Meeting Competing Demands:
The Shifting Approach to Ensuring Teacher Quality in One Alternative Certification Program Site

A Paper Prepared for the
American Education Research Association
Annual Conference, 2003

Sarah E. Birkeland
The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers
The Harvard University Graduate School of Education

Over the past decade, alternative teacher certification programs have proliferated across the nation as a response to a projected shortage of certified teachers. Hundreds of such programs currently operate in at least forty-four states, certifying nearly 25,000 teachers annually (Blair, 2003). Typically, alternative certification programs provide abbreviated pre-service training, rapid entry to paid teaching positions, and some form of mentoring during the first year of teaching (Hawley, 1990). These programs are attractive to participants because they generally require lesser commitments of time and tuition than traditional certification programs, and they allow candidates to attain state certification while earning a full salary (Peske, 2002).

While all alternative certification programs face the challenge of preparing quality teachers quickly, they approach the task in many different ways. For example, some rely on rigorous selection processes to identify a few promising individuals, while others depend on carefully designed learning experiences to convey necessary skills to large cohorts of participants. The current debate about the pros and cons of alternative certification – which is both polarized and rancorous – focuses on the question of whether or not such programs should exist. This debate ignores the variety in approaches to training teachers, casting all programs in a similar light (Dill, 1996). As such programs continue to proliferate, and district and state-level policymakers face real questions about whether and how to implement them, it is useful to move beyond polarized discussions about whether alternative certification should exist to look closely at how those existing programs work.

At the Project on the Next Generation of Teachers (NGT), we are conducting a qualitative comparative study of thirteen alternative certification program sites in four

states in an effort to understand how they interpret and implement the task of preparing quality teachers. In the preliminary stages of that study, we created a framework to describe five distinct approaches programs might take to ensure the quality of the teachers they train (Peske, 2002), ranging from an emphasis on selecting talented people to an emphasis on hiring expert faculty to train participants. In this paper I apply that framework in a focused analysis of one program site. The analysis shows how the program's context, capacity, and stakeholders' beliefs about teaching cause the approach to quality to shift dramatically from design to implementation. It highlights the tension between the pressure for quantity – the need to certify many teachers quickly – and the pressure for quality – the need to ensure that those teachers are skilled and knowledgeable.

Beliefs about Teaching and The Debate about Alternative Certification

An ongoing public debate pits alternative certification against traditional certification programs, focusing on assumed differences in implementers' beliefs about teaching: whether the qualities that make a good teacher are innate or learned; whether skills for teaching are best learned through classroom study or hands-on experience; and the relative importance of content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in successful teaching. In an article outlining the history of alternative certification, Stoddart and Floden (1995) hypothesize that the development of such programs is driven by three assumptions about teaching: if one knows the subject matter, one can teach it; one learns to teach by teaching; and candidates with prior work experience become better teachers than candidates without it. These assumptions are controversial, particularly at schools of education that emphasize pedagogical training and educational theory.

Critics of alternative certification advocate more formal, pre-service preparation for teachers, emphasize the importance of pedagogical training, and assert that high professional standards are the key to attracting more candidates and raising the quality of teaching in the long run (Darling-Hammond, 1997, 2000; Hawley, 1990). Proponents argue that alternative certification may actually improve the quality of the teaching force by attracting candidates with desirable traits such as maturity, content expertise, and a history of professional and academic achievement (Ballou & Podgursky, 1994; Feistritzer, 1994; Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, 1999). They further contend that lessons in how to teach are better learned in practice than in university classrooms (Dill, 1996). This debate, which pits supporters of alternative certification against its critics, obscures the existing variety among the programs themselves.

The Variation Among Programs

Hundreds of organizations in forty-four states currently sponsor alternative certification programs (Feistritzer & Chester, 2002). These programs are managed by a variety of institutions, from the state department of education in New Jersey to a small, rural school district in Louisiana. The degree of centralization and standardization varies among programs; the Connecticut Department of Education controls the operations at all 3 sites of its alternative certification program (Peske, 2002), while Massachusetts centralizes recruitment, selection and assessment for its state sponsored program, but allows sponsoring agencies at individual sites to craft curricula that meet state standards.[1]

The numbers of candidates served by alternative certification programs varies greatly: for example, a program in Battle Creek, Michigan trained only three teachers in

---

[1] Personal communication with Orin Gutlerner, MINT Director, 5.24.02

2001-2002,[2] while the Los Angeles Unified School District trained hundreds.[3] The

nature of the preparation they offer also varies greatly; the Illinois Math and Science

Academy provides an intensive, yearlong series of hands-on learning experiences to

candidates,[4] while the district-run program in Hillsborough County, Florida provides little

training and relies on performance assessment to identify unacceptable teachers.[5]

Approaches to Quality: A Framework

As part of ongoing research on alternative certification programs, Susan Moore

Johnson, Heather Peske and I developed a preliminary framework for understanding how

such programs conceive of and provide for the quality of the teachers they prepare. What

methods do they employ for screening or training participants, and which method is most

emphasized in the program's design? We developed this framework based on our belief

that, if we are going to make meaningful comparisons among programs, we must begin to

tease out their differences in structure, philosophy and approach. In "The Faculty are the

Peske (2002) presented the NGT framework, identifying five approaches

programs might take to ensure the quality of the teachers they train: reliance on selection;

reliance on expert faculty; reliance on a well-designed program structure; reliance on

adherence to state standards, and reliance on assessment. Each is defined below.

Reliance on Participant Selection*: Individual program candidates maintain quality*
This approach to quality emphasizes the selection process as the main lever of quality
control. Directors and faculty rely on a rigorous process for choosing participants who
match the program's criteria. They assume that if they choose the right people, those
people will succeed in the program and in teaching.

---

[2] Personal communication with Tina Powell of Battle Creek Public Schools, 7.18.01
[3] http://certificated.lausd.k12.ca.us/cert/OLDSITE/DistrictInternProgram
[4] http://www.imsa.edu/team/oiapp/altcert
[5] http://apps.sdhc.k12.fl.us/public/dept/staffdev/acp/prog_partic

Reliance on Expert Faculty*: Master teachers maintain quality*
This approach to quality relies on expert faculty members to ensure quality by overseeing the program and delivering program content. They understand teaching and students, know what candidates need to learn and do in order to be successful, and can wisely select, induct, train, and evaluate program participants. The approach depends a great deal on the characteristics of the expert teachers and on their relationships with participants.

Reliance on Program Structure*: Structured experiences maintain quality*
This approach to quality relies on well-designed learning experiences for participants to assure that participants learn to teach well. For example, directors may invest in developing a curriculum for preparing new teachers, assuming that its delivery will produce quality teachers. This approach de-emphasizes the selection of faculty and participants.

Reliance on State Requirements*: Certification regulations maintain quality*
This approach to quality places faith in state requirements for certification. It assumes that if the program rigorously adheres to certification requirements, by whatever means necessary, the candidates who complete the program will be qualified to teach.

