

---

# 6C

## Action

*Professional Services Committee*

### Special Education District Intern Effectiveness Study

---

## AGENDA INSERT

**Executive Summary:** The Commission will review the report to the Legislature on the required study of the effectiveness of the Education specialist District Intern Program for teachers of students with mild to moderate disabilities. This study is designed to determine whether this program should continue beyond the sunset date of January 1, 2008.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission takes action to receive and transmit the Education Specialist District Intern Effectiveness Study.

**Presenter:** Michael McKibbin, Administrator,  
Professional Services Division

#### Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates.

February 2007

---

---

# **Study of the Effectiveness of the Education Specialist with Mild/ Moderate Disabilities District Intern Program: Report to the Legislature**

---

---

## **Executive Summary**

This item presents the report to the Legislature required by Education Code Section 44329. The study examines the effectiveness of the District Intern Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate Disabilities) program after it was expanded to six programs throughout the state and provides conclusions and a recommendation based on the data collected. The Commission's authority to issue credentials in this area is scheduled to sunset on January 1, 2008; (EC 44325 a).

The Commission staff has collected data on the effectiveness of this program from a variety of sources. These include:

- Review of each program's response to the Commission's Accreditation Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness that all programs must meet including descriptions of required coursework and the support system for each intern.
- Review of Alternative Certification Funded Program data. This includes review of annual narrative reports on the successes and challenges of the programs well as demographic and quantitative data such as retention rates.
- Interviews with each District Intern program director conducted in January 2007, about the successes and challenges of developing an Education Specialist Mild/Moderate disabilities program.
- Responses to questionnaires sent in December 2006 to District Intern Education Specialist interns, graduates, support providers and site administrators to survey their judgments on the effectiveness of the program particularly in terms of the skills and knowledge taught and the support provided to interns in the program.

The findings of the study were organized around five questions that examine the effectiveness of the program to achieve the goals of the District Intern Education Specialist program. Following are the questions and the major conclusions of the study.

- 1. Does the Education Specialist District Intern Program help meet the shortage of special education teachers in California's classrooms?** The number of Emergency Permits and Credential Waivers for Education Specialist Credentials issued has been reduced significantly in the past six years and the Education Specialist District Intern Program has expanded six fold in that time frame. In 2000-2001 There were 6,249 persons serving on Special Education Emergency permits. By 2004-05 this number was reduced to 3,065. Although there may be a number of reasons why this has happened, the availability and expansion of both university and district intern programs have contributed significantly to this decrease.

2. **Are there any differences among those who enter classrooms through this route compared to more traditional student teaching based routes?** The persons who become special education teachers through the internship route, including the District Intern Education Specialist program bring into the profession candidates who may not otherwise enter teaching through student teaching routes:
  - The interns are twice as racially diverse as the current teaching workforce.
  - The percentage of males seeking special education credentials through internships in California is twice the national average.
  - Nearly forty percent come into teaching after another professional career.
3. **Have these six programs developed teacher preparation that meets the needs of partnering districts?** These programs are now providing district interns for nearly two hundred of California's school districts. The primary reason for creating these programs given by the six directors was to meet the need for special education teachers in their service areas. Practice based programs were developed for a variety of school settings specifically to meet the needs of the partner schools and districts. Every year the programs have grown as the requests from their partnering districts have increased.
4. **Have these programs been able to develop instructional and support systems that meet the needs of their clients?** All programs have responded to the Commission's program standards in designing and implementing their programs. Programs provide preservice instruction before the intern becomes teacher of record, instruction is based on classroom application, coursework is offered after school and on Saturdays, programs use a cohort model and support is provided both at the site and the program level. In Spring 2006, interns were asked to judge the effectiveness of 45 different content measures in helping them become competent special education teachers. Eighty percent of the ratings fell in the "highly effective" or "effective" range and the remaining 20 percent were rated as "somewhat effective." None were rated lower than "somewhat effective."
5. **Do the six programs who participated in this pilot have the capacity to prepare and support high quality Education Specialist teachers for students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities?** In interviews with program directors, issues about the ability of the programs to provide high quality instructional and support services were addressed. Directors expressed confidence in their ability to provide a full array of instructional activities. The directors also provided a complete description of the support system, but frequently reflected on the challenges they face in that component. Putting together the instructional programs seemed to be less of an issue than finding the kinds of quality support providers with experience and expertise in Special Education. Programs are using retired teachers to supplement on site supervision. This strategy moves in the right direction, but it is not sufficient in and of itself. On site support continues to be an area of concern. Programs will need to engage partnering districts and schools in discussions of how to increase the on-site support of special education intern teachers. Measures that have been implemented such as the enhanced support provisions in SB 1209 that will help address on site support issues.

**Recommendation:** As a result of the positive evidence of program effectiveness provided in the responses to the questions asked in the study, the Commission recommends that the sunset date of January 1, 2008 be removed from statute. This would allow Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate Disabilities) District Intern Programs that meet the Commission Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness to continue and be authorized to recommend candidates for

California credentials. This study has identified some areas for improvement, especially in the area of intern support. The Commission and its staff will work with programs in these areas and they will be addressed in the report due to the Legislature in 2009.

### **Introduction and Background for the Study**

The District Intern Program was originated in 1983 (Stats.1963, Chap.498, Hughes, Hart). The original program allowed districts and county offices to offer teacher preparation programs for single subject candidates. Since then the enabling statutes have been amended eight times as this type of teacher preparation program has expanded into new credential areas and increased the number of providers. Among the changes that have occurred was expansion into multiple subjects and bilingual credentials (1987) and special education (1994). Most recently SB 933 (Chapter 304, Statutes of 2006, Machado) amended the District Intern statutes to authorize another pilot program (until January 2010) to allow school districts to provide Education Specialist credential services in all areas of disability. A more detailed description of the amendments may be found in Appendix A.

With each expansion, Education Code Section 44329 has been amended to require a study of the effectiveness of the program. The first two studies examined the effectiveness of the statewide district intern program. The third study required the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to study the effectiveness of the Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate Disabilities) District Intern Pilot Program that is being implemented in Los Angeles Unified School District. The fourth study, reported in this agenda item, once again examines the District Intern Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate Disabilities) program and the effectiveness of the program after it was expanded to six programs throughout the state and provides a series of conclusions and recommendations based on the data collected. A fifth effectiveness study is required in SB 933 (Chapter 304, Statutes of 2006, Machado).The Commission is required to report on the expansion into all special education areas on or before January 2009.

The third mandated, data-based effectiveness study titled *A Study of the Effectiveness of the Education Specialist District Intern Pilot Program in Los Angeles Unified School District: A Report to the Legislature* was presented to the Legislature in spring 1999. This study determined that in the judgment of the candidates, graduates, employers, and the accreditation review team, the Los Angeles District Intern Education Specialist Program was generally effective in preparing credentialed teachers for students with mild to moderate disabilities.

The 1999 study also recommended that there were certain conditions that should be met if this pilot was to be expanded into other districts and regions of the state. The issue that was of greatest concern was the capacity necessary to put together such a program, particularly in terms of human resources. As page 41 of the 1999 study states:

“Implementation of a district intern specialist program will require an enormous commitment of resources by the participating district(s). Unless the district(s) clearly have the capacity to provide a well developed teacher preparation curriculum, have sufficient number of Education Specialist support providers and have administrators designated to staff the program, they should not undertake the creation of a District Intern Education Specialist program.

Similarly, it should be clear that the proposed specialist program has sufficient instructional and support expertise to address all competency areas at both initial (Level I) and advanced (Level II) levels. They should demonstrate the capacity of the program by responding to the Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for District Intern Education Specialist Programs.”

One of the purposes of the current effectiveness study is to explore the concerns raised in 1999 study. Questions four and five of this study focus on the concerns from the 1999 study.

### **Definitions and Methodology Used in this Study**

Based on review of the enabling statutes and discussions with policy makers, the Commission staff has arrived at the following definitions to guide the methodology of this effectiveness study. Dictionary definitions of the word effectiveness include “accomplishment of a desired result or the fulfillment of a purpose or intent, producing a result.” The Education Code provides further information on what the intent of the original statute for district intern programs and this study was. It was found that the priorities of the statute were to meet the shortage needs of the participating districts and produce high quality special education teachers who were retained in their teaching positions. Therefore, this effectiveness study will focus on examining whether this pilot program was able to help accomplish the desired result of helping meet the state’s need for highly qualified special education teachers.

The Commission staff has collected data from a variety of sources. These include demographic and descriptive data on Education Specialist District Interns since these programs began. In order to receive alternative certification funds each intern must complete a Consent Form which certifies program participation and provides employment and demographic information for each intern. Annually Commission staff conducts both paper and pencil and on line surveys of interns. These questionnaires focus on intern satisfaction with the program and the kinds of services that they received. For this report to the Legislature, another survey was conducted of those who support, employ and evaluate the performance of District Intern Education Specialist Teachers with the purpose of examining the skills and abilities of those prepared through this program. Through the following data sources, the Commission examined program and candidate effectiveness through a variety of lenses and made recommendations based on the findings from the data collected as follows:

1. Review of each program’s response to the Commission’s Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness. Each program must meet the Commission’s Accreditation Standards. This includes all Preconditions that stipulate compliance with specific quantitative requirements such as amounts of pre-service preparation (that preparation offered prior to becoming teacher of record); Standards Common to all programs such as leadership and fiscal requirements; and Program Standards, such as those standards that set forth the knowledge, skills and abilities that each intern must demonstrate. All six District Intern Education Specialist programs have been approved by the Committee on Accreditation based on the Commission’s review process for all accredited Education Specialist programs.
2. Review of Alternative Certification Funded Program Data. All of the programs that are the subject of this study have applied for and received Alternative Certification Funding pursuant Education Code Section 44380-44386. Among the funding conditions that that each program must meet is to provide information about their program. This includes

review of annual narrative reports on the successes and challenges of the program, descriptions of required coursework and the support system for each intern, as well as demographic and quantitative data about the interns in the programs such as retention rates.

