

**ALTERNATIVE ROUTES TO TEACHER
CERTIFICATION IN WASHINGTON STATE:
Final Report**

Appendices

Marna Miller

December 2004



***Washington State
Institute for
Public Policy***

Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification in Washington State: Final Report

APPENDICES

Marna Miller, Ph.D.

December 2004

Washington State Institute for Public Policy

110 Fifth Avenue Southeast, Suite 214

Post Office Box 40999

Olympia, Washington 98504-0999

Telephone: (360) 586-2677

FAX: (360) 586-2793

URL: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov>

Document No. 04-12-2901A

WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Mission

The Washington Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs the Institute, hires the director, and guides the development of all activities.

The Institute's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State. The Institute conducts research activities using its own policy analysts, academic specialists from universities, and consultants. New activities grow out of requests from the Washington legislature and executive branch agencies, often directed through legislation. Institute staff work closely with legislators, as well as legislative, executive, and state agency staff to define and conduct research on appropriate state public policy topics.

Current assignments include projects in welfare reform, criminal justice, education, youth violence, and social services.

Board of Directors

Senator Don Carlson
Senator Karen Fraser
Senator Linda Evans Parlette
Senator Betti Sheldon
Representative Don Cox
Representative Phyllis Kenney
Representative Cathy McMorris
Representative Helen Sommers

Dennis Braddock, Department of Social and Health Services
Marty Brown, Office of Financial Management
Douglas Baker, Washington State University
Stephen Jordan, Eastern Washington University
Sandra Archibald, University of Washington
Thomas L. "Les" Purce, The Evergreen State College
Ken Conte, House Office of Program Research
Stan Pynch, Senate Committee Services

Staff

Roxanne Lieb, Director
Steve Aos, Associate Director

CONTENTS

Appendix A: South Sound Transitions Consortium	A-1
Appendix B: South Sound Partnership	B-1
Appendix C: Skagit Valley Network	C-1
Appendix D: Southwest Washington Consortium.....	D-1
Appendix E: Puget Sound Partnership	E-1
Appendix F: Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership.....	F-1
Appendix G: State Approval Standards For Residency Teaching Certificate	G-1
Appendix H: History of Alternative Certification Efforts in Washington State	H-1
Appendix I: Washington’s Teacher Certification Programs	I-1
Appendix J: Survey of Interns, Spring 2003	J-1
Appendix K: Survey of Interns, Spring 2004.....	K-1
Appendix L: Survey of Mentor Teachers, Spring 2003.....	L-1

APPENDIX A: SOUTH SOUND TRANSITIONS CONSORTIUM

This section describes in detail the first cohort through the South Sound Transitions Consortium (SSTC), those enrolled in the 2002–03 school year. This is the cohort on which the evaluation focused. Outcomes of this cohort and subsequent changes to the program are noted at the end of this appendix.

Institution(s) of Higher Education/ESD	St. Martin's College
School Districts	Tacoma and Clover Park
Funding Source	Federal
Number of Interns 2002–03	Federal Interns: Route III: 28
Recruitment Focus	Math, biology, chemistry, general science, middle level (math/science option), English as a Second Language, bilingual education, special education, instrumental music, foreign language, or in subject matter shortages in specific geographic locations
Start Date	July 1, 2002
Tuition	\$7,560*

*Cost assumes intern does not need additional coursework to fulfill endorsement requirements.

First Cohort: 2002–03

Intern Selection: St. Martin's received 50 applications from which 30 interns were accepted based on an initial transcript review by St. Martin's and interviews conducted by school districts. Two candidates dropped out before the summer academy, leaving 28 in the program. Applicants for the Clover Park School District were required to pass the Urban Perceiver Test (UPT), designed to assess an applicant's sensitivity and attitude toward working with diverse populations.

Recruitment was targeted toward active duty and retired military personnel, current emergency substitutes, and mid-career professionals. Each applicant was expected to have coursework endorsing him or her to teach in a shortage area or be within one or two courses of meeting state endorsement requirements. St. Martin's required that all interns earn a minimum of two endorsements, one primary plus one additional primary or supporting endorsement.

Coursework/Learning Opportunities: Instruction for the alternative route interns was structured similarly to St. Martin's Fort Lewis teacher preparation program, offering the same number of credits and covering the same course content. At the Ft. Lewis Extension,

each term lasts eight weeks. Interns were required to enroll in nine semester credits for each of five consecutive terms for 45 total credits.

Upon entering the program, interns met with the dean of St. Martin's education division to review transcripts and ensure all required pre-professional courses and endorsement requirements had been met. Interns were given three options for meeting these requirements:

- Equivalent coursework (verified through transcript review);
- Course waiver based on prior life experience and evidence of competency;¹ and
- Partial course waiver based on prior life experience and demonstrated skill plus a research paper specifically illustrating that portion of the necessary knowledge or skills where documentation is missing.

During the summer, interns attended three full-day classes per week for six weeks covering middle school methods, content reading, and technology applications. Instruction during the first term of the school year was arranged in three afternoon (pull-out) learning modules. During September and October, interns attended four seminars each week for a total of nine hours per week. Two of the seminars were during the school day (total five hours) and two were after school (four hours per week). From October to December, seminar time was reduced to five hours, held during the school day. For the remainder of the internship, interns were at their school site full-time while attending one Saturday class per term (covering education law and issues of child abuse/neglect) and teacher seminars scheduled as needed in the afternoons. These seminars were intended to connect educational theory to field-based observations and assigned performance tasks.

Interns completed the same coursework required for students in the traditional post-baccalaureate program, although scheduling was altered to accommodate interns' teaching. Interns were able to provide evidence of competency to fully or partially waive program course requirements during the summer and internship year. Each course syllabus provided specific outcomes, expected products, and topics to be covered. It allowed interns the opportunity to challenge all or part of each course.

Courses were set up in learning modules with specific topics taught at certain times so interns with partial waivers could be exempt from attending modules they did not need. All the interns were able to demonstrate evidence for a full or partial waiver of at least one course, although waivers were mainly used for satisfying pre-professional course requirements.

After interning for half the school year, interns had two options for exiting the program early:

- **Pre-Approved:** Interns with three years of documented teaching experience could request a reduced student teaching experience. Approval resulted in a "planned early exit" from the program.

¹ Interns can demonstrate evidence in a variety of ways, including research papers, lesson plans, and PowerPoint presentations.

- **Early (Open) Exit:** Interns could exit the program if both the mentor and college supervisor agreed that the intern had met all standards, including at least six weeks of independent teaching.

Interns could exit the program when they met all standards on St. Martin’s assessment rubric and the statewide pedagogy assessment and had completed coursework or demonstrated competency for all learning modules. Additionally, each intern submitted a Classroom Learning Instructional Plan, Positive Impact Plan, Family Involvement Plan, Professional Growth Plan, and Personal Reflective Paper. Classes primarily met at locations arranged by each school district. Some instruction, such as the technology course, took place at St. Martin’s to take advantage of better technology facilities.

Mentored Internship: Interns spent the majority of the school year in the classroom full-time (with the exception of pull-out learning modules). Each intern was paired with one mentor for the course of the internship. Interns were expected to complete a full-year internship unless approved for early exit from the program.

Mentor Selection and Training: Mentors were encouraged to attend the OSPI Mentor Academy, as well as engage in mentor training programs designed at the district level. Additionally, St. Martin’s developed the Community of Professional Mentors program used to identify, recruit, and train potential mentors. This program was designed to bring mentors from various professions together to explore new styles, strategies, and methods of mentoring. Training opportunities were also available at the district level.

Costs: Alternative route interns paid \$7,560 in tuition and were eligible for federal financial aid. Tuition was set as a program cost and did not vary based on credit waivers, nor did it cover additional prerequisite or endorsement coursework an intern might need. This cost was nearly the same as St. Martin’s Military Extension post-baccalaureate teacher certification program; however, it was considerably less than the cost of post-baccalaureate certification at the main campus (\$23,650). In 2002-03, alternative route interns and military extension students were charged \$170 per credit (\$160 per credit for alternative interns during the summer) compared with \$550 per credit paid by regular students on the main campus. All but two interns opted to apply their federal stipend directly toward tuition.

Outcomes for First Cohort:

- Number enrolled..... 28
- Number completing 20
- Percent completing..... 71%
 - Exiting early 22%
 - Teaching in 2003–04 82%

Challenges for the First Cohort: The first cohort of interns faced the following challenges:

- Confusion about funding. St. Martin’s expected checks for *Transitions to Teaching* grants to come directly to the college to pay tuition. Instead, checks were sent to students.

- The requirements that candidates in the alternative routes program complete the same coursework as the post-baccalaureate program, in addition to the yearlong internship, may have contributed to the rather high drop-out rate (29 percent). Three of the eight candidates who left the program subsequently enrolled in the traditional—and slower—post-baccalaureate program.
- The existence of two funding streams for alternative certification created problems, particularly among mentors. The two school districts had alternative routes interns in both the state and federal programs. Thus, mentors of state-funded interns received \$5,000 while mentors of federally funded interns received \$500.

Did the program meet the legislative objectives? In most respects, the SSTC met the legislative objectives. The program provided intensive field-based training, including a mentored internship. Nearly half the interns judged the program to be flexible. Only 12 percent felt the program was not adaptable to their existing knowledge and skills, and 83 percent of interns reported they were able to waive coursework. Over half of program graduates were able to complete the program in less than a school year. All of the graduates (100 percent) received endorsements in shortage areas. All of the mentor teachers judged their interns to be at least as well prepared as graduates from traditional teacher-training programs, and 73 percent judged their interns to be better prepared than new teachers from traditional certification programs.

In its first year, however, this program had the highest rate of attrition (29 percent) of all programs. Retention of interns has improved; attrition was only 7 percent for the 2003–04 cohort.

The following criteria were used to determine if the alternative routes programs met the legislative objectives. Most are intern responses to the Spring 2003 survey. Information on early exits was provided by the program director. Employment information came from the Spring 2004 survey of former interns and the program director.

Preparation

Time spent in the mentored internship

Average: 26 weeks

Range: 8–36 weeks

Time until assuming classroom responsibility

Average: 9.5 weeks

Range: 2–36 weeks

How well did the program courses prepare you for your mentored internship?

Not Well 1	←—————→			Very Well 5
6%	17%	39%	17%	22%

How valuable was the coursework component?

Not Valuable 1	←—————→			Very Valuable 5
6%	16%	28%	44%	6%

How valuable was the mentorship?

Not Valuable 1	←—————→			Very Valuable 5
6%	0%	6%	11%	78%

Flexibility and Expediency

How flexible was the program?

Not at All 1	←—————→			Very 5
11%	22%	22%	39%	6%

How adaptive was the program to your pre-existing knowledge and skills?

Not at All 1	←—————→			Very 5
12%	0%	24%	53%	12%

Were you able to waive coursework?²

Yes: 83%

No: 11%

Did not attempt to waive coursework: 6%

Early Exits

Fifty-five percent of the interns completed the program before the end of the school year.

How burdensome were financial costs?

Not a Burden 1	2	3	4	Very Much a Burden 5
11%	6%	17%	33%	33%

If someone asked you if they should pursue alternative certification in this program, how would you respond?

	Percent Responding	
	2003 (In training, N=18)	2004 (Teaching, N=17)
Yes, without reservations	22%	25%
Yes, but with some reservations	61%	62%
No, follow a more conventional certification program	6%	0%
No, enroll in a different alternative certification program	11%	12%

Filling Shortages

Of the 28 candidates initially enrolled in the program, 20 (71 percent) completed the program. One hundred percent of those completing the program are endorsed to teach in shortage areas, and 88 percent of respondents were employed as teachers in 2004.

² According to the Dean of Education, all interns waived at least one course.

Evaluation of SSTC Participants

Mentor teachers during the pre-service year were asked how well prepared the interns were compared with graduates of traditional teacher training programs.

At internship completion, compared to new teachers from conventional teacher training programs, how well prepared to teach independently was the alternative route intern?

Much Less Prepared 1	←—————→			Much Better Prepared 5
2	3	4		
0%	0%	27%	36%	36%

Changes Since the First Cohort

- Interns 2003–04 all in Route III
 - Enrolled..... 14
 - Completing³ 13 (93%)
 - Teaching in 2004–05 13 (100% of completers)
- Interns 2004–05
 - Route III 16
 - Route II 1
- Tuition for the 2004–05 cohort is set at \$10,800, with an additional \$225 in fees.
- SSTC had a high rate of attrition in the first cohort. The program director attributes much of the attrition to stress. Several interns did not understand when they applied that the program would require a large time commitment that would make outside employment difficult. Since the first cohort, the program has made a concerted effort to make this clear to applicants. The second cohort had a much higher completion rate.
- In 2003, the program changed its name to Secondary Teacher Alternate Route (STAR).
- Field supervisors are involved earlier in the program than during 2002–03.
- The program modified the schedule for formalized instruction. In 2002–03, during September and October, interns attended seminars nine hours per week in the first

³ One intern has completed all but the portfolio and has one year to do so.

quarter, 5 hours of which were held during the school day (pull-out). From October to December, seminars were reduced to 5 hours per week, all pull-out.

In 2003–04, interns attended seminars for 8 hours per week, 5 hours in pull-out sessions, from September through December. In 2004–05, interns attend seminars for 8 hours per week, plus attending two Saturday sessions. For 2005–06, the program plans to eliminate pull-out sessions, retain after school sessions, and include 3 to 4 Saturday sessions.

- Simplified tuition payment. In 2002–03, interns were required to pay tuition on the St. Martin's campus. Since then, interns may pay their tuition at the Ft. Lewis satellite where they take their classes.

APPENDIX B: SOUTH SOUND PARTNERSHIP

This section describes in detail the first cohort through the South Sound Partnership, those enrolled in the 2002–03 school year. This is the cohort on which the evaluation focused. Outcomes of this cohort and subsequent changes to the program are noted at the end of this appendix.

Institution(s) of Higher Education/ESD	Pacific Lutheran University and Green River Community College		
School Districts	Auburn, Bethel, Bremerton, Clover Park, Dieringer, Franklin Pierce, North Kitsap, Puyallup, Renton, Stevenson-Carson, Sumner, and Tacoma		
Funding Source	State and Federal		
Number of Interns 2002–03	State Interns: Route I: 12 Route II: 8 Route III: 11	Federal Interns: Route III: 24	Self-Pay Interns: Route III: 4
	Total Number of Interns: 59		
Recruitment Focus	Route I: Elementary Special Education and English as a Second Language Routes II & III: Mixed—all grade levels across multiple endorsement areas with priority given to shortage areas		
Start Date	Route I: March 1, 2002 Routes II & III: July 5, 2002		
Tuition	Route I: \$34,500–35,000 Routes II & III: \$8,500*		

* Cost assumes intern does not need additional coursework to fulfill endorsement requirements.

First Cohort: 2002–03

Intern Selection: South Sound Partnership (SSP) received 126 applications from which 59 interns were accepted to the program based on an initial transcript review conducted by Pacific Lutheran University (PLU) and personal interviews with both PLU and the districts. Interns from all routes were expected to find sponsoring districts prior to applying; however, PLU offered to help Route III (state and federal) interns find placement upon acceptance. Initially, 17 Route III interns were accepted as self-pay, meaning they did not receive a stipend and were responsible for finding a placement school and mentor willing to participate in the program. When additional federal grants became available during the summer, 13 of the self-pay interns met the eligibility criteria, leaving four self-pay. From their program budget, PLU funded an additional \$500 annual stipend to support the mentors of self-pay interns.

Coursework/Learning Opportunities: PLU created a standards framework that outlined competencies and learner outcomes corresponding to each of the state's teaching standards. The framework provided examples of evidence interns could collect to demonstrate each standard was met. This evidence was reflected in the intern's portfolio or satisfied through equivalent coursework. Interns could also earn "credit by exam," but it was expected that this would only be used for Route II and III interns in order to fill endorsement requirements. In addition to the portfolio and required coursework, all interns were evaluated using the statewide pedagogy assessment.

As part of the application and screening process, interns were asked to construct an initial portfolio indicating any educational and professional experience that might satisfy state teaching standards. This initial portfolio was used to design each intern's Teacher Development Plan, a tool outlining how remaining standards would be met based on the standards framework.

Route I: Route I courses ran from spring quarter 2002 through summer quarter 2003, with interns generally attending classes Monday evening and some Saturdays. Route I interns followed a uniform Teacher Development Plan that was less performance-based than Routes II and III. While credit for five of their courses (15 to 20 credits total) could be gained through a portfolio, Route I interns were still required to take significant coursework to fulfill the university requirements for a bachelor's degree.

The structure of the program was similar to PLU's regular undergraduate teacher preparation program in terms of course content and program length. However, the alternative route was designed to be more field-based, requiring approximately half the credit hours be structured as "performance tasks" and completed in the field (the regular program is designed so only a quarter of the credit hours offered are field-based).⁴ The alternative route requires approximately the same number of credits, about 91 compared with 75 to 85 credits for the regular program (elementary plus special education endorsement).

Route I interns demonstrating competency in all performance standards and passing the pedagogy assessment could complete the program beginning in August 2003. Most completed by October 2003.

Whenever possible, Route I candidates continued to work as paraeducators, with course assignments based on the classroom where they were working. However, paraeducators were not employed during their student teaching.

Route II and III: For eight weeks in July and August, Route II and III interns attended class all day Friday and Saturday and spent four additional hours during the week in field-based educational settings, such as summer school (12 credits of coursework). In addition, these interns spent five hours a week working as teaching volunteers, tutoring, or working with small groups in a local summer school program.

⁴ For example, interns were asked to conduct a case study of two students at their site, examining records, lesson plans, classroom observations, and conducting interviews to explore theories of student learning.

Courses were organized around a series of tasks and assignments reinforcing topics such as learning theory, classroom management, and planning/assessment. During the school year, interns registered for six credits: four hours were “internship” hours, one hour was devoted to a required class “Issues Related to Child Abuse/Neglect,” and the last hour was for an “Integrating Seminar” allowing faculty to provide guidance and support and assist interns in developing their portfolios. During the internship year, Route II and III interns continued to collect evidence for their portfolio, based on their Teacher Development Plan, until all standards were met. Routes II and III completed a minimum of 18 semester credits.

Route II and III interns were eligible to exit the program beginning in December 2002. An intern could extend his or her internship through December 2003 if needed for no additional cost.

The majority of instruction and faculty support for all interns took place at PLU. Some Route II and III endorsement requirements could be taken at Green River Community College if needed.

Mentored Internship: Interns from all routes were in the classroom full-time. They might have continued to work as paraprofessionals or emergency substitutes for a significant proportion of their internship, but for at least 12 weeks they were required to engage in full-time student teaching. By working in the school district, some Route I and II interns were able to maintain their benefits for most of the year.

Most interns were paired with one mentor for the course of their internship; however, a few split their time between two mentors to accommodate multiple endorsements.

Mentor Selection and Training: Mentor recruitment and selection are left primarily to the school district. Some districts select mentors based on their compatibility with intern endorsements, while others tap into an existing pool of district-trained mentors.

Green River Community College (GRCC) offered state-paid mentors a two-day training seminar in the summer and provided four additional development meetings throughout the year. The summer seminar provided training on communication, developing an observation template, integrating interns into the classroom, and mentoring best practices. Portions of this training mirrored OSPI’s Mentor Academy, to which all mentors were invited. Training was tailored to prepare mentors for working with alternative route interns. Thirty-eight of the 48 mentors invited attended the GRCC mentor training.

In addition to the training opportunities offered by the program partnership and OSPI, several of the participating school districts created district-wide mentor training programs that intern mentors were either required or encouraged to attend.

Costs: Route I interns paid approximately \$34,500 to \$35,000 in tuition compared with the cost of two years of undergraduate study at PLU (\$40,000 to \$42,000). Route II and III interns paid a block price of \$8,500 as opposed to \$17,700 to \$26,600 (depending on endorsement) to complete PLU’s regular post-baccalaureate certification program. Alternative route interns were eligible for federal financial aid, and Route I and II interns received the \$4,000 Conditional Scholarship.

Outcomes for First Cohort:

- Number enrolled..... 59
- Number completing⁵ 54
- Percent completing..... 92%
 - Exiting early⁶ 28%
 - Teaching in 2003–04⁷ 87%

Challenges for the First Cohort: Two challenges the first cohort faced were funding and mentoring.

- The existence of two different funding streams was confusing. Students and the colleges did not know when the checks would arrive, making budgeting difficult. Mentors received either \$5,000 or \$500, depending on whether funding was state or federal.
- Mentors were central to the success of the internship. Although mentors received training, they did not always understand the degree to which the program relied on them to instruct interns in teaching methods.

Did the Program Meet the Legislative Objectives? The South Sound Partnership appears to have met the four legislative methods.

- 1. Preparation based on intensive field-based training, adequate coursework, and mentoring.** The program provided intensive field-based training, including a mentored internship. Sixty-two percent of interns reported their coursework prepared them well for their mentored internships, and 68 percent rated the coursework as valuable.
- 2. Flexibility and expediency for individuals to transition from their current careers to teaching.** Interns rated the program as flexible and adaptable to their pre-existing knowledge and skills. The program permitted highly qualified interns to exit the program before the end of the school year.
- 3. Filling teacher shortages.** Ninety-two percent of interns completed the program. Sixty-seven percent of those completing the program are endorsed to teach in shortage areas, and 87 percent of respondents were employed as teachers in 2004.
- 4. Meeting the same state certification standards as traditionally prepared interns.** Like all other programs, graduates of the South Sound Partnership met or exceeded state certification standards.

⁵ The 8 percent attrition in this program includes a candidate who died.

⁶ Routes II and III only. Route I interns would not have been eligible for early exit.

⁷ Among the 38 interns responding to the 2004 survey.

The following criteria were used to determine if the SSP alternative routes program met the legislative objectives. Most results are intern responses to the Spring 2003 survey. Information on early exits was provided by the program director. Employment information came from the Spring 2004 survey of former interns and the program director.

Preparation

Time spent in the mentored internship

All Routes

Average: 29 weeks

Routes II and III

Average: 26 weeks

Range: 6–36 weeks

Time until assuming classroom responsibility

(Time until assuming responsibility did not vary by route.)

Average: 6.1 weeks

Range: 0–20 weeks

How well did the program courses prepare you for your mentored internship?

Not Well 1	←—————→			Very Well 5
2	3	4		
17%	5%	17%	26%	36%

How valuable was the coursework component?

Not Valuable 1	←—————→			Very Valuable 5
2	3	4		
2%	15%	15%	28%	40%

How valuable was the mentorship?

Not Valuable 1	←—————→			Very Valuable 5
2	3	4		
7%	10%	10%	14%	60%

Flexibility and Expediency

How flexible was the program?

Not at All 1	2	3	4	Very 5
0%	5%	21%	33%	40%

How adaptive was the program to your pre-existing knowledge and skills?

