning Laboratory consultants, and the architect, was the basis for the development of the educational specifications. A list of these people has been compiled and included in the appendix.

The specifications that were published in June, 1964 called for the following allocations:

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Area in Square Feet</u>
Administration & Guidance	2,575
Food Service	5,600
Instructional Materials Center	4,520
Little Theatre	3,600
Language Arts	
English, Speech & Drama	6,060
Foreign Language	3,910
Science	7,840
Mathematics	6,200
Social Studies	5,750
Physical Education	14,830

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Area in Square Feet</u>
Art	2,600
Music	3,842
Vocational Education	
Industrial Arts	3,800
Business Education	2,400
Home Economics	<u>3,400</u>
TOTAL	71,477

These space allocations were then constructed in the form of related circles showing the approximate size and general relationship between each area.

These preliminary guidelines were not designed to be absolutely binding on the architect. They were designed to serve as a guide by indicating the approximate space needed to facilitate the educational activities prescribed. As the architect developed the preliminary drawings, changes were made through use of the same cooperative action that developed the educational specifications.

The final plan for the school, developed by Shaver and Company and approved by the Board of Education, incorporated most of the recommendations of the School Planning Laboratory. It provided spaces that were designed to offer optimum utilization for a team teaching program at the junior high level. The final floor plan is included in the appendix.

## CHAPTER THREE

### SCHOOL STRUCTURE

The purpose of this section was to analyze the building structure as a whole and then as separate components and show how the structure lends itself to a team teaching program.

Team teaching was aided by a flexible building structure. Different activities required different physical arrangements and the School Planning Laboratory believed that a flexible building would aid a program that was constantly needing to change the physical arrangements of the teaching stations. The School Planning Laboratory did not want to design a building for a fixed enrollment and a static program. They recognized that teaching stations and services needed to be designed so that they could be expanded and varied in a balanced manner to accommodate an increasing enrollment and a changing program.

New Providence Junior High School has proven to be very flexible in the way that it can be used. An examination of each section of the building revealed this.

The basic idea in designing the building was to divide the structure into two parts--an academic area for classes where there was a minimum noise level and an



activities area where group interaction could occur with less disturbance to surrounding classes. This plan has allowed classes such as band, woodworking, physical education, and chorus to have more freedom in their conduct.

The two sections of the building were separated by a brick wall. On each side of the divider was a large open space to further insulate noise. One of these open areas was a commons area for large and small group work. The other was a wide corridor leading to the administrative area. A closer examination of each of these areas revealed the potential utilization of each area for team teaching.

### English

The English area was composed of three large rooms, a large open instructional materials center, and an even larger commons area that was shared with the social studies department.

Each large classroom had room for at least eighty students and contained teaching stations for three teachers. Mobile cabinets divided the room into any arrangement that the teachers felt was appropriate for the current teaching situation.

The instructional materials center contained additional teaching stations, cabinets, study carrels, tables for small group work, shelves for books, and audio visual supplies.

The commons area was a large area with a considerable number of tables and chairs. It could be utilized for large group instruction, movies, lunch activities, or for any other activity that required large open spaces.

### Social Studies

The social studies space allocation was similar to that used by the English department. The seventh and eighth grades had large classrooms, an instructional materials center, and a commons area available for use. Instead of a large three-teacher room for the ninth grade, a smaller room seating about thirty students was used for ninth grade world geography. This course was taken by only about one hundred and fifty students a day and as a result team teaching space was not needed to an extent that would require a large room.

### Science

Science was similar to social studies since two large rooms for the seventh and eighth grades were used and a smaller room was reserved for the ninth grade. The instructional materials center contained sinks and laboratory facilities for use in experiments. Storage facilities for scientific equipment were also available for use by the science personnel.

### Mathematics department

The mathematics department used a large classroom

that had a capacity of one hundred and twenty students. This room was usually divided by mobile cabinets so that a section seating approximately thirty students was separated from the rest of the room. In addition, a small classroom located next to the large room was also used permanently. Two members of the math team "floated," using classrooms throughout the building to conduct classes when the regular teachers assigned to the area were having planning sessions.

Auxiliary areas provided for the math team included two instructional materials centers that were used for teacher planning, reference, small group work, and individual study. A large commons area located next to these areas also provided considerable expansion area for testing or other appropriate activity.

The section of the building reserved for "noisy activities" offered many opportunities for team teaching. In addition to regular classrooms, the area contained a large commons area, a theater seating three hundred and fifty that could be used for many types of group activity, and a gymnasium that provided space for fifteen hundred.

### Home Economics

The home economics room was divided into three sections, an area for kitchen activities, a living room area, and a classroom and sewing area. Two home economics teachers divided their time between various homemaking activities in appropriate home settings.



### Shop

The shop area was composed of three classroom areas and a work area for woodworking activities. A variety of activities such as drafting, metal work, and woodwork was conducted by a team of two teachers.

### Physical Education

A team of four teachers conducted physical education activities for the entire student body. Many activities were conducted in an integrated setting through the use of a gymnasium that was not divided into separate areas for boys and girls. When weather permitted, outside playgrounds were also used.

