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ABSTRACT

School years 1965-66, 1968-69 and 1970-71 showed surging growth in the nation's supply of paraprofessionals followed by a leveling off in 1971-73. These circumstances created a need for policy planning concerning future paraprofessional programming and funding. But the data base necessary for this decision-making did not then exist on a national scale.

This study is intended to fill that data gap. It focuses on paraprofessional programming, training, and utilization around the nation in school systems which enrolled 5,000 or more pupils in school years 1971-72 and 1972-73. Responses elicited from these school systems by a questionnaire revealed base-line data on the extent of paraprofessional programming, along with information on two important components of it, institutionalization and
career development.

A total of 1,148 school systems responded to the questionnaire, of which 1,065 had paraprofessional programs employing 135,809 paraprofessionals. Over one-third of these paraprofessionals were employed in the nation's 23 largest school systems while 27 per cent were in schools enrolling 5,000 to 15,000 pupils. Heaviest use of paraprofessionals was found on the East and West coasts and in the Great Lakes States.

Study findings on institutionalization of paraprofessional programs indicated that despite enthusiasm on the part of local educators and the community, only one-fifth of the school systems under study could support their paraprofessionals completely if federal funds dried up and less than one-half could support them partially. Some paraprofessionals were still being paid for less than a full school day. They were organized in only one-quarter of the school systems under study. Their access to the benefits typically granted to teachers was mixed. Few paraprofessionals who attained teacher certification had been hired by the school systems under study.

That some institutionalization of paraprofessionals has taken place can be read from the findings that personnel policies for a majority of paraprofessionals were being decided by the school personnel department. For a large
minority of paraprofessionals supervision came from central office personnel and evaluation from their principals.

While about 45 per cent of the school systems under study said they had career advancement plans, 83 per cent of the paraprofessionals in these school systems were working as aides, the lowest level of the career lattice. Whether this was by choice or not was not indicated, but only 29 school systems reported operating three and/or four-level instructional career ladders.

The school systems under study appear to define career advancement more in terms of salary than of job level. And paraprofessional salaries have increased about as much as teachers' since school year 1965-66.

The basis for career advancement was reported to be job performance in 28 per cent of the school systems and joint evaluation in 18 per cent of school systems under study. While only 13 per cent of the school systems saw in-service training of paraprofessionals as a basis for career advancement, three-quarters of the systems provided it. Of these, three-quarters trained teachers and paraprofessionals together and 83 per cent provided joint planning time for teachers and paraprofessionals. In contrast, while one-quarter of the school systems said college credits are a basis for career advancement, one-third of them reported they had paraprofessionals who are studying

viii
in colleges or universities but only one-sixth of the paraprofessionals in the study are in fact doing so. Two-thirds of the paraprofessionals employed held high school or GED degrees and 27 per cent had some college.

A review of open-end responses from the 1,065 school systems reported in this survey indicates that the variety of uses of paraprofessionals has expanded far beyond the duties that were envisaged in early writings on the subject. In addition, career development seemed to be farther along in school systems receiving federal EPDA funds than in others.
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CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND

A decade ago, at a time when a growing awareness of poverty was gripping the country, a new movement appeared on the national scene. The development was paraprofessional programming. In addition to playing an important part in anti-poverty activities around the nation, paraprofessional programming combined with new thrusts of the education reformers such as individualization of instruction, child-centered learning, team teaching and differentiated staffing. At that same time, the country was experiencing a temporary teacher shortage.

The paraprofessional movement burgeoned swiftly. Even as late as 1972, according to the National Education Association (NEA), paraprofessionals were "the fastest growing body of employees in U.S. schools." 1 An essay written in 1972 pointed out:

The use of paraprofessionals is so wide-spread today--very likely aides outnumber professional teachers by a significant margin--that the educator can hardly ignore the role. 2


Purpose of the Study

Paraprofessional utilization is now at record highs and increasing numbers of education professionals are participating in the movement. Out of this has developed a clear need for policy planning and decision making at the national, state and local levels. At issue is the kind and quality of future paraprofessional programming and how it can be achieved.