Reliance on Summative Assessment*: Formal assessments maintain quality*
This approach relies on formal assessments as the means for ensuring quality. The assessment tools, usually administered at the end of the program, document participants' performance and signal whether candidates are qualified to teach. Program designers focus on creating assessment tools that measure the skills and characteristics they believe quality teachers to have.

We anticipate that most alternative certification programs rely on all five of these approaches to some extent. "The programs include faculty assumed to be effective, select candidates who one might expect to succeed, institute some type of deliberate structure, comply with certification regulations (state, district, or both), and include a summative assessment of teachers' performance." (Peske, 2002, pp. 11-12) However, we postulate that one approach tends to drive the program. For example, in her analysis of the alternative certification program in Connecticut, Peske (2002) concluded that the program ultimately relies on expert faculty to ensure quality. The director hired faculty whom he believed to be experts in training teachers, and in turn allowed them to select participants and determine the curriculum.

Extending the NGT Quality Framework – Not Just How, but Why

<u>Beliefs about Teaching and Teachers</u>

   Program developers' and directors' beliefs about whether good teachers are born or made undoubtedly inform their strategies for ensuring the quality of the teachers they train. The five approaches outlined in the quality framework reflect a range of beliefs about teaching: A director who believes that good teaching depends on individual traits or prior experience may rely heavily on a rigorous selection process (Reliance on Participant Selection).   The belief that good teaching is the result of skills and knowledge that can be taught may lead a director to emphasize the importance of the academic experience; that director may put her faith in a well designed curriculum (Reliance on Program Structure); skilled and knowledgeable faculty (Reliance on Expert Faculty); or the logic of state regulations (Reliance on State Requirements). A belief that teachers learn by experience, and that differences in quality are observable through practice, may lead to an emphasis on performance assessment (Reliance on Summative Assessment).

<u>The Role of Context in Shaping the Approach to Quality</u>

   Preliminary analysis of different program designs and a review of available literature suggest that approaches to quality cannot be explained by developers' and directors' beliefs alone. The program goals and context surely play roles as well.   For example, the severity and geographic location of the teacher shortage may shape a program's selectivity, the rigor and length of the coursework, and the amount of interaction among faculty and participants. Pressure for quality and pressure for quantity often exist in tension with one another; when attempting to certify many teachers quickly, program providers must decide which elements of training are essential.

Some past research has examined the role of contextual factors in shaping the designs of alternative certification programs. In 1991, Zumwalt reported that programs in Los Angeles, Connecticut and New Jersey were developed in response to different conditions in the states' teaching pools: California and New Jersey faced more acute shortages and restricted resources than did Connecticut. As a result, their designs differed. Zumwalt characterized the Los Angeles and New Jersey programs as "top down," created by policy mandate with a short time frame for implementation. With no time for discussion and few available resources, directors adopted an approach to ensuring quality that relied on adherence to certification rules (Reliance on Meeting Standards, in the NGT framework). The Connecticut program developed in a less urgent setting, with greater available resources, in a manner Zumwalt (1991) describes as "participatory" (p. 88). Since faculty shaped Connecticut's program, Zumwalt found that quality assurance relies heavily on the faculty and the coursework they developed; Peske's (2002) conclusions support this finding.

The Role of Capacity

Whatever the context and whatever their beliefs, program providers ultimately rely on available resources to achieve their goals. The confluence of available resources – fiscal, physical, and human – define the program's capacity for implementation. The amount of money available shapes who directors can hire and for how long, as well as what materials and resources they can provide participants. The availability of physical resources, such as classroom space and technological hardware, affects where classes are held, how many participants can be accommodated, and the kinds of learning experiences

they can engage in. The availability of human resources, in the form of skill and expertise, may directly relate to the quality of coursework and mentoring.

Snyder (1999), after studying a program in New Haven, California, added a discussion of programmatic resources to the literature about alternative certification program design. He emphasized the importance of New Haven's partnerships with the district personnel office and a local university in resolving dilemmas about hiring, training, and supervision. As Snyder's work highlights, there are ways to improve programmatic capacity. Programs can create strategic partnerships with other organizations in order to expand resources or available services. They can also use technology to increase the efficiency of service delivery or to meet the challenges of geography or time.

Analyzing Context, Capacity and Quality at One Site: California Teachers Corps North

This paper explores the confluence of context, capacity and beliefs about teaching as they influence the design and implementation of the approach to quality in one program, the North site of the statewide, university-run California Teachers Corps (CTC).[6] The focused analysis draws on data I collected at the site in May and November of 2002, through in person, semi-structured interviews ranging in length from one to two hours. Respondents include the CTC North site program director, two technology consultants who had participated in program design, five faculty members, and one of the two co-directors of the statewide umbrella program.[7] I sought to understand how the originators and staff of this three-year-old program conceived of and implemented the

---

[6] I have changed the name of the program, the names of all respondents, and pertinent identifying information, in order to ensure confidentiality.
[7] Interview protocols are attached as Appendix A.

task of preparing high quality teachers in the face of a shortage; how they harnessed resources and formed partnerships to enhance program capacity; and what the challenges in successful implementation of this program design were.

Data analysis was an iterative process. After interview tapes had been transcribed, I wrote a thematic summary for each transcript, then created several cross-transcript memos to capture emergent concepts. I shared these memos with my research team (Susan Moore Johnson and Heather Peske), and returned to the data for further analysis based on their feedback. I generated a list of thematic codes and coded the transcript data in order to illuminate emerging patterns and verify hunches.

Findings

I found that in this centrally designed and controlled, but locally implemented, program there is not one fixed approach to quality: the approach to quality apparent in implementation at the North site differs markedly from that specified in the design. The CTC umbrella program was created with a clear emphasis on the program structure, which is standardized for delivery to teaching interns all over the state. The design also incorporates selection and assessment procedures intended to help ensure quality. However, in implementing the program, the California Teacher Corps North Site has developed its own approach to quality - one that emphasizes neither the program nor the screening procedures, but the expertise of the faculty who implement them. This shift is due to capacity-related and contextual factors that prevent the director and faculty from implementing the program as intended, as well as their personal beliefs about teaching, teaching teachers, and the purpose of the alternative certification program they are delivering.

Long-time students of organizational theory, Bolman and Deal (1997), caution that organizations are both ambiguous and fluid: efforts to capture a dynamic reality on paper inevitably fall short. CTC North continues to adapt and expand; faculty and participants change; old challenges are addressed and new challenges arise. The analysis in this paper presents a snapshot of data from the site, and does not provide a fixed image of operations. It does, however, illuminate the importance of context, capacity, and implementers' beliefs in shaping the program's approach to preparing quality teachers.

The History and Design of the California Teacher Corps

The California Teacher Corps was created in 1998,[8] as the brainchild of the chancellor of a large, public statewide university system. Analysts were estimating a shortage of 30,000 credentialed teachers in California, with 17,000 needed in the elementary grades, due in part to the Class Size Reduction Act of 1996. The chancellor believed that the university system had a responsibility to alleviate the teacher shortage, and further believed that a distance education program might be an effective way to reach people who were already teaching on emergency credentials in rural and remote parts of the state. He received a $5 million allocation from the state legislature to develop such a program, and called together a development team consisting of forty faculty members from every campus around the state. Within that development team, several committees formed, including an assessment committee and a curriculum committee. The chancellor bought out up to half of participating professors' time for the 1998-'99 school year so they could concentrate on program development. Professors regularly traveled to meet in person at the same location.