### Band and chorus

Band and chorus were housed in two adjoining rooms and teachers shared a common office. Many activities were conducted jointly. The theater, located across a hallway, provided an ideal setting for band and choral functions.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### HISTORY OF THE TEAM TEACHING PROGRAM

The staff of New Providence Junior High School has been engaged in team teaching since 1966 when the building was first occupied. However, planning for team teaching started even before construction of the school began. Initial planning was conducted by staff members and administrators with help provided by the School Planning Laboratory at the University of Tennessee.

Summer planning sessions involved a variety of approaches. Several formal sessions with teachers were held where general information was distributed and discussed. Additional planning sessions for program development were held with each academic area, and on many occasions small groups of teachers met to work on specific projects.

A gradual approach was taken in the development of the program. School-wide team teaching was the objective, but it was felt that this goal could best be obtained through a program that gradually incorporated teams.

The project was begun in September, 1966, with three teams. These teams were from the areas of English, social studies, and science. Two teachers in each area agreed to work together teaching a group of sixty students.

The total number of students involved at this time was about twenty percent of the student body. Members of each team shared the same classroom, conducted all planning for class activities together, and were jointly responsible for daily class progress. Occasionally one teacher would work with all sixty class members while the other member did paper work. At other times one teacher would work with an individual student, a small group of students, or even half of the total class, depending on the current need.

By April, 1968, the program involved thirty-five teachers, composing twelve teams. The subject areas in which team teaching could be found included seventh, eighth, and ninth grade English; seventh and eighth grade social studies; seventh grade math; seventh and eighth grade science; typing; physical education; home economics; and industrial arts.

At this point in the program, the staff was using a synergetic approach to teaming although a hierarchic structure was already becoming apparent to a certain extent. A synergetic approach meant that each member of the team had an equal responsibility for the functioning of the class as opposed to a hierarchic structure where there was a team leader and team members who were delegated different amounts and kinds of responsibility.

Since large departmentalized classrooms were available for use, single discipline team teaching was used in all subject areas. Two or three teachers were jointly



responsible for teaching one subject each period in a large classroom. This program could easily be distinguished from cross-discipline team teaching where two or more teachers form a team to teach two or more subjects to a group of students.

During the fall of 1968, the staff reorganized to carry the team teaching program another step forward. The entire faculty was organized into five departmental teams--English, social studies, math, fine arts, and science. Each team elected a chairman to preside over team planning sessions.

Each department organized its team teaching program in a way that best suited the curriculum in the department. As a result, distinguishable patterns of team teaching became evident in each departmental area.

### Mathematics

The mathematics department was the only area where teachers were responsible for teaching all three grades. Each teacher taught two periods of seventh grade students, two periods of eighth graders, and two periods of ninth graders. This system allowed all eight math teachers to teach a single grade at the same time.

The advantage was that students could be grouped into up to eight different ability groups. This method of teaming allowed a free interchange of teachers and students between groups. During any period, teachers could swap

classes, combine classes or divide groups in any manner that they felt would be beneficial.

### Science

The science department had divided themselves into three groups and taught three separate aspects of their subject. These divisions were earth science, biological science, and physical science. One year was spent on each subject.

The seven science teachers considered this when they organized the department. As a result, three teachers taught seventh grade science, three taught eighth grade, and one taught ninth grade since the elective ninth grade course had significantly fewer students.

The seventh and eighth grade teachers worked in large team classrooms that provided for ninety students. They used the commons areas which provided the opportunity for smaller groups to function as the need arose.

A chairman was elected for the entire department. He conducted departmental meetings and guided the direction of the team. The free interchange of ideas and teaching methods enabled every grade level team to profit from the experience of others in the department.

### Fine arts team

The fine arts team was composed of home economics, physical education, industrial arts, foreign language, band, chorus, and typing. The teaming emphasis was placed on

group planning rather than group teaching. The team elected a department chairman to conduct team meetings and to help coordinate activities conducted by the group.

Emphasis was placed on cooperative work done by more than one class. For example, a foreign language stage production might have art students drawing the sets, industrial arts students constructing props, and band and chorus members helping with music and background arrangements.

### Social Studies team

Most of the team work in social studies was done by the seventh and eighth grade teams. World geography was taught in the ninth grade as an elective course. Small class size and the elective course nature made it more advantageous to teach it separately.

Seventh and eighth grade social studies were taught in two large team teaching classrooms and in the adjacent commons area.

The courses were taught through the use of a concept approach over a period of two years. A seventh grade student entering the program was taught fifteen concepts important to American and world history during the two years.

This approach allowed all six teachers and approximately one hundred and fifty students each period to work together. Combinations and divisions into as many as six different groups were possible each period through the use of this approach.



English

The English department used three large team teaching classrooms for their programs. Three teachers formed a team for each grade level. Most of the planning was done separately by each grade-level team. Joint meetings by all three grades were conducted by an elected team leader. This approach used the concept of teams within a team.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### IMPLEMENTING THE PROGRAM

#### Planning sessions

During the summer of 1966 planning sessions were sponsored for teachers interested in developing a team teaching program. These sessions were used to develop units of study, to plan activities, to discuss team teaching techniques, and to develop a feeling of unity among team members. These meetings allowed the members of the pilot project to begin the program on a well-planned basis.