3. Interviews with Program Directors. Each District Intern program director was interviewed in January 2007, about the successes and challenges of developing an Education Specialist Mild/Moderate disabilities program specifically for this report to the legislature, with a particular focus on the capacity of these programs to prepare and support interns. The seven questions that were asked can be found in Appendix B.
4. Participant Surveys. In January 2007, questionnaires were given to the Mild/Moderate Education Specialist District Interns who were in their second year in the program in the six pilot programs. The support provider and the site level administrator for each sampled intern were also asked to complete a questionnaire for each intern surveyed. A fourth survey was distributed to graduates of the six programs two years following graduation. These questionnaires were used as a way to check and confirm the data from the other three sources focusing on the program's effectiveness from their particular point of view. These four surveys may be found in Appendix C.

The information from these four sources has been collected, reviewed and summarized in the Report of the Data section of this report that begins below. Based on that data, the Commission staff makes the recommendations that can be found in the last section of this report, which can be found on page 21.

### **Effectiveness Study: Report of the Data**

The data on the effectiveness of District Intern Education Specialist programs in the current study is organized around a series of questions. Each question is posed to examine one of the areas that District Intern Education Specialist Teaching Credential programs are expected to effect.

#### ***Question 1: Does the Education Specialist District Intern Program help meet the shortage of special education teachers in California's classrooms?***

Special Education Teachers have been one of California's largest areas of teacher shortage. One way to determine teacher shortages is by reviewing data on credential permits and waivers. Through a series of efforts the number of persons serving on Emergency and Provisional Permits and on Credential Waivers for Education Specialist teachers has been greatly reduced over the past six years. In 2000-2001 There were 6,249 persons serving on Special Education Emergency permits. By 2004-05 this number was reduced to 3,065.

Although permit and waiver data are not yet available for later years for all districts after 2004-05, the data from the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) affirms that these trends continue. There were 381 Special Education Emergency Permits in 2004-05 in the LAUSD. In 2005-2006 this number had dropped to 242. This drop was accomplished by increasing the number of candidates who were prepared to teach special education students. This was largely done through internship programs, both university and district based programs.

In LAUSD the number of university interns in 2000-01 was slightly over 100. By 2004-05 this number had increased to 238, and 2005-06 the number was 368. The LAUSD District Intern Education Specialist program followed a similar pattern with fewer than 80 participants in 2000-

01; 94 in 2004-05 and 177 in 2005-06. This year the LAUSD has 244 in the Education Specialist section of its District Intern program and continues to partner with nine University Special Education Intern programs to further increase the supply of qualified Special Education Teachers.

Six District Intern programs prepared 639 special education candidates in 2005-06. These six programs provided special education teachers for 187 districts in 23 California counties. A description of these programs may be found in Table 1. Two different program design models were used. A single district model was used in the state's two largest districts, and a consortium model, which was administered by agencies such as county offices of education that are designed to serve multiple districts. The single district models are the Los Angeles Unified School District and the San Diego Unified School District. The consortium models are Orange County Office of Education, Project Pipeline, San Joaquin County Office of Education, and Stanislaus County Office of Education.

The number of university and district intern programs has increased in virtually the same rate as issuance of these credential permits has decreased. Both university based and district based programs have contributed to this result. The increase in the District Intern Education Specialist program has been particularly dramatic in those areas such as the San Joaquin Valley. Because there was relatively little availability of university based Education Specialist Credential Intern programs in that region, two programs emerged to fill the void. With the introduction of District Intern Education Specialist Program, the number of special education emergency permits in San Joaquin County has dropped from 71 in 2004-05 to 27 in 2005-06. In the other programs the permit and waiver use has also declined in similar ways.

**Table 1  
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate District Intern Program Information**

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Year Program Approved</b>	<b># of Interns Enrolled 2005-2006</b>	<b>Number of Graduates</b>	<b>Number of Districts Served</b>	<b>Number of Counties Served</b>	<b>2006-07 Preliminary Intern Enrollment</b>
Project Impact: San Joaquin COE	2003	136	22	89	9	128
Orange COE	2004	53	22	22	3	61
Project Pipeline	2003	124	21	39	11	136
Los Angeles USD	1994	244	215	1	1	289
Stanislaus COE	2004	40	4	29	3	40
San Diego City Schools	2004	20	0	1	1	42

***Question 2: Are there any differences among those who enter classrooms through this route compared to more traditional student teaching routes?***

In addition to meeting the needs of partnering school districts in shortage areas, one of the goals of alternative certification programs is to provide a route into teaching for candidates who might not otherwise enter teaching and for those who are underrepresented in the teaching workforce. Data from annual Intern Consent forms, which document participation in an intern program for registration and funding purposes, provide information about Special Education District Interns (DIs).

- Twenty-five percent of the DIs were prepared in out of state undergraduate programs. This is almost double the normal rate in California.
- Fifteen percent of the DIs received their undergraduate degrees from University of California campuses. DI programs provide an opportunity for special education preparation and certification since relatively few University of California campuses offer this preparation.
- Thirty one percent of the DIs were male. This is similar to those who enter university special education intern programs. This number is significantly higher than the number of male candidates who enter special education programs nationwide, which is 14 percent.
- Forty-one percent of the DIs were from those groups traditionally underrepresented in the teaching workforce. Across all intern programs, 48 percent of the interns in California are non-white, and these figures have been quite consistent for seven years. This compares to the teaching population of California's current teachers which is approximately 25 percent non-white.
- Although fewer than the number of second career single subject interns, about one third of the DIs came into teaching after a career in another profession.

To summarize, the District Intern Education Specialist teachers matriculated from University of California campuses and from out of state at a greater rate than expected. Special Education DIs came into teaching from second careers at a lower rate than their other intern teaching credential counterparts. More males choose to become special education teachers through internships in California than the national sample, and interns are more diverse than the comparative state and national samples. The DIs are a diverse group, but not greatly different from those who choose university intern programs.

***Question 3: Have these six programs developed teacher preparation programs that meet the needs of partnering districts?***

In the case of all six district intern programs, the reason given by their directors that these programs were created was to meet the need for special education teachers in their service area. As was noted in the 1999 District Intern Effectiveness Study, The LAUSD program was begun because the district could not hire every person prepared in Los Angeles basin university special education programs and still not meet their needs, without regard for the other seventy districts in the county. In the San Joaquin Valley, both the San Joaquin and Stanislaus County Offices of Education programs began because the local universities were able to meet only a fraction of the need of the area. Similar stories were told by the other three programs. In each case the programs developed a practice based program specifically designed to cater to the needs of the partner schools and districts. In the beginning of each program, most of the candidates

came by recommendations from the districts. Many of the candidates were those who had been originally hired on emergency permits.

The programs were developed based on the same Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness as all accredited Education Specialist Programs. Each program brought together an advisory committee made up of special education administrators and teachers from area districts as well as representatives of nearby universities. In interviews with program directors, most stressed the importance of strong collaborations with participating districts. In the case of the consortium programs, partner districts were brought together to make program decisions. In the single district programs divisions within the district were brought together.

Each program developed an instructional program and support system that was standards-based and practice oriented, and was designed to meet the needs of teachers who would be responsible for a classroom at the same time they were engaging in teacher preparation. The programs and their partners developed recruitment and selection strategies and created decision making and program management structures that met the needs of the participants. Table 2 presents a summary of the features of the six District Intern Education Specialist programs. Each program was reviewed on those components listed in Education Code Section 44385.

An expanded description of the six programs and a listing of their instructional program coursework are provided in Appendix D.

In addition to special day class and resource settings, partnering districts requested that the programs provide interns for a variety of school settings. Two of the programs place teachers in schools for incarcerated youth. Two of the programs work with charter schools. Three of the programs serve schools in rural areas, meeting the specific needs of participating districts. All six programs target paraprofessionals, second career teachers and those underrepresented in the teaching workforce. In interviews with directors, one of the trends that was noted was that until recently a large portion of the interns began their teaching as emergency permit holders, and the most pressing need was to provide credential services for these teachers. More recently the needs of the districts have been to serve candidates who are entering the intern program directly and providing them with ongoing support and practice-based instruction.

**Table 2**  
**Features of the District Intern Education Specialist Programs**

	<b>San Joaquin COE</b>	<b>Orange COE</b>	<b>Project Pipeline Sacramento COE</b>	<b>Los Angeles USD</b>	<b>Stanislaus COE</b>	<b>San Diego USD</b>
<b>Teaching Sites (in addition to day class and resource)</b>	Charter, Alternative, Juvenile Court, CYA, Non-Public (Spec Ed), Magnet , Rural & Inner City	Alternative, Juvenile Court, CYA, Non-Public (Spec Ed) & Inner City	Magnet, Rural & Inner City	Alternative & Magnet	Non-Public ( Special Education) Rural	Charter, Alternative, Inner City & Specialized Learning Centers
<b>Recruitment:</b>	Paraprofessionals, Second Career, Males, Underrepresented groups & Direct applicants to COE	External, Second Career, Paraprofessionals, Males, Underrepresented Groups, Pre- Intern/Emergency Permit Holders, Principal referrals	Paraprofessionals, Provisional & Emergency Permits Holders Second Career, Males, Underrepresented Groups & Other teaching assignments	Paraprofessionals, Pre-Intern & or Emergency Permit Holders, Second Career, Underrepresented Groups, and an External, Country- wide recruitment Team	Paraprofessionals Second Career, Pre- Intern & or Emergency Permits Holders, county credential analyst referrals, previously credentialed teachers	Paraprofessionals, Pre-Intern & or Emergency Permit Holders, Second Career, Males, Underrepresented Groups, EDJOIN, San Diego COE, & Referrals from within
<b>Length of Program</b>	36 months	24 months	36 months	36 months	36 months	24 months
<b>Pre-service (clock hours)</b>	120 clock hours	120 clock hours	169 clock hours	240 clock hours	150 clock hours	210 clock hours
<b>Frequency of course offerings during academic year</b>	Twice/week 3 hours	Once/week 4 hours 3-4 Saturdays	10 hours every other Friday evening and Saturday	Once/week 2 hours Once/week 1 1/2 hours	1 hour/week 3 hours Twice/week	6.5 hours/weekly 4 hours/weekly