---

[8] The history of the program, including when events occurred and the rationale behind the decisions made, was recounted for me by Harvey Fiat, a technology consultant who was on the original design team.

After an intensive year of meetings and discussion, the team of faculty settled on a program design. California Teacher Corps is an eighteen-month distance-learning program. [9] It is designed to serve people who are already teaching, uncertified, in public and private schools all over California. In order to enroll, interns must pass a statewide, standardized assessment of subject matter knowledge called the MSAT, and they must secure a classroom teaching job. The program includes only those teachers in "multiple subject" assignments – those teaching in self-contained elementary, middle, or alternative high school classrooms. Interns' primary coursework experience is independent: they complete a set of course assignments provided to them when they enroll, and email their work to an adjunct university faculty member, who also observes them monthly. Each intern is also assigned an on-site mentor from among the faculty at his or her school. In 2001-2002, the program enrolled approximately 850 interns who were teaching in schools all over the state.

The California Teacher Corps is directed by two faculty members at a southern campus of the sponsoring university system. The co-directors are responsible for overseeing operations at the program's five regional centers, each of which is housed on a university campus and staffed with a site director. Directors of the five regional centers participate in weekly conference calls with the statewide directors, and meet monthly in person, a system of communication designed to ensure parallel operation of all 5 centers. Emphasizing the importance of site-to site standardization in the program's approach, co-director Charlene Frome explains, "when you're accredited statewide, you really try to

---

[9] The program now enrolls candidates who have not passed the Multiple Subject Assessment for Teachers (MSAT), labeling them pre-interns, and providing 5 months of intensive MSAT training. Candidates who complete the 5 month training and pass the test are then enrolled as interns. Thus, they take 23 months, rather than 18, to graduate.

make sure that we're all basically doing things the same way…It's a huge coordination process of keeping this thing rolling, and to keep everybody on the same page."

A site director manages regional operations at each university center, in turn employing a cadre of traveling adjunct faculty. These faculty members are not tenure-track; they live in communities all over the region and work from home. Each faculty member provides support to up to twenty interns, as the interns complete the standardized series of assignments provided to them when they enroll. The faculty members also oversee the assignment of school site mentors, and travel extensively to conduct monthly observations of interns' classroom teaching. Finally, this cadre of traveling faculty is responsible for assessing the interns at the end of each of four stages, based on a standardized assessment process created by the original design committee. Participant screening and selection for the entire program is coordinated by the campus of the chancellor, in the southwestern part of the state.

CTC's Intended Approach to Quality: Reliance on Program Structure and Screening
Reliance on Program Structure

While the centralized design of the California Teacher Corps does include elements of the five approaches to quality outlined in the NGT framework, it emphasizes the program structure as the key quality control mechanism. This Reliance on Program Structure in ensuring quality rests on the assumption that if the program has the right combination of well-designed components such as clinical experiences, coursework, and mentoring, then quality will be a natural outcome. As Peske (2002) explained "The program is responsible for delivering the quality, and the people involved in the program (faculty, participants) are fairly interchangeable parts who enact the program" (p. 10). In developing CTC, forty members of the university-wide faculty collaborated to carefully

design a learning experience for interns, which includes rigorous, sequenced coursework delivered through a study guide, mentoring from an on-site colleague as well as a university faculty member, and attendance at five Saturday seminars. This combination of experiences is supposed to allow teachers to develop necessary skills, and it is designed to apply to interns in different schools and districts serving different populations of children all over the state. As state-wide co-director Charlene Frome describes the program,

> The study guides are sort of the professor…I jokingly call it 'the sage on the page,' because it gives all the activities, all the readings, all the websites, all the CD-roms. All the things that people need to think about that a professor would normally facilitate are all written down in this program.

These learning experiences are standardized for interns all over the state, despite interns' varied teaching contexts.

Reliance on Selection and Assessment

The original California Teacher Corps design team also specified procedures and standards for selecting interns. Requirements for admission include a bachelor's degree with minimum grade point average; passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test; a successful interview with a traveling adjunct faculty member, and subject matter expertise as demonstrated by passage of a standardized test called the MSAT. Applications are initially screened at the central office, then passed on to faculty members at regional sites for interviews. The faculty receives training in the highly structured Haberman Urban Teacher Interview process,[10] and they are charged with conducting Haberman interviews and determining a score for each applicant. Faculty

send interview scores back to the regional director, who in turn determines admission and notifies the central office. This process is standardized with the goal of selecting skilled, knowledgeable interns with the potential to succeed with diverse groups of students.

The assessment procedure is also standardized throughout the program, as outlined by a subcommittee of the original design team. At the end of each of four program stages, interns submit portfolios of their work, which the faculty members evaluate against the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. In an attempt to ensure fair and consistent evaluation of portfolios, program directors arrange " sessions, in which faculty from all five regions gather to score sample portfolios and compare notes. The portfolio assessment, faculty assessment of teaching practice relative to state standards, and intern participation ultimately determine whether an intern passes the program. The program relies on the summative assessment as a final opportunity to screen for intern quality before issuing certification.

The Realities of Implementation: Quality meets Context and Capacity

The California Teacher Corps involves a series of experiences for the interns, from selection to coursework to mentoring to assessment. Each of these experiences is designed as a lever of quality, intended either to enhance interns' knowledge and skills or to eliminate those interns whose knowledge, skills or traits are unsuitable. Each of these program elements was also designed with embedded assumptions about the capacity of local faculty and interns to carry them out. For example, program designers created the coursework experience with the assumption that interns would have the time and motivation to

---

[10] The Haberman Urban Teacher Interview was developed my Martin Haberman, of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. It is a highly structured, standardized, scored interview process designed to measure the skills and predispositions Dr. Haberman has found to be related to success in urban teaching.

complete 12-20 hours of coursework a week, on top of their regular teaching duties. In reality, that time commitment has been unrealistic for many interns, and the faculty members employed by the North site have begun to use their discretion in making adjustments to the program.

The following discussion outlines the design of each quality-ensuring element, some of the conditions necessary for its success, and the mismatch that occurred in this program between those conditions and reality. The analysis demonstrates that in the case of CTC North, the mismatch leads to a shift in responsibility for ensuring quality from the program structure and screening processes to the program faculty. The result is that in reality, if not in design, California Teacher Corps North relies on expert faculty to ensure the quality of the teachers it produces. This finding demonstrates the potential for fluidity and dynamism in alternative certification program sites' approaches to quality.

"I'd like to see more quality and less quantity": Context and capacity alter the selection process

The success of the California Teacher Corps' selection process as a quality ensuring mechanism rests on several conditions. First, there must be more qualified applicants than there are spaces, so that directors and faculty have an interest in turning some applicants away. Second, the interview process must yield candidates with the appropriate characteristics and skills to succeed in the program as well as the classroom.