After school began in the fall of 1966, each team participating in the program taught five classes each day. This left one period to be used for team planning sessions. During this period, members of the team could work together to develop the program further. Additional time was obtained by periodically using a faculty meeting on Tuesday afternoon for departmental group meetings and by allowing some members of the team to plan while others conducted large group meetings with their students.

Project Mid-Tenn, a federal education project under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, provided money for participants' salary and consultants' fees on numerous occasions so that teachers could continue development of their programs. Mid-Tenn continued until

August of 1969, and by this time the program was well underway.

### Staff resistance

The development of a team teaching program involved cooperation among the individual participants in the program. Since some teachers might continue thinking of themselves as individual practitioners rather than as members of a team working toward a common goal, the following steps were taken in order to insure a cooperative attitude:

1. Inform the staff--In order to provide staff members with as much information as possible about team teaching, information was gathered and compiled in notebooks that were distributed to the staff. These notebooks were kept by teachers in their classrooms and were regularly supplemented with new material that became available. In addition, films on team teaching were shown at regular intervals during planning sessions and faculty meetings. This enabled teachers to see as well as read about desirable teaming techniques.
2. Visit other team teaching schools--Members of the New Providence staff visited other schools that were using team teaching. A partial list of these schools is found in the appendix.



This enabled them to become better acquainted with applications of team teaching theory. A few members of the faculty had participated in workshops at other schools where they had a chance to work as part of the teaching team. Teachers who made visitations were then asked to report back to the entire staff and share their experiences.

3. Inservice workshops and outside speakers for staff meetings--Key individuals from other team teaching schools were willing to work with staff members at faculty workshops and during day-long inservice meetings. A list of consultants has been included in the appendix. These meetings were conducted informally so that local staff members had a chance to question the speaker and give their opinions.
4. Gradual development of the team teaching program--Complete development of the team teaching program at New Providence took an entire year to complete. Initially, in the twelve areas used for team teaching, teachers were allowed to decide for themselves whether they wanted to team teach. If they chose to teach alone, cabinet dividers were arranged to divide the room. The first year five groups team taught. During this year workshops,

consultants, literature, and administrators emphasized proper ways to implement team teaching programs. At the beginning of the second year, a third member was assigned to each of the team teaching areas. This led to a more desirable team arrangement. By May, 1969, team teaching was being practiced in all areas of the building, with teams being composed of two, three, and four members.

### Parental concern

New Providence attempted to gain maximum parental involvement in all of its programs. The following steps were taken to secure this involvement:

1. Inform parents at the outset--Information releases in newspapers and mimeographed sheets for parents were distributed when the school was first opened.
2. Continued orientation--Monthly bulletins, as well as special bulletins to parents, continued to supply information about the program. Parent Teacher Association meetings discussed various aspects of team teaching, and parents were invited to visit the school during the day to see the progress being made by their children.
3. Involve parents actively in the program--Parents

were used as classroom aides and resource personnel in many classes at New Providence. This enabled many parents to become directly connected with the program and to feel more a part of it.

### Audio Visual Equipment

In order to be effective, teachers at New Providence tried to develop well-planned large group lectures as well as stimulating small group discussions. Audio-visual equipment contributed to the effectiveness of these multiple group arrangements.

New Providence began a library of audio visual supplies and equipment as soon as the school opened. Being a new school, time was necessary to develop a well-balanced library of materials and equipment suited to the team teaching needs of the staff. However, over the three year period, a comprehensive library of supplies and equipment was developed for use by teachers.

### Flexible Scheduling

The staff at New Providence felt that a more effective team teaching program could be developed through the use of a flexible "block of time" schedule. It was hoped that such a program could be developed so that teachers could control the length of their daily class periods. They felt that all learning does not need to be done in sixty-minute periods. Some activities could be



done in less time while other activities took longer. If the teaching teams could regulate the time spent in each class each day, a more productive learning environment could be developed.

During the summer of 1967, teachers and administrators worked to develop a schedule that would give teachers a block of time with the same students. The schedule that was developed scheduled the same group of students for two courses during a two hour period. The team members that taught these courses could then decide how much time would be spent in each of the two courses each day. This allowed complete flexibility within a two hour block of time.

This process was repeated three times during the day so that during a six period day three two-hour blocks of time could be allotted to the teachers. This aided the team teaching development by allowing teachers to control the time available during the day rather than have the rigid one-hour class periods control their activities.

#### Additional help for the team

In order to provide teachers with all the help that was possible, New Providence developed a program providing teaching teams with supportive assistance. Several types of help were used:

1. Salaried aides--Four aides were available to help teachers with clerical chores. These aides maintained instructional materials centers,

typed tests, mimeographed papers, and occasionally served as small group discussion leaders.

2. Volunteers--Parent organizations provided clinic helpers for the school and a program utilizing community resources provided guest speakers and classroom participants.
3. Student teachers--Teaching teams at New Providence found student teachers to be an asset to their program. They were assigned to teach small groups, to act as resource persons for independent study, and to present large group instruction. As the student teacher gained proficiency, he was able to assume an increasing amount of responsibility within the team. The student teachers' first experience often was with small remedial groups. Later he worked with larger groups and presented large group lectures. By the end of the quarter the student teacher had become a meaningful contributor to the team.