**Table 2 (Continued)**  
**Features of the District Intern Education Specialist Programs**

<b>Program</b>	<b>San Joaquin COE</b>	<b>Orange COE</b>	<b>Project Pipeline Sacramento COE</b>	<b>Los Angeles USD</b>	<b>Stanislaus COE</b>	<b>San Diego USD</b>
<b>Intern Selection Criteria</b>	Academic, Experience w/youth, Program/District interview	Academic, Experience w/youth, Local interview	Academic, Interviews by Program panel and district	Academic, Experience w/youth, Gallop Selection, Intern Interview Process	Academic , Interview, Employment with district.	Academic , Experience w/youth Interview w/ Program/District
<b>Support Methods</b>	Onsite observation, consultation, and demonstration. Cohort seminars, teachers on part-time release, retired teachers, Cell phone availability	Onsite observation, consultation, and demonstration. Alumni, Informal, On line/email	Onsite observation, consultation, and demonstration. Cohort seminars, On line, Alumni	Onsite observation, consultation, and demonstration. Cohort seminars, On line,	Onsite observation, consultation, and demonstration. Cohort seminars, Former Special Ed & SELPA teachers, retirees	Onsite observation, consultation, and demonstration. Cohort seminars, Full-time released highly qualified Special Education Teachers
<b>Average Site Level Support (hours/week)</b>						
<b>First Year</b>	1 hour per week	2.5 hours/week	1 hour/week	2 hours/week	1 hour/week	6.5 hours/week
<b>Second Year</b>	½ hour per week	2.5 hours/week	1 hour/week	1 1/3 hours/wk	1 hour/week	4 hours/week
<b>Average Program Level Support (minutes/month)</b>						
<b>First Year</b>	60-90 min -2/month	150 min/week	90 min /month	40 min/week	80 min/month	60 min/month
<b>Second Year</b>	60-90 min/month	150 min/week	90 min/month	40 min/week	75 min/month	60 min/month
<b>Assessment Measures</b>	Ca TPA CTP Portfolio	Ca TPA Portfolio	Ca TPA, Portfolio	Ca TPA Portfolio, Self-Assessment	Portfolio	Portfolio

***Question 4: Have these programs been able to develop instructional and support systems that meet the needs of their clients?***

As Table 2 shows all of the six programs are two to three years duration. All six programs offer their instruction in segments of varying length. Review of accreditation program documents shows that in many cases the instruction is offered initially at a foundational level and later re-examined during the program at levels of greater complexity and based on classroom applications. This is particularly true in topics such as Positive Behavioral Support and Student Assessment. Knowledge and skills such as these seem to benefit from an instructional approach that allows blending theory and application. All programs begin with at least 120 clock hours of preservice instruction before the intern becomes teacher of record. The range of instructional hours in the program is from 390 clock hours to 888 clock hours with an average of 580 clock hours. This does not include supervised practicum experiences which would add an average of 123 clock hours and performance assessment experiences would add an average of another 60 clock hours. A complete listing of each program's course offerings can be found in Appendix D. All programs provide both Level I and Level II programs and lead to a Clear Credential.

Coursework is offered after school and on Saturdays in locations as near to the intern's school sites as possible. Each program has at least thirty instructional modules that are taught by county and district administrators, experienced special education teachers, retired educators, and other experts in a particular special education content field, including some university faculty who teach similar subjects in university based programs.

All programs also provide support seminars led by the support and supervisory staff. In these seminars the interns have opportunities to talk about classroom issues and discuss how the instructional strategies and classroom management practices are working for them. The support and ideas that the interns get from their cohort has been mentioned as among the most powerful features of the program in nearly every survey of intern support that the Commission has done. The second page of Table 2 shows the different methods used to provide support. All programs provide support both at the site level and the program level. Three of the programs use support methods that provide teachers who are fully released to provide support for the interns. Five of the programs use retired special education teachers as one source of support.

All programs use the cohort model, in which interns enter as a group and proceed through the program together for the duration of the program. The programs provide regular opportunities for the cohorts to meet in a seminar format and provide personal and instructional assistance to each other with the guidance of a program advisor or coach. Most of the programs also use electronic means to provide another level of support. For example in Los Angeles each intern and peer coach are provided a computer. Both are encouraged to use e-mail to ask questions, and check in on how things are going on those days when they do not see each other. Interns frequently send messages to the program level coach, a member of the intern cohort, or to a course instructor about management or instructional issues. Although this type of support does not replace face to face assistance, it can help reduce the feelings of isolation and respond to the immediate needs of the intern.

In addition to cohort and electronic support, each intern receives support at the site and at the program level. Each intern is assigned a site support person by the participating district. There

are cases when the Education Specialist Intern is the only special education teacher at that site. In those cases programs use a teacher or program specialist from the county office of education, central district office, or a retired special education teacher for site level support. At the program level, supervision and support is provided that is designed to coordinate the instruction, support and performance evaluation. In the 2006 User Survey the average range of formal site level support was between 1 hour per week and 6.5 hours per week and one half hour and 4 hours per week in the second year in the six District Intern Education Specialist programs. Program level support ranges from 60 minutes a month to 160 minutes a month.

All six programs use program level supervisors to assess the classroom performance of each intern. Most of the programs require the development of a performance portfolio that includes items such as required assignments, examples of instructional products, and examples of student work.

In the spring of 2006, interns in all funded internship programs were asked to rate the effectiveness of their preparation program as part of the annual data collection process. The data from the respondents in the six District Intern Education Specialist programs were reviewed. Three questions from the User Survey provided particularly relevant data about the effectiveness of the instructional program. Interns were asked to judge the effectiveness of 45 different content measures in helping them become competent special education teachers. In all of the effectiveness measures in the survey of interns, none was rated less than somewhat effective. Eighty percent of the ratings fell in the highly effective or effective range, and the remaining 20 percent were rated as somewhat effective.

The purpose of the User Survey was to gauge how the programs were doing on these effectiveness measures and to provide feedback for program improvement purposes. Each program was provided data about its own program as well as state aggregated ratings for comparison purposes. In the six programs, the two areas that seem to need improvement according to the interns are Providing Strategies for Teaching English Learners and Using Instructional Technology. Interns reported that the instruction in Teaching Special Populations and Providing Effective Learning Environments was particularly effective in these intern programs. The expressed need for improvement in teaching English learners is consistent with the expectations of SB 1209 and the Williams Lawsuit settlement to expand and improve the instructional offerings in this area.

Interns were also asked about the support that they received. Interns were asked to comment on the degree to which they were matched to their support providers in terms of grade level, subject, student population and proximity. The ratings for all six programs on the four indicators for support provider matching were all rated, on average, in the highest two categories (fairly well matched or well matched.) The interns gave high ratings to both the site level support provider and the program level support provider in five of the six programs. In interviews with the program directors issues related to improving access to support providers were discussed. It is expected that the provisions of SB 1209 to provide enhanced support will provide more frequent access to support and assistance for interns.

***Question 5: Do the six programs who participated in this pilot program have the capacity to prepare and support high quality Education Specialist teachers for students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities?***

In interviews with the six program directors, the issues related to the capacity of district or county based programs were discussed. In particular, issues related to the ability to deliver an instructional program that must provide a curriculum addressing a broad range of general and special education topics were discussed. The interviews also focused on the capacity of programs to provide support to interns in their field settings. In some cases the programs served many school districts and vast geographic areas.

Each program approached these two issues (instruction and support) based on the needs of the partnering districts and recognized the challenges. The directors expressed confidence in their ability to provide a full array of instructional activities. The directors also provided a complete description of the support system, but frequently reflected on the challenges they face. Most directors talked about how essential retired special education teachers had become to their programs. Because of the pressures of initiatives such as No Child Left Behind and IDEA, support providers are becoming even harder to find and employ as support providers because experienced teachers feel pressures to remain in their classrooms. Finding course instructors did not seem to be as great a challenge, particularly when their time commitment was finite. Most instructors appreciated that their many years of experience, knowledge and skills were being recognized, and they could pass on what they had learned to the next generation of special educators.

In addition to regular, formal support, all of the program directors and the program documents cite the importance of both informal and specialized support. In addition to scheduled observations, the importance of access during preparation time, at lunch, after school, on line or by phone was critical to the success of the program. The programs also noted that the need for support varied widely from one intern to another. Some need a great deal of close order, ongoing support with lots of demonstration lessons and feedback. Others need less assistance with the support provided being more in the nature of providing professional tips and techniques that only come with more experience.

Most of the programs have employed specialized support providers for interns who need specific or extended assistance. For example in LAUSD, because many schools operate on a year round schedule, appropriately matched support providers may not be on the same track as their assigned interns. For these interns the district assigns a “start up coach” to assist the intern during those critically important beginning weeks of teaching. In other cases the program will bring in a specialized coach, such as a reading specialist or bilingual specialist, to work with interns who need this type of assistance. One of the concerns of the directors is that this kind of support does not fit well when calculating frequency counts or averaging the amount of support that is offered.

Another indirect measure of capacity is the retention rate of interns. Annually all funded intern programs are required to submit the retention rate of those interns who have received alternative certification funding. The six District Intern Education Specialist programs have submitted these

data for the years that they have been in operation. Only one program has been in operation for the five year standard that is used for most programs. The five year rate for Education Specialist District Interns is 85 percent. The three year retention rate for the three programs that have been in operation for that long is greater than 90 percent.

### **Effectiveness of the Program as Measured by Recent Graduates, Second Year Interns and their Support Providers and Employers**


The final assessment measure of this study was to conduct a series of surveys that were distributed to recent graduates and second year interns in December 2006/January 2007. The support provider and the employer of each of the sampled second year interns were identified, and they were asked to complete a brief survey about the second year intern and the district intern program. The four questionnaires may be found in Appendix C. Thirty-nine graduates, 100 interns, 85 support providers and 191 employers were surveyed in the six programs. The return rate was 91 percent for the site administrators (employers), 49 percent for current interns, 45 percent for graduates and 42 percent for mentors (support providers).