Not at All 1	2	3	4	Very 5
0%	16%	19%	35%	30%

Were you able to waive coursework?

Yes: 49%

No: 28%

Did not attempt to waive coursework: 23%

Early Exits

Twenty-eight percent of the interns in Routes II and III completed the program before the end of the school year.

How burdensome were financial costs?

Not a Burden 1	2	3	4	Very Much a Burden 5
5%	14%	17%	28%	37%

If someone asked you if they should pursue alternative certification in this program, how would you respond?

	Percent Responding	
	2003 (In training, N=43)	2004 (Teaching, N=38)
Yes, without reservations	35%	50%
Yes, but with some reservations	48%	44%
No, follow a more conventional certification program	15%	6%
No, enroll in a different alternative certification program	3%	0%

Filling Shortages

Of the 59 candidates initially enrolled, 54 (92 percent) completed the program. Sixty-seven percent of those completing the program were endorsed to teach in shortage areas, and 87 percent of interns were employed as teachers in 2004.

Evaluation of SSP Participants

Mentor teachers during the pre-service year were asked how well prepared the interns were compared with graduates of traditional teacher training programs.

At internship completion, compared to new teachers from conventional teacher training programs, how well prepared to teach independently was the alternative route intern?

Much Less Prepared		←—————→			Much Better Prepared	
1	2	3	4	5		
3%	8%	17%	33%	39%		

Changes Since the First Cohort

- SSP has suspended its Route I program. PLU tuition is high, and it was thought that paraeducators would be less interested in the program after the reduction in the value of the state stipend from \$22,600 to \$8,000. PLU plans to offer the program to Route I interns in 2005 on a schedule that would permit candidates to maintain their employment income.

- The state partnership grants have been modified to mirror the federal grants. Now all interns receive \$8,000, and all mentors receive \$500. This has simplified administering the program, and all parties involved are aware of how the funding occurs.
- PLU now works more closely with the districts on mentor selection. It also has prepared a mentor handbook specific to the alternative routes, explaining clearly the expectations for mentors and interns. The field supervisors also work more closely with the mentors than during the program's first year.
- PLU has altered its coursework to include a greater emphasis on teaching methods.
- The program has involved National Board certified teachers to focus on content area methods.
- The application process now includes a group interview.
- Intern statistics:

Interns	2003–04	2004–05
Enrolled	55	68
Completing	50 (91%)	N/A
Teaching in 2004–05*	50 (100% of completers)	N/A

*Includes three people who are substitute teaching.

- Tuition for the 2004–05 cohort is set at \$9,900.

APPENDIX C: SKAGIT VALLEY NETWORK

The Skagit Valley Network offered the alternative routes program for only one year. This appendix describes the program as it was implemented in the 2002–03 school year.

Institution(s) of Higher Education/ESD	Western Washington University
School Districts	Burlington-Edison, LaConner, Mount Vernon, Sedro-Woolley
Funding Source	Federal
Number of Interns	Federal Interns: Route III: 16
Recruitment Focus	Secondary math and science
Start Date	July 15, 2002
Tuition	\$6,000–\$8,000*

*Range accommodates variability of internship length. Cost assumes intern does not need additional coursework to fulfill endorsement requirements.

First Cohort: 2002–03

Intern Selection: The Skagit Valley Network (SVN) received 54 applications from which 16 interns were accepted following a transcript review and personal interviews. Priority was given to interns already meeting state endorsement requirements for secondary math or science or within a few credits of completing required coursework. While the partnership received funding to support 30 interns, recruitment efforts did not generate enough qualified applicants to fill all slots.

Coursework/Learning Opportunities: The standards framework at Western Washington University (WWU) outlines corresponding competencies and desired learner outcomes for each of the state teaching standards. These competencies have been organized under three components of professional study: foundational knowledge, effective teaching, and professional development. The framework also provides examples of equivalent coursework or evidence interns can collect to demonstrate each standard has been met.

Initial competency was established through personal interviews with interns and through a file review of transcripts, admissions essays, and letters of recommendation. From this, faculty advisors and interns established a teacher development plan outlining steps for gaining and demonstrating proficiency in the remaining competencies.

The classroom-based component of this program took place for an intensive three-week period during the summer and continued one evening a week throughout the internship. Coursework during the summer focused primarily on three key elements of pedagogy:

instructional strategies, management techniques, and curriculum. During the school year, instruction was split into two learning blocks introducing a majority of the same foundation content offered through the regular program. These learning opportunities were provided through weekly instructional seminars online or via the K–20 telecommunications network.

The performance-based component of this program was completed at an individualized pace with guidance from WWU faculty and mentors. Based on each intern's teacher development plan, certain evidence was collected through portfolios and presented in several formats, including papers, reflections, case studies, PowerPoint presentations, family involvement plans, and professional growth plans.

Interns met monthly with university science and math faculty and mentors or district representatives. They also met a least once a month with their "Instructional Team," consisting of their mentors and university supervisors. Before beginning the final three weeks of full-time teaching, the exit portfolio demonstrating that all competencies were met was reviewed and signed off by the Instructional Team. Additionally, all interns were evaluated using the statewide pedagogy assessment prior to exiting the program.

The alternative route program was similar to WWU's regular post-baccalaureate program in terms of performance expectations and standards. Both programs are approximately the same length; however, alternative route interns had the option to exit early by demonstrating competency. The alternative program was structured in learning blocks rather than courses to facilitate more performance-based learning; alternative route interns left the program having earned 48 quarter credits rather than the 65 offered through the regular program.

Mentored Internship: Interns were in the classroom full-time four days a week until all competencies were met. Interns were expected to assume full teaching responsibility for at least three weeks prior to program completion. Each intern was placed with one mentor for the course of the year, but several schools had more than one intern.

Mentor Training and Selection: Each district recruited and recommended mentors to the WWU/SVN Board. Selected mentors attended a two-hour overview of the alternative route program during the summer, jointly provided by WWU and the SVN. Mentors also attended a first-year teacher mentor training during the summer, introducing basic concepts of effective mentoring. They continued to receive two hours of training every month for the duration of the internship. The OSPI Summer Mentor Academy was optional.

Mentor Compensation: Although the SVN received the federal stipend, with \$500 allocated for mentor teachers, the program decided that mentors would receive an additional \$3,000 (\$1,000 per quarter) to provide compensation closer to that of mentors in the state program, which was \$5,000 in 2002–03.

Costs: Alternative route interns paid \$5,000 in tuition compared with the \$4,932 charged for the regular post-baccalaureate program in 2002–03. In addition, interns were required to pay for the supplemental payments to mentors. Thus, an intern who completed after one quarter paid \$6,000: \$5,000 in tuition plus \$1,000 for the mentor. An intern who remained in the program would pay the \$5,000 tuition plus \$3,000 for the mentor for a total of \$8,000.

WWU structured tuition payments so that the interns' \$5,000 stipends were applied directly toward tuition costs. Because interns were enrolled as non-matriculated students at WWU, they were not eligible to receive federal financial aid.

Outcomes for the First Cohort:

- Number enrolled..... 16
- Number completing 13
- Percent completing..... 85%
 - Exiting early 55%
 - Teaching in 2003/2004¹⁰ 100%

Program Status: The alternative routes program at the SVN was suspended after the 2002–03 school year. The funding for the program was very complicated, due in part to the decision to fund mentors in this federal program at a rate commensurate with payments offered in the state program at the time. Because WWU's post-baccalaureate program was already serving a similar population, it was easier to manage one program than two. Alternative route interns were at a disadvantage, relative to the regular post-baccalaureate program, because as non-matriculated students they were not eligible for financial aid.

Did the Program Meet the Legislative Objectives? Overall, the SVN appears to have met the legislative objectives. The program provided intensive field-based training and produced certified teachers with endorsements in shortage areas. Interns gave the program moderate ratings on flexibility and adaptability. However, 55 percent of interns completed the program before the end of the year. One hundred percent of graduates are currently employed as teachers.

The following criteria were used to determine if the alternative routes programs met the legislative objectives. Most are intern responses to the Spring 2003 survey. Information on early exits was provided by the program director. Employment information came from the Spring 2004 survey of former interns and the program director.

Preparation

Time spent in the mentored internship

Average: 29 weeks
Range: 20–36 weeks

¹⁰ Among the eight interns responding to the 2004 survey.

Time until assuming classroom responsibility

Average: 4.1 weeks

Range: 2–16 weeks

How well did the program courses prepare you for your mentored internship?

Not Well 1	←—————→			Very Well 5
0%	27%	27%	27%	18%

How valuable was the coursework component?

Not Valuable 1	←—————→			Very Valuable 5
0%	36%	36%	18%	9%

How valuable was the mentorship?

Not Valuable 1	←—————→			Very Valuable 5
0%	0%	0%	8%	82%

Flexibility and Expediency

How flexible was the program?

Not at All 1	←—————→			Very 5
0%	18%	64%	18%	0%

How adaptive was the program to your pre-existing knowledge and skills?

Not at All 1	←—————→			Very 5
9%	18%	36%	36%	0%

Were you able to waive coursework?

Yes: 18%
 No: 55%
 Did not attempt to waive coursework: 27%

Early Exits

Fifty-five percent of the interns in the SVN exited the program before the end of the school year.

How burdensome were financial costs?

Not a Burden	←—————→			Very Much a Burden
1	2	3	4	5
9%	9%	27%	36%	18%

If someone asked you if they should pursue alternative certification in this program, how would you respond?

	Percent Responding	
	2003 (In training, N=11)	2004 (Teaching, N=8)
Yes, without reservations	45%	12%
Yes, but with some reservations	55%	75%
No, follow a more conventional certification program	0%	0%
No, enroll in a different alternative certification program	0%	12%


Filling Shortages

Of the 16 candidates initially enrolled in the program, 13 (85 percent) completed the program. All those completing the program are endorsed to teach in shortage areas. One hundred percent of respondents reported working as teachers in Spring 2004.

Evaluation of SVN participants

Mentor teachers during the pre-service year were asked how well prepared the interns were compared with graduates of traditional teacher training programs.

At internship completion, compared to new teachers from conventional teacher training programs, how well prepared to teach independently was the alternative route intern?

				
Much Less Prepared				Much Better Prepared
1	2	3	4	5
0%	8%	25%	33%	33%

APPENDIX D: SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON CONSORTIUM

This section describes in detail the first cohort through the Southwest Washington Consortium (SWC), those enrolled in the 2002–03 school year. This is the cohort on which the evaluation focused. Outcomes of this cohort and subsequent changes to the program are noted at the end of this appendix.

Institution(s) of Higher Education/ESD	City University and Educational Service District 112										
School Districts	Battle Ground, Camas, ESD Co-op, Evergreen, Kelso, Longview, Washougal, Vancouver										
Funding Source	State										
Number of Interns	<table> <tr> <td>State Interns:</td> <td>Self/District-Pay Interns:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route I: 10</td> <td>Route I: 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route II: 5</td> <td>Route II: 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route III: 4</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Total Number of Interns: 25</td> </tr> </table>	State Interns:	Self/District-Pay Interns:	Route I: 10	Route I: 3	Route II: 5	Route II: 3	Route III: 4		Total Number of Interns: 25	
State Interns:	Self/District-Pay Interns:										
Route I: 10	Route I: 3										
Route II: 5	Route II: 3										
Route III: 4											
Total Number of Interns: 25											
Recruitment Focus	Special Education—all grade levels										
Start Dates	Route I: February 23, 2002 Route II/III: June 24, 2002										
Tuition	\$7,200–\$9,000										

First Cohort: 2002–03

Intern Selection: In 2002, the SWC received 108 applications from which 25 interns were accepted based on a review of transcripts by City University and personal interviews by partnering districts. Priority was given to applicants who had completed all necessary prerequisite coursework and demonstrated considerable experience working with children. Thus, most interns had experience working in schools prior to applying. Six interns were accepted as self- or district-pay (i.e., the intern does not receive a state stipend and the mentor is compensated through the school district).

Coursework/Learning Opportunities: For each intern, an individual teacher development plan was created based on prior coursework, and—for all but Route I—whether the intern wished to receive a second BA. Route I interns completed approximately 90 credits to earn the BA with an endorsement in special education. Because few applicants had the requisite credits for endorsement in special education, the credits required for Routes II and III (and now Route IV) were often about 90 credits. In the first cohort, most interns in Routes II and III chose to obtain a second BA degree. Those choosing not to receive a second BA were required to complete about 76 credits, depending on the teacher development plan.

Competencies identified for both the residency certificate and special education endorsement are grouped into learning modules that are each assigned a course and a performance task. Based on this model, City University divided the internship year into three sequential learning experiences.

- 1) University Classroom Experience:** City University required all routes to complete a core group of 30 to 35 credits relating to foundation knowledge of both general and special education. Instruction was offered as follows:

Route I: During winter and spring quarters, Route I interns attended class Saturdays and Wednesday afternoons, completing 15 quarter credits. For six weeks during the summer, they attended classes full-time five days a week, completing the last 21 credits of their classroom experience.

Routes II and III: Beginning in late June, Route II and III interns attended an intensive five-credit class full-time for two weeks. They then joined the Route I interns for the next six weeks, completing the 21 foundation credits. For their remaining 12 to 15 classroom credits, Route II and III interns attended class three Saturdays a month during the fall and winter quarters.

- 2) Field Experience/Internships:** The field experience portion of the internship took place during fall and winter quarters. Interns were in the K–12 classroom full-time. The field experience was structured around 20 to 25 field-based performance tasks from which interns earned 30 to 45 quarter credits, depending on their teacher development plans. These tasks were designed to help interns demonstrate learning for certain special education endorsement requirements as well as pedagogy and foundation knowledge necessary for residency certification. On average, an intern spent 15 or more hours weekly working on performance tasks; however, this varied based on personal background and knowledge. City University provided a weekly seminar that interns were required to attend at least once a month and additional in-service training over the K–20 network to support performance tasks and intern development.
- 3) Student Teaching Experience:** During the last ten weeks of the program, interns participated in a focused student teaching experience when they assumed more responsibility. For approximately eight weeks of this experience, interns assumed full responsibility of the classroom; this varied depending on the ability of each intern. Interns also maintained a log, critical incident reflection reports, weekly schedules, and student teaching plan book. During this time, interns also completed their exit portfolios and continued to attend seminars.

Interns able to demonstrate compatible coursework or competency gained through work experience had the option of “challenging” program coursework; however, this alternative was not extensively used. After completing half an internship year in the classroom, interns who had satisfied all coursework and performance tasks could exit the program early. However, in this first cohort, no interns completed the program before the end of the school year.

Compared with City University's regular undergraduate teacher preparation program, the alternative route program is approximately six months shorter and more field-based. However, much of the course content and structure is the same as, or only slightly adapted from, the regular program.

Mentored Internship: Interns were in the classroom full-time for the entire school year. Each intern was placed with one mentor for the course of the internship year with the exception of one intern who worked with two mentors. Self-pay interns had the option of continuing to work as paraeducators in the school until they were ready to begin their formal ten-week student teaching experience.

Mentor Selection and Training: The consortium chose to develop its own mentor training based in part on OSPI's Mentor Academy. The content of the training was generally aligned with OSPI's academy, covering coaching, supervision, classroom management, assessment, professional conduct, ethics, and professional development. However, more emphasis was placed on supervision and evaluation to address the more involved role of alternative route mentors in intern development and assessment. Mentors attended two full days of training in the summer, another full day in October, and continued to participate in half-day trainings offered monthly throughout the year.

Costs: In 2002–03, interns paid between \$7,200 and \$9,000 in tuition depending on their number of credits. City University charged alternative route interns \$150 for each classroom credit (approximately 45 credits total) and a flat rate of \$500 for field-based credits to pay for the portfolio review. In the same year, regular undergraduate students were charged \$199 per credit for a total cost of about \$18,000. All Route I, II, and III interns who enrolled in the undergraduate program (first or second bachelor's degree) were eligible for federal financial aid. Route II and III interns enrolled as certificate only were required to take less coursework but were not eligible for federal financial aid. All Route I and II interns received the \$4,000 Conditional Scholarship offered by the state.

Outcomes for the First Cohort:

- Number enrolled..... 25
- Number completing 24
- Percent completing..... 96%
 - Exiting early 0%
 - Teaching in 2003–04¹³ 95%

¹³ Among the 20 interns responding to the 2004 survey. According to the program director, all interns in the cohort are now employed as teachers.

Challenges for the First Cohort:

The biggest challenge for the SWC was the short amount of time available to create the program and recruit the applicants and interns.

Did the program meet the legislative objectives? With the first cohort, the SWC appears to have met the four legislative objectives.

- 1. Preparation based on intensive field-based training, adequate coursework, and mentoring.** The program provided intensive field-based training, including a mentored internship. Seventy-five percent of interns reported their coursework prepared them well for their mentored internships, and 71 percent rated the coursework as valuable.
- 2. Flexibility and expediency for individuals to transition from their current careers to teaching.** Interns rated the program as flexible and adaptable to their pre-existing knowledge and skills. The program permitted highly qualified interns to exit the program before the end of the school year, although none did in the first cohort.
- 3. Filling teacher shortages.** Ninety-six percent of interns completed the program. All those completing the program are endorsed to teach in shortage areas, and 100 percent of respondents are currently employed as teachers.
- 4. Meeting the same state certification standards as traditionally prepared interns.** As in the other programs, graduates of the SWC met or exceeded state certification standards.

The following criteria were used to determine if the SWC alternative routes program met the legislative objectives. Most results are intern responses to the Spring 2003 survey. Information on early exits was provided by the program director. Employment information came from the Spring 2004 survey of former interns and the program director.

Preparation

Time spent in the mentored internship

Interns in all routes spent 36 weeks in internships.

Time until assuming classroom responsibility

(Time until assuming responsibility did not vary by route.)

Average: 9.8 weeks

Range: 0–32 weeks

How well did the program courses prepare you for your mentored internship?

Not Well	←————→			Very Well
1	2	3	4	5
0%	4%	21%	54%	21%

How valuable was the coursework component?

Not Valuable	←————→			Very Valuable
1	2	3	4	5
0%	8%	21%	33%	38%

How valuable was the mentorship?

Not Valuable	←————→			Very Valuable
1	2	3	4	5
10%	10%	5%	19%	57%

Flexibility and Expediency

How flexible was the program?

Not at All	←————→			Very
1	2	3	4	5
0%	9%	42%	33%	17%

How adaptive was the program to your pre-existing knowledge and skills?

Not at All	←————→			Very
1	2	3	4	5
0%	8%	21%	58%	12%

Were you able to waive coursework?

Yes: 42%
 No: 42%
 Did not attempt to waive coursework: 17%

Early Exits

None of the interns completed the program before the end of the school year.

How burdensome were financial costs?

Not a Burden	←—————→			Very Much a Burden
1	2	3	4	5
8%	4%	39%	13%	35%

If someone asked you if they should pursue alternative certification in this program, how would you respond?

	Percent Responding	
	2003 (In training, N=24)	2004 (Teaching, N=20)
Yes, without reservations	45%	30%
Yes, but with some reservations	45%	65%
No, follow a more conventional certification program	10%	5%
No, enroll in a different alternative certification program	0%	0%

Filling Shortages

Of the 25 candidates initially enrolled in the program, 24 (96 percent) completed the program. All those completing the program are endorsed to teach in shortage areas, and 100 percent of respondents are currently employed as teachers.

Evaluation of SWC Participants

Mentor teachers during the pre-service year were asked how well prepared the interns were compared with graduates of traditional teacher training programs.

At internship completion, compared to new teachers from conventional teacher training programs, how well prepared to teach independently was the alternative route intern?

Much Less Prepared	←—————→			Much Better Prepared
1	2	3	4	5
0%	0%	33%	53%	13%

The Institute also surveyed a sample of principals in schools where nine of the SWC graduates are currently teaching.

Compared with other new teachers, how well prepared was the alternative route graduate?

Better prepared 56%
 As well prepared 33%
 Less well prepared 11%

Compared with other new teachers, is the alternative route graduate:

An excellent teacher 67%
 A good teacher 9%
 A fair teacher 22%
 A poor teacher 0%

Based on your observations and experience of the alternative route graduate, how would you feel about hiring another graduate of an alternative routes program in the future?

More inclined to consider hiring 22%
 Equally inclined to consider hiring 67%
 Less inclined to consider hiring 11%

Changes Since the First Cohort

In most respects, the SWC continues to operate as it did during the 2002–03 school year. The change from the state support for the interns from a stipend set at 80 percent of a

starting teacher’s salary to an \$8,000 conditional scholarship affected the number of qualified applicants in the 2003–04 school year. The program director speculated that “...potential candidates were too aware that the previous year their counterparts had been paid for the internship.”

In 2004–05, the program was expanded to Centralia, where the same special education program is offered in partnership with ESD 113 and Centralia College.

Another partnership was added in the Vancouver School District, in collaboration with Western Washington University, Central Washington University, and St. Martin’s College, to train six fine arts specialists who had been teaching under conditional certificates. These candidates all have Masters degrees in dance or theater, so they require no coursework in their endorsement areas. The program for residency certification for this group will require 40 to 55 credits.

In 2004–05, the total alternative routes enrollment at City University has grown to 46 interns in three partnerships.

In 2003–04 and 2004–05, the consortium received a grant from OSPI enabling the SWC to offer \$500 to \$1,000 in extra scholarship funding for interns and to increase mentor compensation to \$2,000.

The program established an advisory council, which includes local and regional special education directors, and is increasing communication with them and giving them input as to direction of the program and any curriculum changes they feel are necessary. This increases the active referral of candidates to the program and active sponsorship of interns.

Intern statistics:

Interns	2003–04	2004–05¹⁴
Enrolled	16	40
Route I	7 ¹⁵	16
Route II	2	6
Route III	7	4
Route IV	NA	14
Completing	15 (94%)	NA
Teaching in 2004–05	14 (93% of completers)	NA

Tuition for the 2004–05 cohort ranges from \$8,000 to \$9,000 depending on the Teacher Development Plan.

¹⁴ Includes enrollment in Centralia and the fine arts program in Vancouver.

¹⁵ Includes one person who lacked an AA degree but met requirements for admission to BA program; the intern did not receive state support.

APPENDIX E: PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP

This section describes in detail the first cohort through the Puget Sound Partnership, those enrolled in the 2002–03 school year. This is the cohort on which the evaluation focused. Outcomes of this cohort and subsequent changes to the program are noted at the end of this appendix.