Most of the student teachers at New Providence came from Austin Peay State University. During 1968, two interns working in the Vanderbilt MAT program were also stationed at the school.

## CHAPTER SIX

### EVENTS THAT HELPED AND HINDERED THE PROGRAM

The development of the team teaching program at New Providence received considerable help from the start:

1. Building Structure--The building was designed specifically to implement a team teaching program. Teachers and administrators had worked with the University of Tennessee's School Planning Laboratory to develop a set of specifications that would enable the architect to know what should be included in the building to help staff members with the program. As a result, the building design that was finally approved by the board of education incorporated ideas that local teachers and administrators had recommended for a team teaching program. Teachers were able to enter the finished building knowing that they would not be hindered by a building structure that was not flexible enough to meet their changing needs.
2. Mid Tenn Project--Project Mid Tenn, a federal education project funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act,



contracted with the local board of education to use New Providence as a demonstration center. This project provided the school with \$33,000 in 1967, \$40,000 in 1968, and \$55,000 in 1969. This money was used to buy additional materials and equipment for the school, to pay supplementary personnel to aid with the school programs, to provide consultative help, to cover travel expenses for the staff on visits to other schools, and to provide money for in-service training experiences. Project Mid Tenn, through the services it provided to the school, enabled the team teaching program to have all the physical requirements that were necessary to succeed.

3. Administration in favor of the program--New

Providence Junior High School was fortunate to have administrators who were in favor of developing a team teaching program. Mr. Clint Daniel, principal, and Mrs. Nell Harris, assistant principal, encouraged the development of such a program from the initial planning stages to its completion. Mr. William Sanford, director of schools, also was very enthusiastic about the development of team teaching at New Providence. Mr. Daniel and Mrs. Harris were able to arrange meetings, supply information

and generally coordinate developmental activities in ways that would have been difficult for individual teachers to accomplish.

4. Enthusiastic staff--Development of the program would have been difficult if the teachers involved had not been enthusiastic and dedicated. New Providence was fortunate to have staff members who were interested in the program, and who had the initiative to develop it through hard work and dedication.

There were also several occurrences that hindered the team teaching program development. These included:

1. Building was not finished on schedule--The New Providence building was scheduled to be completed in September of 1966. Due to construction delays, the entire building was not occupied until February of 1967. This resulted in housing the entire student body in only half the building. This was a very crowded situation that did not lend itself to good teaching, and certainly not to the development of a team teaching program.
2. Project Mid Tenn was late starting--The staff of New Providence had anticipated the start of this project in September of 1966. However, due to delays in funding the project from Washington, the program actually began in March

of 1967. This delay prevented teachers from obtaining early exposure to consultants, making exploratory visitations to other schools, obtaining help from personnel employed through the project, and receiving the physical benefits of the increased supply of equipment and teaching materials necessary to the team teaching program.

3. More students than were anticipated--It was anticipated that New Providence would provide educational facilities for approximately 900 to 1,000 students. However, when school first opened in 1966 there were already 1,000 students that had enrolled and this number had increased to over 1,300 by May of 1969. This larger student body prevented, to an extent, small group work because of the increased number of students that needed the attention of the teachers.
4. Teacher turnover--Out of a staff of thirty-five, New Providence lost nine teachers during the first year of operation. Most of these nine teachers were wives who had husbands moving to assignments in other states. This turnover meant that new teachers had to be worked into the team framework. Even though this resulted in a small problem, the changeover did not



result in significant difficulties. However, a more fluid program would probably have resulted from continuing with all the teachers who had originally started the program.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### MEASURING THE RESULTS

Instruments were available that measured the success of the program in terms of pupil, teacher, and parent satisfaction with team teaching as a learning tool.

In 1966 a survey was taken to determine student reaction to a wide variety of situations that related to the innovative nature of the school. A copy of this survey is included in the appendix. The survey showed that sixty-four percent of the students filling out a questionnaire liked having a team of teachers better than just one teacher. Seventy-one percent felt that they received more individual help through the team approach. Seventy-four percent asserted that they learned more in a small group.

In 1969, Dr. Fred Bunger evaluated student reaction to the New Providence program. This evaluation showed that seventy-one percent of the students measured were inclined to believe that team teaching benefited them as students. Eighty-six percent thought their teachers were attracted to the New Providence teaching plan and eighty-nine percent thought that independent study time was used wisely. Dr. Bunger pointed out that the items which reflected student reaction to team teaching should challenge the faculty and administration to continue to improve the organization and

implementation of their instructional teams.<sup>1</sup>

Teacher reaction to the program was measured through the use of three instruments. In 1967 and again in 1969 the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was administered, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was given in 1969, and a questionnaire concerning the instructional program was prepared and administered by Dr. Fred Bunger, professor of education at Austin Peay State University.