Program Ratings Provided by Site Administrators. Employers were asked to rate how the interns compare to other beginning teachers that have taught in schools they administer and to rate the interns in four instructional areas. They were asked to rate the program's support system as well as the effectiveness of the program at reaching the goals of the enabling legislation. The results are as follows.

As Chart 1 shows, nearly two-thirds of the responding administrators rated the identified DI as better than other beginning special education teachers who had taught in their schools. One quarter of the responding administrators judged the DIs as good as other beginning education specialists. Slightly under ten percent judged the DIs not as good as other beginning education specialists. The administrators were asked to judge the effectiveness of the interns on four measures: classroom and behavior management; planning; assessing student learning and providing effective teaching strategies. In their judgment 74 percent of the DIs were better than other beginning special education teachers in classroom management. In the other three categories of instructional effectiveness, the administrators said that 90 percent of the DIs were as good or better than other beginning special education teachers who had taught in their schools.


**Chart 1**  
**Comparison of District Interns to other Special Education Beginning Teachers by Site Administrators**

How does the (named intern) compare with other beginning special education teachers who have taught in schools where you were an administrator?




As a follow up question to the comparison reflected in Chart 1, the site administrators were asked whether they would hire other district interns. In Chart 2 administrators in schools with District Intern Education Specialist teachers were asked, “If you have another opening in special education, would you request another intern teacher?” Seventy-five percent responded yes and three percent responded no, with the reminder saying maybe. In the last question the employers (site administrators) were asked to provide judgments about the goals of the special Education District intern Program. On the question that related directly to them and their responsibilities, “Helping administrators meet their need for teachers in shortage areas,” 65 percent responded that program met this goal very well and 34 percent said the goal was met adequately. Chart 3 displays these data.

**Chart 2:  
Would You (Site Administrators) Request Another Intern Teacher If There Were Other Teaching Openings in Special Education?**



**Chart 3  
Administrator's Rating of  
Program Goal of Meeting Shortage of Special Education Teachers**


The intern program has a number of goals. Please rate how well the program (through interns who have taught in schools you administered) has achieved these goals: helping administrators meet their need for teachers in shortage areas?



The data from the survey of site administrators was quite complimentary of the Education Specialist District Intern Program. Their responses were positive about the interns in comparison to other beginning teachers, about the program and about how the program helped meet the needs of the administrators in their work.

Support and Assistance Provided to Interns. Consistent with earlier findings in this report, support was the most problematic area of the District Intern Education Specialist program according to program participants. Current interns and support providers were asked to provide information about the frequency that support was provided to current interns. This support includes both formal and informal meetings, visitations and observations. Chart 4 shows the frequency of support as reported by interns. The range of response was from no site level support reported by one intern to six hours a week reported by another intern. Forty-two percent stated that they had three or more contacts per week with their site level support provider. Of particular concern was that 22 percent of the interns stated that they had support activities on average once every two weeks. Support providers were asked the same question as current interns. Their responses followed the same pattern on frequency of visitations as the interns.

**Chart 4:  
Frequency in Times Per Week Current District Intern Education Specialists Received Support from Site Level Support Providers**



The average length of support confirms the patterns of the frequency of the support activities. Thirty two percent of the interns and 47 percent of the support providers stated that they spend less than thirty minutes a week in support activities. Table 3 displays these data. Nearly half of the interns reported spending less than an hour with their provider. Twenty one percent of the interns and twenty three percent of the support providers reported that they spend more than two hours a week in support activities and the remainder, which is 33 percent of interns and 22 percent of support providers spend between one and two hours in support activities.

**Table 3**  
**Average Length of Support Time Provided per Week**

	Less than 30 minutes	30-59 minutes	1-2 hours	2-4 hours	4 + hours
<b><i>Intern</i></b>	30	14	31	13	7
<b><i>N=95</i></b>	31.6%	14.7%	32.6%	13.7%	7.4%
<b><i>Support Provider</i></b>	37	8	18	15	3
<b><i>N =81</i></b>	46.8%	8.9%	21.5%	19%	3.8%

Interns and graduates were asked about the kinds and topics of support activities that were pursued. Table 4 presents the activities. Discussions of teaching techniques and practices were the most frequent activity reported by interns, closely followed by activities related to curriculum and lesson planning, observations of intern teaching and discussions of those observations. The categories of support activities were similar to earlier examinations of this topic. Seventy three percent of intern graduates reported that the topics and activities that they had participated in while interns were worthwhile and transferable to their current classroom practice.

**Table 4**  
**Topics of Interactions between Interns and Support Providers as Reported by Graduates Interns**

<b>Activity /Topic</b>	<b>Percent of Graduates Listing Participation in Activity</b>
Discussion of Teaching Techniques and Practices	95%
Curriculum Development and Lesson Planning Activities	92%
Formal Observation of Teaching	92%
Discussions of Observed Lessons	90%
Support Providers Demonstration Techniques and Strategies	82%
Student Assessment Activities	77%
Review of Core Curriculum	72%
Review of Subject Matter	69%

Graduates and employers were asked about the quality of support. Sixty two percent of the program’s graduates rate the level of assistance they received from both their support provider at the school site and from the program as excellent. Twenty five percent of the graduates rated the site support as adequate, and twelve percent gave an inadequate rating. Although only five percent of the site administrators rated the support system as poor, their ratings of the support system were among the lowest rated features of the District Intern Education Specialist program. Fifty eight percent of the employers stated that they felt that interns were well supported, which was among their lowest ratings. Although the ratings for support were generally positive by employers and graduates (approximately sixty percent excellent), these ratings were the lowest given on any topic in each respective survey of program participants.

Overall Effectiveness Ratings by Survey Participants. Candidates and graduates were asked to rate the effectiveness of their instructional and support systems in their District Intern Education Specialist program. The results for the interns in the last year of their programs and of the graduates two years after graduating from the intern program were quite similar in the effectiveness of the instructional program. Of the fifteen instructional measures only one graduate measure and no current intern measure was judged not helpful by as much as ten percent of the respondents. Sixteen percent of the graduates said that the “instruction on working with families of students” was not helpful. This was also the highest category for the current interns with nine percent giving this a not helpful rating. On ten of fifteen instructional measures, three quarters of the graduates and two-thirds of the candidates stated that their instruction had been either helpful or very helpful. For candidates “using technology to support student learning” had the lowest rating with sixty-one percent stating the instruction was either helpful or very helpful. In summary even the lowest rated instructional components were well above the mean.

Mentors were asked to reflect on the effectiveness of the program in preparing DIs. As Table 5 shows ninety five percent of the mentors thought the program was effective in preparing interns. When graduate DIs were asked to reflect on their experience after two years of teaching, eighty two percent rated their preparation as effective or very effective. When these ratings are combined with the comparison of employers of district intern education specialist teachers (65 % better, 25% as good), it is clear that those who have the most contact with these beginning special education teachers believe the program is effective. When retention data are added in the analysis (85% retained at five years and 90% at three years), the evidence of the effectiveness of the program is compelling.

**Table 5**  
**Effectiveness of Education Specialist District Interns**  
**as Reported by Mentors and Graduates**

	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective
Mentors	1.2%	3%	30.8%	64.2%
Graduates		17.9%	38.5%	43.6%

**Recommendation**

As a result of the positive evidence of program effectiveness provided in the responses to the questions asked in the study, the Commission recommends that the sunset date of January 1, 2008 be removed from statute. This would allow Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate Disabilities) District Intern Programs that meet the Commission Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness to continue and be authorized to recommend candidates for California credentials. This study has identified some areas for improvement, especially in the area of intern support. The Commission and its staff will work with programs in these areas and they will be addressed in the report due to the Legislature in 2009.

## **Appendix A**

### **Historical Background on the District Intern Program**

The District Intern Program was initiated as part of Senate Bill 813 (Chapter 498), the Hughes-Hart Education Reform Act of 1983. As part of a comprehensive package of school reforms, this statute established an alternative route into teaching for single subject teachers. The program was originally known as the Teacher Trainee Certificate Program. The statute created an opportunity for school districts to initiate internship programs. Teacher trainees had to possess baccalaureate degrees, but they were not required to enroll in university courses during the internship. Instead, as a condition for employing teacher trainees, the 1983 statute required each school district to provide teacher trainees (interns) with the support of mentor teachers or other experienced educators a professional development plan that included the instruction required by statute and deemed necessary by the district and participant evaluation process. In addition to holding a baccalaureate degree, trainees were required to pass the state basic skills examination (CBEST), demonstrate subject matter competence by examination, and hold a major or minor in their subject area.

In 1994, lawmakers made more changes in the District Intern Program. Senate Bill 1657 (Hughes, Chapter 673 of the Statutes of 1994), provided a second option for demonstrating subject matter competence; completion of a Commission-approved subject matter program. The 1994 statute also allowed the Los Angeles Unified School District to conduct a pilot study of a District Intern Program for Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities. The statute required that a study of the effectiveness of the special education pilot program be conducted and the results of the pilot study be reported to the Legislature in 1999. That study was presented to the Legislature in March 1999. The 1994 statute also required the Commission to develop standards for Mild/Moderate Special Education District Intern Programs. The standards were drafted in consultation with the Los Angeles Unified School District and the Commission's Special Education Advisory Panel. Those standards were adopted by the Commission in December 1996, and were the basis for the implementation of the pilot credential program.

In 1998, SB 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) was enacted into law. Included in the credential reforms provided by this legislation was the requirement that all teacher preparation programs be subject to the same approval and accreditation processes, standards and procedures.

SB 2029, (Chapter 1087, Statutes of 2002, Alarcon) further amended the District Intern statutes. It allowed District Intern Education Specialist Programs Mild/Moderate disabilities to be offered in any California district. The bill eliminated the requirement to teach one year in a general education setting prior to a special education specialist placement. The bill also required the effectiveness study that is provided in this report.

Most recently SB 933 (Chapter 304, Statutes of 2006, Machado) amended the District Intern statutes to authorize a pilot program (until January 2010) to allow school districts to provide Education Specialist credential services in all areas of disability. The Commission is required to report on the pilot program on or before January 2009.