Institution(s) of Higher Education/ESD	Seattle Pacific University and the Puget Sound Educational Service District								
School Districts 2002–03	Highline, Kent, Lake Washington, Mercer Island, Renton, Seattle, Snoqualmie, Tukwila								
Funding Source	State								
Number of Interns 2002/2003	<table> <tr> <td>State Interns:</td> <td>Self-Pay Interns:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route II: 7</td> <td>Route III: 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route III: 9</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Total Number of Interns: 18</td> </tr> </table>	State Interns:	Self-Pay Interns:	Route II: 7	Route III: 2	Route III: 9		Total Number of Interns: 18	
State Interns:	Self-Pay Interns:								
Route II: 7	Route III: 2								
Route III: 9									
Total Number of Interns: 18									
Recruitment Focus	Secondary math and science								
Start Date	July 5, 2002								
Tuition	\$13,725								

First Cohort: 2002–03

Intern Selection: The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) received 160 applications from which 16 interns were selected based on a review of transcripts by SPU, Puget Sound ESD, and personal interviews by partnering districts. Priority was given to applicants who could be endorsed in secondary math and science; however, PSP admitted a small number of interns endorsed in special education and English as a Second Language. It was also expected that each intern have experience working with youth. Two additional interns were accepted as self-pay (interns not receiving a state stipend and responsible for finding their own mentors in a school district willing to provide mentor compensation).

Coursework/Learning Opportunities: All interns are required to complete 45 credits of coursework for certification but had the option of taking 15 more credits to earn a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) the summer following the internship year. Courses were adapted from SPU’s current MAT program. The alternative route courses are similar in content but structured to be more independent and performance-based than the regular program. All interns engage in the same course of study regardless of route.

Summer instruction ran for four weeks, Monday through Thursday, for six hours a day (nine credits total), covering foundations of education and introduction to teaching. During the internship year, interns took courses one evening per week for a total of 12 credits per

quarter. Half these credits were earned through classroom instruction, and the other half were earned through completing assignments tailored to their internship site.

In the fall, SPU faculty met with each intern to construct a teacher development plan identifying performance indicators meeting state residency certificate standards and benchmarks indicating when each standard has been met. Interns were allowed to waive coursework through transcript review of equivalent coursework or demonstration of competency. For interns demonstrating some, but not all, of the competencies required for a course, SPU was flexible in structuring a modified session covering only the content the intern needed (essentially waiving a portion of the course) or allowing the intern to engage in more independent coursework. Interns were also evaluated using the statewide pedagogy test. All formalized classroom instruction took place at SPU.

Mentored Internship: Interns were in the classroom full-time for the duration of the internship year, aligned with the requirements of the teacher contract. A formalized student teaching experience took place spring quarter. Each intern was placed with one mentor at the middle or high school level for a full school year. Program administrators did not allow early exit from the program as coursework was scheduled throughout the year.

Mentor Selection and Training: Puget Sound ESD worked closely with the school districts for mentor selection but selection was primarily conducted by district human resource departments. Mentors were asked to attend one of OSPI's mentor academies offered during the summer. A one-day training was provided in the fall that was tailored to alternative route mentors. Three additional evening classes were scheduled throughout the year to provide ongoing guidance and support. Puget Sound ESD developed a supplemental handbook as an additional training resource for mentors.

Costs: Interns paid \$13,725 (\$305 per credit) in tuition. An additional \$5,000 was charged if interns choose to complete their MAT the following summer. This cost is compared with approximately \$21,000 (\$325 per credit) charged for the regular MAT program. Tuition was set as a program cost and did not vary based on credit waivers. The tuition did not cover additional prerequisites or endorsement coursework an intern may have needed. All interns were eligible for federal financial aid, and all Route II interns received the \$4,000 Conditional Scholarship offered by the state.

Outcomes for the First Cohort:

- Number enrolled..... 18
- Number completing 17
- Percent completing..... 94%
 - Exiting early 0%
 - Teaching in 2003–04 91%

Did the Program Meet the Legislative Objectives? PSP provided intensive field-based training and produced certified teachers with endorsements in shortage areas. Ninety-one

percent of graduates reported they are currently employed as teachers. All the mentors reported their interns were better prepared than graduates of traditional teacher training programs. The program did not permit early exits.

The following criteria were used to evaluate how the alternative routes programs met the legislative objectives. Most are intern responses to the Spring 2003 survey. Information on early exits was provided by the program director. Employment information came from the Spring 2004 survey of former interns and the program director. Full reports on the surveys of interns and their mentors are provided in Appendices J, K, and L.

Preparation

Time spent in the mentored internship

All interns spent the entire school year (36 weeks) in the mentored internship.

Time until assuming classroom responsibility

Average: 5.6 weeks

Range: 0–16 weeks

How well did the program courses prepare you for your mentored internship?

Not Well	←—————→				Very Well
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	15%	46%	38%	0%	

How valuable was the coursework component?

Not Valuable	←—————→				Very Valuable
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	15%	54%	23%	8%	

How valuable was your mentorship?

Not Valuable	←—————→				Very Valuable
1	2	3	4	5	
15%	15%	8%	8%	54%	

If someone asked you if they should pursue alternative certification in this program, how would you respond?

	Percent Responding	
	2003 (In training, N=13)	2004 (Teaching, N=11)
Yes, without reservations	27%	27%
Yes, but with some reservations	73%	64%
No, follow a more conventional certification program	0%	0%
No, enroll in a different alternative certification program	0%	9%

Filling Shortages

Of the 18 candidates initially enrolled in the program, 17 (94 percent) completed the program. All those completing the program are endorsed to teach in shortage areas. Ninety-one percent of respondents were employed as teachers in 2004.

Evaluation of PSP participants

Mentor teachers during the pre-service year were asked how well prepared the interns were compared to graduates of traditional teacher training programs.

At internship completion, compared to new teachers from conventional teacher training programs, how well prepared to teach independently was the alternative route intern?

Much Less Prepared				Much Better Prepared
1	2	3	4	5
0%	0%	0%	25%	75%

Changes Since the First Cohort

In most respects, PSP continues to operate as it did during the 2002–03 school year. However, it has expanded the number of school districts and has placed interns in districts beyond the bounds of the Puget Sound ESD. Because of resource constraints, ESD is no longer an active partner in the program.

Enrollment information since the first cohort is listed below:

- Interns 2003–04
 - Route II 4
 - Route III 14
 - Completing..... 17 (100%)
 - Teaching in 2004/2005¹⁶ 15 (88%)

- Interns Enrolled 2004–05
 - Route II 6
 - Route III 16
 - Route IV 6

Tuition for the 2004–05 cohort is set at \$14,000.

¹⁶ The program director reported that two of the 2003–04 graduates are unemployed.

APPENDIX F: SEATTLE TEACHING/LEARNING PARTNERSHIP

The University of Washington's Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (TLP) operated for only one year. This appendix describes the program as it was implemented in the 2002–03 school year.

Institution(s) of Higher Education/ESD	University of Washington
School Districts	Seattle
Funding Source	Federal
Number of Interns	Federal Interns: Route III: 23
Recruitment Focus	Middle school math and science
Start Date	June 24, 2002
Tuition*	\$14,500

*Cost assumes intern does not need additional coursework to fulfill endorsement requirements.

2002–03

Intern Selection: The Teaching/Learning Partnership program (TLP) received 70 applications from which 23 interns were selected. Priority was given to interns already meeting state endorsement requirements for middle-level math or science or within a few credits of completing required coursework.

Coursework/Learning Opportunities: The internship year was structured as a combination of coursework and field experience. Instruction provided to alternative route interns differed from the regular program in that it was tailored for teaching in the Seattle School District. The theory provided by the University of Washington's (UW) College of Education and the content provided by the College of Arts and Sciences was aligned with the curriculum used in Seattle middle schools. Faculty from these colleges worked with master teachers to design and implement the instruction as follows:

- **Summer Quarter:** The summer academy was structured in nine week-long periods with interns attending classes full-time five days a week. Four of the weeks covered adolescent development and included theory and observations of how students learn science and mathematics. The remaining five weeks included both mathematics and science content applied to the pedagogical and classroom application of curriculum units (Connected Mathematics Project and nationally recognized inquiry science units on topics such as earthquakes and properties of matter). Specialized instruction occurred for interns with particular expertise in content or pedagogy.

- **Fall and Winter Quarters:** Interns attended classes all day Tuesday and half a day Thursday (13.5 hours of instruction per week) with every other Friday devoted to independent time, small group time, and/or whole cohort meetings (31 credits). Interns were at their school sites Mondays, Wednesdays, Thursday mornings, and every other Friday during these two quarters. During this time, interns were also collecting evidence of proficiency through coursework and field work, establishing a foundation for the intern portfolio constructed during the fourth quarter (spring).
- **Spring Quarter:** Interns were assessed prior to spring quarter to determine competency and areas for growth. This time was individualized to the needs of each intern in order to complete teacher certification requirements and included the construction of the portfolio to provide evidence of meeting all competencies emphasizing professional reflections, evidence of learning from the program, and professional development.
- **Summer Quarter:** Interns had the option of finishing requirements for a Masters in Teaching (MIT).

In addition to state requirements for certification, interns were also evaluated using the statewide pedagogy test. Instruction during the summer was offered at a Seattle-area middle school, and instruction during the year was located at a variety of sites, including UW's main campus.

Mentored Internship: The TLP program structured its mentored internship using a departmental mentoring model. In this model, three to five interns were placed at the same high need, urban school and received mentoring from five to ten department teachers. One of the mentors at each site was designated the "chief worrier," who acted as the primary supervisor and coordinated intern-mentor interaction. The expectation was that interns would benefit from observing a variety of teaching styles across several math and science subjects.

Mentor Selection and Training: Mentors had the option of attending the OSPI summer academy; however, none were able to attend due to scheduling conflicts. UW created its own mentor training adapted from the UW handbook for student/cooperating teachers for the regular teacher preparation program. Program administrators met monthly with the "chief worriers" at each site. They also relied on Seattle's professional coaches. These individuals work in schools to facilitate staff moving forward on reform plans, which at all sites includes increasing achievement in mathematics and, for some, science.

Costs: Alternative route interns paid \$14,500 in tuition for the certification portion of the program. This is compared with the \$5,817 cost of tuition for the post-baccalaureate certification program offered at UW's Bothell campus. This marked difference in tuition occurred for several reasons. First, the TLP interns were registered as graduate students so they could have the option of getting a Master in Teaching and be eligible for federal financial aid. In addition, the UW Seattle College of Education had no funds for managing or teaching this program. Thus, the entire cost of the program was financed from tuition paid by the interns. Tuition was set as a block program cost and did not cover additional prerequisite or endorsement coursework an intern might have needed.

Interns who completed requirements during the final summer for an MIT paid approximately \$2,500 in additional tuition.

Program Status: The Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership was suspended after the 2002–03 school year. The TLP was tailored specifically to prepare interns to teach science and math in the Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership, but budget problems in the district in 2003 made placement of graduates more difficult. This, and the higher tuition costs, contributed to the UW faculty's decision not to continue the option.

Did the Program Meet the Legislative Objectives? The TLP provided intensive field-based training and produced certified teachers with endorsements in shortage areas. One hundred percent of graduates are currently employed as teachers. Principals at the schools where they are teaching found the graduates at least as well prepared as traditionally trained new teachers and judged them to be good or excellent teachers. The program received low marks from interns on flexibility and adaptability to pre-existing knowledge and skills.

The following criteria were used to determine if the alternative routes programs met the legislative objectives. Most are intern responses to the Spring 2003 survey. Information on early exits was provided by the program director. Employment information came from the Spring 2004 survey of former interns and the program director.

Preparation

Time spent in the mentored internship

Average: 35 weeks
Range: 32–36 weeks

Time until assuming classroom responsibility

Average: 9.2 weeks
Range: 3–32 weeks

How well did the program courses prepare you for your mentored internship?

Not Well 1	←—————→			Very Well 5
1	2	3	4	5
0%	35%	47%	18%	0%

How valuable was the coursework component?

Not Valuable 1	←—————→			Very Valuable 5
1	2	3	4	5
6%	47%	35%	12%	6%

How valuable do you feel this mentorship was?

Not Valuable 1	←—————→			Very Valuable 5
1	2	3	4	5
0%	0%	6%	41%	53%

Flexibility and Expediency

How flexible was the program?

Not at All 1	←—————→			Very 5
1	2	3	4	5
24%	35%	18%	24%	0%

How adaptive was the program to your pre-existing knowledge and skills?

Not at All 1	←—————→			Very 5
1	2	3	4	5
35%	35%	24%	0%	6%

Were you able to waive coursework?

- Yes: 0%
- No: 88%
- Did not attempt to waive coursework: 12%

Early Exits

None of the interns in the TLP exited the program before the end of the school year.

How burdensome were financial costs?

Not a Burden 1	←—————→			Very Much a Burden 5
2	3	4		
0%	0%	0%	38%	62%

If someone asked you if they should pursue alternative certification in this program, how would you respond?

	Percent Responding	
	2003 (In training, N=17)	2004 (Teaching, N=14)
Yes, without reservations	0%	0%
Yes, but with some reservations	47%	71%
No, follow a more conventional certification program	27%	14%
No, enroll in a different alternative certification program	27%	14%

Filling Shortages

Of the 23 candidates initially enrolled in the program, 20 (87 percent) completed. All those who completed are endorsed to teach in shortage areas. Ninety-one percent of respondents were employed as teachers in 2004.

Evaluation of TLP participants

Mentor teachers during the pre-service year were asked how well prepared the interns were compared with graduates of traditional teacher training programs.

At internship completion, compared to new teachers from conventional teacher training programs, how well prepared to teach independently was the alternative route intern?

Much Less Prepared 1	←—————→			Much Better Prepared 5
2	3	4		
0%	0%	33%	53%	13%

The Institute surveyed a sample of principals in schools where 12 of the TLP graduates are currently teaching.

Compared with other new teachers, how well prepared was the alternative route graduate?

Better prepared42%
As well prepared58%

Compared with other new teachers, is the alternative route graduate:

An excellent teacher8%
A good teacher.....92%
A fair teacher.....0%
A poor teacher0%

Based on your observations and experience of the alternative route graduate, how would you feel about hiring another graduate of an alternative routes program in the future?

More inclined to consider hiring38%
Equally inclined to consider hiring....62%
Less inclined to consider hiring.....0%

APPENDIX G: STATE APPROVAL STANDARDS FOR RESIDENCY TEACHING CERTIFICATE

The State Board of Education expects state-approved teacher preparation programs to “require interns to demonstrate in multiple ways, over time, specific state board of education required standards, criteria, knowledge and skills, including, where appropriate, evidence related to positive impact on student learning.”¹⁷

The knowledge and skills standards for the residency certificate are as follows:¹⁸

Foundational Knowledge

1. State goals and essential academic learning requirements.
2. Subject matter content for the area(s) taught, including relevant methods course work and the knowledge and skills for each endorsement area.
3. Social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education, including an understanding of the moral, social, and political dimensions of classrooms, teaching, and schools.
4. Impact of technological and societal changes on schools.
5. Theories of human development and learning.
6. Inquiry and research.
7. School law and educational policy, including laws pertaining to school health and safety.
8. Professional ethics.
9. Responsibilities, structure, and activities of the profession.
10. Issues related to abuse (identification, impact, responsibilities, and methods of teaching about prevention). (abbreviated)
11. Standards, criteria, and other requirements for obtaining the professional certificate, including a professional growth plan.

Effective Teaching

12. Research and experience-based principles of effective practice for encouraging intellectual, social, and personal development of students.
13. Different student approaches to learning for creating instructional opportunities adapted to learners from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

¹⁷ WAC 180-78A-010(7).

¹⁸ WAC 180-78A-270.

14. Areas of exceptionality and learning—including, but not limited to, learning disabilities, visual and perceptual difficulties, and special physical or mental challenges.
15. Effective instructional strategies for students at all levels of academic abilities and talents with an awareness of the influence of culture and gender on student learning.
16. Instructional strategies for developing reading, writing, critical thinking, and problem solving skills.
17. The prevention and diagnosis of reading difficulties and research-based intervention strategies.
18. Classroom management and discipline, including:
 - a. Individual and group motivation for encouraging positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
 - b. Effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication for fostering active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interactions in the classroom.
19. Planning and management of instruction based on knowledge of the content area, the community, and curriculum goals.
20. Formal and informal assessment strategies for evaluating and ensuring the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.
21. Collaboration with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community for supporting students' learning and well-being.
22. Effective interactions with parents to support students' learning and well-being.

Professional Development

23. The opportunity for interns to reflect on their teaching and its effects on student growth and learning.
24. Educational technology including the use of computers and other technologies in instruction, assessment, and professional productivity.
25. Strategies for effective participation in group decision making.

APPENDIX H: HISTORY OF ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION EFFORTS IN WASHINGTON STATE

Prior to 2001, there were several programs or proposals to create alternative routes for teacher certification in Washington.

St. Martin's Pilot Certification Program. In 1991, the State Board of Education (SBE) created a pilot certification program at St. Martin's College in Lacey, offering a paid internship and pre-service training for prospective teachers holding a master's degree or a BA/BS with five years of work experience. The program was discontinued after only one cohort due to a lack of teacher shortage at the time and reluctance on the part of districts to hire teachers who were not regularly certified.

Troops to Teachers. Troops to Teachers (TTT) is a federal program enacted in 1994 as a way to cope with military downsizing. It provides financial assistance and incentives to hire former military personnel who become public school teachers. TTT interns can enroll in regular certification programs, but more than half choose an alternative route. Although a TTT office was established in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), no Washington colleges or universities were willing to develop an alternative program option for TTT interns.

Teach for America. Teach for America is a private, non-profit organization that trains and places college graduates in inner city schools with teacher shortages. Participants attend a five-week training institute in the summer and then spend two years teaching in an urban school. In 1994, the SBE authorized a Teach for America pilot program in Seattle, but the program was discontinued after one cohort due to differences in philosophy between Teach for America, the district, and the Seattle Education Association.

1998 Alternative Certification Bill. In 1998, the Legislature enacted a bill directing OSPI to issue alternative certificates to teach in secondary schools to individuals holding a bachelor's degree with at least five years of professional work qualifying the intern to teach in a specific subject area.¹⁹ The bill required districts to recommend individuals for this certification and develop a plan for providing training, supervision, and support. The alternative certificate was valid for two years, but after two years of successful teaching experience, interns could receive a regular residency certificate with no additional requirements. The bill was vetoed by the Governor.

¹⁹ E2SHB 1374, 1998 Session.

APPENDIX I: WASHINGTON'S TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS

Types of Teacher Certification Programs and Number of Certificates Offered by Washington State-Approved Teacher Preparation Programs 2004–05

Institution of Higher Education	Under-graduate	Post-Bac	MIT	Certificates Issued 2002–03
Antioch University	✓	✓	✓	99
Central Washington University	✓	✓		471
City University	✓		✓	214
Eastern Washington University	✓	✓	✓	389
Gonzaga University	✓	✓	✓	73
Heritage College	✓	✓	✓	95
Northwest College	✓	✓		41
Pacific Lutheran University	✓	✓	✓	193
Saint Martin's College	✓	✓	✓	64
Seattle Pacific University	✓	✓	✓	87
Seattle University			✓	96
The Evergreen State College			✓	30
University of Puget Sound			✓	114
University of Washington			✓	142
University of Washington – Bothell		✓		52
University of Washington – Tacoma		✓		50
Walla Walla College	✓	✓		33
Washington State University	✓	✓	✓	418
Western Washington University	✓	✓	✓	454
Whitman College	✓			11
Whitworth College	✓	✓	✓	130

OSPI, *Annual Report 2002-2003: Certificates Issued and Certificated Personnel Placement Statistics* (Olympia, WA: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, December 2003), <www.k12.wa.us/certification/pubdocs/annrpt.pdf>, Table D, and OSPI, *Teacher Certification Programs*, <<http://www.k12.wa.us/certification/ProfEd/TEACHproctype.aspx>>.

APPENDIX J: SURVEY OF INTERNS, SPRING 2003

At the time of this survey (April and May 2003), most interns in the first cohort were still in their pre-service training. The survey was administered to interns as a group for those enrolled in the Puget Sound Partnership (Seattle Pacific University), Southwest Washington Consortium (City University), and the Seattle Teaching/Learning Program (University of Washington). It was also administered as a group to Route I interns in the South Sound Partnership (Pacific Lutheran University). The survey was mailed to interns at the other two programs, to interns absent from the group session, and to those who had completed their program early. Where names were available, surveys were also mailed to those who had dropped out.

The Alternative Route Experience

Which alternative route program are/were you enrolled in?

	Number Enrolled	Number That Responded	Percent That Responded
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	17	13	76%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	20	17	85%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	13	11	85%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	55*	43	78%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	22**	18	82%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	24	24	100%

* Includes one who did not complete the program. ** Includes two who did not complete the program.

Which route are/were you enrolled in?

	Route I	Route II	Route III
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0	5	8
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0	0	17
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0	0	11
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	11	6	26
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	0	1	17
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	12	8	4

Before enrolling in the program, did you have a conditional or emergency teaching certificate in Washington? (Routes II and III only.)

	Percent
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	38%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	6%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	10%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	50%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	33%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	17%
<i>All Programs</i>	26%

Did you relocate in order to enroll in the alternative route program?

	Percent
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	8%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	6%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	5%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	6%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	4%
All Programs	5%

Are you currently employed as a teacher?

	N	Percent Teaching
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0	NA
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0	NA
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	6	50%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	9	56%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	6	17%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0	NA

Of those who had completed the program by spring.

Are you teaching in the same district where you did your internship?

Of nine interns who exited early and were employed as teachers, six (67 percent) were teaching in the districts where they did their mentored internships.

If you are/were in Routes I or II, are/were you able to maintain your employee status in the school district while you were enrolled in the program?

	Route I (N=22)	Route II (N=20)
Yes, continued to work	27%	25%
Yes, took leave of absence	45%	45%
No, but able to continue to participate in benefits program	9%	5%
No, had to resign	45%	25%

Did you have sufficient time in the field and internship classroom to prepare you to teach on your own?

	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	100%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	100%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	98%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	94%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	100%
All Programs	98%

What grade level did you choose to teach during your internship?

	Percent
Early childhood (pre-school)	1%
Elementary school	32%
Middle school	49%
High school	23%

Adds to more than 100% because some interns taught more than one grade level.

If middle school, why did you choose this grade level?

	Percent
Enjoy working with this age group	60%
Responding to need	19%
Other*	35%

* 64 percent of those signifying "Other" indicated they were assigned to teach this grade level.

What subject areas will you be endorsed to teach? (Interns may be endorsed in more than one subject.)

Endorsement	Percent	Endorsement	Percent
Agricultural Ed	0%	Library Media	0%
Bilingual Ed	1%	Marketing	0%
Biology	12%	Math	20%
Business Ed	1%	Middle Level - Humanities	9%
Chemistry	7%	Middle Level - Math/Science	20%
Dance	0%	Music	1%
Drama	1%	Physics	9%
Early Childhood Ed	3%	Reading/Literacy	1%
Early Childhood Spec Ed	6%	Science	15%
Earth Science	8%	Social Studies	8%
Elementary Ed	20%	Special Ed	31%
ESL	7%	Technology	1%
English Language Arts	6%	Traffic Safety	0%
Family & Consumer Sciences	0%	Visual Arts	1%
Health & Fitness	1%	World Languages	2%
History	6%		

Percentage of interns endorsed to teach in shortage subjects.