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was designed to measure those attitudes of a teacher which predict how well he will get along with pupils in interpersonal relationships. On a scale measuring from minus one hundred and fifty to plus one hundred and fifty, the original staff had a range from minus eighty to plus one hundred and two, with a median of plus thirty. During the two year period covered from the first testing to the second testing, the median score for the staff had increased from plus ten to plus thirty. Dr. Bunger said that while the range had increased both at the bottom and top end, the concentration at the more recent testing had been moved sufficiently higher on the range to have made a rather significant increase in the median score. He concluded that this test should cause concern and should cause the

---

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Fred Bunger, "Evaluation of New Providence Junior High" (paper submitted to Project Mid Tenn as part of a yearly evaluation, June 16, 1969), p. 9.



faculty to implement a program to improve the way in which the faculty views students and themselves.<sup>2</sup>

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was designed to measure teacher morale. This opinionnaire showed that the overall teacher morale at New Providence Junior High School was slightly above average by the norms of the test, with twenty-one percent of the teachers reflecting above average teacher morale and twelve percent being below average in morale. School facilities had a buoyant effect upon teacher morale with seventy-nine percent of the faculty registering above the sixth stanine and no faculty member registering a score below the fourth stanine. Dr. Bunger concluded that the scores were rather pleasing, and showed that the teachers were positively affected by the school and its program in general.<sup>3</sup>

Dr. Bunger's instructional program questionnaire showed that twenty teachers out of thirty-one felt that there are enough advantages under the team teaching plan to warrant continuance. Significantly, ten felt that they were not involved to the extent that they were qualified to answer while only one teacher said no. Dr. Bunger concluded that the faculty involved registered strong approval of team teaching as a desirable teaching technique.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

Parent reaction to team teaching was not measured specifically, although the reaction of two hundred and fifty parents to the innovative program at New Providence was measured by Dr. Bunger in his evaluation. It showed that eighty-one percent of the parents indicated knowledge of the innovative program and that given the choice, eighty-six percent would not desire to send their child to another school in the system. Dr. Bunger concludes that the parents gave the school a pat on the back and that their approval of the program was reassuring.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### CONCLUSION

This paper has discussed the development of a team teaching program at New Providence Junior High School in Clarksville, Tennessee from May, 1966, to May, 1969.

The school was planned through the use of a team approach, utilizing teachers, administrators, county court, school board members, architect, and the School Planning Laboratory of the University of Tennessee. It was decided in the initial planning that team teaching would be used in the building and as a result the school specifications that were developed provided for a school structure that would implement such a program rather than restrict it. This was done by making the building as flexible as possible, to provide for changing programs.

The team teaching program began with six teachers in September, 1966, and gradually expanded until it included thirty-five teachers and the entire student body. Each department developed the type of team teaching program that best suited the needs of the teachers in the department.

There were many considerations that had to be made in implementing this program. Planning sessions were begun even before completion of the school and continued



through the coming school years. The possibility of staff resistance to the program was contended with by developing a staff information program, through visits to other team teaching schools, inservice workshops, and through a program that gradually developed. Parental concern was eased through an extensive information program, a continued orientation, and by actively involving parents in the program. The team teaching program was further helped through the use of an extensive audio-visual library, flexible scheduling, and additional aides for the teams such as student teachers, volunteers, and salaried aides.

Specific things that helped the team teaching program included the flexible building, Project Mid Tenn, an enthusiastic administration, and a willing staff.

There were also several occurrences that hindered the team teaching program development. These included a larger student body than was anticipated, a teacher turnover, the lateness of completion of the building, and a late start of Project Mid Tenn.

By May of 1969 the program had developed throughout the school and was functioning without significant problems.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fred Bunger, "Evaluation of New Providence Junior High"  
(paper submitted to Project Mid-Tenn as part of a  
yearly evaluation) June 16, 1969.