The reality of selection does not match the designers' vision, for several reasons. First, the selection process lacks the intended rigor, due to intense administrative pressure for the program to grow. As faculty member Colleen DeLong explains, "there is not much of a selection process," beyond enforcement of the minimum grade point average

15

requirement. Faculty members do administer the Haberman interview, though DeLong

says that they have agreed to adapt the scoring system. "There is no zero" on the scale

that CTC North has developed, whereas it is possible for interviewees to earn a zero for

poor answers as the interview is designed; "We are supposed to use our discretion."

DeLong states that in an effort to keep the program growing, the faculty members

recommend most interns who meet minimum requirements. Thus, they ultimately rely on

district hiring procedures to weed out unsuitable applicants. "We figure that if someone

wants to hire them" they must be decent applicants. However, since the districts have

such a desperate need for teachers, this does not provide for effective quality control.

DeLong is not impressed with the academic and intellectual credentials of the interns she

works with. She describes them as "lackluster… I'd like to see more quality and less

A Contextual Problem: The Pressure to Grow as the Shortage Abates
        Director Chuck Sabin acknowledges that it is difficult to be selective, given the

program goal of certifying as many uncertified teachers as possible. The CTC North site

has a high acceptance rate of applicants: "I guess we probably take 85 percent -- 80-85

percent." Those who are not admitted are often barred because they have not met specific

program requirements: "because of GPA, because of -- they haven't gotten certain things

        Sabin's supervisors are pressuring him to keep his numbers up, and he is looking for

reasons to admit applicants, rather than reasons to turn them away.

> We've been given by our chancellor's office a 40 percent growth (target) for next year.
> It's a huge, huge growth target…. When the chancellor's office sold the California
> Teachers Corps to the Governor, and got initial funding, they said that this was going
> to be a significant answer to the credentialing of teachers in the state of California.
> While we have about 850 students we've served this year, it's nowhere near what they

promised. And now, what they promised is -- depending on who you talk to, I've heard figures as high as 5,000 a year.

This pressure for growth has created stress for administrators at all levels of the program, as contextual factors have rendered the original program goals unrealistic. Statewide co-director Charlene Frome explains that the teacher shortage in California may be abating, for a variety of reasons. For example, as the economy takes a downturn, fewer teachers than anticipated are retiring. Intern programs have appeared all over the state, and large numbers of previously uncredentialed teachers have earned certification in the last few years. Meanwhile, many districts have altered their approaches to meeting the 20 to 1 student to teacher ratio mandated by the Class Size Reduction Act:

> [Districts] weren't using absolute numbers of 20 [teachers] to 1 [student]. They were talking about an average. And some of them have gone maybe to 22. So that hasn't -- that's also helped to reduce the need for so many teachers because originally it was absolutely 20 to 1. If you had 21 students, you had to create another class. So, I think all of those things have contributed to a little bit of a downswing in the intern credentials.

The shortage that had reached crisis proportions when the program was conceived and designed has become less dramatic in recent years. Ironically, CTC directors are ambivalent about the lessened need for newly credentialed teachers, since the programmatic goal of increasing the number of interns served has not changed.

Sabin recognizes that one of major reasons applicants are turned away from his CTC site is that they do not secure teaching jobs in time to start the program. He is beginning to work with districts to facilitate the hiring process of applicants who meet the academic requirements. "We're anticipating that this will be our way of making our (growth) target." This information, when viewed in the light of DeLong's suggestion that the program relies on district hiring processes to do the weeding, points to circularity in the selection process.

This circularity is, in part, due to conflicting goals of admitting highly qualified applicants and simultaneously certifying as many teachers as possible. Harvey Fiat, a consultant to CTC North who was on the design team, says that the program does not have the "privilege" of being selective, while simultaneously "trying to serve the mass market."

Screening for the wrong skills?
The Haberman interview is designed to determine whether or not an applicant will teach effectively in an urban environment; the interview does not screen for the qualities necessary to complete the CTC program successfully while teaching full time. In order to make it through the CTC program, faculty member Maria Lopez says, "you need to be a self-starter, and motivated, and be able to set goals, and responsible."

Another adjunct faculty member, Carlos Acebo,[11] agrees:

You can't expect to have a professor hand feed you information or have face-to-face discussions with classmates. If you're that type of person who needs that kind of structure, then you're going to have to go on-site. There have been California Teacher Corps people who have started [this program], who have stopped and went into a traditional program, just for those reasons.

Acebo finds that after the coursework has begun, it becomes clear who will be successful, and who will not. The adjuncts do not often fail interns who stick with the program, but they do report counseling out the people who are not making it. Acebo says that sometimes interns "realize that, 'I can't cut it. This isn't the right program for me,' or 'at this point in my life, I can't do this,' for whatever reason, and they'll drop out on their own."

Variable selectivity in the district hiring processes, and the mismatch between what the Haberman Interview screens for and what it takes to succeed in the program

---

[11] I interviewed faculty members Carlos Acebo and Maria Lopez together. They expressed similar perspectives on many aspects of the program, which may, in part, have been due to the fact that they had access to one another's responses to interview questions.

means that the traveling adjunct faculty often perform a de facto screening process once the program has started. They counsel out the interns whose skills or dispositions are not in line with program standards. Faculty member Maria Lopez explains that the screening mechanisms they use are not particularly effective in determining who will be successful, anyway: "After they're in California Teacher Corps, I can address [whether or not they will succeed], but before [they begin the program] I don't feel I can address that." Her colleague Colleen DeLong estimates that she counsels out 3 of 20, or 15%, of her interns each year because they are unable or unwilling to meet the demands of the program.

"The problem we have with our program is that it may be too hard": A mismatch between the program structure and the interns' realities

The traveling adjunct faculty hope not to counsel students out; rather they hope to provide enough support to help the interns complete the program. Once the interns are admitted, adjuncts try to accommodate those interns' needs in order to facilitate success and allow them to earn their credentials. As Lopez explains, "it's the job of the [adjunct] to get the intern finished and through the program with a credential." Sometimes this means abbreviating or amending the program design, and the curriculum in particular.

The curriculum for California Teacher Corps fills four, three ring binders – one binder for each stage of the program. Interns receive the binders when they enroll, in one large shipment from the CTC Southwest office that also includes the texts they will be required to read. Assignments appear in the sequence in which the original program designers intended for interns to complete them, and include activities like reading several articles about classroom management and creating a management plan, or assessing the reading skill of 5 students using running records and writing a report detailing the

19

experience.[12] Interns are expected to complete the coursework independently, in their own classrooms, and email written products to the adjunct faculty member assigned to them. In the second year of California Teacher Corps's operation, the traveling adjunct faculty created a tool for interns they call the Pacing Guide, which suggests a timeline for completing assignments so interns do not fall too far behind.