### **Previous Studies and Evaluations of the District Intern Program**

Education Code Section 44329 has required that the Commission conduct a series of studies of the effectiveness of the District Intern Program and report its effectiveness to the Legislature. In 1987, the Commission produced *The Effectiveness of the Teacher Trainee Program: An Alternative Route into Teaching in California*. That report was the most extensive report on alternative certification that had been produced in this country to date. The report included descriptive information on the alternatives available, presentations of the data that were collected through questionnaires, interviews with interns, support persons, evaluators, instructors and program administrators, and classroom observations of district interns (then called teacher trainees). A matched sample of second year traditionally trained teachers, and second year emergency permit holders were compared with Teacher Trainees at program sites throughout the state. The report examined the instructional plans, the support systems, and the evaluation processes of these programs. It analyzed the effectiveness of the beginning teachers using the data collected in the nearly 500 classroom observations that were conducted. The study also reported on those who had left the program before completing the required two years of instruction. Finally, the report arrived at a series of conclusions and made five recommendations to the Legislature. These recommendations included that the program be continued if each program is approved and evaluated in the same fashion as all teacher preparation programs are and found to meet the same quality accreditation standards. This recommendation came to fruition when SB 2042 was passed in 1998.

Education Code Section 44329 has been amended over the years to require additional studies of the effectiveness of District Intern Programs. The second study was completed in 1992 entitled *Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification in California: a Report to the Legislature*. This report presented the array of options that were available to become teachers, examined alternative certification in other states, described and illustrated the certification options and recommended several ways to improve alternative certification.

In 1996, the Commission produced the second statewide survey of District Intern Programs. The report entitled *The Effectiveness of District Intern Programs of Alternative Teacher Certification in California: a Longitudinal Study*, provided an analysis of the effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of district intern programs drawing on the 1987 study and examining data collected over the next seven years including extensive data collected from candidates and graduates of district intern programs during that period.

The third mandated, data-based effectiveness study was presented to the legislature in spring 1999. *A Study of the Effectiveness of the Education Specialist District Intern Pilot Program in Los Angeles Unified School District: A Report to the Legislature*, used questionnaires collected from 80 percent of the candidates and graduates from the Los Angeles program and interviews with 115 administrators, support providers, candidates and graduates as well as reviews of program documents to examine the effectiveness of the program. This study determined that in the judgment of the candidates, graduates, employers, and the accreditation review team the Los Angeles District Intern Education Specialist Program was generally effective in preparing credentialed teachers for students with mild to moderate disabilities. There were areas that needed improvement such as the need for consistent ongoing support for each intern and the need for focused, advanced coursework for Level II (professional clear) credential candidates.

(See pp 38-39 of 1999 Study) The program subsequently has made adjustments to address these concerns.

The study also recommended that there were certain conditions that should be met if this pilot was to be expanded into other districts and regions of the state. The issue that was the most perplexing was the capacity necessary to put together such a program, particularly in terms of human resources. The question that was asked was, "If Los Angeles has difficulty putting together the resources, instructional staff and support system, how can we expect smaller entities to do this?" In the Los Angeles program there were more than 30 instructional modules that needed to be taught each year. Each intern must have at least one and sometimes more than one mentor that provides ongoing, systematic support. Each program needs an administrative staff that has specific time dedicated to this program. As page 41 of that report states:

"Implementation of a district intern specialist program will require an enormous commitment of resources by the participating district(s). Unless the district(s) clearly have the capacity to provide a well developed teacher preparation curriculum, have sufficient number of Education Specialist support providers and have administrators designated to staff the program, they should not undertake the creation of a District Intern Education Specialist program.

Similarly, it should be clear that the proposed specialist program has sufficient instructional and support expertise to address all competency areas at both initial (Level I) and advanced (Level II) levels. They should demonstrate the capacity of the program by responding to the Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for District Intern Education Specialist Programs."

**Appendix B**  
**District Intern Education Specialist**  
**Program Director Interview Questions**

1. What was the purpose in developing your districts mild/moderate program?
2. Has the program helped to meet this purpose? Please explain both quantitatively and qualitatively how it has helped.
3. Instructor: Who serves as your instructors? What other responsibilities do they have within the program, or with the county office of education or other partnering districts?
4. What have been the greatest challenges in developing your program?
5. What has been the program's primary recruitment source? e. g. recommendations from districts, second career, etc.
6. Describe the components for the intern's support system? How is this system coordinated with the districts?
7. How many current candidates do you have?

**Appendix C**  
**Survey Questions**  
**District Intern Education Specialist**  
**Second Year Interns**  
**Support Providers**  
**Site Administrators**  
**Program Graduates**

**INTERN CANDIDATES**  
**Special Education Interns Survey**

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 School \_\_\_\_\_

2. To what extent do you believe your special education intern program helped you:

	Not available	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very helpful
a. Improve your teaching knowledge and skills	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. Improve your knowledge of content	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. Plan and deliver instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Teach special education students	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. Meet special education students' needs	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. Understand performance levels for students	<input type="checkbox"/>				
g. Use technology to support student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>				
h. Create an environment conducive to student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>				
i. Address equity and diversity	<input type="checkbox"/>				
j. Manage classroom behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>				
k. Analyze student work	<input type="checkbox"/>				
l. Work with families of students	<input type="checkbox"/>				
m. Improve student achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>				
n. Develop, implement, and track IEPs \ and ITPs	<input type="checkbox"/>				
o. Improve your knowledge of various disability categories, their characteristics, and strategies for teaching students with those disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1. Emotionally disturbed	<input type="checkbox"/>				
2. Learning disabled	<input type="checkbox"/>				
3. Mild/Moderate mental retardation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
4. Autism	<input type="checkbox"/>				
5. Visual impairments	<input type="checkbox"/>				
6. Auditory impairments	<input type="checkbox"/>				
7. Speech impairments	<input type="checkbox"/>				
8. Other health impairments (ADD/ADHD)	<input type="checkbox"/>				

3. On average, how often per week do you meet formally with your mentor teacher/support provider?
  - More that 3 times / week     2-3 times / week     once / week
  - once every 2 weeks     less than once every two weeks
  
4. On average, how often per week do you meet informally with your mentor teacher/support provider?
  - More that 3 times / week     2-3 times / week     once / week
  - once every 2 weeks     less than once every two weeks
  
5. On average, how many total hours per week do you spend working with your mentor teacher/support provider?
  - more than 4 hours / week     2-4 hours / week     1-2 hours / week
  - 30-59 minutes / week     less than 30 minutes / week
  
6. What types of activities do you engage in while meeting with your mentor teacher (check all that apply)?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum development and lesson planning needs <input type="checkbox"/> Student assessment and review of student work <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of teaching practices and techniques <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration of teaching techniques and strategies	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of disability categories and needs <input type="checkbox"/> Observation <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of observed lesson <input type="checkbox"/> Review of content-related materials <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
--	--
  
7. Have the subjects/topics covered in your program to date been a worthwhile use of your time in training?
  - Yes     Somewhat     No
  
8. Have the subjects/topics covered in your program to date been transferable to your classroom experiences?
  - Yes     Somewhat     No
  
9. Which subjects/topics have been most beneficial to you up to this point?
 

---



---



---



---
  
10. Which subjects/topics haven't been covered up to this point that would be beneficial to you?
 

---



---

**Comments** (Please add any comments about your mentor teacher/support provider, site supervisor, or the Education Specialist intern program)

**INTERN EMPLOYERS**  
**Special Education Intern Survey**

\_\_\_\_\_ (name) is a special education intern at your school.

What is your: District \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Please respond to the following questions about the above-named person's effectiveness as a beginning teacher and his/her Teacher Preparation program.

1. How does he/she compare with other beginning special education teachers who have taught in schools where you were an administrator?

Better                                       Not as good  
 As Good                                       Can't say

2. How does he/she compare with other beginning special education teachers in the following areas:

A. Classroom and behavior management?

Better                                       Not as good  
 As Good                                       Can't say

B. Planning and implementing instructions?

Better                                       Not as good  
 As Good                                       Can't say

C. Assessing student learning?

Better                                       Not as good  
 As Good                                       Can't say

D. Providing effective teaching strategies?

Better                                       Not as good  
 As Good                                       Can't say

3. How well has the intern program supported the development of this beginning special education teacher?

Very well  
 Adequately  
 Poorly  
 Can't say

4. If you have other teaching openings in **special education**, would you request another intern teacher?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

5. The intern program has a number of goals. Please rate how well the program (through interns who have taught in schools you administered) has achieved these goals:

A. Bringing under represented persons into teaching?

- Very well
- Adequately
- Poorly
- Do not know

B. Bringing second career, and other mature persons, into teaching?

- Very well
- Adequately
- Poorly
- Do not know

C. Preparing teachers using a “learning by doing” philosophy, encouraging a site-based teacher team?

- Very well
- Adequately
- Poorly
- Do not know

D. Helping administrators meet their need for teachers in shortage areas?

- Very well
- Adequately
- Poorly
- Do not know

**Comments** (Please add any comments about the Education Specialist intern assigned to your school and/or the Education Specialist intern program)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**INTERN GRADUATES**  
**Special Education Interns Survey**

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

2. To what extent do you believe your special education intern program helped you:

	Not available	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very helpful
a. Improve your teaching knowledge and skills	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. Improve your knowledge of content	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. Plan and deliver instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Teach special education students	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. Meet special education students' needs	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. Understand performance levels for students	<input type="checkbox"/>				
g. Use technology to support student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>				
h. Create an environment conducive to student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>				
i. Address equity and diversity	<input type="checkbox"/>				
j. Manage classroom behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>				
k. Analyze student work	<input type="checkbox"/>				
l. Work with families of students	<input type="checkbox"/>				
m. Improve student achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>				
n. Develop, implement, and track IEPs and ITPs	<input type="checkbox"/>				
o. Improve your knowledge of various disability categories, their characteristics, and strategies for teaching students with those disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1. Emotionally disturbed	<input type="checkbox"/>				
2. Learning disabled	<input type="checkbox"/>				
3. Mild/Moderate mental retardation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
4. Autism	<input type="checkbox"/>				
5. Visual impairments	<input type="checkbox"/>				
6. Auditory impairments	<input type="checkbox"/>				
7. Speech impairments	<input type="checkbox"/>				
8. Other health impairments (ADD/ADHD)	<input type="checkbox"/>				

3. Please reflect back on the support you received during your experience as an Education Specialist intern. Rate the level and amount of assistance you received from the following areas:

A. Your mentor/support provider at the school site.

Excellent     Adequate     Inadequate

B. Support persons from the Education Specialist intern program.

Excellent     Adequate     Inadequate

C. Your intern cohort (other interns prepared in the same group)

- Excellent    Adequate    Inadequate

4. What types of activities did you engage in while meeting with your mentor teacher/support provider (check all that apply)?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum development and lesson planning needs    | <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of disability categories and needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Student assessment and review of student work       | <input type="checkbox"/> Observation                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of teaching practices and techniques     | <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of observed lesson                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of subject matter                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of content-related materials           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration of teaching techniques and strategies | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____                                   |

5. Were the subjects/topics covered in your program a worthwhile use of your time during your training?

- Yes    Somewhat    No

6. Were the subjects/topics covered in your program transferable to your classroom experiences?

- Yes    Somewhat    No

7. Overall, how well do you believe your special education intern program prepared you to teach in a special education classroom setting?