## APPENDIXES



## APPENDIX A

### SCHOOL PLANNING LABORATORY STAFF

John W. Gilliland, director

Norman L. Boyles, associate director

Orin Graff, department head,  
educational administration

Howard F. Aldmon, associate professor

L. O. Haaby, professor

W. W. Wyatt, professor

#### Staff Members:

William B. Feild

Charles E. Trotter

George M. Roberts

W. Frank Johnson

John Ed Justus

## APPENDIX B

### CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION

Clarksville, Tennessee

### CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Halbert Harvill, Chairman

E. H. McCutchen, Vice Chairman

Glenn Abernathy

George Fleming

Ben Kimbrough

Paul Smith

James C. Cunningham

### SUPERINTENDENTS

William H. Sanford

T. M. Oakley

### ARCHITECTS

Shaver and Company, Salina, Kansas

## APPENDIX C

### PLANNING COMMITTEES

#### Administration

Howard Thompson  
Clint Daniel  
Alice Johnson

#### Guidance

Emily Marable  
Lorena Bagwell  
Marcia Zwier  
Arthur Hunt

#### Library and Materials Center

Lillian Fort  
Helen Sadler  
Lucille Dugger

#### Languages

Marion Page  
Carol Sherard  
Judy Harter

#### Social Studies

Joe Winn  
Betty Jo Wallace  
Nell Harris

#### Science

Walter Celusta  
Robert Patton

#### Food Services

Sarah Ellis  
Madolyn Evans

#### Language Arts

Freda Law

#### Music

Victor Karhu  
Margaret Mills  
LaRue Pryor

#### Mathematics

William Price  
Bobby Wall

#### Home Economics

Gloria Shelton  
Evelyn Bell

#### Physical Education

Ronald McKinney  
Charles Quarles  
William Covington

#### Industrial Arts

W. R. Waller

#### Art

Ila Davidson  
Maxine Crosslin

#### Business

Bobbie Hargis  
Olive Howard

#### English

Robert Woodland  
Nancy English  
Mary Shearon

#### Agriculture

Thomas Harris



## PLANNING COMMITTEES (continued)

Vocational

Florence Strassheim  
Thurston Lee  
William E. Smith

## APPENDIX D

### CONSULTANTS USED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEAM TEACHING PROGRAM

- Mark Boyer, Principal, University City High School, University City, Mo. -- Principal of an innovative high school using team teaching, flexible scheduling and independent study. Mr. Boyer visited New Providence during the summer of 1968 as part of a team teaching workshop sponsored by PROJECT MID-TENN.
- Dr. Harry A. Becker, Superintendent of Schools, Norwalk, Connecticut -- Superintendent of an innovative school system involving team teaching, flexible scheduling, and independent study. Dr. Becker also was employed as part of the 1968 summer workshop.
- Allan A. Glatthorn, Principal, Abington High School, Abington, Pennsylvania -- Principal of innovative school system. Utilizing flexible scheduling, team teaching, independent study, and large and small groups.
- Thomas R. Bowman, Superintendent, Abington School System, Abington, Pennsylvania -- Superintendent of innovative school system. Utilizing flexible scheduling, team teaching, independent study, and large and small groups.
- Dr. Emmett Williams, Professor of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida -- Dr. Williams was at New Providence during the 1968 team teaching workshop and also during the pre-school planning sessions.
- Mel H. Robb, Research Associate, Educational Research Association of Greater Cleveland, Rockefeller Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio -- Mr. Robb attended the 1968 summer workshop.
- Dr. C. H. Peterson, Norwalk, Connecticut -- Competent with team teaching. Norwalk is an outstanding school system. Dr. Peterson explained the program used in his school during the summer workshop in 1968.
- Calvin Grieder, Professor of School Administration, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado -- Writes for Nation Schools, articles of innovations. Visited New Providence in 1969 to gather information for a magazine article. He also worked with teachers at this time during planning sessions.

- Morris H. Pixley, Joel Ferris High School, Spokane, Washington -- Principal of I/D/E/A demonstration school. Worked with a group of New Providence teachers who attended a Kettering Foundation workshop at Cocoa Beach, Florida in the spring of 1968.
- L. E. Etter, Principal, Meeker High School, Meeker, Colorado -- Principal of innovative school utilizing flexible scheduling and individualized instruction.
- Shelby Counce, Director of Secondary Education, Memphis City Schools, Memphis, Tennessee -- Kettering Board of Directors. Instituted flexible scheduling in Memphis. Dr. Counce worked with teachers in workshops during the summer of both 1967 and 1968.
- Allen Baker, Asst. Principal, Los Alamitos High School, 601 North Brookhurst, Anaheim, California -- Worked as a Kettering consultant with modular scheduling during the summer workshop sponsored by Project Mid Tenn in 1968.
- A. B. Wolfe, Director of Nova Schools, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida -- Director of a school district utilizing experimental education. Dr. Wolfe helped New Providence teachers during the 1968 workshop at Cocoa Beach, Florida.
- Gaylor Petrequin, Principal; William Tapfer, Vice Principal, Marshall High School, Portland, Oregon -- School features flexible scheduling and independent study.
- Ted McCloud, Memphis City Schools, Board of Education, Memphis, Tennessee -- Flexible scheduling. Developed the mechanics for a modular schedule at Tresevant High School in Memphis. He shared his experiences with New Providence teachers during a visit to Memphis in 1968 and also at later meetings at New Providence.
- John Gilpin, Research Associate, Self Instruction Program, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana -- Mr. Gilpin is familiar with instructional objectives. He visited New Providence for an evening meeting during summer workshops in 1968.
- Thorwald Esbensen, Assist. Supt. in Charge of Instruction, Duluth Public Schools, Duluth, Minnesota -- Wrote the book "Individualizing the Instructional Program". Dr. Esbensen worked with Mr. Gilpin during his visit.
- Lois Hatchmeyer, 956 Vine St., St. Charles, Mo. -- Experienced with instructional objectives. Worked with teachers during summer workshops and also visited during the year to help with program development.



Gardner Swenson, Materials Dissemination Center, 27965 Cabot Road, South Laguna, California -- In charge of the UNIPAC Dissemination Center. Mr. Swenson worked with teachers during the Cocoa Beach workshop.

Eugene Howard, Director for Kettering Foundation, Project I/D/E/A, Dayton, Ohio -- Board member of Kettering Foundation. Written articles on team teaching, non-graded, and modular scheduling. Visited New Providence during 1968 and worked with teachers during the day.