Such decisions cannot be made without careful examination of the past decade of paraprofessional programming. But the data base necessary for this decision making does not exist on a national scale at this time, although a number of limited studies provide some over-all statistics or individual project information.

This study is intended to fill the gap in available data by focusing on paraprofessional programming, training and utilization in school years 1971-72 and 1972-73 in the 1,800 school systems around the nation which enroll 5,000 pupils or more. By examining information on paraprofessional training and utilization, cataloging and comparing the data findings and interpreting current trends, this study provides a rational base for decisions on programmatic and funding directions for the future.
Goals for this Study

Three goals will be pursued in this study to fulfill the broad purpose spelled out above:

First goal: to collect base-line data about training and utilization of paraprofessionals

The first goal is to gather and systematize information about paraprofessional training and utilization collected during the decade since paid paraprofessional programming began. National statistics are available from NEA and HEW surveys, and some data can be obtained on individual programs and projects, but there exists no recent full-scale national survey on paraprofessional training and utilization. Nobody has systematically set down the roles paraprofessionals are playing in schools today. Nor is there information on how or how much they are trained, paid, organized and supervised. Neither is it known how their numbers compare with those of professional staff and pupil enrollment. This base-line data must be gathered and analyzed.

Second goal: to document the nature and extent of paraprofessional institutionalization

The pioneers of the paraprofessional movement, who launched prototype programs as early as 1964 and 1965,
viewed the institutionalization of paraprofessional programs in the nation's schools as central to the issue of reform in schools, aimed directly at improving pupil learning.

According to Bowman and Klopf:

The sponsors of the demonstration programs believed that even if there were no shortage of teachers, the introduction of more adults in the classroom would enhance the quality of education, if they were adults selected on the basis of their concern for children and as potential collaborators in the learning-teaching process rather than primarily on the basis of previous training. They saw great possibilities in the professional team enabling the teachers to differentiate education so as to meet the individual needs of pupils, as diagnosed by the teacher. They saw, too, in this multi-level team approach escape from rigid structuring in the classroom—for example, more freedom of movement, more small groupings, more independent activities than would be feasible for one person often operating under difficult teaching conditions. In fact, the teacher might, with this assistance, be able to experiment with innovative techniques otherwise impossible.³

In this way, the educational reformers conceptualized paraprofessional programming as part of the educational change spirit of the Sixties. But the teacher shortage Bowman and Klopf mentioned, which leveled off beginning in 1969, no doubt accounted at least in part for the rapidity of paraprofessional growth during that period. Whether the paraprofessional movement can be expected to continue, rise, level off, or recede in the period of teacher abundance

projected for the 1970's and 1980's is a question that bears looking at.

Moreover, as both the historical and statistical data of this study will show, a large part of the paraprofessional growth of the Sixties was supported by federal dollars. Indeed those years saw a huge increase in over-all federal expenditures in education, aimed by and large at low income communities from which many paraprofessionals were drawn.

Now federal expenditures in education are dwindling, along with the national commitment to aid the poor. Under these conditions there is some question about further growth in numbers of paraprofessionals, or even if current levels can be maintained, as local and state educational agencies find themselves paying more and more of the costs of education. This question must also be examined in the light of recent findings that local schools are increasingly "adopting economy measures" and are expected to be "living with austerity for a long time to come," while half the nation's school bond issues were voted down in school year 1971-72.  


The two factors, teacher abundance and dwindling federal support, will greatly affect the intent and nature of paraprofessional institutionalization even though such programming is considered important to educational reform strategies.

For institutionalization of paraprofessional programs in school systems around the nation is not a reality unless paraprofessionals are in regular job slots in the school system. Such employment status is based on "hard" or local tax-based funds, not federal grants, which are reflected in the local school budget by "fixed line items...at each operation level" as well as "annual salary with tenure, increments, social security, sick pay and other fringe benefits." The need for such employment status for paraprofessionals was emphasized early in the report of a training program in D.C. Public Schools, conducted in 1969 by the Washington School of Psychiatry, which recommended that parent-teacher groups, teacher unions and NEA locals face up to the "entire problem of including aides in the regular budget." 6


Conclusive data on this question must come from an examination of local school budgets, including provisions for projected salary increases each year as paraprofessionals move up through the system. Such a study should be undertaken in the future. For now it is possible to sketch a picture of what those findings might look like by exploring sources of paraprofessional funding--federal, state and local--in school systems today.