As the faculty members have implemented the program, they have realized that even with the pacing guide, interns consistently fall behind in their work. Balancing full time teaching with up to 20 hours per week of independent coursework is too much for them. The CTC North site director, Chuck Sabin observes, "If you look at the pacing guide, and the way that it's organized, it's impossible. We've had students complete that pacing guide for one term, and at the end of that they're completely exhausted and burned out." Harvey Fiat, who was on the original curriculum design team agrees: "The problem we have with our program is that it may be too hard."

Shifting the Approach to Quality

Faced with the knowledge that the interns simply were not able to complete the learning experience designed for them, Sabin and his faculty decided to break the state-wide mandate of fidelity to the curriculum. Rather than slow the pace of the program, which would allow interns more time to complete the required assignments, Sabin granted his adjunct faculty autonomy to modify the curriculum itself. He encourages them to focus on the outcomes the program expects interns to demonstrate. As Sabin explained,

> In our region, we've given our faculty latitude to make those decisions: What can a student reasonably do to show the outcomes that the program expects? I'm more concerned about the outcomes than I am with them completing every assignment. If a student were to try to complete every assignment, that person would find it nearly

---

[12] At the time of this writing, the CTC design team is revamping the curriculum to meet new standards legislated in SB 2042. The curricular revisions will be complete in late spring 2003.

impossible....these people are working full-time; they have the demands -- because ours tend to be in their early to mid-thirties -- the demands of kids and family and other responsibilities, and then doing this on top of it?

The faculty members have each taken responsibility for tailoring coursework to meet their interns' needs, and adopted approaches reflective of their own goals, values and beliefs. Adjunct faculty member Maria Lopez explains that she sees the assignments as a hurdle that she must help the interns over on the way to demonstrating desired outcomes.

> Every [faculty member] handles this differently, and the job says that we have autonomy to do so, so when they have, let's say, 80 assignments that they have to do throughout the stage, we're willing to negotiate with them, if there's a particular assignment they think doesn't apply to them, for some reason, then maybe they can do something else instead. ... But the end result is the same: they have to have an understanding of the (California Standards for the Teaching Profession[13]), and they have to be integrated into their teaching naturally by the end of the program, hopefully.

Bertrand Crooks, also a traveling adjunct faculty member for CTC North, says that he tries to share responsibility with his interns for determining which assignments they should work on. "I would say, okay, show me what you've got? What are your questions? Where are you going?... Quite frankly, after they get through with the first stage, they're telling me -- this is what I'm doing. This is how I'm doing it." He allows them to take the lead in determining which assignments they should do, in which order, based on their individual schedules and classroom contexts.

Carlos Acebo sees his interns as teachers first, and students second, and he also helps them modify assignments to fit their particular contexts. "I don't want to disrupt what they're doing on-site, just because of my request to have this many assignments done this day, and

---

[13] Included as Appendix B.

so I allow a lot more flexibility in what assignments they do." He, like other faculty, believes it is his job to use judgment in helping interns over the hurdles in the program, so that those interns can get their credentials and keep teaching. This orientation reflects a lessened commitment to the Structure Approach to quality than the design team held. The faculty's overriding interest in retaining teachers also reflects the initial impetus for developing this program – to alleviate the shortage.

A former teacher himself, Acebo is empathic with new teachers and the difficulty of making it through the first few years:

> Your whole year is going to be real, real -- a real struggle. And then if you add on top of that that you have to put in fifteen to twenty hours a week to get your credentialing done, it's enough to drive someone out of the profession. And that's what we don't want to do.

In taking the administration of assignments into their own hands, the faculty has taken on a good deal of responsibility for ensuring the quality of the interns, shifting it away from the curriculum as created by the program design team. They must judge which assignments are essential for interns and what they need to learn in order to teach well.

"This is a weak link in the program": Lacking capacity to find and train mentors

The challenge of finding mentors

Another set of conditions necessary for the successful implementation of the program, as designed, relates to the on-site mentors. The program design relies on a consistent, statewide supply of skilled mentors who – for five hundred dollars a semester - are willing to help the interns hone their practice. In the case of CTC North, the realities of capacity have not matched these programmatic assumptions. One reason has to do with geography. The site has a particular responsibility to serve teachers in rural and remote areas of the state, unlike other regional sites, which are located in urban areas. This means that the

North site's interns are far flung, in schools and districts where Sabin and his team of faculty have not been able to build personal relationships. Therefore, when teachers are accepted into the program, faculty often rely on school principals to choose on-site mentors, and those principals sometimes have few options for qualified mentors and little knowledge of what CTC expects mentors to do.

Julia Nevins, a part-time faculty member for CTC North who is also a district administrator, reports that some schools in her district have so many uncredentialed teachers that it is hard to find enough mentors to go around. "Like there's a little school [in a rural town] - they only have fifteen teachers, and four of them are California Teacher Corps interns… We have some campuses that have one intern teacher, and then we have another campus that has twenty-six out of - I think they have sixty teachers." Her colleague Bertrand Crooks says he does always manage to find someone to mentor his interns, though occasionally he has to look in other schools. When no one is available at the school site, "we'll go on to the County Office of Ed, and find somebody, but it always -- in every situation I know of, it's another grade-level teacher."

The Challenge of Training Mentors

The program not only lacks capacity to find mentors; directors and faculty are also at a loss as to how to train them. In recent years, as he and the faculty have struggled to find willing and able on-site mentors, Sabin has become convinced that standardized training for mentors is necessary. He explains,

> We have our mentors. I think they're like a critical, critical player in the preparation of teachers, but I think we've had -- up until about a year ago, we've had a serious flaw in our program in that we just basically identified somebody who we thought would be a good teacher and mentor, and then you know, said, 'provide mentoring; provide help to these people,' without much support structure for them. So, we started looking at how can you start addressing their needs.

23

Last year, Sabin and the other regional directors decided that they would find a way to train the on-site mentors, in order to better regulate the mentoring experience for interns. Because the mentors teach all over the state, and funding for travel expenses was not available, conducting face-to-face training sessions is not feasible. Sabin explained,

> For some of the [directors] who are in urban areas, it was easier, because you can provide some training; give [mentors] release time; ask them to come to a workshop. You get at least some people showing up that way. For us it doesn't work. You know, we do these and maybe get four to eight people sign up, and we have 250 interns. That's not good.

In 2001, in hopes of addressing this capacity challenge, Sabin approached a non-profit consulting agency and asked them to create a training curriculum for on-site mentors. He asked that the curriculum be one that mentors could complete independently, at their convenience. The agency did create one, and in order to facilitate easy delivery of that curriculum to teachers in rural and remote schools, the CTC technology team transferred it to a CD-rom, with a video-streamed introduction by traveling adjunct faculty member Carlos Acebo. The curriculum takes about 18 hours to complete. It details the responsibilities of the mentor position and provides training in supervision, observation and feedback. Sabin is very pleased with its quality, and believes that if the on-site mentors complete it, the training may in turn improve the quality of the mentoring that interns receive. However, convincing the mentors to complete the training has proven challenging.