Mrs. Margaret Lindman, Principal, College High School, 900 Forrest View Road, Evanston, Illinois -- Consultant for Mid-East area working with I/D/E/A UNIPAC program. Visited Clarksville on three occasions during 1967 and 1968 to help teachers develop individual learning programs.

Dr. Claude Mathis, Associate Dean of Grad. Schools, Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois -- Continuous Progress.

Dr. Stephen Alley, Director of Teacher Training, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah -- Continuous Progress.

Stephen White, Assistant to the Chairman, Carnegie Commission on Educational T.V., Educational Development Center, Newton, Mass. -- Associated with research commission on educational T.V. Aided with the initial development of the television system at New Providence in 1966.

Roy O. Hinch, Director of Visual Education, Euclid Public Schools, Euclid, Ohio -- Audio Visual director for progressive school system. Worked with teachers in February, 1967 concerning the development of audio-visual procedures.

Jack Tanzman, Director of Audio Visual Communication, Plainview-Old Bethpage Public Schools, Central School District No. 4, Plainview, New York -- Audio Visual director. Writes for Nations Schools. Served as a consultant during a 1969 Reachhigh workshop.

E. Dudley Parsons, Director of Visual Education, Minneapolis Public Schools, Minneapolis

J. J. McPherson, Head of Demonstration Center, Educational Media Branch, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. -- Dr. McPherson worked with teachers in 1968 concerning the utilization of audio-visual systems in the school.

Donald Ely, Director of Audio Visual Center, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York

Allison V. Slagle, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tennessee -- Teaches Audio Visual courses, consultant at State NEA workshop.

B. Frank Brown, Principal, Melbourne High School, Melbourne, Florida -- Dr. Brown met with teachers during the fall of 1968 to discuss a non-graded program for the school.

Dr. L. O. Haaby, Professor of Education, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee -- Dr. Haaby worked with the pre-school planning for New Providence in 1966.

Professor Lyman Burbank, Director of Teacher Education, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee

Frank Bowles, Director, Educational Program, The Ford Foundation, New York, N. Y.

Dean Sam Johnson, Professor of Education, Dean of School of Education, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee -- Dr. Johnson worked with teachers during pre-school planning in 1966.

Dr. Glen Ovard, Coordinator, Educational Experimental Programs, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah -- A group of local teachers, including staff members at New Providence, studied with Dr. Ovard during a two week workshop at Brigham Young in the fall of 1968.

Dr. Vernon Johnson, Director of Special Education, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee -- Dr. Johnson worked with teachers during a county wide workshop in 1968.

Dr. Phillip Schoggn, Chairman, Department of Psychology, Peabody, Nashville, Tennessee -- Dr. Schoggn worked with teachers during pre school planning during 1966.

Donald Thistlethwaite, Chairman of Department of Psychology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Robert Kite, Cocoa Beach Public Schools, Cocoa Beach, Florida

Dr. Edward Pino, Superintendent, Cherry Creek School District, Denver, Colorado -- Discussed an individualized learning program during a summer workshop in 1968.

Dr. George Collins, Schools for the Future, New York, New York



Mr. Lathan Keatts, Supervisor, Tennessee Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee

Clifford LeFevre, Director, Exemplary Team Teaching Center, Ogdon, Utah -- Worked with teachers attending the team teaching workshop in Utah in 1968.

Martin Garrison, Superintendent of University City Schools, University City, Missouri

J. Revis Hall, Superintendent of Schools, Aniston, Alabama

Dr. J. Lloyd Trump, Associate Secretary, NASSP, Washington, D. C. -- Dr. Trump met with principals, administrators, and teachers during a 1968 summer workshop to discuss team teaching and how to apply it practically to the New Providence situation.

Miss Nell Deering, Cocoa Beach High School, Cocoa Beach, Florida -- Miss Deering was a consultant at the Cocoa Beach workshop and helped teachers to develop individualized learning packets.

Larry Ferguson, Nova Schools, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Dr. Fred Bunger, Professor of Education, Austin Peay State University; Dr. Harold Pryor, Department of Education, Austin Peay State University; Dr. Ellis Burns, Professor of Education, Austin Peay State University; Dr. Bryan Crutcher, Department of Education, Austin Peay State University -- Worked as part of a team teaching panel during a summer workshop in 1967.

## APPENDIX E

### A PARTIAL LISTING OF ORGANIZED WORKSHOPS CONDUCTED AS PART OF THE TEAM TEACHING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

1. Summer, 1967 -- Organizational workshop for teachers and administrators
2. Fall, 1967 -- County workshop. Time was provided for teachers to work on programs in their own schools.
3. Spring, 1968 -- Consultants met with teachers during school planning periods.
4. Spring, 1968 -- Group interaction workshop
5. Summer, 1967 -- Team Teaching workshop, one week, consultants working with teachers
6. Summer, 1968 -- County workshop
7. Fall & Winter, 1968 & 1969 -- Meetings with consultants during and after school
8. Summer, 1968 -- Workshop sponsored by Project Mid Tenn on innovations
9. Summer, 1969 -- Workshop sponsored by Project Mid Tenn on innovations



## APPENDIX F

### A PARTIAL LISTING OF VISITATIONS MADE BY THE STAFF AT NEW PROVIDENCE FOR THE PURPOSE OF LEARNING ABOUT TEAM TEACHING PROGRAMS AT OTHER SCHOOLS.