- Not effective    Somewhat effective    Effective    Very effective

8. Which subjects/topics were most beneficial to you?

---

---

---

---

9. Which subjects/topics weren't covered that would have been beneficial to you?

---

---

---

---

**Comments** (Please add any comments about your mentor teacher/support provider or the Education Specialist intern program)

---

**INTERN MENTORS**  
**Special Education Support Provider Survey**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ (name) is a **special education** intern assigned to you.
2. What is your: District \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_
3. On average, how often per week do you meet formally with your intern teacher?  
 More that 3 times / week     2-3 times / week     once / week  
 once every 2 weeks     less than once every two weeks
4. On average, how often per week do you meet informally with your intern teacher?  
 More that 3 times / week     2-3 times / week     once / week  
 once every 2 weeks     less than once every two weeks
5. On average, how many total hours per week do you spend working with your intern teacher?  
 more than 4 hours / week     2-4 hours / week     1-2 hours / week  
 30-59 minutes / week     less than 30 minutes / week

6. To what extent do you believe the special education intern program has helped the above-named intern with:

	Not available	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very helpful
a. Improving teaching knowledge and skills	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. Improving knowledge of content	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. Planning and delivering instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. Teaching special education students	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. Meeting special education students' needs	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. Understanding performance levels for students	<input type="checkbox"/>				
g. Using technology to support student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>				
h. Creating an environment conducive to student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>				
i. Addressing equity and diversity	<input type="checkbox"/>				
j. Managing classroom behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>				
k. Analyzing student work	<input type="checkbox"/>				
l. Working with families of students	<input type="checkbox"/>				
m. Improving student achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>				
n. Developing, implementing, and tracking IEPs and ITPs	<input type="checkbox"/>				
o. Improving knowledge of various disability categories, their characteristics, and strategies for teaching students with those disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1. Emotionally disturbed	<input type="checkbox"/>				
2. Learning disabled	<input type="checkbox"/>				
3. Mild/Moderate mental retardation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
4. Autism	<input type="checkbox"/>				
5. Visual impairments	<input type="checkbox"/>				
6. Auditory impairments	<input type="checkbox"/>				
7. Speech impairments	<input type="checkbox"/>				
8. Other health impairments (ADD/ADHD)	<input type="checkbox"/>				

7. What types of activities do you engage in while meeting with your intern teacher (check all that apply)?
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum development and lesson planning needs    | <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of disability categories and needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Student assessment and review of student work       | <input type="checkbox"/> Observation                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of teaching practices and techniques     | <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of observed lesson                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of subject matter                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of content-related materials           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration of teaching techniques and strategies | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____                                   |
8. Overall, to what extent do you believe the special education intern program is effective at preparing intern teachers to teach in a special education classroom?
- Not effective    Somewhat effective    Effective    Very effective

**Comments** (Please add any comments on the intern you mentor or the Education Specialist intern program)

---

---

## **Appendix D**

### **Description of District Intern Education Specialist Programs**

#### **Los Angeles Unified School District**

Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program (LAUSD) began as a pilot program in 1994. This intern program is an accredited teacher preparation program leading to the California Professional Clear Education Specialist Credential with Mild/Moderate Disabilities. LAUSD candidates are required to complete 240 hours of pre-service before entering the classroom. Subsequent courses are conducted one evening a week and selected Saturdays. English learner certification coursework is included in the professional development plan. Level I of the Education Specialist Program follows a two-year sequence of courses. A 120 summer practicum providing general education field work is required at the end of the first year. Level II is completed in the third year.

LAUSD is a Special Education Local Planning Area which is divided into eleven sub districts. The intern program collaborates with local university intern programs through monthly regional network meetings and the District Intern Steering Committee. University consultants have been involved in program advisement and development since the program's inception. In recent years the majority of LAUSD interns are recruited from within the district including Pre-interns, Paraprofessionals and those teaching on Provisional/Emergency Permits. However, in the past two years the trend has been to have candidates enter into the intern program directly rather than being hired as an emergency permit holder because they do not meet intern admission requirements.

Support for LAUSD interns is provided by several methods. Each intern is part of a cohort group, and the group continues through the duration of the program as a unit. Mentors are experienced special educators provided by the local school site where the intern is teaching. Coaches, who are recently retired LAUSD highly performing special education teachers, provide program level support. Coaches are hired by the intern program and are available by phone or email along with site visits. Although the mentor may change during the internship, the intern coach remains consistent during the three year program.

Intern evaluation includes the use of a formative portfolio assessment. About every six weeks the cohort group meets with the portfolio construction and reflection facilitator. The facilitator provides feedback to the intern regarding portfolio tasks. The tasks are designed to apply knowledge learned in courses directly in the classroom. Level II requires completion of an individual induction plan to focus on an area of emphasis. The concentration of the induction plan leads to an action research project. A portfolio exit review is also required at the completion of Level II.

Some of the recent accomplishments of the LAUSD Program include establishing a collaborative partnership with the California Science Center that provides facilities for the pre-service program. Another collaborative effort with the LAUSD Mathematics, Science and Technology Center offers resources in Science. Interns and staff members received scholarships from Instructional Services to attend a Technology/Physical Education and Fitness symposium

providing strategies to integrate technology and heart health which was embedded into the 2006-07 curriculum. The District Intern Program has designed a new Moderate/Severe Program to be submitted for approval to the CCTC. The Education Specialist staff entered into collaboration with the Division of Special Education and the Division of Instructional Support to enhance curriculum options, choices of materials, and activities to prepare Education Specialists.

Among the challenges noted by the program are finding a six-week block of time to schedule the winter pre-service orientation. Ongoing challenges include recruiting, training and maintaining support providers when the majority of the District Interns are assigned to schools that do not have enough qualified veteran teachers to serve in that capacity, nor is there sufficient monetary compensation adequate for the work involved continues to be a challenge. This issue may be addressed as the district implements the enhanced internship portion of SB 1209.

**LAUSD Education Specialist Program for Teachers of Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities**

*All courses and portfolio tasks for the three-year program are designed according to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards and the Council for Exceptional Children Standards for the Mild/Moderate Credential.*

<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Course Name</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Year One – Level I</b>			
ESEd 400	Pre-service Orientation : Foundations for Special Education	240	8
ESEd 401	Education Foundations and Characteristics of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Implications for Classroom Management and Instruction	32	2
ESEd402a	Assessment and Instruction for Mild/Moderate Disabilities	16	1
ESEd 303a/b	Curriculum and Methods of Teaching Reading /Language Arts in General Education	32	2
Ed 220	Educational Foundations – Policies, Ethics and Professional Practices (On-line Class)	32	2
ESEd 306.11g	English Language Development	16	1
ESEd 318s	Curriculum and Methods of Teaching History/Social Science in General Education	16	1
ESEd 404	Methods of Teaching Physical Education, Health and Life Skills	16	1
ESEd 405	Methods of Positive Behavior Support	16	1

<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Course Name</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Points</b>
ESEd 301.1as	Practice in Teaching - Community Connection	32	1
ESEd301.1b	Practice in Teaching - My Life as a Teacher	32	1
ESEd 402.1a	Portfolio Construction and Reflection	96	3

### **Year Two – Level 1**

ESEd 408	Collaboration, Consultation and Co-Teaching in a General Education Setting	120	6
ESEd 402b	Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	32	2
ESEd 406	Collaboration and Communication skills for Special Education	16	1
ESEd 407s	Multicultural Aspects of Special Education	16	1
ESEd 403	Methods of Teaching Art, Music and Language Arts	32	2
ESEd 304a/b	Curriculum and Methods of Teaching Mathematics/Science in General Education	32	2
Ed420g	CLAD/BCLAD Methodology	32	2
Ed 421g	CLAD/BCLAD Cultural Diversity	16	1
ESEd 401.1c	Practice in Teaching - My Life as a Teacher	32	1
ESEd 401.1d	Practice in teaching - My Life as a Teacher	32	1
ESEd 402.1b	Portfolio Construction and Review	96	3

### **Year Three – Level II**

ESEd 515	Advance Seminar in Special Education	16	1
ESEd 511	Advanced Language and Literacy in Special Education	32	1
ESEd 514	Advanced Assessment, Curriculum, Instruction and Program Evaluation	32	2
ESEd 512	Technology in Special Education	16	1
ESEd 509	Collaborative Teaching and Communication	16	1
ESEd 513	Advanced Behavior Evaluation and Guidance	16	1
ESEd 516	Professional Development and Relationships	16	1
ESEd 510	Transition, Vocational and Career Development	16	1
ESEd 508	Methods of Teaching Social Studies, Mathematics, Science and Content Literacy	16	1
ESEd 501.1e	Practice in Teaching - My Life as a Teacher	32	1
ESEd 501.1f	Practice in Teaching – My Life as a Teacher or A Picture Is Worth a Thousand Words	32	1
ESEd 502.1c	Portfolio Construction and Reflection	96	3

## **Project Pipeline**

The program addresses all of the Preconditions and Standards for the Level I and Level II Special Education Credential in Mild/Moderate Disabilities. The total number of courses required for the program is equivalent to 55 units of university coursework. The design of the District Special Education Internship Credential Program requires that applicants meet the standards for both the Level I and Level II credentials, therefore standards at both levels are addressed in courses across the curriculum, from the six-week pre-service program to the culminating Level II induction/portfolio documentation course. A single course may address portions of standards for both Level I and Level II credentials, however beginning in the summer following Year Two and continuing through Year Three, the courses are more advanced, responding primarily to Level II standards.