Information from the previous question was used to estimate the proportion of interns who were endorsed to teach in subjects that OSPI considers to be shortage areas. This is the percentage of interns endorsed in at least one shortage subject:

	Endorsed in at Least One Shortage Area
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	92%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	100%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	63%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	89%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	100%
All Programs	88%

How long do you plan to stay in teaching?

Average: 18 years

Range: 2 to 40 years

Mentored Internship

How many mentors did you have during your internship?

	Average
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	1.3
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	1.6
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	1.7
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	1.8
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	1.1
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	1.2
All Programs	1.5

Was your mentor teacher supportive of the alternative route program?

	Percent Yes
First mentor (N=127)	89%
Second mentor (N=49)	88%

Did your mentor teacher do any of the following?

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2
Introduce you to staff at the school	79%	29%
Allow you to observe and later discuss classes	80%	37%
Let you know his or her plan for increasing your teaching responsibilities	76%	32%

Note: Mentor 1 is the first mentor the intern had. Where there was a second mentor in the same school, such things as introductions would have been unnecessary.

How much time did you spend with your mentor each week? (Average number of hours.)

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2
Before school	2.7 hours	2.6 hour
During school	14.4 hours	9.3 hours
After school	4.4 hours	2.9 hours
Total hours per week	21.5 hours	14.8 hours

Which of the following activities were part of your mentored internship?

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2
Classroom observation	95%	94%
Team teaching	76%	61%
Co-planning	80%	71%
Guidance/advice	86%	88%
Face-to-face interaction	91%	88%
Phone messages	56%	43%
E-mails	55%	41%
Parent/Teacher conferences	84%	63%
Other*	23%	22%

* Other activities listed by interns included daily curriculum/lesson planning, writing Individual Education Plans (IEP), IEP tests and meetings, multidisciplinary team (MDT) meetings, grading and assessment, team meetings, tutoring, and working on school festivals.

How would you rate your interaction with your mentor?

	Poor	←—————→			Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5
Mentor 1	5%	5%	14%	19%	58%
Mentor 2	6%	12%	6%	22%	54%

How valuable do you feel this mentorship is/was?

	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> Not Valuable ←—————→ Very Valuable </div>				
	1	2	3	4	5
Mentor 1	7%	7%	7%	17%	63%
Mentor 2	6%	6%	14%	18%	56%

How long were you in the classroom with the mentor teacher before you assumed responsibility for the class?

	Weeks (Average)	Range
Route I	6.7	0–29
Route II	6.4	0–25
Route III	9.8	0–20
<i>All Routes</i>	8.7	0–29

Coursework

How well did program courses prepare you for your mentored internship?

	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> Not Well ←—————→ Very Well </div>				
	1	2	3	4	5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%	15%	46%	38%	0%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%	35%	47%	18%	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%	27%	27%	27%	18%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	17%	5%	17%	26%	36%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	6%	17%	39%	17%	22%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	4%	21%	54%	21%
<i>All Programs</i>	6%	14%	29%	30%	21%

After you began your mentored internship, approximately how much time did you spend on coursework (class and study time) for the program?

	Hours Per Week
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	6
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	13
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	12
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	15
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	19
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	22
<i>All Programs</i>	15

If you took courses during the mentored internship, when were they scheduled?

Time Courses Were Scheduled	Percent
Evenings	55%
Weekends	51%
Early mornings (before school)	20%
Late afternoons (after school)	26%
Weekdays during the school day	29%

If weekdays (N=35)

How many days per month? 5.5 days per month

How many hours each time? 5 hours each time

How burdensome was the coursework?

By Program	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> Not a Burden ←————→ Very Much a Burden </div>				
	1	2	3	4	5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%	8%	54%	23%	15%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	6%	6%	12%	47%	29%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%	9%	9%	27%	56%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	0%	24%	24%	24%	29%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	6%	12%	0%	53%	29%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	0%	8%	29%	62%
All Programs	2%	12%	18%	32%	36%

How valuable was the coursework component?

By Program	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> Not Valuable ←————→ Very Valuable </div>				
	1	2	3	4	5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%	15%	54%	23%	8%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	6%	47%	35%	12%	6%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%	36%	36%	18%	9%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	2%	15%	15%	28%	40%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	6%	16%	28%	44%	6%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	8%	21%	33%	38%
All Programs	2%	20%	26%	28%	24%

To meet your endorsement, did you have to take additional courses in endorsement subject matter? (Routes II and III only)

	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	15%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	18%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	36%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	81%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	61%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	75%
<i>All Programs</i>	53%

Did you receive sufficient information on a full range of teaching issues?

	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	77%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	62%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	70%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	82%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	82%
<i>All Programs</i>	76%

Cost

Did you receive any of the following types of financial aid?

	State Stipend	Federal Stipend	Conditional Scholarship	Other Financial Aid	No Financial Aid
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	77%	0%	38%	31%	8%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%	0%	6%	65%	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%	100%	0%	18%	0%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	49%	30%	28%	44%	2%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	0%	100%	6%	50%	0%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	50%	0%	33%	50%	12%
<i>All Programs</i>	34%	47%	21%	45%	4%

Note: Interns may not have understood the source of their stipends.

To what extent were costs a burden?

	←—————→				
	Not a Burden				Very Much a Burden
	1	2	3	4	5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%	15%	46%	23%	15%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%	0%	0%	38%	62%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	9%	9%	27%	36%	18%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	5%	14%	17%	28%	37%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	11%	6%	17%	33%	33%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	8%	4%	39%	13%	35%
All Programs	6%	9%	23%	27%	35%

How did you address program cost challenges?

	Percent Yes
Financial Aid	62%
Family Support	65%
Savings	52%
Other	26%

Twenty-five interns listed the following other means of addressing the challenges of program costs. Items are listed in order of frequency cited.

- Loans
- Credit cards
- Unemployment insurance
- Jobs during student teaching
- Moved to reduce living expenses
- Quit the program

Program Evaluation

How flexible is/was the program?

	←—————→				
	Not at All				Very
	1	2	3	4	5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%	0%	54%	31%	15%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	24%	35%	18%	24%	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%	18%	64%	18%	0%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	0%	5%	21%	33%	40%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	11%	22%	22%	39%	6%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	9%	42%	33%	17%
All Programs	5%	13%	32%	31%	19%

How adaptive is/was the program to your pre-existing knowledge and skills?

	Not at All 1	←————→			Very 5
		2	3	4	
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	9%	8%	33%	42%	8%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	35%	35%	24%	0%	6%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	9%	18%	36%	36%	0%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	0%	16%	19%	35%	30%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	12%	0%	24%	53%	12%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	8%	21%	58%	12%
All Programs	8%	15%	23%	38%	16%

How burdensome is/was the program in terms of time commitment?

	Not a Burden 1	←————→			Very Much a Burden 5
		2	3	4	
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%	8%	54%	23%	15%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	6%	6%	12%	47%	29%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	0%	24%	24%	24%	29%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	6%	12%	0%	53%	29%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	0%	9%	29%	62%
All Programs	7%	12%	28%	34%	19%

Were you able to waive coursework?

	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	8%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	18%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	49%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	83%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	42%
All Programs	39%

Did you have the opportunity to exit early? (Routes II and III only)

	Opportunity for Early Exit
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	82%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	59%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	67%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	25%
All Programs	43%

Did you exit early?

	Exited Early*
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	55%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	28%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	55%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%
All Programs	20%

* Final percentages provided by programs.

At exit from the program, did you feel you were well prepared to assume full-time classroom responsibilities? (Of those who had completed the program in Spring 2003)

By program	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	100%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	92%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	80%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	94%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	86%*
All Programs	39%

* Only six interns responded.

If someone asked you if they should pursue alternative certification in this program, how would you respond?

	Yes, without reservation	Yes, but with some reservations	No, enroll in a different alternative certification program	No enroll in a more conventional program
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	27%	73%	0%	0%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%	47%	27%	27%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	45%	55%	0%	0%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	35%	48%	3%	15%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	22%	61%	11%	6%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	45%	45%	0%	10%

Personal Information

Gender

	Percent
Male	27%
Female	73%

Age

Average Age	41 years
Age Range	23 to 63 years

Ethnicity

	Percent
White	89%
Black	4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2%
Hispanic	2%
Native American	0%
Other	3%

What are the strengths/weaknesses of the alternative route program as a way to train new teachers?

Responses From Puget Sound Partnership

- I think it was great to have interns experience the entire year in a classroom, rather than just a quarter.
- Strengths—in school all year; helpful.
- Make sure classroom management is taught before we are in classroom. Lesson and unit planning should be taught earlier. These subjects were taught after they had become issues in the classroom. I had difficulties getting sufficiently ahead in planning while keeping up with my own class work. Strengths: Classmates (university) to help through rough parts. The mentor is so much more important in this program that they MUST be good or the program falls apart.
- The internship is its greatest strength; to learn how to teach you have to do it. And it's so helpful to get that experience with someone else there to help out.
- The internship component is strong in its time commitment, but weak in its quality. We each had our individual experiences and had ample time to share these, but we did not experience, directly, the variety of teaching often found in traditional student teaching components.
- Arrangement of course work. Little slow letting me know my situations or answer certain concerns.
- The opportunity to spend a year in the class room was a huge strength. We are better prepared for actual teaching. The weakness was the lack of early exit.
- EXCELLENT way to transition professionals into teaching. I wouldn't be here if it weren't for this program.
- Amount of time in classroom is invaluable. I feel I have already done my first year of teaching; the coursework was pretty weak.
- Strengths: I feel the extended time in the classroom is invaluable. The flexibility of the program, the consolidated coursework, the university supervisor are all paramount. Weaknesses: Clearer guidelines for transitions in and out of the classroom. Clearer expectations of the mentor.
- Strengths—provides valuable coursework in educ; 1 year internship vs student teaching
Weakness—Mentor selection process.
- Full year internship! Would have liked a little more before internship.

Responses From Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership

- Strengths: lots of time in the schools. Weaknesses: too expensive, too much coursework that was not helpful, excessive pressure from different directions, too much focus on classwork during student teaching.
- The experience in the field was a strength of the program. We spent more time in the field (~7 months) than many program, and it was invaluable.
- Newness of the program—lots of snags made this a hard program. The real strength was the make up of the cohort.
- Finished in one calendar year. Focused on middle school adolescent development.
- The strength would be it addresses subject shortage needs.

- Weaknesses—No assessment of prior knowledge of teaching; assessment class offered after student teaching. Strengths—Responded quickly to my concerns and questions; help pull things together when needed.
- Cost (I had planned on additional support forthcoming as had been anticipated).
- Not flexible to individual strengths and weaknesses. Not enough teaching time EARLY in the program. WAY too expensive and time commitment doesn't allow for supplementing income.
- Too strict in program requirements.
- The program was billed as a flexible program which it wasn't in the sense that we were not given credit for preexisting knowledge/experience. It was a "one-size fits all" but different program modeled after the regular UW program.
- Good that it is a shorter time. Good to allow more intern time actively at schools. Poorly organized, structured, no planning evident. Quality teachers and support not present. Missed out on some valuable class work that UW usually offers.
- Too much money!! More than a regular program; disorganized.
- Weaknesses: did not value previous life experience; did not provide coursework that was relevant to the diverse urban classroom I interned in; was too costly in terms of time, \$, and amount of work required to change careers.

Responses From Skagit Valley Network

- This program suited my needs perfectly. I would not have sought certificate through standard means. For someone with strong background. Our teaching academy teacher Joan Beardsley did an outstanding job in preparing us for the classroom. My experience was wonderful because of her contribution. She modeled for us how to do everything—so we were ready for the classroom (I was able to teach my mentor some of the things that Joan taught us).
- The biggest weakness is the lack of financial support for the intern. This program is not intended for the new college grad, but for seasoned and experienced professionals who come with financial/income needs. The program does not allow time for interns to work in outside employment, so something must be done to accommodate their financial needs.
- Western Washington University missed the point... the point was to allow the mentor teachers to be our primary source of information and to expose us to the students early. Many times I was forced to choose between being on-site with my mentor and students or jumping through hoops for Western. Their role was overemphasized. It was also too convenient that tuition expenses were exactly equal to our living stipend plus the stipend we receive to set up our class. We never received a breakdown as to where that money went.
- Strength—Being in the school full-time. Weakness—The rubric we were held to always seemed to change; communication from WWU extremely poor; WWU must realize program enrollees are not 19 year old full-time on somebody else's dollar, student's without other commitments—family ...
- Strengths—putting mature adults into the classroom rather than requiring ALL of the coursework. Weakness—help candidates understand endorsements and their ramifications.
- The big strength is that it is perfect for people who have already grown up and know that they are meant to be teachers. A weakness is if a person isn't teacher material they aren't told to leave the program.
- Strength was breadth; weakness was overemphasis on reflection (we route 3 people already know how to "self-cognate").

- Strengths: shorter schedule; more in-class time for observation and experience; flexible coursework (independent study online). Weakness: Unrealistic fall schedule of school time and coursework. Unclear expectations, timeline, responsibilities. Unhelpful in resolving issues arising from its being unclear who was in authority over me.
- Weakness: District's attitudes that do not value individuals with work experience. Strength: Internship provides a "hands-on" experience that could not be learn[ed] in an University.
- Apprentice model works! Less time is good for people giving up their income!
- Allows ability to move at own pace through program. If there are not strong teaching skills in place, could be difficult to gain those. If problems with mentor, hard to change.

Responses From South Sound Partnership

- The biggest strength is the flexibility of the program and the ability to allow early exit if capable. The weakness would be the overall cost to students.
- Not consistent from one candidate to the next; too much theory and not enough practical hands-on everyday things as a teacher you MUST have: i.e., lesson plans, basic fundamental knowledge; university people were too far removed from everyday classroom experience.
- Strengths—flexible, instructors are excellent role models. Weaknesses—Program setup is not very accommodating for students living outside the cooperating school districts.
- The faculty.
- It is great for those who have a degree and an aptitude to teach. I think it is a very fine program.
- Strengths—Intensive but quick; learning in the classroom. Weakness—Info wasn't always clear; too unstructured at times.
- The strengths are that the program focus on the primary information need to learn. The weakness is not having time to cover learning strategies.
- Keeping me informed—very bad.
- Great opportunity for students working in a participating district. Financial burden for me has been devastating. Flexible hours was beneficial for me and enabled me to get a quality education and my teaching certificate.
- It is a great opportunity for AA holding paras to attain a teaching certificate.
- No weaknesses. A strength is the support of PLU staff and the school district (Tacoma).
- PLU and the school district support the alternative route program. No weaknesses.
- It's incredibly hectic and really instills the idea and the routine into you regarding a life of service. One of the biggest strengths is that you dipped into the "classified" pool which is already used to the "school way" and is trained and willing to work dam hard to get that change to go higher.
- The amount of course work required during student teaching was brutal.
- This course was too intense. I would not advise anyone to do this.
- Weakness—We are too tired to start teaching—every night, weekends—plus work—this track is too difficult of a time commitment. This is a great idea, but you really need to change some pieces. When you are looking at this again, put one of us on the team; our input would be of value. I money was giving monthly—tuition was due by semester. Poor management of money; money was not given to us right away; poor partnership with some mentors/district picked; Green River teach program was a joke—it was useless—waste of money. Strengths: it got me my certificate.

- In theory, it is a good way to train new teachers; however, internship and required heavy course load IS NOT a good combination! The mentor stipends were TOO high for the amount of work/effort they put out. Because of my level of competence, they had to do very little for me. Others mentors receive about \$500.00.
- The flexible hours of evening courses is a great strength. The instructors were a strength. The most significant weakness was the amount of coursework and classroom seat time in conjunction with student teaching. Also having to take leave of absence from my current job leaves me without a paycheck for July and August.
- Strength: Teaching was current to best practices and current research. Weakness: Mentors were not well-screened but chosen by districts.
- Strengths—flexibility, support. Weaknesses—clear expectations.
- Strengths—flexibility, real life training to teach; focus on teaching instead of writing papers. Weakness—mentor selection/placement. School districts with a shortage of a type of teacher would often NOT have the best mentor for that type of teacher. Students should mentor in a district without the shortage, then get the job in the district with the need.
- Weaknesses: There wasn't one place to call for any program questions; sometimes poor communication between Univ and District, and difficulty getting questions answered. Strengths: Financial support, including stipend and long-term sub; good scheduling of courses to accommodate jobs and family obligations; good mentors, supervisors, and professors; credit for my knowledge, skills, and experience.
- Less philosophical discussions/more classroom applications. Procedures for preparing to set up and teach a classroom.
- Strength—year long internship. Weaknesses—poor communication from PLU to school to Alt route students.
- (1) Few burdens on time; (2) Variety of informative teaching models/instruction; (3) Program stimulated philosophical thought regarding teaching.
- The teachers I had, both in class and as mentors, were very, very good. The documentation regarding the Alternative Route program could have been less wordy and more clearly stated.
- Strengths: flexible, relatively quick, opportunity for a grant to reduce expense. Weaknesses: poor communication between administration, schools, mentors, and students.
- Great program.
- Strengths. This program allows you to understand the teaching profession firsthand avoiding mistakes you would make without that knowledge.
- This program honors those who have a passion to teach by allowing for a way to reach their goal in a faster track. The University was outstanding and highly flexible.
- Strengths: Great hands on learning; mentors more than willing to help upcoming teachers. Weaknesses: New program; still working on details.
- Strengths—Gives new teachers entering the field a foundation for teaching. Good classes and internships. Weaknesses—Does not differentiate people who have had teaching experience in the past. Everyone takes the same classes. Also, many students must take extra courses to meet course and endorsement requirements such as "Math for Elementary Teachers." Ridiculous course and waste of time.
- Too much emphasis on theory/philosophy and specialized education (Spec Ed). Not enough on practical day to day teacher duties; i.e., lesson planning, discipline, parent teacher conference, prioritizing and balancing duty with personal life in order to avoid burnout.

- I found strengths in being paired up with an excellent mentor. This means the mentor/mentee relationship is extremely important for the success of the program.
- Strength: More focus on hands on teaching than I think is in a regular program. Weakness: I felt the courses at college poorly prepared me for the real world of teaching.
- It allows you a "hands on" or "on the job training" that you do not receive in other programs. Because I had the opportunity to work w/ 2 different mentors, in two different school setting, I benefited tremendously. Having more "method" class-like seminars would have been helpful.
- Alternative route program made it possible for me to bring years of my working expertise into the teaching arena. I personally do not see any weakness in PLU's program. It was extremely well organized and orchestrated! The Dean, Associate Dean, and teachers were competent, committed to us as students and the program, and helpful.
- Strength—internship in both GE & special ed; have opportunity to work with the community; time to observe before teaching; lesson plans needed before teaching. Weaknesses—too much course work while student teaching.
- Strengths: Allows those who might not otherwise be able to earn a teaching cert. Weakness: Poor planning, advising, etc. on the part of PLU. They obviously bit off more than they could chew—possibly because they were not given any funds to implement the program.
- The mentorship component of the program is nearly unprepared. I found the mentor I worked with after I realized the school year would begin with no arrangement being made by PLU for Route 3 candidates.
- I was a paid all year intern. It would have been nice to have an outline of what my year should have looked like. The program could have been more structured.

Responses From South Sound Transitions Consortium

- S—Reading and study of education issues and historical developments. W—Poor interaction with school admin staff. Admin staff was out of the loop provided little active or passive support.
- Strength: Designed and capable of certifying in less than one year. Good mentor provided. Weakness: Course load was poorly timed and workload was at times trivial or excessive in busy work.
- Strengths: fast track; good exposure to mentor (full school year); opportunity to interact with various school staff. Weaknesses: Tends to be financial burden; course content compressed—content gaps.
- Absolutely requires all your time and energy. You cannot work during this time. I still could not finish in a year.
- So new a program that the rules kept changing. Class times kept changing. Needed to be ultra-flexible to survive.
- What I found as a major strength was the amount of time that was save[d] in obtaining a Tcert and the grant money that paid a good deal of the cost. I also like stepping into the classroom and being with the students—right away—using the classroom as a[n] educational tool!
- Excellent program except that there were too many assignments in class which took time away from the internship preparation.
- Some of the coursework was before the interns were placed and did not transfer over or was wasted. Flexible staff; supportive staff.
- Mainly focus on classroom management. Assigning mentor/mentee that have similar vision.

- The school (St. Martin's) was not equipped to handle a cohort program. They were non-responsive to student needs; however, they had no problem changing the program to fit their needs.
- Strengths—intern in classroom as opposed to traditional student teaching; flexible program. Weaknesses—order classes were taken; time devoted for classes not always sufficient.
- Good way for people with degrees and professional work experience to get just the amount of training they need and no more. St. Martin's, though, needs help administering the program. The concept, however, is wonderful. I'm very glad I did this.
- Less time; more classroom experience.
- Strength: Time, life experience. Weakness: Depends on individual's background—I worked as a paraeducator, was comfortable.
- As much as possible the alternative route should try and consider mothers with little children, and every attempt for fathers who must maintain their current job status until the course is finished and they are hired. There were times when timing was bad. Some of the course work could have been [more practical]. Exceptional Diverse and At Risk course could have been more factual infor for charts and papers.
- Information in the general education coursework was redundant. It could have been streamlined. I would like to have begun with an overview of education in Washington State, including information from OSPI re: future goals and integration in school districts.
- Weaknesses: There should be more time to observe other teachers (instead of mentor), to reflect, and to integrate insights. St. Martin's needs to do a better job of managing the transition program. They don't know how to adapt curriculum to make it more integrated and less burdensome and repetitive.
- It is an intensive one-year program, not meant for working people.

Responses From Southwest Washington Consortium

- It does an excellent job in preparing teacher candidates for teaching. The portfolio is somewhat burdensome but necessary for showing proof of learning to employers.
- Strengths—fast, financial aid help, on the job training, staff support. Weaknesses—tremendous amount of coursework combined with full-time internship was very demanding physically and on family.
- Strengths = very thorough in providing academic base in preparing for special ed. Weaknesses = intensity of program; communication not always made clearly.
- Without investing independent time to gather additional research, will they be really prepared?
- It helps to see where to begin and a end result of expectations.
- I believe this is an excellent opportunity for para-educators to become certified. I feel that if a student does not have a background in education, this program might be too challenging.
- Strengths: time—gets you teaching faster; well-rounded—useful coursework. Weaknesses: HARDEST YEAR OF MY LIFE! VERY STRESSFUL—BUT I'M ALMOST DONE! NO DOWN TIME. I LIVE, EAT & BREATHE THIS PROGRAM!
- Strengths: The cohort approach is supportive and a great method of building a professional network. The only drawback was in not having ALL program information before we were expected to commit.
- It was fantastic to be able to work in choice of profession and get paid while doing school. No medical and dental has been a problem as head of household.