The Problem of Accountability

In 2002, Sabin distributed the training CDs to all of his on-site mentors, with an offer of university credit to every mentor who completed the curriculum. To his chagrin, not one mentor completed the curriculum and asked for credit. In retrospect, Sabin believes he was unrealistic to think mentors would commit time to the training while managing their

own classrooms and supporting interns. "When you hand somebody something that's 18 hours long, you can't expect that they're going to do it."

Sabin has since encouraged the adjunct faculty to walk the mentors through the CD personally. "This is a weak link in the program," comments CTC North faculty member Colleen DeLong. "The mentors don't want to be trained. They think they are fine just

DeLong has no way to force them to accept training, and she has no hand in selecting them. Therefore, while she is grateful when the mentors she works with are helpful, she does not rely on them for assistance in supporting or assessing interns. DeLong, like her colleagues, takes her classroom observations very seriously, providing detailed feedback to interns, with the assumption that it may be the only feedback they receive.

Sabin observes that the lack of capacity to screen and train mentors does shift additional responsibility for supporting and assessing interns to the adjuncts.

> Realistically, the mentor is there every day, so that relationship that we haven't yet developed in a way that we need to is going to be critical to our ability to support more interns, and to support them more successfully. Right now, our [faculty members] do a lot of direct service that could be done by somebody else, if we're helping that other person to assume that role better.

Maria Lopez tried something new recently, hosting a weekend get-together for mentors in her home. "I just walked them through paperwork and gave them a little introduction to the program, and they seemed to feel better that way. It's really important, that initial contact in the relationship we have with them, because that helps them know exactly what their role is to support that intern." She hopes that by building bridges with the mentors she will strengthen their sense of connection and accountability to the program, but she admits that hosting these gatherings is outside the bounds of her job description. She

hosted the mentors on her own time, and at her own expense, and not all faculty members are willing to make similar sacrifices.

"I have to consider every intern differently": Adjusting Assessment

The assessment process at CTC North has also shifted from its original design, away from the standardized procedure and into the hands of the adjunct faculty. The portfolio, assessed by faculty against the CSTP and according to agreed upon norms, is supposed to account for one third of an intern's grade for a given stage. Classroom teaching, assessed against the CSTP during faculty's monthly observations, also counts for a third of the grade. The final third depends on participation: posting comments in on-line threaded discussions, attending five Saturday seminars per year, and maintaining regular communication with the assigned adjunct faculty member.

However, Chuck Sabin and his cadre of faculty at the North Site have decided not to adhere to the standardized California Teacher Corps guidelines for assessment. In particular, Sabin allows his faculty to adjust the relative weights of the program components in assessing interns. None of the five North site adjuncts I interviewed weighs the three components equally, and each described a different calculus for determining whether interns pass. Carlos Acebo reports, "I've heard one-third, one-third, one-third; I've heard fifty percent teaching, thirty percent portfolio, twenty percent online participation; then I've heard, oh, you can just do whatever you feel." The result is that individual faculty members use their discretion in deciding which interns pass, and therefore which receive California teaching credentials.

One reason that North site faculty have decided to abandon the system for assessing interns specified in the program design is that the system is difficult to implement. State

certification guidelines require that interns demonstrate proficiency in the six California

Standards for the Teaching Profession in order to earn certification. Those six standards are

supposed to be the focal point of assessment, an expectation that makes sense to Sabin, who

says, "I'm more concerned about the outcomes than I am with (the interns) completing

every assignment." However, the faculty members report that it is not easy to see evidence

of those six standards in the portfolios that interns complete, and that norming sessions for

portfolio review focus on the organization and appearance of portfolio binders rather than

evidence of good teaching. Colleen DeLong remarks that this may be because assignments

are not designed to produce intern work that in turn demonstrates proficiency in the

standards. "Even if an intern does all of the assignments well, you cannot see those

(CSTP) standards demonstrated in the portfolio."

John Krupke, an administrator who was on the original design team, explains the

lack of alignment between the portfolios as assessment tools and the assessment

standards. He cites differences in approach between the Curriculum and Assessment

committees of the original design team.

> The Assessment Committee was operating from what are called the California
> Standards for the Teaching Profession, which are organized into six domains…. The
> lack of alignment came from the fact that the curriculum teams were organized around
> subject matter as opposed to around these six domains. And they were traditional
> subject matter. We had our reading methods group, and we had our math methods
> group, and we had our foundations of educational psychology group, and they were
> all building curriculum. Well, that's not the way the California Standards for the
> Teaching Profession are organized. That's not the way that the curricula and the
> assessment tools that we developed were organized because we were working from
> the CSTP. So, essentially, we had a standards-based assessment process founded on
> the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. And we had a subject matter
> driven curriculum that wasn't originally focused on the CSTP.

The misalignment between the curriculum design team's focus on content and the

assessment committee's focus on standards creates an implementation challenge. The

portfolio that interns present for assessment does offer a record of the assignments they have completed; however, it does not demonstrate that they have met the six Standards for the Teaching Profession on which the adjunct faculty must base certification.

The design of the portfolio assessment reflects the original design team's emphasis on program structure in the approach to quality. They focused on building a well-designed set of learning experiences, with evidence that interns had completed the program as constituting sufficient assessment. However, since this does not match the assessment guidelines of the state, the system breaks down. The responsibility for ensuring quality again falls to the faculty, who are on their own to find evidence of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession in interns' practice. Most rely primarily on classroom observations, to which they also bring their own ideas of what high quality teaching looks like and a strong mandate to certify large numbers of teachers.

Carlos Acebo explains his philosophy of assessment:

> I have to consider every intern differently. For example, I have this one gal, she's been teaching twenty-three years. She's excellent, but she struggles with the computer, and something happened. The computer broke. She doesn't have money to get a new computer, so she is behind in some of the computer assignments, and so I didn't think it would be fair to ding her a lot, just because of that. So, I kind of take it case by case. To me, as long as they are showing integrity, and doing their personal best with all those different components, I think that's passable….I've given "no pass"es on portfolios, but still passed the student in the stage, because they were such a strong teacher.

When Acebo runs across an intern who he thinks is a good teacher, he wants to keep that person in the classroom. Therefore, he is willing to de-emphasize a poorly constructed portfolio (even one graded "no pass") and allow an intern to continue into the next of the four program stages, based on classroom teaching performance alone. This accords with his

personal values; he believes it would be counterproductive to run a good teacher out of the profession for failing to complete program requirements that he sees as superfluous.

Maria Lopez expressed a similar flexibility in her requirements for the portfolio, with an emphasis on retaining those interns who she believes to be good teachers.

> It's a case-by-case type of thing, and I'll adjust my scales, accordingly, based on what the intern is showing me. The excellent classroom teachers, those are the ones I want to keep charged and pumped about their teaching ability, and so I'll weigh that heavier in their evaluation. The ones who are struggling -- you know, they may be great, great teachers, but struggling writers, yes, I'll weigh more heavier on the classroom teaching side.

Sabin relies on the expertise and judgment of his faculty, and allows their assessments of interns to stand. "I don't overturn grades. I don't know of any (regional site director) who's ever overturned a grade. Faculty autonomy is faculty autonomy."

