

In February, 1939, the members of the Main Committee were asked the following question in order to critically approach the problem: "What is wrong with teacher education in health and physical education at the undergraduate and graduate levels?" The responses of the committeemen were excellent. One hundred four separate items distributed into twelve categories were mentioned with reference to undergraduate teacher education. Thirty separate items distributed into five categories were mentioned with reference to graduate teacher education. A detailed report of this first step was sent to each member of the Main and Advisory Committees.

The answers of each Committeeman to the questions mentioned above obviously were based upon some underlying philosophy of teacher education in health and physical education. The next step therefore was to seek the respective philosophies of the committeemen, since any aim and major objectives of teacher education which would be agreed upon (the planned third step in the original study) would emerge from a philosophy of teacher education. Responses from the committeemen as to their respective philosophies were poor. One committeeman gave his philosophy in a seventeen-word sentence. Several others sent copies of articles on teacher education which they had written, or addresses on the general subject which they had given. One committeeman made no reply whatsoever. These results were not wholly unexpected. The project was time-consuming and demanding of considerable thought. The Chairman sympathetically understands that the various committeemen are very busy throughout the year.

## II. TOWARD COOPERATION

In the meantime word of the study spread and communications came in from state directors, city administrators, directors in the college women's field, and teacher trainers. The volume of and expressed interest of these inquiries plus the fact that representatives of other organizations stated that they also planned to make similar studies, indicated that an effort should be made to save duplication of time, money, energy, and to avoid the criticism of a lack of professional cooperation and efficiency.

Consequently, the Chairman interviewed the President of the National Association of Directors of Physical Education for College Women, for the purpose of ascertaining the possibility of cooperation on the study from that organization. Negotiations were concluded in July at the annual convention of this organization, when it was voted to actively cooperate. Doctor Dorothy Ainsworth, President of the N.A.D.P.E.C.W., was named representative with others to be named as needed.

In the meantime, at the annual convention of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, some of the members of the Committee on Teacher Education of the College Physical Education Association discussed the advisability of this Committee's cooperating with one from the A.A.H.P.E.R. The latter organization planned to conduct a teacher education study to replace one that was discontinued in 1937. Cooperation with the A.A.H.P.E.R. would bring together the remaining interested organizations, for example, the state directors and city administrators.

Within a few days after the conclusion of this annual convention, the Chairman started negotiations with the proper officers of the A.A.H.P.E.R. for the purpose of securing cooperation on a teacher education study. These officers reacted favorably but felt that a committee representing the three organizations (C.P.E.A., N.A.D.P.E.C.W., and A.A.H.P.E.R.) should be appointed by the president of the latter organization. Considerable correspondence and several conferences followed and it became evident to this Chairman that if a cooperative study were to result, it would be necessary to have a joint committee appointed in this manner.