- Strengths—hands on in classroom for a year; faculty came from the trenches recently. Weakness—too many task and too much paper work with having to teach full-time. Some tasks are not realistic for usefulness in the classroom.
- The strengths are that the year long internship gives you valuable experience and the intense courses are also invaluable. The weakness is that you have to give up your prior employment and have not benefits.
- The year long mentorship is critical. It allows for most contingencies that a teacher might face in the classroom and building. 70/30 classroom versus university time could facilitate better project completion.
- Too much paperwork!
- Taking people with previous experience in the classroom into this program is great in that they know what they are getting into. Being paid during the internship was extremely important. I do feel however that it would be better if all classwork was completed before the internship began.
- Strengths and weaknesses are often the same; i.e., a lot of info in a short time. Classes should have been completed before the internship. Each task should have been a workshop to clarify expectations.
- Strengths—a working knowledge of sp. Ed. Environment. Weaknesses—not enough faculty/mentor help readily accessible; often they need to find answers before answering question. Each task should have had a seminar/workshop to introduce us to expectations to clarify expectations.
- Strengths: close relationships with teachers and interns. 1 year in classroom. Weaknesses: time split between classroom and portfolio work. Bad placement for internship.
- It was a huge time and \$ commitment—I have been immersed in the learning environment and that's good! I have no "life" outside of this experience. Because we were a new program, there has been a lot of changes. We were told one thing then it would change to another thing many times!!
- Strengths are being able to complete a degree and endorsement in 1 year. Weaknesses include a lot of academic material that is hard to grasp in a short amount of time.
- Good program. Best hands-on experience around. Tasks seemed a little redundant at times. Kinks in new program getting worked out—more communication would be nice.
- The concept of time management is an issue that candidates must continually make adaptations for.
- Strengths are the year-long internship experience—to see students at the beginning of the year to the end! Lots of hands-on/real situational experiences helps to learn procedures and reasons for what we are learning in the classroom/textbooks. Weakness—having poor mentors or placements that are limited. There needs to be more observation times for elem., middle, high.
- I thought it was an excellent way to train new teachers. It gave people already involved in education an opportunity to continue his/her education.

Thinking of the program you are/were enrolled in, what areas need improvement, e.g., coursework, mentored internship, performance-based nature of the program?

Responses From Puget Sound Partnership

- This program worked out for me, but I'm not sure it was the correct choice. My mentor was not in my classroom very often and I don't really feel like I had an actual INTERNSHIP.
- More care taken in selecting mentors, informing mentors about nature of program.

- More classroom management material in pre-internship summer class.
- Coursework could have been reorganized, but it could also have been more academically challenging. The internship component was overly time-consuming, attempting to replace (or relieve almost entirely) the first-year woes. Our first year will be just as busy as it would with less internship. We need more basis to our practice of teaching.
- Coursework.
- Consideration for individual abilities and "readiness" need more weight. Some of us have been in classes for years—a year long mentorship was not always necessary. Assistance in placement!
- More time with my cohort—"support time."
- Coursework needs improvement. I had very little feedback from my university advisor.
- Coursework; mentored internship; mentor training.
- Clearer roles for mentor and mentee. Guidelines clearer for requirements of internship.
- Better information at the beginning re: specifics.
- Some classes seemed to skim over the subject rather than explore in more depth.

Responses From Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership

- Coursework; mentored internship; financial support.
- Coursework. The coursework was good but in an order than might have been better if done differently. For example, we got more classroom management towards the end rather than at the beginning.
- Better communication w/ school sites—buy in from mentors. Performance-base not really evident in this program.
- It was a first year program w/ some glitches. All the components are there—just need some adjustment. Coursework needs some tweaking.
- More assessment class. More ideas on how to deliver math lessons.
- Cost de-fray.
- Selection of mentor; establishing/training mentors earlier in the program.
- Somehow the information was very intensive comparing to the given time frame.
- Decrease financial burden. Allow flexibility in coursework offerings to account for individual needs!
- Professors do not provide sufficient information to apply to classroom/teaching needs. Assignments non-sensical.
- All students needed to have strong mentor teachers. Expectations between professors should be uniform.
- Need mentors that can truly guide students. Coursework not valid. Methods instructors not good caliber and courses were not useful. Too much flipping between school time and UW class time. Could not focus on either. Poorly planned—expectations not clear. Did not take advantage of prior knowledge.
- Organization; better choosing of "master" teachers.
- Coursework!! Needs more content in teaching methods, classroom management, assessment.
- Mentors should be selected more carefully.

Responses From Skagit Valley Network

- The administration of the program was weak and needed improvement. They were figuring stuff out as they went and so there were misunderstandings with requirements and deadlines.
- The program is good, but the university needs to ensure that participating instructors and administrators are SUPPORTIVE!
- Mentors—great ... performance-based—great ... university role—NOT great. Professionals were treated like 18 year-old kids coming out of high school. Tuition costs were \$8,000, but we were not able to receive financial aid.
- Too much coursework. Could have been done (taught) during performance part. Program was trying to be standard school and performance based—not smoothly blended. Administration and discipline professors overtly anti-alternate route (publicly saying we will fail).
- Coursework—ESL, writing curriculum.
- There should have been one day a week where we went to class, instead of having us leave our schools for 1/2 a day. The program needed more cohesion between the Skagit Valley network and WWU. And better structure in general.
- Coursework could be more densely packaged; i.e., same info in less time.
- Expectations, roles of responsibility; coursework "requirements" — some didn't attend compulsory, unnecessary sessions.
- Endorsements need to be improved!! Or endorsement need to be granted by the state or the universities need to provide remote classes (they all say they do but a closer look will show they don't).
- Coursework needs to be fine-tuned to provide ONLY essential info.
- COMMUNICATION! Getting the guidelines set ahead of time and being consistent with information given to interns about expectations, timelines, financial information and coursework.

Responses From South Sound Partnership

- I was very pleased with the program.
- Coursework—more fundamental knowledge; more consistency across the board.
- Program administrators seemed unprepared to handle students living and teaching outside the cooperating school districts. I felt short-changed. Mentored internship needed more direction/support from the program and university.
- Explain and show what a portfolio looks like.
- It is so flexible that it worked well for me and I had no problems.
- Coursework—They spent so much time building foundations that there wasn't enough time for methods coursework.
- I am satisfied with the coursework and mentored internship; no improvement needed. I can think of no areas to be improved.
- Classroom management.
- Start classes summer quarter would eliminate some of the coursework during internship.

- Less copious projects while student teaching. Better financial planning up front so there would be less worry about \$ while worrying about grades and classes.
- Equal disbursement of the funds for all the school districts.
- Everything is well planned.
- Financial aid/mentor pay should be divided between mentor and cooperating teacher; one person/entity should be in charge; build in "time" to stay home from work to do homework.
- My mentors receive stipend payments only as long as I am in their classrooms. I believe they have, and are, "stalling" when it comes to supporting my progress in order to keep getting paid.
- Mentored internship was a flop. Green River handled it poorly; their focus was on mentors. Interns weren't even notified for events.
- Areas of improvement—PLU should of discounted the tuition. PLU didn't give us clear picture of the classes. We never knew what class and when we were to attend.
- Mentor teachers need to be clear about their responsibilities. MAKE SURE that course work is not required during internship! Cut down internship time from 1 year to 4-6 months. Do not take away source of income from students. Use a university that has lower tuition. And finally, provide MORE FINANCIAL AID. Unsubsidized loans are not very attractive and put hardships on students!
- The greatest need for me is the needs for greater communication and knowledge of program with the mentor. My experience was not a positive one—although my cooperating teacher was instrumental with assisting—and guidance—and overall very helpful and informative. A possible idea would be to include an Alternative Route Participant to be involved in the beginning process and have an input as to what work and what needs are essential. Needs to be refined. Also the stipend that was given to the mentor should have been shared 50/50 with the cooperating teacher! And honestly, the amount given \$5,664 seems to me to be an enormous amount—especially for such a limited amount of time given to me.
- Mentor selection should be handled better. Some time for observation of various settings.
- Make sure all mentors go through training/clear deadlines for tasks that align with individual internships.
- Better mentors; more time in the schools; less time at the university.
- See Q51. Also, better communication between college, district, and mentor. Need one central in charge location. My mentor had no guidance re: program. Coursework is excessive and not valuable. Take suggestions from university supervisor and teacher for new course responsibilities.
- Administrative communication.
- Consistent requirements for all participants and districts. Improve communication from Day 1 to mentors/interns.
- Requirements of course to exit. Financial requirements. Need a teaching method class. Communication from PLU to the commitment of course.
- The daunting final tasks could have been more directly addressed in the intensive courses.
- None.
- More access to endorsement classes.
- More video observations of classroom management techniques that work.
- Perhaps a little clearer in direction for completion and evaluation by the University.
- Consistency in length of internship. My understanding of the program was 1 year long internship with a stipend. Yet, others with the same stipend were able to complete early and being subbing. Also, I

don't feel para experience (full-time for 1-2 years) was taken into account on any of the internship time.

- Awareness of required coursework. Regularly scheduled meetings w/ administrators. (Many requirements dropped on us in a "By the way" fashion.)
- The coursework—bring in more CURRENT teachers to talk and share thoughts, tips and ideas. See above comments.
- Stronger communication/organization amongst the university and school district.
- Get a corps of solid mentors and make sure they know how to be mentor. Minimize college classes. Use regular Saturday workshops to get training in state/federal requirements.
- Mentors need to be better educated about the program and the difference it brings to certification. It should be mandatory that mentees work under 2+ mentors a year, giving them more experience.
- I was extremely happy with PLU's program. The portfolios were a "bit" overwhelming.
- All of the above—mentors need to understand their role as "teacher trainers."
- Just coursework load while student teaching.
- Mentors needed more guidance and support. PLU needs to make classes needed for endorsements available earlier in the program year!! I needed better/clearer guidelines as to the portfolio.
- A mentored internship program needs to be created. Some thought needs to be given to living expenses while candidates need to teach during summer and several months following coursework (and financial aid).
- Program structure for all year interns. They need to know their boundaries and responsibilities clearly.

Responses From South Sound Transitions Consortium

- Participants should be scheduled to observe, as many as possible, other classes and teachers in schools within and outside of the partner school district.
- Coordinate course timing and content into a plan that is better sequenced; much less intrusive on time needed for class room.
- Coursework should be more practical, less theoretical. Schedule a greater percentage of coursework separately from mentored internship.
- School (program) counseling was horrible.
- Coursework—a more settled time for classes, i.e., courses should be, say, noon—3 p.m. three days/wk during 1st semester and be in a mentor room Mondays and Fridays and a.m. other days. So time for homework in p.m.
- The communication could have been better. Because we crammed a lot of information into a short period of time, the course teacher needed to coordinate expectations with each other; this didn't happen very often.
- Work load needs to be more concise. Teachers needed to learn to team and coordinate.
- Planning at the university level to reduce conflict of school programs and college/university requirements.
- The coursework needs to be re-focused. The entire St. Martin's program needs to be redesigned.

- A more thorough and better taught assessment course is needed for the program I participated in. Should not get taxed twice on our stipend!
- Better teachers, better mentor.
- More structured schedules.
- Communication—i.e., I did not know the \$3,000 would not be given until AFTER contract signed; choose mentors carefully.
- The Technology class could use a slower pace and talking everyone through each situation. I've mentioned Exceptional Diverse and At Risk.
- St. Martin's needs better and earlier communication with students. General ed coursework should be streamlined.
- Coursework—should be integrated so that methods, classroom management, assessment, lesson plans, and so forth are learned together.

Responses From Southwest Washington Consortium

- Considering we were the first group, it went fairly smoothly. I'm still not sure if this is a great program for people who already have B.A. Degrees as they take the same coursework as people who only have A.A.s.
- I think mentor interviews would be good to be sure their philosophy matches modern special ed philosophy. My mentor did not believe in inclusion or collaboration.
- Communicating expectations and criteria involved in performance tasks and program guidelines.
- The amount of busy work that does not directly attribute to demonstration of proficiency should be lessened.
- Set of definite college course work accepted before starting the program.
- More careful choice of mentor teachers.
- Organization—would have been nice to have all the performance tasks and schedules in the beginning of the summer, 2002. Feel like the mentors have some problems with organization skills with tasks.
- More representation by parapros in recognizing concerns not raised by other stakeholders. Mentor screening and expectations MUST be more stringent.
- Coursework—very hard based on time. Second mentor is very strong but the first was not and had a hard start.
- Performance-based tasks need to be smaller.
- It would be good if the course work could be spread out a little more and if the mentors were trained prior so they understood the expectations.
- For SPED, more intensive study of behaviors, psych conditions, and management techniques.
- More coursework would be beneficial.
- Classes need to be completed before internship. Tasks need to be covered with cohort time.
- Mentored internship—coaches need to be aware of time commitment they are being obligated to.
- Coursework and portfolio valuable—just too much all at once. Mentorship placements need to be more carefully assessed throughout the year.

- The coursework was instructive and very helpful. It was too intense for a one-year program. I have been overwhelmed so often. I don't think a program should be this intense! I love the mentorship internship and field supervision components.
- Those who started in February (18 mos program) got requirements out of the way early. It was challenging to have so many challenges at the same time. Would like 1/2 time internship while classes ongoing then with classes out of way, better concentration on teaching experience. I observed mentor all day while she did most of her job. She is excellent but did not give strong support to my performance tasks. Most of those I did independently, even though she had a great scholarship.
- Transcripts need to be evaluated sooner. Expectations and performance tasks need to be verbally described. Mentors need to be supervised so they complete their terms of the agreement.
- Coursework: Taught what we need to know! Classes in behavior mgt of skills students would be good. Not all mentors were as able as mine was. It would be good to have all info for the year upfront—no changes midstream.
- Tasks assigned need to be consistent from the onset of the program.
- Mentored internship—mentors need to be screened! They have to have the personality traits that will allow themselves to be open, supportive, and willing to take time from their busy sp. Ed. Schedule to actually mentor.
- More knowledge of conditions that may greatly effect individuals financial burdens; i.e., the health insurance/no retirement.

At exit from the program, if you did not feel you were well prepared to assume full-time classroom responsibilities, why not?

Responses From Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership

- Need more information on how kids learn (current research) and how to reach a diverse population of learners. Need REAL LIFE examples.

Responses From South Sound Partnership

- We covered a lot of material in courses but not in depth. I felt I needed more time to practice/consolidate the skills I was developing. While my mentor/supervisor feel I'm ready, I don't feel confidence (in science).
- I'm not good with the classroom management part—kids don't listen to me.
- Trained in middle school. Decided want elementary which requires planning for full day. Behavior management skills poor.
- I can teach in a classroom but have no idea where to begin to set one up.
- Perhaps classroom simulation/observation should be a requisite part of coursework.
- Only because my mentor teacher and supervisor were superb at preparing me.
- I was not offered a mentorship internship at any time. The one I found on my own was insufficient.

Responses From South Sound Transitions Consortium

- I am still not finished. I spent so much time during internship I left the exit portfolio slip to the side.
- Not because of the college program, but because of my mentor teacher and student teaching experience.

Responses From Southwest Washington Consortium

- Yes and no. I am sure I can but my experience is in a resource room with independent work folders, no curriculum to follow, and no cooperative learning. These things I have learned from books and short visits.

APPENDIX K: SURVEY OF INTERNS, SPRING 2004

At the time of this survey (March and April 2004), all interns had completed the program, and most were employed in schools. The survey was mailed to former interns (including three who did not complete the program) at addresses provided by interns in the 2003 survey; where interns did not provide addresses or addresses were out of date, the programs were often able to supply current ones. To increase the response rate, two follow-up letters were mailed to non-respondents and an e-mail was sent when possible. This appendix provides the survey responses.

Q1. In which alternative route program were you enrolled?

	Number Completing	Number That Responded	Percent That Responded
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	17	11	65%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	20	14	70%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	13	8	62%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	55*	37	67%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	20**	16	73%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	24	20	83%

* Includes one who did not complete the program. ** Includes two who did not complete the program.

Q2. In which route were you enrolled?

	Route I	Route II	Route III
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0	5	6
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0	0	14
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0	0	8
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	8	6	23
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	0	3	13
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	10	6	4

Q3. Before enrolling in the program, did you have a conditional or emergency teaching certificate in Washington? (Routes II and III only)

	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	46%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	12%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	57%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	29%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	20%
<i>All Programs</i>	33%

Q4. Did you complete the alternative routes to teacher certification program?

	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	100%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	100%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	97%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	88%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	100%
All Programs	97%

Q5. Did you complete the program before the end of the school year? *The intention of this question was to identify those who exited the programs early. However, the results differed so much from what we know about the programs, that the responses for this question are omitted.*

Q6. Do you now hold a Washington State teaching certificate? *(This table includes only respondents who completed the program. Apparently respondents did not always understand the type of teaching certificate they held. At the end of the program, one graduate held a life-time substitute certificate and all the others held residency certificates.)*

	Type of Certificate				
	Residency	Conditional/ Emergency	Lifetime Substitute	Professional	None
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	93%	7%	0%	0%	7%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	86%	3%	3%	3%	3%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	87%	0%	0%	13%	0%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All Programs	93%	2%	1%	1%	1%

N=105

Q7. If you do not have a Washington State teaching certificate, why not?

Two interns answered this question with the following reasons:

- Must complete portfolio.
- Need one more course to complete the program and am currently enrolled.

Q8. Did you apply for teaching positions after completing the alternative routes program? Statistics only for those completing the program (n=105).

	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	91%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	93%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	89%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	94%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	100%
All Programs	93%

Four individuals who replied "No" to this question also reported working as teachers.

Q9. If you did not apply for teaching positions, why not?

Eight interns answered this question with the following responses:

- I was already in a teaching position and am continuing in that position.
- I had a baby and took this [time] off. I am now looking for a teaching position for fall 2004.
- There have been no jobs available to which I qualify.
- Had to attend classes required for MS.
- Did not feel confident to teach elementary and did not want to teach middle/high school.
- I want to be a respected sub.
- I already had a teaching position at a private school.

Q10. If you did not apply for teaching positions, do you plan to apply in the future?

Only those who had completed but did not apply for jobs (n=7).

Yes 57%
No 43%

Q11. How many teaching positions did you apply for?

Average: 4.1 positions
Range: 1 to 20 positions

Q12. How many applications resulted in an interview?

Average: 2.1 positions
Range: 0 to 8 positions

Q13. Did you have difficulty finding a job as an alternative route teacher?

Percent Yes: 17%

From comments in the surveys, it is clear that some respondents answered this question thinking of local tight job markets rather than whether they felt they were disadvantaged with looking for work because they had come through an alternative route.

Q14. Are you currently employed as a teacher?

	Percent Teaching
Full-time position in public school	62%
Part-time position in public school	10%
Full-time position in private school	4%
Part-time position in private school	10%
Substitute teaching	15%
Not teaching	9%

By partnership:

	Percent Teaching	Number
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	91%	11
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	93%	14
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%	8
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	89%	37
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	93%	15
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	95%	20
All Programs	92%	105

Q15. Are you teaching in the same district where you did your internship?

Only those who are teaching (N=97).

Percent Yes: 55%

Q16. Did you relocate to take your current teaching position?

Only those not teaching in the same district where they interned (N=42).

Percent Yes: 17%

Q17. If you were a paraprofessional in the schools before enrolling in the alternative routes program, are you now employed in the same district where you worked as a paraprofessional? Only those who had been paraprofessionals (N=33).

Percent Yes: 73%

Q18. Now that you are teaching, do you feel that your training in an alternative routes program is as highly valued by your peers as conventional teacher training programs?

Percent Yes: 87%

Q19. What level are you currently teaching?

	Percent Teaching
Early childhood (preschool)	4%
Elementary	30%
Middle/Junior High	45%
Senior High	34%

Adds to greater than 100% because respondents may be teaching at more than one level.

Q20. Is this the same grade level for which you trained?

Percent Yes: 80%

Q21. Is this the same grade level you wanted to teach?

Percent Yes: 89%

Q22. What subject areas are you endorsed to teach? (Interns may be endorsed in more than one subject).

Endorsement	Percent	Endorsement	Percent
Agricultural Ed	0%	Library Media	0%
Bilingual Ed	0%	Marketing	0%
Biology	12%	Math	18%
Business Ed	0%	Middle Level - Humanities	10%
Chemistry	6%	Middle Level - Math/Science	19%
Dance	0%	Music	0%
Drama	1%	Physics	6%
Early Childhood Ed	3%	Reading/Literacy	3%
Early Childhood Spec Ed	2%	Science	17%
Earth Science	11%	Social Studies	6%
Elementary Ed	18%	Special Ed	28%
ESL	11%	Technology	0%
English Language Arts	8%	Traffic Safety	0%
Family & Consumer Sciences	0%	Visual Arts	1%
Health & Fitness	1%	World Languages	3%
History	5%		

Assuming that an endorsement in bilingual education, biology, chemistry, math, middle level math/science, physics, earth science, science, English as Second Language, early childhood education, special education, music, and world language indicates an endorsement in a shortage subject: **Percent endorsed in shortage subject: 88%**

Q23. What subjects are you currently teaching?

Subject	Percent Teaching
Biology	2%
Career Development	1%
Chemistry	2%
Elementary Education	7%
ELL	3%
English/Language Arts	5%
ESL	5%
History	5%
Kindergarten	2%
LAP	1%
Math	23%
ML Science/Math	12%
Oceanography	1%
Physical Education/Health	2%
Physics/Physical Science	4%
Preschool	1%
Public Speaking	1%
Reading	9%
Science	12%
Social Studies	4%
SPED/Resource/Life Skills	23%
Substitute Teaching	7%
World Languages	3%

N=95. Adds to more than 100% because people may teach more than one subject.

Q24. Do you have endorsement(s) to teach the subjects you are currently teaching?

	Percent Endorsed
Yes	75%
For some subjects	6%
No	19%

Q25. Is this what you wanted to teach?