Reliance on Master Teachers: The De Facto Approach to Quality at CTC North

The development team of the California Teacher Corps emphasized Reliance on Program Structure, Selection and Assessment to ensure the quality of the teachers the program credentialed. However, as summarized in Figure 1, mismatches between the assumptions embedded in the program design and the realities of program context and capacity have prevented the North site director and faculty from implementing the program as it was originally conceived. In each instance, North site director Chuck Sabin has encouraged his traveling adjunct faculty to assume responsibility for ensuring quality. Ultimately, Sabin relies on their expertise to ensure the quality of the interns that the program trains:

> I guess the underlying philosophy that I'm working under, if I were to attach an epistemology to this, I would say that materials don't teach people, but relationships do... We've taken the approach that if you, as a faculty member, given that we've hired you for your expertise, and knowing about teacher education, and knowing

29

about what it takes to prepare a teacher, and knowing the content, then you as a faculty member should be responsible enough to know what your student needs.

Sabin's approach at the North site contrasts with statewide co-director

of the program design in which, "the study guide is sort of the professor." Rather than

assuming that the expertise that will serve interns is located in the curriculum, Sabin

assumes that the expertise is located in the faculty. This assumption is key to the difference

between the Reliance on Program Structure approach to quality and the approach to quality

implemented at Sabin's site.

Sabin and his faculty acknowledge that their site's approach to implementing the

program may be different than the approaches at other CTC sites.   Sabin knows that the

degree of latitude he allows his faculty "is not something that you'll find in other regional

centers." For example, "there are other regional centers that claim that their interns do every

assignment." He also believes that his faculty is, as a whole, more qualified than the

faculties at other sites. "We've hired -- I would put our [faculty] in terms of their knowledge,

their ability to work with interns, their skills as [faculty members], head and shoulders above

any other region…. it's something I'm particularly proud of."

Faculty member Bertrand Crooks credits Sabin for hiring great faculty (like himself).

You've got to be careful how you say this, because you don't want to make it sound like it only succeeds if it has good people, but [Sabin and his former co-director] have got real good people: …They've hired really good faculty that care about people, that want to make people successful.

Together, Sabin and his faculty have developed a primary focus on supporting the

interns in their teaching, and they have bent program requirements around meeting that

concern. According to faculty member Carlos Acebo, "we've kind of come up with our

own philosophy about what new teachers need to survive in the profession, and we don't

want them to just get their credential. We want them in for the long haul."

Figure 1: A Summary of Assumptions Behind the Design, the Reality, and How those Change Design

Quality Ensuring Lever	Assumptions about Capacity & Context	Realities of Capacity and Context	How People Cope
Selection - Minimum gpa - Pass Praxis - Haberman interview - Must have job	- There will be more qualified applicants than we can accept. - The selection criteria will be indicators of an ability to complete the program successfully.	- The shortage mandate requires that the program grow. - The selection criteria are not accurate indicators of who will succeed in the program.	- Haberman interview relaxed– individual faculty use their discretion. - People are admitted to the program who do not succeed; faculty members counsel them out or relax the curriculum.
Coursework - Assignments completed independently, in classroom in 12 to 20 hours per week.	- Interns will have time to complete the coursework - Assignments will fit in with other job requirements	- The interns do not have time to do the coursework - The assignments are not always translatable to their classroom contexts	- Faculty relaxes coursework requirements, allowing interns to modify or skip assignments.
Mentoring - On-site mentor assigned by principal, expected to meet with intern weekly	- There will be enough motivated, talented on-site mentors available for interns. - The on-site mentors will voluntarily participate in trainings.	- High quality mentors are not always available - Mentors do not participate in voluntary training. The program has no way to hold them accountable.	- Faculty members do not rely on the mentors for support. - Traveling faculty do regular classroom observations and assess interns without taking mentor reports into account.
Assessment - Portfolio of assignments - Teaching is assessed by assigned faculty	-The program's desired outcomes will be demonstrable in the portfolio as well as teaching.	- CSTP outcomes are not demonstrable in the portfolio.	- Faculty members weigh teaching more heavily than the portfolio, and find ways to pass the people who they think are good teachers.

Drawbacks of this De Facto Approach

        While the site's approach to quality assurance, which relies heavily on expert

faculty, has developed out of apparent necessity, it has drawbacks. Faculty members were

quick to point these out. As she outlined the different things she does to support her interns,

Julia Nevins sighed, "it's difficult…. It is a lot of work for a [traveling adjunct faculty

Maria Lopez notes that the faculty must expend extraordinary effort to make the program work, and believes the situation is untenable in the long run.

> I think the strength of the California Teacher Corps is…the relationship between the [faculty member] and the intern. The support that [the program] offers their interns is really significant, if the intern takes advantage. But I also feel like I am spending, as a [faculty member], more time than I'm paid for to support those interns. If that's how it's going to be, then I worry that we're not going to have a lot of good [faculty], because maybe just like teachers, they're going to get burned out, and overloaded with work, and then the quality that they give their interns falls, and that is a concern that I have personally.

The faculty has become the centerpiece of this program, overtaking the carefully designed curriculum and creating a new capacity challenge for Sabin: how will he find faculty who are willing and able to do this taxing work, and how will he be able sustain them?

Implications

Close analysis of the approach to quality at the California Teacher Corps' North site demonstrates that the approach to quality is dynamic and dependent on a host of factors. The approach that is evident in implementation, one that relies heavily on the skill and expertise of master teachers, is not the approach that program designers envisioned. The shift in approach is the result of issues of capacity and context; the realities of implementation have not played out the way designers assumed they would. As faculty of the North Site assumes responsibility for ensuring the quality of the teachers they certify, they rely on their personal beliefs about teaching and the purpose of the program.

For Chuck Sabin, director of the CTC North Site, there are clear implications. As he strives to increase the number of interns in his program, he must find ways to shift the burden of support and training from individual faculty members or risk overwhelming them. Refining the system for training on-site mentors, and building in accountability for completing that training, is one way to shift that burden. Rewriting and streamlining the curriculum, a task that the entire design team is currently engaged in, may also shift some burden away from the faculty and back to the program structure itself.   A decreased emphasis on program growth may allow the faculty more selectivity, while a realignment of the assessment process with program goals may shift emphasis back to that process as a means for ensuring quality. Faculty member Maria Lopez hopes that Sabin will reduce the faculty's workload and increase their pay; such a move would require increased fiscal capacity, which does not seem likely.

Conclusion

As alternative certification programs proliferate and analysts continue to study them, it is important to bear several things in mind. First, we must acknowledge the tension between quantity and quality – the pressure to certify many teachers quickly and the mandate that they be highly qualified - and the effect of that tension on program design. Second, we must consider the roles of context and capacity in shaping those designs and their implementation over time. As providers face changing policy and labor market contexts, and experience shortages in fiscal, physical or human resources, their programs' approaches to training quality teachers will evolve. Understanding that dynamism may, in turn, inform the current debate about alternative certification programs, shifting the focus away from whether such programs should exist – they do, in

large and growing numbers – and towards what they deliver to the participants who enroll

in them.