The program continues to struggle with providing services to those hired by programs after the school year has begun. Providing pre-service instruction to interns hired in the fall, makes it difficult to create the kind of learning environment needed for their students.

### **Project Pipeline PRESERVICE PROGRAM OF PREPARATION**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>SESSIONS</b>	<b>CONTACT HOURS</b>
ESMM 501: Program Overview	2	6
ESMM 502: Diversity in Our Schools	9	27
ESMM 503: Reading Instruction	5	15
ESMM 504: Foundational Teaching Skills in General and Special Education	13	39
ESMIM 505 Effective Instructional Delivery	10	31
ESMM 506: Developing JEPs	3	15
ESMM 507: Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities	8	24
ESMM 508: Preparing for the First Day of School	1	3
ESMM 510: Portfolio Development	3	9
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>169</b>
<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>9 units equivalent course credit</b>	

## LEVEL I AND LEVEL II PREPARATION

(Courses addressing standards in only Level I or both Levels I and II combined)

ESMM 604:	Psychological and Social Foundations of Learning	1 Unit
ESMM 602:	Adaptations of Basic Skills Instruction	3 Units
ESMM 605:	Curriculum-Based Measurement	1.5 Units
ESMM 606:	The Woodcock-Johnson Achievement Tests	1 Unit
ESMM 607:	Behavior Strategies and Supports for Students with Disabilities	2 Units
ED 300:	Curriculum & Methods in Elementary School Mathematics	2 Units
ED 200:	Methodology of Teaching Reading and Writing	3 Units
ED 201:	Language Acquisition: Communication for English Language Learners	3 Units
ED 309:	Technology in the Classroom	2 Units
ED 305:	Health Across the Curriculum	1 Unit
ESMM 620:	Intern Support and Supervision (2 Units for 2 semesters)	4 Units
ESMM 702:	Strategies for Teaching Special Needs Students	2 Units
ESMM 706:	Students with Other Disabilities	1 Unit
ESMM 710:	Communication for Team Building	1 Unit
ESMM 720:	Intern Support and Supervision (2 Units for 2 semesters)	2 Units
ESMM 750:	Culminating Level I Practicum	4.5 Units
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>34 UNITS</b>

## LEVEL II COURSES

ESMM 714:	Transition Planning in Special Education	1 Unit
ESMM 802:	Advanced Special Education Instruction	2 Units
ESMM 805:	Assessing Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities	2 Units
ESMM 807:	Advanced Behavioral and Emotional Supports	1.5 Units
ESMM 810:	Collaboration and Consultation in Special Education	1.5 Units
ESMM 815:	Legal Issues in Special Education	2 Units
ESMM 850:	Professional Induction and Reflection (one unit each semester of program)	2 Units

**SUB-TOTAL** **12UNITS**

**TOTAL LEVEL I/LEVEL II** **46UNITS**

**PLUS PRESERVICE PROGRAM** **9 UNITS**

**TOTAL PROGRAM** **55 UNITS**

### **Orange County Office of Education**

Orange County has offered an approved Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern Program since 2004 and is currently serving 28 school districts and preparing 53 Education Specialist, Mild Moderate interns. OCOE conducts a 24 month integrated program that addresses the standards for Level I and II full-time teaching assignments. The program requires 9 semester units of pre-service coursework. The remaining intern coursework is offered 1 day per week in addition to at least 3-4 Saturday classes per semester. The curriculum of the internship program joins theory and practice by combining coursework, on-the-job consultation and supervision.

During the two year program, interns receive support from an advisor, practicum supervisor and peer coach. Each support provider has a different area and duties to teach and monitor the intern; they include: establishing regular meetings, setting up the classroom, becoming familiar with the school, text books, providing observations, and providing feedback to the intern. Utilizing the cohort model, Education Specialist intern teachers are admitted into the program after meeting the basic requirements to become the teacher of record for an appropriate position in a public school.

The cohort of intern teachers takes coursework together for two years to complete program requirements. OCOE intern teachers are instructed and supported by a community of professional educators, district and school administrators, classroom practitioners, and faculty of institutions. These professionals serve as course instructors, practicum supervisors, academic cohort advisors, and school-based peer coaches. The program serves clientele from traditionally underrepresented groups in the teaching profession as Latinos and males. Throughout the program, interns apply the theory and research based best practices presented in the coursework in their classroom. The interns' classroom teaching practice is supervised for a minimum of three semesters. As practitioners in the field of Special Education, instructors and practicum supervisors are available to discuss with interns the success and/or needed adjustments to more appropriately meet the needs of every individual student.

Integral to each Practicum Course is the Induction Plan. Special education teacher interns must establish an Induction Plan during the first semester under the guidance of their practicum supervisor and site administrator. The Induction Plan will link the theory and research based coursework to application in the classroom. During the second and third semesters of practicum field experiences, the special education intern teacher reviews his/her Induction Plan and reflects on growth as a teacher. After discussing strengths and areas of growth with their practicum supervisor, interns decide if adjustments need to be made in the Induction Plan. If so, the Induction Plan is adjusted and noted in the Practicum Notebook. Interns also decide which course assignments/applications would best document growth as a teacher. Artifacts documenting growth are collated in a professional portfolio. Special education teacher interns present their professional portfolio as part of the final review.

To address the need for all teachers to be prepared to work with English language learners, AB 1059 (Ducheny) became effective on July 1, 2002 and requires that all Commission accredited Multiple and Single Subject teacher preparation programs implement a new standard for the preparation of teachers to assist K-12 students to maintain academic progress across the

curriculum while continuing to develop English language skills. Orange County Consortium District Intern Program uses the standards driven by AB 1059 as a guide for embedding coursework and field experiences throughout the two-year program to prepare the special education interns to teach English language learners effectively.

Late hiring continues to be the most difficult challenge for the program. By putting interns in the classroom in September or October and therefore missing the opportunity for the intern to complete their preservice preparation, puts them at a considerable disadvantage.

### **Orange County Consortium District Intern Program Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Disabilities**

The Education Specialist District intern Program offers a course of study and schedule designed for employed teachers. Interns need to complete pre-service course which include a three part Orientation and Advisement meeting, Introduction to Teaching and Learning, and Classroom Management I. Courses required for all education specialist intern teachers to earn a Professional Clear Education Specialist Credential (Mild to Moderate Disabilities) include:

<i>Course Number</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Semester Units</i>
ITE 200	Introduction to Special Education for Special Education Teachers	3
ITE 205	Basic Assessment for Special Education Teachers	
ITE 206	Practicum / induction 1 For Special Education Teachers	2
ITE 209	Curriculum Strategies & Content Standards For Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities	3
ITE 210	Characteristics and Education: Mild to Moderate Disabilities	3
ITE 211	Assessment and Measurement	1
ITE 212	Practicum / Induction II for Special Education Teachers	2
ITE 213	Technology in the Special Education Classroom	2
ITE 214	Special Education in a Diverse Society	2
ITE 215	Collaboration, Communication and Consultation Skills for Special Education Teachers	2
ITE 216	English Language Development Methodology	3
ITE 217	Practicum / Induction III For Special Education Teachers	2
ITE 218	Managing Exceptional Behaviors	3
ITE 219	Critical Health Concerns	2
ITE 220	Transition Planning, including Vocational Education	2
ITE 222	Professional Portfolio Including Induction Plan	2

## **San Diego City Schools**

The San Diego City Schools (SDCS) offers a district-based “in house” Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern program that integrates the Level I and Level II teacher preparation program. In May 2004, the Level I component was granted accreditation with an anticipated approval date for Level II by summer 2006. The program takes approximately three years to complete and culminates with a Professional Clear Education Specialist Credential. San Diego’s program serves 40 district interns with the majority being recruited largely from within the district. Other recruitment strategies include monthly informational meetings on “district in-house” credential programs. These meetings are advertised online with ED JOIN at [www.edjoin.org](http://www.edjoin.org). Program information is also disseminated via targeted presentations to university classes, at local, state, and out-of-state teacher Job Fairs, and for identified audiences throughout the participating districts, e.g. classified employees and general education teachers in the district.

The District “in-house” Special Education Credential Program (DSEICP) was recently developed to further address the need for credentialed special education teachers and to uniquely prepare special education teachers for assignments in a large urban district. Pre-service consists of 180-210 hours of coursework that begins in the spring and summer prior to the first semester of teaching. This coursework is specifically designed to provide foundational learning for the credential program and prepare intern candidates for their first teaching assignment.

Support providers collaborate with site administrators by participating in observations, conferences and following up with interns to implement recommendation into the intern’s teaching practice. The Program Manager of the Special Education Intern Programs and the assigned support provider regularly collaborate with site administrators to promote success of each intern. Interns are evaluated annually during their participation and must receive a performance rating of “effective” from the site administrator to continue in the program.

One of the most important features of the SDCS Special Education Intern Program are employment of Support Providers that are experienced special education teachers released full-time to work with their assigned interns. This includes support prior to the start of the school year with on site assistance setting up the intern’s classroom.

**San Diego City Schools District Integrated Level I and Level II Education Specialist Program**

To complete the San Diego City Schools District Integrated Level I and Level II credential program for the Professional Clear Education Specialist credential in Mild/Moderate Disabilities, interns must successfully complete the following course sequence.