Percent Yes: 85%

- Q26. Do you like teaching this/these subject(s)?**
Percent Yes: 97%
- Q27. Do you plan to continue teaching this/these subject(s)?**
Percent Yes: 96%
- Q28. Do you plan to obtain additional endorsements?**
Percent Yes: 57%
- Q29. If yes, in which areas? (N=52).**
Percent new endorsements in shortage subjects: 54%
- Q30. How long do you plan to continue teaching?**
Average: 16.8 years
Range: 1 to 30 years
- Q31. As a first-year teacher, do you currently have a mentor assigned to you?**
Percent Yes: 70%
- Q32. Does your current mentor receive compensation to serve as your mentor?**
Of those with a mentor assigned (N=66).
Percent Yes: 82%
- Q33. Does your teaching job require you to supervise any after-school activities?**
Percent Yes: 17%
- Q34. Do you receive additional pay for after-school responsibilities?**
Of those with after-school responsibilities (N=16).
Percent Yes: 56%

Interns were asked the following questions about their mentored internship *while they were in the alternative routes program.*

Q35. How long did you spend in your mentored internship? *(Some interns may have read this question to mean the length of time they had major responsibility for the class, and may thus have understated the length of their internships. For example, at South Sound Transitions, internships lasted a minimum of 18 weeks.)*

	Average (weeks)	Range
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	36	All 36 weeks
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	36	All 36 weeks
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	25	16 to 30
South Sound Partnership (PLU) ²⁰	25	8 to 48
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	26	6 to 36
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	36	All 36 weeks
All Programs	30.4	6 to 48 weeks

Q36. Was your mentor teacher supportive of the alternative routes program?

Percent Yes: 86%

Q37. How valuable was your mentored internship in preparing you to teach on your own?

Not valuable	←————→			Very Valuable
1	2	3	4	5
7%	4%	8%	27%	53%

Among those reporting an unsupportive mentor teacher (N=11):

Not valuable	←————→			Very Valuable
1	2	3	4	5
27%	18%	36%	18%	0%

²⁰ Some paraeducators continued to work in the schools as part of the program and may not have included that time. Also, South Sound Partnership permitted some interns to continue their internship into a second school year, if it was necessary, so the maximum time in internship was 48 weeks—more than a school year.

Q38. Responses to Q38 are listed in the section for open-ended questions at the end of this appendix.

Q39. Responses to Q39 are listed in the section for open-ended questions at the end of this appendix.

Interns were asked the following questions about the coursework component *while they were in the alternative routes program.*

Q40. How valuable was the coursework component in preparing you to teach on your own?

	Not Valuable 1	2	3	4	Very Valuable 5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	20%	10%	20%	30%	20%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	14%	21%	43%	21%	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	12%	12%	38%	38%	0%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	3%	10%	23%	32%	32%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	15%	15%	8%	54%	8%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	0%	16%	37%	47%

Q41. Did you receive sufficient information on a full range of teaching issues?

	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	50%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	85%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	77%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	58%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	84%
All Programs	76%

Q42. Responses to Q42 are listed in the section for open-ended questions at the end of this appendix.

Interns who were not currently employed as teachers were asked the following questions.

Nine respondents reported completing the program but were not employed as teachers in the spring of 2004. Eight responded to these questions.

Q43. If you are not now teaching why not?

	Percent Yes
Applied for jobs, received no offers	25%
Did not accept offer of teaching position	0%
There were no positions	12%
Other*	62%

*Other reasons included the following:

- Am currently in the interview process waiting for offer
- Did not apply to teach. Teaching too much work and not enough fun.
- I am applying for various jobs including teaching.
- I had a bad experience at my student-teaching school. I did not get along with my mentor. I recently started applying for teaching positions.
- I took this year off to stay home with my baby that was born 7 weeks early.

Q44. Will you apply for teaching positions in the future?

Percent Yes: 75%

Interns were asked the following questions about the overall alternative routes program.

Q45A. Compared to your expectations, how flexible was the program?

	Not at All 1	2	3	4	Very 5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	18%	18%	0%	18%	45%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	64%	21%	7%	7%	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%	12%	50%	12%	25%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	0%	8%	6%	36%	50%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	19%	19%	31%	12%	19%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	15%	20%	15%	35%	15%
All Programs	16%	15%	14%	25%	30%

Q45B. Compared to your expectations, how adaptive was the program to your pre-existing knowledge and skills?

	Not at All 1	2	3	4	Very 5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	18%	18%	18%	27%	18%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	43%	29%	21%	7%	0%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	12%	12%	12%	38%	25%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	0%	8%	14%	31%	47%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	12%	12%	31%	25%	19%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	5%	10%	20%	55%	10%
All Programs	11%	13%	19%	31%	25%

Q45C. Compared to your expectations, how burdensome was the program in terms of time commitment?

	Not at All 1	2	3	4	Very 5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%	18%	27%	36%	18%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%	7%	7%	29%	57%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%	12%	25%	38%	25%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	6%	22%	25%	19%	28%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	0%	0%	6%	50%	44%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%
All Programs	2%	11%	15%	30%	42%

Q46. At exit from the program, do you feel you were well prepared to assume full-time classroom responsibility?

	Percent Yes
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	82%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	92%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	100%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	80%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	79%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	84%
All Programs	84%

Q47. If not, why? (Reasons cited by those who felt not well prepared are listed in the section for open-ended questions at the end of this appendix.)

Q48. If someone asked you if they should pursue a teaching certificate through the alternative routes program, how would you respond?

	Yes, without reservation	Yes, but with some reservations	No, enroll in a different alternative certification program	No enroll in a more conventional program
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	27%	64%	9%	0%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%	71%	14%	14%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	12%	75%	12%	0%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	50%	44%	0%	6%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	25%	62%	0%	12%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	30%	65%	0%	5%
All Programs	30%	59%	6%	5%

Interns who did not complete the alternative routes program were asked the following questions.

Q49. When did you leave the program?

Three respondents did not complete the program:

- One left after completing the mentored internship.
- Two left after beginning the mentored internship.

Q50. Why did you leave the program prior to completion?

Reasons cited were as follows:

- Family crisis: Baby daughter went into intensive care for over four months.
- Matching teacher to guide me through the program.
- Paperwork/opportunity.

Q51. Do you plan to pursue teacher certification through another route?

None of the three plan to pursue teacher certification through another route.

Personal Information

Q52. What is your gender?

	Percent
Male	24%
Female	76%

Q53. What is your age?

Average Age: 43 years

Age Range: 24 to 64 years

Q54. What is your ethnicity?

	Percent
White	86%
Black	6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5%
Hispanic	2%
Native American	0%
Other	3%

The following are responses to open-ended questions (Q38, Q39, Q42, Q47, and Q55).

Q38. Looking back at your mentored internship, what aspects have proven most helpful to you as a new teacher?

Responses From Puget Sound Partnership

- Lesson preparation; assessment preparation; classroom management.
- Immediate feedback, support in difficult situations, perspective, teaching ideas, organizational strategies.
- I never interned; I was on my own from day one so there was not really a transition from intern to new teacher this year.
- I started teaching the third day. I was lucky enough to have a brilliant mentor. The internship was the best way to put our theory into practice immediately! Every teacher-to-be should be "thrown-in" like that.
- Working as a full-time teacher I've already had the "first year."
- Spending an entire year in one classroom. Mentoring in the same subject area/same district as my current position.

- Mentor advice: You can't reach everybody (students). Office support, paraeducators, and custodians are valuable. Integrate technology!
- Seeing the students evolve through the school year. Watching the teacher establish his relationship to the students.
- Beginning to end experience—see the change in students through the year.
- Building a network.

Responses From Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership

- Practical experience; support of mentor.
- Daily guidance by a true master teacher.
- Just doing it. Supervisors/observations by university people.
- Time as the lead teacher, all aspects.
- Feedback from mentor.
- I had 2 mentors—one of my mentors illustrated multiple entry points for student engagement very well.
- Longer period of time; experienced mentor teacher better, not only that but also who loves his/her teaching profession.
- Seeing how the teacher handled seating, paper flow, structure of the day.
- Watching someone teach who has honest regard for his students.
- Having a more experienced mentor teacher.
- Experience with diverse students in a difficult situation—good to do this while I had back-up first.
- I worked with a really great math teacher. I use a lot of his classroom management and lesson planning techniques.
- A variety of teaching ideas; ways to teach reading/writing in the content area.
- Encouragement; modeling classroom management; flexibility; lesson planning.

Responses From Skagit Valley Network

- Lesson planning; discipline/classroom management.
- My mentor was positive and supportive of my teaching. My mentor showed me how to leave a textbook and expand on concepts with projects.
- The time spent collaborating, teaching, and reflecting.
- Being in the classroom for an extended long period—from the beginning of the school year well into second semester.
- Being in the classroom as the year evolved. Hands-on experience.

- Classroom management; lesson planning.
- I am an adult and they treated me that way. The classes and experience were to the point and relevant for professionals.

Responses From South Sound Partnership

- I was actually a veteran teacher with over eight years experience. The support and validation I received is what was important and helpful.
- The support I received from other teaching staff in the building. My mentor did not take much interest in the Alternative Routes program. My cooperating teacher that I worked with in the classroom was very helpful and continues to be an asset towards my learning.
- Modeling of various instructional strategies, professionalism with parents, students, and staff, and dedication to education.
- Classroom management issues, administration expectations, strategies to use to deal with difficult students.
- It showed me I can teach under stressful conditions.
- It was a good partnership. I got to choose her.
- Being exposed to different styles and ideas.
- Planning, organizing, actual teaching, dealing with discipline, relationships with mentor teachers.
- General experience in dealing with a classroom—learn by doing.
- One mentor let me do what I wanted, a new curriculum, but was not experienced in it. The teaching experience was very good, but unsupported. The second one was knowledgeable and supportive.
- The opportunity to plan, teach and evaluate my teaching.
- Day-to-day challenges; classroom management.
- Having had the opportunity to serve under two mentored experiences, I was able to compare/contrast styles of the two, which in turn helped me fine tune my style in the classroom.
- Having the opportunity to take over the classroom instruction and management.
- Classroom management; lesson plans.
- Management techniques.
- My mentor was tough, and she expected high standards. She did not waste any learning time.
- Various teaching methods, classroom management and organization.
- Classroom management; routines/procedures; organization.
- My mentor was and is very skilled at classroom management and knowledge of the EALRs.
- Outlook/philosophy on teenagers; keeping cool—composed; activities to fill time.
- When my supervisor would visit my class and advise. When my mentor observed and advised.
- Having hands-on experience and having someone support you and answer any question you have.

- My internship was conducted in the same school district and school in which I now work.
- Teaching a variety of students with various learning disabilities.
- Guidance in planning curriculum and writing lesson plans. Also, classroom management techniques help now.
- Learning how to document student learning and how to teach to a variety of learning styles, including special needs.
- Most valuable to me was the ability to teach as much as possible during my mentorship time.
- Classroom management techniques.
- My age (57).

Responses From South Sound Transitions

- I vow not to be a teacher who simply will show up but one who wants learning to take place and to work for that.
- Practical guides to lesson planning and alternative teaching practices.
- Relationship building, planning.
- Classroom management.
- Classroom set up to be more efficient.
- My mentor teacher made sure I did and was involved in everything she did which helped.
- Actual teaching experience: 90% of my internship I taught all of the classes. My mentor gave me most curriculum materials.
- General classroom exposure and practice teaching.
- Going through the school year. Watching lessons taught. Experiencing each aspect of teaching.
- Seeing all the required paperwork, grading, etc., and realizing I was committing myself to a profession—not a job.
- What NOT to do. (I had a terrible mentor). I learned more just subbing at schools.
- Basic day to day experience in a classroom—i.e. classroom management, organizing, adapting lessons.

Responses From Southwest Washington Consortium

- Due to the fact I was there the entire year, I got to see and do everything (classroom set up, scheduling, report cards, etc.). That was invaluable.
- Teaching, of course. Mostly learning to do the SpEd IEP paperwork.
- Solo teaching, interaction with administration, documentation, classroom mgmt strategies, and exposure to curriculum.

- The solo teaching part at the end of the year when it was my job to do all aspects of a teacher but was in a supportive environment.
- Attending Multi-Disciplinary meetings (MDT); supervising assistants.
- Coursework was concurrent with classroom experience. And as issues came up at school was able to access mentor.
- Conducting IEP meetings with a mentor. I was able to facilitate an IEP meeting for real students, not just case scenarios.
- The year in the classroom, but I valued having classroom (at the university) time also.
- Communication with paras/parents/team.
- I closely watched characteristics of control teaching and realized I did not want to be that teacher.
- Shadowing mentor in different settings; slow ease in with integration into solo teaching.
- Learning to write IEPs and run meetings. Learning to manage difficult behaviors. Learning how to plan lessons with a full year in mind (not just a unit or 1 lesson).
- My focus was directed entirely to my internship—I was on a leave of absence from my parapro position.
- I think the most valuable aspects were the actual teaching time, learning how to motivate students to do their best work, and learning some classroom management skills. I also find the experience of writing goals and objectives very helpful. Another great aspect of this program was the opportunity to be able to intern at every age group. I spent a week at the pre-school, a week at the middle school, and a week at the high school in our district. I think that this was critical, because I knew then, where I was most comfortable teaching and the age group I most enjoyed.
- Learning to handle difficult and temperamental assistants.
- Seeing all facets of special ed—meetings, paperwork, scheduling, etc.

Q39. Again, looking back at your mentored internship, what could your mentor have done differently to be more helpful?

Responses From Puget Sound Partnership

- Met regularly; communicated better or more effectively.
- More co-teaching time.
- She observed me twice; I think a little more involvement could have been beneficial.
- She was really fantastic, but we could have spent more time reflecting together on my teaching and admin stuff in general.
- He could have had more time to work with me in my classroom. (My mentor was teaching a full load—5 classes—separate from my own.) He was unable to observe more than the occasional 6th period class.
- Nothing—she allowed me to get my hands into everything.

- He was very supportive, but could not give me feedback as often as I would've liked. He was VERY busy.
- Told me what I did well in addition to what I did poorly. Helped with lesson plans rather than just criticize them. Not lied about me in meetings with the principal and SPU observer.
- Leave me alone! Usually did—occasionally didn't—frustrating!
- Mentors should not be jealous of mentees' degrees. I have a Ph.D. while my mentor didn't. She did everything to prevent me from getting a certificate.

Responses From Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership

- They were both great.
- More teaching; coplanning.
- Spend more time observing and analyzing student behavior and work.
- Spent more time explaining how he set up classroom norms at beginning of the year.
- Neither mentor teacher was a great teacher. Identifying a mentor with more than 3 years experience would have been nice.
- Work closely and give me honest feedback.
- Included me more in parent contacts and meetings about SpEd students.
- A little less controlling.
- Brainstorm ways to organize the classroom and class time management of difficult students.
- At the time the information was perfect for what I could take in. Someone can only show or tell an intern so much—the rest you have to learn as you go.

Responses From Skagit Valley Network

- Arranged for me to observe other teachers more.
- Classroom management techniques—I needed more alternatives. What do you do when the textbook is lacking in depth—where are good resources to pull from?
- More supportive of my teaching style; more observation time; time spent in different age level.
- More consistent feedback.
- I was well paired with my mentor; she was very open and flexible.
- He could not have been better.
- He could have been less helpful; he was so happy to have me he would rush in if I ever needed help.

Responses From South Sound Partnership

- Nothing. She was great.

- Conducted follow-ups of my lessons that I was teaching. Included me in staff development activities. Provided meaningful dialect of what was "good" and what needed improvement—to provide growth of teaching techniques.
- Nothing, my mentor went above and beyond to guide and mentor me. They continue to support me.
- The district could have announced the new teacher social earlier. I could never attend this social function because the notice was always so short.
- She could have been less critical, demanding, and unsure of herself, that I would not have been a threat to her since she just returned to work from a stroke.
- She was great! I wanted her—she wanted to help me. It's all about relationships.
- I actually had fantastic mentors!
- My mentor showed me how NOT to be a teacher.
- I wish that there had been a relationship between my public school coordinator and the mentors—they had never met. I wish my first mentor had been easier to trust.
- The mentor could/should have had a LOT more direction from PLU.
- Been more supportive of me and the program. Provided more feedback. It was difficult feeling like I always felt like I had to prove myself.
- She was absent for two months.
- Been more pro-active in helping develop lessons/units. Saying "this works, try it."
- My mentor was great and we are friends now. We could have communicated further with learning methods.
- Nothing, she did a wonderful job and was terrific to work with and learn from.
- Observe more; allow me to observe many veteran teachers.
- Spend more time on learning computer systems such as Grade-Pro, & WSIPC, grading at a junior-high. I wish I could have shadowed at a junior high.
- Given me more responsibility and allowed me to do special projects.
- My mentor was very helpful. There wasn't more she could do.
- She was very supportive and helpful.
- She was very helpful and patient with all my questions. She couldn't have done anything differently.

Responses From South Sound Transitions

- My mentor was very lazy instructor and did very little to help me or the students.
- Share more knowledge about resources and materials.
- Define personal opinion vs. policy.
- Grade book process (clarify).

- Had me do more curriculum planning. Make me aware of and do administrative responsibilities. I feel completely overwhelmed by my responsibilities above and beyond the classroom.
- Involve evaluators and recruits to see how well I teach.
- Walking me through some of the more difficult math lessons.
- I was not entirely equipped for classroom management, but that was not his fault.
- Not applied to be a mentor; he only wanted the extra help.
- He was not very confident in the system or in himself. It made it difficult.

Responses From Southwest Washington Consortium

- Absolutely nothing; she prepared me totally.
- I was put in a position to help my mentor, not the mentor teach me.
- Have me do more of the IEP paperwork.
- Not much! The technical side was taught at university while I learned the functional side in the room.
- My first mentor could have done her part of the job: the 6 observations, 3 formal evaluations, "individualized instructions/assistance in completing my portfolio," develop a trusting relationship, encouraging, and so on.
- Taught me how to keep data, scheduling inclusion students, introduced curriculum materials, adapting curriculum, modeled teaching.
- I think it is important to meet weekly to give more feedback. It would be nice if the mentor was not new to the building, staff, etc.
- I believe having at least alternate Fridays to work on the tasks at the university would have been helpful. Perhaps every Friday.
- Encouraged me to try new things with students. Not given so much negative feedback on every written internship assignment turned in and every lesson observed.
- Very effective mentoring.
- On a number of occasions I was assigned a group of students—handed a "teacher book" and sent to another room to work. I could have used more support (esp. with the curriculum at the beginning).
- My "first half" mentor took maternity leave at winter break. She was not as interested in the program as the stipend. My "second half" mentor was incredibly talented and supportive. She remains in contact with me and consistently offers useful advice.
- My mentor could have had more consistency in guiding me with my performance tasks and in setting up my files and my portfolio. I feel like the entire task/portfolio portion was completely my responsibility and my mentor had no interest in it at all. She did not even ask to see the completed product. That was disappointing, because I'd worked so hard to do a professional job on that whole half of the internship.
- Understand that interns need to teach and are not just classroom assistants. Pay attention to the requirements of the program.

Q42. Looking back on the alternative routes program, what subjects were not presented which would have been helpful to you as a new teacher?

Responses From Puget Sound Partnership

- More curriculum and planning.
- I would recommend spending time looking more in depth at problems facing teenagers—such as the "cutting" phenomenon in schools, sexuality issues, etc.
- Classroom management, techniques, literacy, professional development, special education, administrative policy, political education policy—it's so important that teachers are fully aware of important education legislation!
- Having had some teaching experience, I now realize that I would have better benefited from a more academic certification course. I wanted to delve more in-depth into the history, current methodologies/philosophies, etc., of education but with my full-time internship I hadn't the time or energy.
- Alternative Education. I also think it would be great for interns to visit a juvenile prison school or alternative program. Not all youth succeed in traditional schools.
- I think getting more subject-specific information would have been helpful specially for lesson plans.
- Would have liked more classroom management TECHNIQUES, not theory. Dealing with difficult parents.
- Everything. The professors at SPU were not prepared to teach the subjects at all. In addition, they were not qualified to teach the subjects.

Responses From Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership

- Would have enjoyed some choice in coursework—one size fits all doesn't always work.
- Classroom management; technology in classroom, use in teaching.
- More time spent on classroom management.
- Assessment/teaching by inquiry in a diverse classroom.
- Mathematics (Algebra).
- We had very poor instruction in math ed generally, not because the plan was bad but the instructor was very weak.
- Assessment was an optional course—I would have liked it earlier and as part of the program.
- Management; assessment; SPED.
- Reading strategies (specific ideas for way to teach reading/writing in the content areas).
- I wish we would have talked about how to actually grade tests and quizzes.

Responses From Skagit Valley Network

- It would have been nice to have had more instruction on lesson planning and the adjustments necessary to meet specific student needs. (Maybe this is best learned through OJT).
- More info on classroom management, discipline, and assessment.
- Creating curriculum. Tell your student teachers that classroom courses do not prepare you for certain classroom management challenges.
- More classroom management; Understanding by Design—how to plan.
- More on motivating unmotivated students.
- School paperwork procedures (keeping track of CPT, etc.).
- The reality of how horrible the first year of teaching can be. No one ever warned me.

Responses From South Sound Partnership

- I found all the information necessary was presented.
- More information regarding the pro-certification program—and to what extent I'd need to begin additional clock hours.
- PLU did a fantastic job of preparing me for my role. The PLU staff also increased my job knowledge confidence and I service in a leadership role in my building.
- Classroom management role playing issues.
- More special education information, such as IEP information.
- Nonverbal messages to refine classroom management skills—ENVoY.
- Not enough on details/specific of classroom mgmt. Too much theory.
- I found that I needed a better background in "methods"—I needed more exposure to a variety of teaching styles.
- More in-depth information on methods for elementary teaching, and more info on how to grade!
- Methods classes, more classroom management, special education.
- More subject-based training—how to present math topics and more on cooperative learning.
- Grade level expectations instead of just the EALRs.
- Dealing with parents. More classroom management.
- Interview hints, resume and cover letter tips, classroom management, less philosophical issues. Curriculum and lesson plans.
- How to conduct FBA (Functional Behavioral Assessment).
- Methods, methods, methods!!
- School politics; more effective discipline techniques; time management.

- Classroom discipline; dealing with parents (conferences); helping those who are not qualified for special services, yet need help; lesson planning.
- How to teach reading to student with special needs.
- High-risk students, motivate students who refuse to learn, EBP's.
- We could have had more information on planning and assessment.
- More curriculum-focused subjects like how to teach 7th grade science.
- All subjects were covered appropriately.
- I feel we had a good overview. A few of the classes were rushed through and could have been more concise, such as assessment and the class re: writing IEPs.

Responses From South Sound Transitions

- I would have liked to work towards an elementary cert. It was not available.
- Practical aspects of paperwork and grading.
- Should have been more organized; methods, assessment, and classroom management were all very weak.
- Methods of teaching.
- Teaching a diverse student population, specifically African-American students. Additionally, effectively communicating with parents and so-called "problem parents." This last term requires more definition on my part. These parents enable poor decision making by their children.
- All these different programs to teach science or math that they ask if you have experience in, in interviews.
- Many of my basic education courses were repetitive. I needed more content area course work (i.e., language acquisition, grammar, foreign language teaching).
- More practice teaching with feedback from actual students.
- Examples of plans and curriculum in Connected Math.
- I now know I needed more depth and observation on classroom management. Reading is not the same as doing!
- It wasn't so much what they taught or didn't teach—it was HOW St. Martin's administered the whole program; horribly!
- Reading.