REFERENCES CITED

Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (1994). Recruiting smarter teachers. *The Journal of Human Resources, XXX*(2), 326-338.

Blair, J. (2003, January 9). Skirting tradition. *Education Week/Quality Counts 2003,* pp. 35-41.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: Debating the evidence. *Teachers College Record, 102*(1), 28-56.

Dill, V. S. (1996). Alternative teacher certification. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 932-960). New York: MacMillan.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1994). The evolution of alternative teacher certification. *The Educational Forum, 58*(2), 132-138.

Feistritzer, C. E., & Chester, D. T. (2002). *Alternative teacher certification: A state-by-state analysis 2002*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Hawley, W. (1990). The theory and practice of alternative certification: Implications for the improvement of teaching. *Peabody Journal of Education, 67*(3), 3-34.

Peske, H. G. (2002). *Connecticut's alternative route to certification: A case study*. Unpublished Qualifying Paper, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Snyder, J. (1999). *New Haven Unified School District: A teaching quality system for excellence and equity.* New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Stoddart, T., & Floden, R. E. (1995). *Traditional and alternative routes to teacher certification: Issues, assumptions, and misconceptions.* New York: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. (1999). *The teachers we need and how to get more of them*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Zumwalt, K. (1991). Alternative routes to teaching: Three alternative approaches. *Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(2), 83-92.

Appendix A: Interview Protocols
Interview Protocol for the Program Director[14]
Excerpted Questions about Quality

Program Specifics:
How many interns participate in the program each year?

How are participants recruited to the program? Who is responsible for it?
Who selects them?

Is there a maximum program size? What percentage do you reject?

What leads candidates to this program in particular?

How does the training candidates in the alternative program receive differ from the
training they would receive if they enrolled in the university's traditional program?

History

What prompted the development of the California Teacher Corps? (What problem is it
trying to solve?)

Who took the lead in program development? Who were the supporters?

What is the relationship between this program and the other CTC programs in CA?
What was the relationship between the Ed School and the Science, Technology and
Information Resources Center in designing this program?
   • Probe: how did this partnership come about?

How is this program situated within/received by the university?
               • What is the relationship between this program and the on-campus intern
                 program?
               • Do the faculty between the on-campus program and California Teacher
                 Corps cross over?

How is CTC funded? (Who pays whom for what?)

How does this program see itself in relation to BTSA[15]? In relation to district induction?

Does the program rely on either of those for any element of support/training?

Partners:
Tell me about your relationship with partnering schools and districts?
- What do they gain from you?
- What do you gain from them?

Who is primarily responsible for supervising teachers during their participation in the program? CTC or the schools?

Describe your partnership with the Technology Enhancement Program?
What do they do for CTC? How did that partnership come about?

The Faculty:
Describe your Traveling Adjunct Faculty

How is the faculty recruited?

What is the selection process for faculty?

What do you expect of the on-site mentors?

How are they hired? Are they trained?

Curriculum:

How was the curriculum designed?
- What are the learning objectives for participants?
- What logistical factors were considered in designing the curriculum?
- How did you think about the state standards in relation to the curriculum?
- What kinds of changes have occurred over time in the curriculum?
- What are the particular benefits and challenges of this delivery system?

Is there any coursework you wish you could offer, but cannot?

Future Plans

What about this program is most helpful to interns?
Where does it fall short?

What are the plans for the future of the program?
- Next year? In five years? In ten years?
- Probe: do you anticipate growth? Do you anticipate any programmatic of curricular changes? Do you expect the pool of applicants to remain stable?

Interview Protocol : Faculty
Excerpted Questions Regarding Quality

I am interested in learning about your role in the program. Can you tell me more about your current position?
- [Probe for history of involvement, role]

When did you begin to teach in the program?

What attracted you to teach in this program?

How were you hired?
- Probe: Who chose? Was there an application and interview process?

Were you trained for your role on the faculty?

Recruitment
How are participants recruited for the program?

What are recruitment priorities?
- Probe: teachers of color? bilingual? math and science? Special ed?

Should the recruitment priorities and strategies be the same next year? Why or why not?

Selection of Participants
Could you describe the selection process for applicants to the program?

Tell me about your role in the selection of candidates.
- What are you looking for when you select candidates? How do you know if a candidate is a good match for the program?

Incentives
If I am a person interested in teaching, what might lead me to choose this program over others in the area?

What might lead me to this instead of the on-campus intern program?

The Coursework
Did you have a role in designing the assignments?
If so,
- What were your priorities, in terms of topics to include?
- What constraints did you have to consider?

What assignments do the participants say they find most useful in learning how to teach?
Why are those assignments useful?
What do they say they find least useful in learning how to teach?
Why did those assignments turn out not to be useful?

What might make the coursework component better?

Assessment of Participants
What is the process of assessing interns? What is your role in that assessment?

Is there a point at which you decide whether participants "pass" the coursework?
- How do the CA certification standards fit in to the process?
- Do any of the participants fail to pass the program? What happens to them?
- Do people ever drop out? How often? Why?

Support while Teaching

Would you explain how the school-site support component of the program is organized?

How many interns are you supporting? Where are they located?

In what ways do you support your interns while they are teaching?

Who helps you support them?

How do you coordinate with administrators and other teachers at your interns' schools?

What is the division of labor between you and the on-site mentors?

What is a typical week like for you?

What are the challenges for you in this arrangement?

What works well? What would you do differently if you had more time?
What would you do differently if you had more money to spend?

Program Changes
In what ways has the program changed over the last few years?
- Could you provide specific examples of the way(s) in which the program has changed over the years you have been working here?

In your judgment, what is the most useful aspect of the program? [examples?] What do you judge the least useful?

How will/should the program change in the next few years?

Partner Interview Protocol:
Director of the Technology Arm[16]

Program Origins
How did the technology project come about?

Whose idea was it?

What problem were you hoping to solve with it?

How/when did CTC get involved?

What is the relationship between this project and CTC?

What do you do for them? What do they do for you?

Roles
What is your daily involvement in the technology project like?

Who from CTC works with you on this project? What do they do?

What role does John Krupke play?

Research Findings
How is the technology project going?

What are you finding in the research component?

What are the challenges of using technology to train teachers?
        For the University?
        For faculty as teachers?
        For Interns as learners?

The successes?
How do teachers actually use this technology?

---

[16] The technology project is an independent technology team that operates within the university. They have formed a partnership with CTC; the technology project coordinates the delivery of on-line coursework to participants. In turn, technology project uses CTC participants as subjects in their research about teachers' use of technology.

Appendix B:
California Standards for the Teaching Profession

Adopted by Commission on Teacher Credentialing in 1997, and approved by the state superintendent of instruction and endorsed by State Board of Education, 1997

- Engaging and supporting all students in learning
- Creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning
- Understanding and organizing subject matter for student learning
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for all students
- Assessing student learning
- Developing as a professional educator