<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Course Name</b>	<b>Semester Units</b>
<b>Spring Pre-service Requirement</b>		
ED 99	Teachers as Readers and Writers	1
ED 101*	Educational Psychology & Child/Adolescent Development	3
SE 103	Characteristics & Needs of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities	2
<b>Summer Pre-Service Requirement</b>		
SE 100a* or SE 100b	Field Experience in General and Special Education	4
	Field Experience in Special Education	2
SE 101	Introduction to Literacy	2
SE102	Introductory Seminar in Special Education	2
<b>Year One</b>		
SE 104	Practicum and Seminar in Special Education I (Fall)	2
SE 106	Behavior Management and Positive Classroom Supports	2
SE 107	Practicum and Seminar in Special Education (Spring)	2
ED 103	Theory and Methods of Beginning Reading Instruction	2
SE 108	Assessment and Evaluation of Learning	2
ED 106*	Theory and Methods of Reading and Language Arts Instruction	2
SE 109	Law and Ethics in Special Education	2
<b>Year Two</b>		
SE 200	Practicum and Seminar in Mild/Moderate Disabilities III (Fall)	1
SE 105	Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities	3
SE 201	Communication, Collaboration, and Networking	2
SE 203	Practicum and Seminar in Mild/Moderate Disabilities IV(Spring)	1
SE 202	Typical and Atypical Language Development	2
SE 204	Theory and Methods of Content Area Instruction	2
<b>Year Three**</b>		
SE 300	Induction, Inquiry, and Practicum (Fall)	
SE 301	Advanced Behavior Management and Positive	2
SE 302	Transition and Transition Planning	2
SE 303	Induction, Inquiry and Practicum (Spring)	
SE 304	Advanced Assessment, Curriculum, and Instruction	2
SE 305	Advanced Collaboration, Consultation, and Co-teaching	2

\*This course is not required for interns who possess a California Multiple Subjects credential.

\*\*Year three courses pending approval from CCTC.

### **San Joaquin County Office of Education: Project Impact**

The IMPACT Program applies the concept of the district internship to a county-wide consortium model, with the county office providing coordinated development and geographically convenient delivery of a comprehensive teacher-training program to interns throughout the county. IMPACT was approved in 2003 and currently (2005-06) is serving 127 interns in 89 districts.

Interns are organized into cohorts and take all their coursework together, which is taught in blocks. Cohorts meet two evenings per week. Each course meets one night per week, for three to twelve weeks, depending on the course. Support is provided by a veteran teacher or Peer Coach. The Peer Coach and the intern spend one hour a week of coaching and support. All Peer Coaches are provided with training specific to the requirements of the program and the needs of the intern. In addition to Peer Coaches, Practicum Supervisors are assigned to each intern. The Practicum Supervisor is responsible for observation and assessment of each intern. This includes thirty observations and post-conferences. Practicum Supervisors also conduct semester Reflection Conferences for each intern for the purpose of deeper reflection of teaching practice and goal setting.

Visiting Educators make Project IMPACT unique. These classroom teachers are on loan from school district within the county. They have duties similar to a Practicum Supervisor, teach courses, assist with struggling interns and have more time availability since they are on site. Practicum Supervisor's observe every new intern at least twice a month and also meet once a semester to discuss the interns' progress.

IMPACT's unique program has been attractive to non-traditional candidates, including a higher proportion of unrepresented minorities. The Program's 93% retention rate after five years and IMPACT's reputation of creating highly qualified teachers is a major recruitment asset.

The program's accomplishments include developing new partnerships and expanding into new regions at the request of the districts. These include a partnership with Sacramento City USD, establishing a "southern cohort" by holding classes at one of Merced COE's facilities to alleviate special education students having to travel long distances to attend coursework. The program received additional funding from a federal grant, Transition to Teaching, to establish other cohorts in geographically convenient locations such as Merced. The program instituted Subject Specific Faculty Meetings, bringing together faculty from throughout the state (in person and via video conferencing) that worked together to insure TPE connections are made and courses are consistent throughout the program and to share best practices. Additionally Mentoring Matters training provided growth for support providers resulting in interns feeling supported and sharing a common language in their skill set.

**San Joaquin County Office of Education — Teacher Development  
Education Specialist District Intern Credential program  
MILD/ MODERATE COURSE SEQUENCE**

Semester One

Typical and Atypical Development	27 hours	9 meetings
Exceptional Learners I	18 hours	6 meetings
Special Education Law	18 hours	6 meetings
Positive Behavior Management	21 hours	7 meetings
Practicum	8-10 observations	

Semester Two

Cultural and Linguistic Diversity	18 hours	6 meetings
Collaboration Skills	30 hours	10 meetings
C & I Beginning Reading	27 hours	9 meetings
C & I Physical Education	9 hours	3 meetings
Practicum	8-10 observations	

Semester Three

English Language Learners	18 hours	6 meetings
Assessment of Learning & Teaching	30 hours	10 meetings
C& I Language Arts and Writing	18 hours	6 meetings
C & I Math	18 hours	6 meetings
Practicum	4-5 observations	

Semester Four

C & I Art	12 hours	3 meetings
Academic Language	18 hours	6 meetings
Health & Specialized Populations	18 hours	6 meetings
C & I Social Science	18 hours	6 meetings
Practicum	4-5 observations	

Semester Five

Historical and Philosophical Foundations	18 hours	6 meetings
C & I Science	18 hours	6 meetings
Seminar: Interpersonal & Social Skills for the Inclusive Classroom	10.5 hours	6 mini-meetings

Level II (110 clock hours of instruction)

Level II Seminar		
Advance Behavior Management & Collaboration Skills		
Advanced Curriculum & Instruction		
Advanced Assessment		
Practicum		

### **Stanislaus County Office of Education**

Stanislaus County Office of Education's Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Program leading to a Professional Clear Credential was approved in the fall of 2003. The program evolved from local school districts partnering with the county office. This program served 28 interns in the 2005-06 school year and has graduated 4 Education Specialist Mild/Moderate teachers to date. The primary recruitment resource is from those who are teaching in or referred from partnering school districts.

Stanislaus addresses pre-service as a prerequisite for advancing into the internship program. The intern candidate must demonstrate competency in the areas of child development, classroom management, pedagogy and methods and special education foundations. The three year program initially focuses on the most critical needs of the classroom teacher and their students. The coursework design reflects the interns pressing and immediate need for foundational information and sequenced courses to reinforce those concepts. Interns attend credential classes two evenings a week for the first two years and one evening a week during year three. Courses are five to ten weeks in duration. The coursework design reflects the intern's immediate need for foundational information and sequenced courses to reinforce those concepts. The sequence of courses is also by design, structured to spiral back to those issues for more sophisticated, deeper study.

Intern support is provided by Practicum Supervisors who observe interns in the classroom teaching and Peer Coaches who observe and coach interns, providing both support and guidance for developing Special Education instructors. Both Practicum Supervisors and Peer Coaches assist the interns in linking theory of coursework to practical application. The Site Administrator observes and evaluates the interns' progress based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and communicates the results of the observation with the Practicum Supervisor. In addition classroom teachers, teachers on full-time release, other program personnel, retired teachers or administrators with a background in Special Education support the interns provide support to interns.

Program evaluation is ongoing by program participants, graduates, and local practitioners with a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experience. An exit interview with graduates is used to gather information about the program.

The program expanded due to several reasons including: an increased marketing effort, a quarterly newsletter that highlights cohorts and topics of interest regarding the program, monthly informational meetings that provide potential interns and district personnel with qualifications for entering the program, information on program design and the assessment system used to evaluate intern competency.

The financial aid component was expanded this year due to partnering with TERI, a non-profit organization that guarantees and originates high quality competitively priced student loans. The APLE loan assumption program offered by the State has also recognized this program and now both collaborations are allowing the program to provide interns with financial support services typical of traditional institutions of higher education. Other accomplishments include

streamlining the procedures and forms used by practicum supervisors, 89% retention rate and graduation of the first cohort of interns.

The support provider’s component continues to be the largest challenge for this program and additional workshops are being schedule to provide effective coaching practice to alleviate this challenge. The faculty and staff have expressed concerns about retention of interns. This includes providing support for struggling interns and clarifying how to communicate and document concerns about their growth as special educators.

**Stanislaus County Office of Education’s Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Coursework**

**Tier I Coursework**

<b>Semester (Preservice)</b>	<b>Course Number and Title</b>	<b>Units</b>
1	411 Practicum	1.0
1	311 Positive Classroom Environment	1.0
1	312 Teaching Learning Strategies	1.0
1	311 IEP Process	1.0
1	314 Spectrum of Student Behavior	2.0
1	315 Collaboration	1.0
2	421 Practicum	1.0
2	321 Diverse Learners with Disabilities	1.0
2	322 Linguistically & Culturally Diverse Learners	1.0
2	323 Assessment I	1.0
2	324 Special Ed Law	1.0
2	325 Seminar I Collaboration/Sp. Ed Law/Behavior	1.0
3	331 C & I Teaching Reading	2.0
3	332 Assessment II	1.0
3	333 Developing as a Professional Special Educator	2.0
3	334 Historical Foundations	1.0
4	441 Practicum	1.0
4	341 English Learners and Special Ed	1.0
4	342 C & I Language Arts, Fine Arts, Visual Performing	2
4	343 C & I Teaching Content to All	2.0
5	451 Practicum	1.0
5	351 Instruction of EL’s and IEP Development	1.0
5	352 C & I Math & Science	2.0
5	353 C & I Physical Education	1.0
5	354 C & I Social Skills	1.0
5	355 Seminar II Curriculum & Instruction	1.0

**Tier II Coursework**

<b>Sem</b>	<b>Course Number and Title</b>	<b>Units</b>
6	461 Practicum	1.0
6	361 Seminar III ( instruction delivered throughout the year)	
6	362 Advanced Behavior	1.0
6	363 Transitions	1.0
7	471 Practicum	1.0
7	361 Seminar III ( instruction delivered throughout the year)	1.0
7	364 Advanced C & I	3.0