Southwest Washington Consortium

- In-depth studies of special education disabilities (Autism, Down syndrome, etc.).
- More ways to educate a diverse special ed population.
- Considering that this was specifically for SpEd alternative curriculum options is part of an Individual Education Plan (IEP). If traditional-general ed isn't working—what are other options?

- Behavior disorders. More info on specific disabilities, i.e., Autism, Fragile X, Prater Willi, etc.
- For special ed, it would be nice to have methods classes in all or at least some subjects other than reading.
- Maybe more about Special Education paperwork.
- Social skills, self-help skills, behavior modification.
- Supplemental classes for specific disabilities.
- More classroom management and behavior management classes.
- More areas to support writing.
- More focus on classroom management with emphasis on behavioral issues.
- Accommodations and implementation for SpEd population on state testing ITBS, WASL.
- Setting up a lesson plan book that logically follows a scope and sequence by subject would have been helpful. I think the Harry Wong videos should be viewed and classroom management (as a course) should be required.
- All areas were adequately covered.
- Perhaps working with several students of different ability levels at once.

Q47. If you did not feel well prepared to assume full-time classroom responsibility after exiting the program, why not?

Responses From Puget Sound Partnership

- In the classroom, I relied a lot more on my previous working experiences (language schools in Japan) than the Alt route program.
- Classroom management was my biggest problem (as it is with most new teachers I understand), and it was hardly touched on at all.

Responses From Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership

- The actual student teaching experience was fine, but the rest—not so good. Lots of busy work, not enough real learning. You would think that a bunch of Ed professors could teach a class....
- As well as reasonably expected—I'm not sure more preparation would have helped.
- I'm not sure anyone ever is fully prepared by their teacher ed programs.

Responses From Skagit Valley Network

(No responses)

Responses From South Sound Partnership

- Is anyone really well prepared? I think it will take 2 to 3 years of teaching to get it down.
- I was somewhat prepared. The classes were too general and aimed more at secondary teaching.
- I did not learn the specific classroom management skills needed to manage the secondary school environment I was placed in.
- Classroom management/discipline skills still very weak. Also, no experience with elementary daily routine—only taught middle school.
- Yes, but after entering a full-time position, felt inadequate. Not enough thorough experience in internship.
- I needed more practice with writing lesson plans and with classroom management.
- I have no idea how to begin setting lesson plans to curriculum and EALRs.
- There was too much time spent on theory and not a lot on the day to day reality of the classroom.
- Only because I was presently teaching under great supervision was I prepared, not due to the alt. program.

Responses From South Sound Transitions

- The program did not prepare me, my mentor teacher did.
- I needed this year to substitute to give me more time in the classroom.
- Only because of my previous experience working with youth and my adaptive personality, not because of the training I had.
- 50% of assigned course work was a waste! Could use same time adding endorsements and eliminating/completing certification paperwork.
- Poor mentor teacher. When I asked for a different mentor teacher so that I could learn how to be better prepared, I was refused.

Responses From Southwest Washington Consortium

- Poor internship.
- I believe if I had started with my second mentor, I would have felt more prepared in scheduling, writing IEPs, curriculum.
- My mentor insisted classroom be run to his standards at all times. Students were to always sit up straight, NO talking, no movement in classroom, no group work—contradicted training methods I wanted to try.

Q55. Additional Comments

Responses From Puget Sound Partnership

- The Alternative Routes to Certification was a great program. As a postsecondary instructor in a special populations program, my courses and instruction have proven to be invaluable. I am not only teaching subjects I love, but I am developing the curriculum as well as being involved in a ground floor team of program developers.
- I really appreciated being in a cohort of adults closer to my age, being part of a group for support and encouragement. I also appreciated the classes being geared toward adult learners. My first year has been so great. I felt much more prepared than most stories I have heard about a first year of teaching.
- The classes were so theoretical and lacked any real, usable value. Most of what I did in-class was, in my opinion, a waste of time. A more usable, valuable course would include workshop-type activities like I attend now as a teacher ... things regarding best practices in classroom management, SpEd, literacy, etc. Why aren't these a part of regular teacher education/certification? Of course it's good to learn "brain" research, how do students learn kind of things. But let's use this immediately in our lives instead of being lectured at.
- My experience was not indicative, per se, of the program as a whole. I had found my own internship and joined the program despite never having been interviewed by SPU. Though my experience level may have differed slightly, I still benefited from the reduced tuition rates, as well as some of the important instruction I did receive. I feel that the mentored internship played a huge roll in the success or failure of the program. Often our class time was spent discussing what happened in our respective internships; it was clear who had a good mentor—they had much to contribute to our discussions.
- The alternative routes program was excellent. As a whole my cohort felt very successful. It may have been a little intense for those of us with children at home. I think we had some "Mom guilt." But being able to finish in 1-1/2 years really made up for it.
- Not all members of the cohort had supportive mentors.
- The person who was responsible for the program at SPU was not very helpful or understanding to our needs in an alternative program. She seemed to resent the fact that our group was on a paid internship program. She was my university advisor and observed me in the classroom only twice (20 minutes each) during the whole internship. I was very lucky to have an exceptional mentor because my advisor was no help to me.
- Regarding Q36, "Was your mentor teacher supportive of the alternative routes program?" She was not supportive of me. I don't know if she supported the program. I am currently volunteering at the Seattle Aquarium teaching school groups visiting the aquarium. I am applying to small public schools and private schools. I did not want to teach after my experiences last year. I am now reconsidering that decision.
- I am so grateful for the opportunity to get my cert and complete my MAT. It was hard—and worth it! SPU was great to work with.
- The idea of this program is good, yet how the program actually was done was very disappointing, not only for me but also other cohort members. SPU classes were not intellectual and stimulating at all. The university professor didn't even bother to visit and observe our teaching until we requested. She even threatened me about the possibility of being certified. I was assigned to a teacher who has never been a mentor and so jealous. It was very difficult and miserable for me to deal with the combination of unsupportive mentor and the university supervisor. If we seriously think about preparing teachers for better, we should stop having unqualified university instructors. For example,

at SPU, a professor taught "diversity in education" but she has never taken any classes at a grad level and that was not her specialty. As a result, the class was not intellectual, shallow, and misleading. I hope you will evaluate the program both in mentoring AND university classes.

Responses From Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership

- During the first two weeks of our program, we read lots about adolescent development, teaching, and diversity. It was hard, but we made progress. Then came everything else—lots of busy work, lots of time at the University (wasted time). They got through to us that a reflective teacher was a good teacher, then didn't give us time (or a forum) to reflect. There was also a fundamental flaw in our "partnership" with the professors in the content area—it was impossible to spend the time to satisfy both the content (math and science professors) and the ed professors.
- Regarding Q43, "If you are not now teaching, why not?" By the time I had finished my program, all the teaching jobs were gone. I graduated later (one quarter) than my cohorts, because the grad school assigned to me an English course while I was in the middle of the program [rather] than beforehand.
- I do not know why the program was considered "alternative." We took the same courses the TEP students did but in a different order (plus, for example, a year of physics) and spent more time in our schools. Calling it "alternative" suggests a shortcut, which this was not. When I applied for jobs, I emphasized my primary secondary and did not communicate anything about the "alternative route." I believe it was the secondary credential that made me such a desired candidate when I applied. Also, because we were an alternative route, we got contract teachers sometimes rather than qualified faculty. This was a huge disappointment to me. Had I known at the outset what I know now, I would have gone the standard route. While most of the cohort could not have qualified for the standard route because they were short courses, particularly (and extremely in math), I could easily have gone the less demanding TEP route. Again, I believe those who interviewed me did not particularly notice that I did an "alternative route program."
- Program horribly organized. Constant battle between the different schools at the University of Washington. No support from union or school district. Bad schedule.
- The program was inflexible. It really wasn't very "alternative" at all. We simply had a longer internship and more coursework to fit into a shorter calendar period. Much of the coursework was very good—some was a real waste of time. The internships were of VERY uneven quality—some were completely inadequate, others okay, only a few really great. This was by far the weakest part of the program—unfortunately most important.

Responses From Skagit Valley Network

- The biggest problems that I have with the program are (1) Lack of living stipend forced participants without alternate financial support out of the program and created financial difficulties for others who chose to complete the program. I understand that this was unique to those of us who went through the Skagit Valley Network. This financial difficulty had a detrimental effect on our training and demonstrated inequitable treatment of the programs by the oversight authorities. And (2) upon admission to the program I was led to believe that I would qualify for both math and physics endorsements. However, towards the end of the classroom portion of my training I learned that Western's math department was not going to approve math endorsements unless we completed additional coursework over and above the state's minimum requirements. I feel that I have been victimized by the old "bait and switch"! And that I am being held to an unreasonable higher standard which places me at a competitive disadvantage to new teachers coming out of the other programs.

- I am in a non-continuing position. I inherited three "wild" and two less-challenging classes from a teacher who "left" before first semester ended. It is a tough way for a first year teacher to start out. Try and prepare all new teachers for "worst-case" situations. There were some at WWU who did not support this program. That was difficult at times.
- The program was a perfect match for me with my experience as a geologist and teacher at WWU. I loved the program. I loved our cooperating teachers. It was especially helpful that we had four interns at Mt. Vernon High School in science. Hence, we did A LOT of collaborating and supporting each other. All the teachers in Mt. Vernon science were wonderful, and it felt like I could ask any one of them for help and ideas. They were so very generous with their time, energy, and ideas. My mentor was wonderful. [The] MVHS teachers deserve lots of credit for the success of the program. In addition, the Seminar Series for new teachers at ESD 189 were excellent. [O]ur master teacher was outstanding. I refer to my notes from the teacher academy she taught on a regular basis!!
- Regarding Q27, "Do you plan to continue teaching this/these subject(s)?" One-year replacement, will be open next year. Will apply for other positions and see. WWU was not adept at incorporating a flexible program into their rigid mindset. Every person who came from WWU to "see" us was negative and freely told us we would not succeed! [One person] freely said so at social gatherings (once to the parents of a TTT person). Great program if the school can support it without the politics effecting the interns.
- I am so happy for the opportunity to participate in the transition to teaching program. I feel like my district is mainly at fault for any of the major difficulties I have had this year: five preps; no books, curriculum, or support; a mentor who is in his first year here, too.

Responses From South Sound Partnership

- This was a wonderful opportunity but very time intensive. I don't think enough complete information was given to the participants prior to starting this project. I am sure if the full impact of time, cost, and effort needed to finish this program would have been shared up front maybe many would NOT have signed up. So in other words, less knowledge is probably better.
- This was a very good program. I have applied to other school districts, and one hurdle I have to "jump" is a question of "actual" education credit hours. If some means of showing a full hourly requirement as being fulfilled could be included on the transcripts, it would remove questions about the program or the qualifications of the teacher applicant. The program is a good one and should be continued. Some of the students who took the class were uncertain as to whether they would pursue teaching (two or three). This program should screen out those who don't know. I do not believe this should be a "try out" program. It is valuable, and space is limited. The course may change minds, but genuine teacher candidates should be the only ones in the program at the beginning of the course.
- The alternative routes program was an invaluable program in allowing me to complete my BAE and helped in my success of finding a teaching position this year. One huge difficult component was the time (schedule) expectations. Partaking in full-time student teaching while carrying 15 credit hours was very difficult. The program also required Saturday and evening classes—with out any time off during Christmas and any other holiday. Also, the mentor I was provided with knew very little about the program and was supplemented quite well—for very little contact with me.
- Better communication is needed (1) between district and applicant regarding choice of mentor, and (2) from both PLU and school district staff regarding the type of money that's offered; both called my conditional scholarship a "scholarship," when actually it's a loan that now must be paid back because I have no teaching job to forgive the loan.

- The Alternative Route 1 allowed me to pursue a life-long dream. Every class I took at PLU was beneficial to my current position. I would do it again and recommend it to others. It is the best way to go!
- Need to change WASL into an assessment tool only. Need to work to exit difficult students more quickly from classroom; they disrupt the learning of other students too much.
- The funding needs to work better. Credit for knowledge and experience should be taken more seriously. Matching mentors and students needs to have some consideration.
- The money was huge piece—some districts paid us—some didn't—some districts gave the stipend and their (our) salary—some didn't. The money needs to be governed better—some districts kept it as our salaries—some districts had us pay our own insurance (which is \$500 a month). Direct rules on how the stipend money should be spent for the district is a must! I think this is a great program—it got me where I wanted to be—serving students/families as a special education teacher. I am planning on starting my masters next year.
- Regarding Q11, “How many teaching positions did you apply for?” Two in state of Oregon; Washington had no openings in the area in which I live in my endorsement areas. Regarding Q12, “How many of your applications resulted in an interview?” Zero—both stated that I currently needed an Oregon certificate which I did not have at that time. Regarding Q13, “Did you have difficulty finding a job as an alternative route teachers?” For the past two years this area's population has been dropping, and all teachers are afraid of being rified. Schools are cutting teaching positions as many people are moving from rural areas to the cities where they can make decent wages. Timber jobs are not available.... Most high paying jobs have been replaced with minimum-wage positions. I have the highest praise for the dean and the instructors at PLU. They are competent, caring, and committed to teaching teachers!
- I think secondary teacher training should be taken out of the University. (1) Get your BA/BS. (2) Work half a year—unpaid—as an observer/limited teacher. (3) Work half a year as a low-paid teacher under supervision. (4) Work one year as an apprentice teacher under a mentor—get a provisional cert. (5) After successful completion of a second year, you get a PROFESSIONAL cert. Each district would have a corps of mentor and supervising teachers who would recommend promoting a prospect through each phase of the process. I feel with the current system—be it traditional or alternative route—is costing too much for the benefit the teachers get!
- My PLU student supervisor helped me to keep perspective—as she knew all of my situations. So that relationship was important. But there were times when I would be praised by her and five minutes later criticized by my mentor for the same activity. A more coordinated relationship between the school system, the mentor, and PLU would have been better, more supportive.
- Having taken and pursued ed classes throughout college, this program was a great extension to previous classes I took as an undergrad. I really feel because I have had previous experiences with classes, coaching opportunities, and emergency subbing, this program complemented my experience. I truly believe that future of this program could better prepare teachers by providing previous experience in the classrooms, more method classes, and more importantly, ensure that mentor teachers strongly understand this program as well as support it 100%—I felt a lot of my energy was spent trying to defend this program.
- The program was extremely helpful to me in terms of speed and access to jobs. I would wish that the curriculum would include more supervised classroom management skills courses.
- No questions were asked about how expensive the program was in terms of loan dept. Myself and others owe \$24,000+, and the promises of loan forgiveness are not working out for me. More scholarship support should be available for the route students who have completed the requirements.

- This program was a lifesaver for me. My industry (telecom) was dying, and with this program I could train for a new field and not have too much down time. I think Alt routes grads should start with five years experience on the pay scale since we needed experience to qualify for the program.
- Be more selective when choosing mentors. If I had a different mentor, I could likely be teaching now.
- Regarding Q13, "Did you have difficulty finding a job as an alternative route teacher?" Yes, but not because I had gone through the Alt Routes program. Regarding Q24, "Do you have endorsement(s) to teach these subjects?" Not reading. The connections I made during the program were great (both people and content). The internship was VERY ROUGH. Frustrations from mentor, myself, and apparent lack of organization on part of institution. Had it been more amicable, I would have gained more and would have wanted to stay longer to learn more.
- I feel the overall program is a terrific idea. I feel our class "wasted" valuable time discussing philosophies. The class should have been divided between elementary/junior/senior high. Discussing actual teaching experiences was helpful. I feel I am now \$10,000 in debt, no job, and under pressure. The grant program was not helpful. I received \$5,000 last year, which helped my family survive. I am extremely bitter that I lost \$3,000 of the remaining grant just because I did not get politically aligned with district personnel who circumvented policies presented to me. I believed I needed to follow policy and wait for positions to post out of district. When in reality, out-of-district candidates (like myself) were being selected for in-district positions. This selection process cost me \$3,000.
- Regarding Q51, "Do you plan to pursue teacher certification through another route?" Don't know. Was near to completion but state standards have changed so fantastically that I am back at square one. I began the Sound Sound Alt Cert Program through PLU in 2002. At that time, uncertainties outnumbered the certainties. After four years as a long-term, year-round, secondary special ed sub, I found myself in the seminars of PLU's alt cert. I completed all objectives and received acclaim from my mentor teacher, but my internship (I had total autonomy with a full load of classes from day one), my pedagogy, was cut short by a family emergency. Following my daughter's recovery, I returned to PLU where I sadly learned the state had drastically changed the requirements. I am now in a quandary and need the governor to help me out!
- I think the program is directed at the right kinds of people ... they have a lot of life experience they bring to the table!
- I feel this is a great opportunity for more mature, experienced people to get certified. However, since many of us switched careers, there wasn't enough training to make sure we were competent for multi-subject teaching. The classes were so philosophical and not practical.
- The Alternative Route program was wonderful. The staff at PLU and the mentor were helpful and supportive. The only problem I had was the cost of the program.
- Couple the program with a grant to cover cost in order to more fully supplement the lost income due to the length of internship.
- I did feel that they spent much time on foundations and SPED but shortchanged methods and assessment. A shift in what is covered might improve program. All in all, it was a wonderful experience and has helped me become an effective teacher.
- I wish the program would have counted my para experience towards my internship time or some type of credit. The year-long internship was difficult because it was a full year of only working part-time. I did not expect that. Overall, it's a good idea. It just needs some fine tuning.
- I would like to express my appreciation to PLU and the state for providing me the opportunity that I have dreamed of. I have wanted to teach all my life but never had the right opportunity to pursue my goal. After 9/11 and the loss of my administrative position, I was able to quickly re-train into a similar field. Thank you for this program.

- This was a wonderful program and gave me an opportunity to obtain a teaching certificate as well as work. As a single parent with two children, this was vital for me, and it helped me achieve my dreams. I plan to begin a masters in education literacy in May. The district I work for didn't participate in the program, so I have accrued a large amount of student loans, but it has all been worth it. Thank you for giving me the opportunity!
- I am almost finished with the Alt. Route III program. I am, and have been, teaching full-time under a conditional contract since the beginning of this academic school year. I am teaching astronomy, chemistry, and biology.
- Make sure all programs are knowledgeable about lifetime sub certificates.

Responses From South Sound Transitions

- My first student teaching was with [a] middle school. My mentor teacher did not put me up in time, plus my college supervisor said he was confused with my teaching. I applied at [another] middle school under another teacher. I began my student teaching in September 2003 until December 19, 2003. My mentor sat me down and explained to me the things that I was doing wrong. My field supervisor came and observed me and gave me a good report. All of the other times my mentor would wait until my field supervisor came and all three would sit down and he began to explain my faults. I asked him long before the 19th of December 2003 would I make it. He led me to believe that I would complete the program. I taught from September to December 19, 2003, and he did not pass me because he said I was not using standard English. There was some words I did not have a problem with. I will complete the program at St. Martin's College.
- Even though I have high regards for this program, I do feel that there was a prejudice against hiring me because of my age and also the middle-level endorsement is too general—administrators did not understand it nor what it represented. Also, withholding our \$3,000 stipend put me in a position where I had to go back to work in retail in order to survive since substituting is so sporadic and undependable.
- The St. Martin's Transitions program was a joke. The only positive aspects were my mentor and the fact that I have my certificate. The administration of the education department had no regard for the life situations of the participants. The instructors were not competent nor professional. St. Martin's should not be allowed to teach teachers.
- In general, course content could be improved by focusing on developing essential teaching skills.
- African-American students comprise the lowest achievement scores on all strands of assessment. Every certificated program should have instruction and defined strategies to combat this situation.
- The basic education courses should be compressed. St. Martin's faculty need to communicate better about material they will cover to avoid duplication. I wish I'd been required to take more content area coursework (specifically for ESL, such as grammar, teaching writing/reading/speaking, foreign language teaching). (I had one course in language methodology!) (It was great but I would have liked more.) A presentation about the final portfolio, early in the program would have helped me to know where I needed to go and to focus. No one ever connected the dots between legislation (ESEA), EALRs, curriculum planning, and daily classroom activities. I discovered those connections on my own. An overview of the Washington State Federation system would have been very helpful the first week of the program. I felt many St. Martin's faculty were not prepared for the capabilities and demands of more mature students. St. Martin's did a poor job of communicating program goals/expectations. I would feel more empowered as a teacher if we'd had a course about RECENT education legislation.
- The teacher shortage is over-stated, to say the least! This can leave many people making the transition from an existing job (as I did) left in the lurch. Being a substitute is not what I intended to do

by going into teaching. Based on my experiences with St. Martin's College, I feel that their participation in the program is a detriment for many aspiring teachers.

- Coursework (workload) requirements with coordination of curriculum among instructors must be fixed! Many hours wasted on repetitive lectures and meaningless homework. Writing a portfolio is my current stumbling block. I know exactly what should be written but do not like writing plans that I will not honestly fulfill when higher priorities for teaching duties will always prevail over the FIP, CLIP, documentation.
- Front load tailor-made lesson plans for curriculum WE ARE EXPECTED to teach. Front load visits to schools who successfully manage classes and have shortcut techniques for parent contact, grading, etc. Skill training on "Grade Pro" and Apple Computer technology.
- Regarding Q16, "Did you have to relocate to take your current teaching position?" Relocate? No, but I have quite a commute.
- The program concept is wonderful. However, my cohorts and I completed the program IN SPITE OF St. Martin's. Many of us wanted to quit. The administrators (especially the dean) were arrogant, disorganized, and patronizing. I have never encountered a more poorly run program. Yes, it was their first year, but even so, they treated us as stupid, lazy students. (Ann Gentle is the only exception; she kept a lot of us motivated to continue.)
- Because we were the first cohort to go through the Transitions to Teaching program there, admittedly, were "bugs" to work out. Miscommunications etc. However, I felt it my responsibility to make the most of it. Staff at St. Martin's were supportive, classmates were great. All way around—a positive experience. Most importantly, the program helped me attain my life-long goal—to teach! Thanks.