1. Greenville, Tennessee
2. Salt Lake City, Utah -- Team teaching workshop
3. Cocoa Beach, Florida -- Individualized instruction
4. Owensboro, Kentucky
5. Nashville, Tennessee -- To visit Appollo School with  
a program similar to New  
Providence
6. Fort Lauderdale, Florida -- Innovative schools
7. Memphis, Tennessee -- To learn about a flexible  
scheduling program at Trese-  
vant High School
8. Melbourne, Florida -- To observe non-graded programs  
of Melbourne High School
9. Northbrook, Illinois
10. Abington, Pennsylvania
11. University City, Missouri -- To observe team teaching  
program
12. Lexington, Kentucky -- To observe team teaching

## APPENDIX G

### A PARTIAL LIST OF STAFF PARTICIPANTS IN INSERVICE VISITATIONS

- |                       |                        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Clint Daniel       | 12. Frank Hodgson      |
| 2. Nell Harris        | 13. David Balthrop     |
| 3. Thurston Lee       | 14. Joe Eddie Williams |
| 4. Linda Nichols      | 15. Zeddie Suggs       |
| 5. Charlotte Marshall | 16. Steve Hagewood     |
| 6. Liodelle Jones     | 17. David Baker        |
| 7. Kitty Savage       | 18. Olivia Harrell     |
| 8. Emma Riggins       | 19. Jim Gross          |
| 9. Sarah Brown        | 20. Alice Gross        |
| 10. Henry McCaslin    | 21. Jim Darke          |
| 11. W. W. Morse       | 22. Ronnie McKinney    |

## APPENDIX H

### STUDENT EVALUATION OF NEW PROVIDENCE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

1. I like the building plan of New Providence Junior High.

Yes	77%
Undecided	9%
No	14%

2. The large classrooms bother me.

Yes	24%
Undecided	7%
No	69%

3. I miss the windows in the building.

Yes	56%
Undecided	15%
No	29%

4. Carpeting should become a part of every school building.

Yes	76%
Undecided	10%
No	14%

5. Our building influences my personal appearance.

Yes	38%
Undecided	29%
No	33%

6. I had rather go back to the old type of building.

Yes	17%
Undecided	12%
No	71%

7. I feel that I should take care and appreciate the equipment that we have.

Yes	87%
Undecided	6%
No	7%

8. My parents are paying taxes for this school building and I am not obligated to take care of it.

Yes	25%
Undecided	17%
No	58%

9. The library furniture made the library more inviting to students.
- |           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Yes       | 88% |
| Undecided | 3%  |
| No        | 9%  |
10. I like to watch programs over our television system.
- |           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Yes       | 66% |
| Undecided | 14% |
| No        | 20% |
11. The method of using activities in class is a good one.
- |           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Yes       | 46% |
| Undecided | 21% |
| No        | 33% |
12. I like having a team of teachers better than having only one teacher in the classroom.
- |           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Yes       | 64% |
| Undecided | 11% |
| No        | 25% |
13. I learn more when I work in small groups.
- |           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Yes       | 74% |
| Undecided | 13% |
| No        | 13% |
14. When I have a team of teachers I get more individual help.
- |           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Yes       | 71% |
| Undecided | 10% |
| No        | 19% |
15. I learn more in classes where the teacher explains for a few minutes and I do the work myself.
- |           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Yes       | 70% |
| Undecided | 15% |
| No        | 15% |
16. Students can help other students sometimes as well as teachers can help.
- |           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Yes       | 84% |
| Undecided | 8%  |
| No        | 8%  |



17. The activity method causes me to do more work and have more interest in my work.

Yes	64%
Undecided	8%
No	28%

18. I learn best when I am allowed to take part in the discussion.

Yes	67%
Undecided	15%
No	18%

19. The visual and audio aids (films, tape recorder, TV, etc.) are helpful to our school.

Yes	89%
Undecided	5%
No	6%

20. Exploratory courses have been helpful to me.

Yes	79%
Undecided	11%
No	10%

21. I wish all of my classes were taught by a team of teachers.

Yes	43%
Undecided	15%
No	42%

22. Most of my teachers are interested in my progress and in me as a person.

Yes	52%
Undecided	25%
No	23%

23. The method of using activities or problems gives every child a better opportunity to work at his own speed without pressure.

Yes	67%
Undecided	14%
No	19%

24. Visitors bother me. I wish they wouldn't visit our school.

Yes	20%
Undecided	13%
No	67%

25. I enjoy talking with the visitors. They do not disturb my work.

Yes	52%
Undecided	20%
No	28%

26. I feel that I can take my problems to the guidance office.

Yes	55%
Undecided	30%
No	15%

27. We need more rules in our school.

Yes	12%
Undecided	12%
No	76%

28. Our school is a friendly school.

Yes	55%
Undecided	25%
No	22%

29. The principal and assistant principal try to understand my problems.

Yes	58%
Undecided	24%
No	18%

30. I am afraid to go to the office, even when I am not in trouble.

Yes	35%
Undecided	12%
No	53%