Responses From Southwest Washington Consortium

- Many special education teachers that pursued their degrees through traditional programs have commented about what thorough training I had and how wonderfully prepared I am for a first-year teacher. I feel that the one-year internship made all the difference in my success.
- Be ready for the compressed time commitment. Participants should not be attending classes while doing internship. Doing the portfolio is a lot to do during the internship. A class on just the portfolio would be very helpful. Having the task notebook at the beginning would be nice.
- Regarding Q26, "Do you like teaching this/these subject(s)?" Yes for reading and math; No for social studies.
- A year-long internship should be the standard for all teacher education programs. For SPED endorsements, there should be more methods classes to round out the teaching responsibility. The staff at City U were patient, flexible, supportive yet held high expectations. An outstanding group. I hope a long-range study is to follow for cohort.
- Regarding Q36, "Was your mentor teacher supportive of the alternative routes program?" Had two mentors: first was not supportive; second was supportive. Regarding Q37, "How valuable was your mentored internship in preparing you to teach on your own?" First mentor was not valuable; second mentor was very valuable. Although the program was difficult, fast-paced, and very time consuming, there was constant encouragement. Although it did not come from my first mentor, it was ever-present from the program director, my field supervisor, the many fantastic teachers, and members of the cohorts. This program was perfect for me and allowed me to accomplish a dream!
- Regarding Q24, "Do you have endorsement(s) to teach these subjects." Only special education. Regarding Q32, "Does your current mentor receive compensation to serve as your mentor?" Only 17 hours—my mentor has put in a lot more time than compensated for. I am very proud to have reached

my goal of becoming a Special Education Teacher. I truly appreciate the opportunity, and the alternative route made it affordable. However, it was extremely difficult to work full-time and keep up with all the school work. Many of us worked nights, weekends, and vacations to do a quality job on both our internship and on the schoolwork. It was frustrating and disappointing to hear that exceptions (lessening of work) were made for those who did not put forth the effort. The cost of tuition was higher than I was told, the paid internship was less than we were promised, and the book list we were given changed. As a result, I bought and paid for books that were not needed and was informed by professors that other books needed to be purchased to use for classes. I believe I am an excellent teacher and mention things as a way to improve the future of the program.

- Before I began the program, I was confident I could walk into a classroom, write IEPs, and handle any situation that might arise. When I exited the program I was so worn to a frazzle that I felt I could never again teach. Many of the courses did not prepare me for teaching. Portfolio writing is only good if one works with seniors. No one, in any of my interviews, wanted to see the portfolio. It was a waste of time. I felt the experience was very degrading. If I had it to do over again, I would have stayed with the WSU program for elementary teachers. Every district has a different way of writing IEPs, and the way we were taught did not correspond to the way the districts wrote them in which I interviewed. My first mentor teacher was not helpful. The second mentor teacher used me as a fill-in for the paras she was short. I had worked in that position for ten years before beginning the program and needed to do the administrative part of the job. Neither mentor could turn loose of the reins and let me lead. I had been substitute teaching this year, and several regular education teachers have asked if I would be willing to apply for their jobs when they retire at the end of the year. This program is too limiting.
- I would recommend screening mentors first to make sure they have the right personality to be a mentor and that they have the time to take on mentorship. Especially for a SpEd teacher because they already have so many IEP meetings. Most mentors were great in my cohort; it was only a few that were not satisfactory.
- I think it would help to interview mentors as to teaching philosophy and actual desire to be involved in the program.
- Regarding Q13, "Did you have difficulty finding job as an alternative route teacher?" Yes, a little—late hire. This was a great, though very tough, program for me. It provided intensive and extensive training in a relatively short (18 months) time period. I especially appreciate how this program taught and assessed at my learning level—papers vs. rote tests, portfolio as evidence of meeting criteria, etc. Though I highly recommend this program, I do not recommend it to everyone because of its intensity. Only those truly serious and committed to their desire to teach will succeed.
- I loved almost every aspect of this program. The only reservations I could express would have to center around how the program was organized. I seldom had the luxury of relaxing ... I never knew what was coming next. Things changed often (schedules, textbooks, even class offerings). We were the first group to go through, and I understood that they were kind of making things up as they went. I am sure this year's group has had a more organized experience!
- I am currently serving on an advisory committee with ESD and City U staff. We are reviewing program successes and challenges.
- Regarding Q25, "Is this what you wanted to teach?" I would have been happy to teach in special education, too, but I didn't want to teach above sixth grade. The Alternative Routes program is a great program for someone who wants a teaching certificate quickly. This is not for the faint-of-heart. This program was very rigorous and demanded all of my time and energy. It was truly the hardest year of my life. It was very hard on my family; thankfully they were very supportive, and we made it through. I am extremely proud of the accomplishment and am so proud to be called "teacher."
- More care needs to be taken regarding mentor teachers. The majority of interns in my program, including me, were miserable at our school placements. Teachers are looking for workhorses and

are irritated easily. Para-educators were awful to many of the interns! This made the year horrible for many of us. I am teaching now and love the work and the people I am working with each day.

APPENDIX L: SURVEY OF MENTOR TEACHERS, SPRING 2003

At the time of this survey (May and June 2003), most interns in the first cohort were completing their pre-service training. The survey was mailed to 153 mentors; 107 responded for a response rate of 70 percent.

Q1. Which alternative route program are/were you associated with?

	Number of Mentors Contacted	Number That Responded	Percent That Responded
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	16	13	81%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	30	17	57%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	16	12	75%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	47	39	83%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	20	11	55%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	24	15	63%
<i>All Programs</i>	<i>153</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>70%</i>

Q2. Programs used different types of mentorship arrangements. Which of the following best describes your experience?

	Percent
One mentor and one intern	73%
Several mentors and one intern	18%
One mentor and more than one intern	1%
Several mentors and several interns	8%

Q3. Did you mentor more than one intern at a time?

Percent Yes: 4%

Q4. Which route is/was your intern enrolled in? (Text for this question included a brief description of each of the routes.)

	Percent
Route I	18%
Route II	19%
Route III	59%
Don't know	5%

Q5. Was the intern placed in your classroom or in another classroom?

	Percent
In my classroom	97%
In another classroom	3%

Q6. At the *beginning* of the internship, compared to student teachers from conventional teacher training programs, how well prepared for the classroom was your last alternative route intern?

	Much Less Prepared	←————→			Much Better Prepared
	1	2	3	4	5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	15%	8%	38%	23%	15%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%	7%	33%	40%	20%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	17%	17%	25%	25%	17%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	13%	18%	13%	21%	34%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	0%	36%	45%	9%	9%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%
<i>All Programs</i>	9%	15%	28%	26%	9%

Q7. Which of the following activities did your mentoring responsibilities include?

	Percent
Classroom observation	96%
Team teaching	66%
Co-planning	92%
Guidance/advice	97%
Face-to-face interaction	94%
Phone messages	47%
E-mails	51%
Parent/teacher conferences	70%
Written/oral evaluation of intern	91%
Other*	11%

* Mentors indicating "Other" listed the following responsibilities and activities: activities with the intern (including attending meetings and trainings together, lesson planning, writing IEPs, and including the intern in social functions at the school) and coordination and placing of interns in the building.

Percentage of mentors indicating time spent with their interns:

	Percent Yes
Before School	85%
During School	96%
After School	91%
Evenings/weekends	16%

Q8. How much time did you spend with your intern? *Average for those indicating spending time with intern at the specified occasions.*

	Average Hours Per Week
Before School	2.9
During School	18.9
After School	3.6
Evenings/weekends	1.6

- **Summing all hours reported, the average total hours per week:**

Average: 24.7 hours

Range: 0.75 to 59 hours

Q9. Did mentoring increase your workload?

Percent Yes: 72%

Q10. (If yes), On average, how many *additional* hours per week did you work?

Average: 5.4 hours per week

Range: 0.5 to 18 hours per week

Q11. Has your last intern completed the internship?

Percent Yes: 69%

Q12. (If yes), How long did it take your last intern to complete the internship?

Average: 20.6 weeks

Range: 5.5 to 36 weeks

Q13. If your last intern has not completed the internship, will the intern finish by the end of the school year? *Of those whose interns had not completed.*

Percent Yes: 84%

Q14. At internship completion, compared to new teachers from conventional teacher training programs, how well prepared to teach independently was the alternative routes intern? (If your intern has not completed the internship, please estimate how well prepared he or she will be.)

	Much Less Prepared	←—————→			Much Better Prepared
	1	2	3	4	5
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	0%	0%	33%	53%	13%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	0%	8%	25%	33%	33%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	3%	8%	17%	33%	39%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	0%	0%	27%	36%	36%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	0%	0%	13%	53%	33%
All Programs	1%	4%	19%	39%	38%

Q15. Would you mentor alternative route interns again?

Percent Yes: 89%

Q16. Were you the primary evaluator of your intern's performance?

Percent Yes: 56%

Q17. During the internship, on average, how frequently did you meet with the field supervisor from the college/university?

	Percent
More than once per week	0%
Once per week	9%
Twice per month	24%
Once per month	57%
Less than once per month	7%
Never met with supervisor	3%

Q18. Prior to this year, had you served as a mentor to other student teachers?

Percent Yes: 57%

Q19. How many years have you been a teacher?

Average: 4.5 years

Range: 3 to 35 years

Q20. Were you selected to serve as a mentor teacher or did you volunteer?

	Percent
Selected to serve as mentor	40%
Volunteered to be a mentor	14%
Both—selected and volunteered	46%

Q21. Were you well-informed about what was expected of you as mentor?

Percent Yes: 62%

Q22. Did you attend any formal mentor training program(s) for this specific internship?

	Percent With Training
Puget Sound Partnership (SPU)	77%
Seattle Teaching/Learning Partnership (UW)	29%
Skagit Valley Network (WWU)	92%
South Sound Partnership (PLU)	67%
South Sound Transitions (St. Martin's)	82%
Southwest Washington Consortium (City U)	87%

Q23. (If yes) Which program(s)?

Of 70 mentors responding, all but five received training offered by the alternative routes programs. The remaining five mentors attended the OSPI summer mentor academy.

Q24. (If yes) Who paid for the training?

	Percent
School district	43%
College/university	10%
ESD	10%
Yourself	6%
Other*	31%

* Other responses (N=21) included alternative route program grant (57%) and mentor stipend (14%).

	Percent
Alternative route program grant	57%
Mentor stipend	14%
Don't know	29%

Q25. Did you receive additional pay to serve as a mentor?

Percent Yes: 97%

Q26. (If yes) How much additional pay did you receive for the school year to serve as a mentor?

Those giving values for the school year (N=87)

Average: \$2,120 for the year

Range: \$100 to \$5,500 for the year

Those give values by the month (N=11)

Average: \$470 per month

Range: \$100 to \$2,100 per month

For each mentor, the estimated total payment was divided by the estimated total additional hours worked (additional hours per weeks times the number of weeks for the intern to complete the program) to arrive at an hourly compensation.

Estimated hourly compensation for additional time

Average: \$21.61 per hour

Range: \$1.56 to \$100 per hour

Q28. If compensation to mentors were reduced, would you still be willing to mentor another intern in this program?

Percent Yes: 65%

Q29. Would you be willing to mentor another alternative route intern if there were no *additional* compensation for mentors?

Percent Yes: 38%

Q30. Is there anything else you would like to add that would help to evaluate this program?

- ARC interns need a structured lesson planning and classroom management course the summer prior to starting in the school. (This is a much better prep than the traditional arrangement.)
- Being a mentor required focusing on specific aspects of teaching in addition to regular position. Enjoyable but very busy. Needed to pay.
- Continue this TTT program.
- Funds for mentors/coordinators need to directly go to these people, be decided upon beforehand, and not go through the school's math, etc., department.

- I believe that most SPED teachers would be willing to be a coach w/o pay. I sure liked this program and feel that my intern is much more ready than if she went the conventional way.
- I don't feel the university observer necessarily was effective. Even though my intern exhibited problems, and was advised by staff at our school to intern longer, the university officials said she was fine and cleared her to complete the program.
- I feel a clear set of expectations would help. The rubrics were convoluted and difficult to find what was needed to do. Also a set minimum of time to show proficiency would be helpful. My intern had a difficult time completing her college coursework. Some of which seemed unreasonable and illogical. Have a set reasonable state requirement for students!
- I felt the program was disorganized with unclear expectations. I feel the internship should be a YEAR LONG commitment for the intern, especially for those with little education background.
- I found the communication between the school districts and the mentoring program to be lacking. When we had questions, it seemed as if no one had the answer.
- I may not choose to attend evening and weekend classes if there was no pay involved.
- I really think that the interns need to be protected by the universities from being placed in situations that are overwhelming, for which they are not academically or even experientially prepared. This can lead to dangerous results or even turn them off to specialty areas that need to be filled by qualified people.
- I think interns need to be pre-selected very carefully. I had a wonderful experience but others in my district did not. Screening for such a program should be tough. (Until this is the norm.)
- I think the schedule that the Alt. Route 1 students had was crazy. They were going to school full-time and spending full days in the classroom. I admire their determination, but think it is crazy to expect a full-time student to teach full-time.
- Interns need more time observing in classroom, more time actually teaching and carrying load alone (my opinion).
- It was a great experience. PLU was very good at preparing and supporting the intern.
- It would be very helpful to meet/interview.
- More information/connections need to be implemented between university/and mentors; not enough follow-up or follow through was provided.
- My intern had volunteer work experience in the classroom and 2 children of her [own]. This proved to be a valuable asset. The intern program needed to provide more instructional theory, methodology and lesson planning opportunities before the interns begin student teaching.
- My intern was terminated from student teaching early because he was so inadequately prepared. He could not function and was detrimentally affecting the quality of the education my students were receiving.
- My mentee was not cut out to be a teacher. Knowing that, I believe that the alternate routes program is valuable and effective. Between the university supervisor and myself, we were able to recognize an unsuccessful candidate before releasing the student into the teaching profession.
- My situation was unique. The intern was removed from the high school, took 2 months out of program and then 12 weeks with me. The amount of time to work with the intern was too short.

- Please consider selecting candidates with some previous experience working with people (adults or kids). Get a more organized university to run the program. Consider consulting Wichita State University's alternative cert. program. Contact: Dr. Robert Lane @twsu.edu.org.
- PLU curriculum required too much of their time during student teach. It needs to revise.
- The actual teaching assignment needs to be extended to 6 months. A potential math/science teacher should get at least 9 months in class teaching experience!
- The frequency of visits from the field supervisor from the university was inadequate. I only saw her once.
- The load of teaching and taking classes was too much for the interns. Observing and teaching a couple of classes for the first two months or quarter; then take a quarter away from school to learn classroom management, lesson planning, etc. At the second semester start teaching one class and move into teaching all classes.
- The pay should be the same for all mentors. I was compensated \$500 and others received \$5,000. This is too big of a discrepancy.
- The style of the Mentoring Institute program didn't match the mentoring situation. My mentee didn't have enough experience in education to follow the format that we were taught with the Mentor Institute program.
- The transitions to teaching program should be 1 school year long—no exceptions. The possibility of exception causes more problems than it prevents.
- Theoretically I was supposed to receive some compensation for mentoring. A packet of information given to the mentor would make clear exactly what to expect.
- This is a good program, but it requires much more of my time than a regular student teacher. The compensation is important.
- This is a needed program.
- This program focused on people who wanted to be math/science teachers for grades 5 - 9. The interns were mature and motivated. I think alternative programs are valuable in filling the need for qualified motivated teachers.
- This program was new so I can understand why people were not well informed about the process of the mentor—i.e., paperwork expectations... I would hope this would improve.
- Q1. Also selected St. Martin's program Q12. 8 weeks; then remained in classroom until end of the year. Just that I thought it was a great program that produced well rounded prepared teachers.
- Q5. Answered both in my classroom and in another classroom
- Q5. Answered both in my classroom and in another classroom Because guidelines were not clear my intern was pulled in many different directions, making it more difficult on the intern, the students, and myself.
- Q5. Both in class and another class. Taught in both science and math classrooms. Q16. Shared with 2nd mentor teacher Q25. Haven't received yet.
- Q5. Both in classroom and in another classroom.
- Q5. Both in my classroom and in another classroom Q8. Mentee was not available Some problems were due to the design of the program. Most were due to the personality of my mentee. If there had

been more competition to get into the program, he would not have been selected. The idea is good—program needs to be revamped.

- Q5. Checked both: in my classroom and in another classroom Q12. Not sure—I worked with her for about 11 weeks. The program I worked with was from UW, for middle school math and science teachers. It needs serious reworking if it is to continue. I've had great experiences with interns from Antioch University in Seattle.
- Q5. In my classroom and another, too. Q17. 3 times/year!! Excellent prep, but not cost-effective or time-effective for students teacher if w/o compensation; could shorten the program significantly; courses + 1/2 yr in classroom.
- Q5. In my classroom and in another classroom—primarily in mine. A key component of the TTT program was the three-week summer intensive institute. Over and over my intern benefited from this. Also, the collegial nature of our H.S. Sci Dept paired with four interns was an outstanding success.
- Q6. N/A Q11. N/A Have only had one Q28 and Q29 answered "Maybe."
- Q6. Never had a student teacher to compare to Q28. Maybe Great experience to do a year long internship; however, a lot for the interns to do (classes, tasks, etc.) plus being at a school all day every day.
- Q6. This was the first year—N/A Q12. Not sure length of program Q14. N/A This was my first intern Q21. Somewhat—at times it was sketchy Q26. Full amount has not yet been paid.
- Q8. During school: We spent full-time together in our classroom. We interacted regularly as needed. Q16. Yes, and with his PLU supervisor. I believe that my 4 days training and several after school workshops helped me to be a better teacher and mentor. For an intern, I think that the hands-on experiences and teaching practice in a "real" classroom is invaluable. We communicated and problem-solved together. This is a pro-active approach in training new teachers.
- Q8. This changed as the semester progressed. Q9. Yes, in the beginning, but reduced the load in the end.
- Q12. Entire school year.
- Q12. Intern did not pass the program. Q17. I had to ask to meet with the field supervisor and director of the ARC! We met twice with the director. I met four times with the field supervisor only because I asked. Q21. Somewhat—my expectation was different than the director and my intern's perception. I would like to be a part of the interview process of matching interns w/ mentors and have collaborative meetings w/ intern and field supervisor. Communication was disjointed.
- Q12. One school year I didn't feel like I knew what was expected of me as a intern with regards to observations and paperwork to complete.
- Q12. One school year. I did not feel I was well informed of what was expected of us before we were into the program for a couple months. The monthly meetings needed to be better organized and more informative on what we were to do.
- Q14. Rated 5 due to personal life experiences and being an older student. Q28. Not unless commensurate with current stipend. The program was too long ... 2 quarters would have been sufficient. With SpEd students it was hard to switch teachers. I would have liked more direction on evaluating my intern. The SPU rubric was only done once although twice was expected. Students need more coursework in their area they will be teaching ... i.e., math, reading and writing.
- Q14. The entire year experience is extremely valuable. Q16. I suppose. To be honest, I have only evaluated my intern on one occasion (approx. Nov-Dec). Q28. Compensation is important, but with a well-placed intern, there are many benefits. Q29. Seriously; compensate people for providing a service and their professional knowledge. 1. Communication between the university and mentor

must improve. Mentors are in a position to understand the university expectations and assist mentees with these tasks. 2. Emphasize the need for methods training. Mentees and mentors should view this as a primary area of focus throughout the internship. Overall, it's a great program to bring qualified individuals into the education field.

- Q15, Q28, Q29: depends on who the intern is I think it is a great program. Q15, 28, & 29 are "maybes" because my intern chose me after we had known each other for 4 years. I would probably be unwilling to give up my classes for a whole year to someone I didn't know.
- Q15. Unsure. Q17. Twice only.
- Q15. Would mentor again if mentor in classroom for less than a yr. Q21. A little yes, a little no. A year was too long. Needed to have more prep in beginning in lesson planning, classroom management. Role of mentor, i.e., responsibilities, was not really clear.
- Q16. Comprises a team of 3: 2 @ City U and 1 on site On site, year long apprenticeship is an excellent way to train this next consortium of special education teachers.
- Q16. Equally split between 2 teachers. It was my experience that the previous knowledge base was an advantage for curriculum but the "daily" teaching challenges remained the same and were worse for people who weren't used to middle school kids.
- Q16. Maybe—University evaluator was probably the primary. Q17. Twice per month at first; once per month later. Q28. If I could have one like Sue B. Q29. Maybe; too tired at this time of the year to think about it. Too valuable a program to let go.
- Q16. Not sure, but felt like it. Q26. Haven't received yet. Q29. Not sure.
- Q16. One of the 2 (primary evaluators) I think we need to make sure the programs offer strong and effective "teacher prep" classes.
- Q16. Team of 3 (2 @ City U and teacher) A good comprehensive program.
- Q16. Team of 3, 2 @ City U plus teacher Q27. \$1,100 from April 17 to end of year, June 13 There is too much extra work required to ask someone to mentor an intern free. The intern requirements have been excellent and authentic.
- Q16. Team—field supervisor, program teacher Q21. Somewhat—it was a new program, so there was some clarification needed along the way. This program is beneficial for both the intern and the mentor. Some aspects of the program were unclear, but I believe that was just due to the continuing development of the program.
- Q17. 3 times all together; never started until November 17. There needs to be a screening process for these candidates. I feel that it is a good program, but I had a sour experience. Lack of communication between the district, school and the consortium.
- Q17. Field supervisor was here 2 times during the period from 2/10/03 (when my intern started) and 6/18/03. Clearer expectations from field supervisor.
- Q17. I never met with the field supervisor. She visited my intern between 1 & 2 times monthly. The year-long internship was very valuable. I feel that times spent in the classroom as a member of the team was invaluable for teacher prep.
- Q17. I only saw her when she came to observe the intern, and never did "we" really meet. COMMUNICATION! I was never notified of the meetings/certificate ceremony/etc. The entire year I felt left in the dark, and alone.
- Q17. Less than once per month.

- Q17. Not at all I believe this is a program worth continuing. I would like to see higher expectations on the University behalf for interns.
- Q17. Once per month or less (4 times) The stipend helps but not the reason I do this.
- Q17. Once per month—if that! PLU was not very organized and didn't clearly communicate expectations to mentors or interns!
- Q17. One time for 5 min. The interns had too much PLU coursework to complete. My intern got stressed out with all the outside work that was required for her classes. She could not give full attention to her special education training.
- Q25. District received \$5,000?! I received \$200 from PLU. My intern's regular college load kept her too busy and stressed out (she had classes in addition to student teaching). Because she was an "experienced teacher" she was too confident and not open to constructive criticism. All of her written language skills were very low. Lesson plans and writing objectives were very poor—these skills should be mastered before student teaching.
- Q28. Depending on training and time requirements. Q29. Perhaps, it depends on the person/intern and the structure of the program. I felt that this was a valuable program and a useful way to get the practical classroom experience so crucial to prepare individuals to be successful teachers. I hope that programs like this will continue to be available.
- Q28. Maybe.
- Q28. Maybe—it's a lot of work. This is a great program that brings experts into the field. It requires a lot of work from everyone. I fully support this program and hope it continues.
- Q29. Yes, but I sure did appreciate the pay! My intern was wonderful. She enhanced our classroom greatly. She'll be a wonderful educator. I'm glad this program gave her the opportunity to get her certification.