But institutionalization of paraprofessional programs rests on more than funding support. It means, too, that paraprofessionals become "a stable and integral part of public service." They must be "incorporated into the entire school structure...and not be a temporary, fragmented expedient adjunct to the school." Any analysis, then, must look closely at the degree to which paraprofessionals are integrated into the school system's regular staff development and utilization practices. Indicators of this might be what office directs paraprofessional personnel policy, who supervises and evaluates paraprofessional, how long the program has run, and other questions

8Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 8.

designed to test whether or not paraprofessionals, like teachers and administrators, are part of the regular school staff.

Third goal: to document the nature and extent of opportunities for paraprofessional advancement on a career ladder and/or lattice

It would be possible to institutionalize paraprofessionals in school systems as holders of low-level, low-paying, dead-end jobs. Indeed this may be exactly what happened but it would not be what the early model-builders had in mind. Instead they called for career development or career advancement—"new careers," to use their terminology—for poor people working as paraprofessionals as well as for cooperating teachers and others. New careers called for:

1) Clear, written definitions of the roles professionals and paraprofessionals would play in classrooms and other school programs.

2) Specific plans for training paraprofessionals, teachers and administrators— in-service and in higher education—to understand and function in these new roles.

3) An occupational track for paraprofessionals that would provide upward mobility through the system by a career ladder or lattice, ultimately, should the paraprofessional desire it, to fully certified teacher.10

10 See Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, for example.
The demands for career development were in part, as will be shown later in the chapter, an outgrowth of the change in paraprofessional focus of the 1960's from dead-end jobs for housewives to jobs for low income people within established public services, including schools. This effort to bring poor people into the mainstream of public schools and other public services was a central thrust for federal education and social program funding during the Sixties.

But the concept of new careers goes beyond the call for help for low income paraprofessionals. In place of dead-end jobs for professionals and paraprofessionals, a career development plan calls for the teaming of professionals with paraprofessionals to work directly with pupils and parents to enhance the teaching-learning experience. Such an arrangement cannot move forward in schools without clear role differentiation and definition for professionals and paraprofessionals. A school structure with a principal and a staff of teachers is "woefully inadequate," Jordan points out and urges the use of task analysis for role definition:

Once roles are defined, positions in the structure can be established, and a functional arrangement created [which will result in a] highly differentiated staff, ranging from top administrators down to part-time
personnel, some of whom may be occupying paraprofessional positions.11

The entire staff differentiation movement, as this study will show later on, is an effort to analyze, define, and develop specific roles primarily for teachers and increasingly for paraprofessionals. The very act of putting a paraprofessional to work with a teacher is the beginning of role differentiation and some kind of definition needs must follow. Anderson recognized this as early as 1964 by pointing out "a general trend toward including a number of functions in paraprofessional assignments once regarded as the province of fully certified teachers."12

New careers theorists sought to take this differentiation of roles still further by establishing for paraprofessionals a progressive series of job levels--from aide, to assistant, to associate, to intern--and seeking to persuade school systems to specify the titles, roles, responsibilities, training experience and salary for each level. This they called a "career ladder"--and suggested that paraprofessionals be permitted to move up the ladder as far as they wished and were able to go. "Upward mobility,"


say Klopf, Bowman, and Joy, "should be possible but not compulsory." Moreover, new careers theorists said that paraprofessionals can be useful to school systems in a variety of educational settings, not only in the classroom, but also in school libraries, in their audio-visual labs, in school counseling activities and in the surrounding communities. So they constructed a series of ladders, with three to five levels in each ladder, one for each of a number of school-related activities. Once set up on vertical and horizontal axes, the table was dubbed a "career lattice." (See Table 1 for sample.)

When a system of differentiation and definition of roles is coupled with the teaming of professional and paraprofessional, it puts considerable burden on schools and colleges to create new kinds of in-service and college training (both undergraduate and graduate) as well as new ways to assess performance. For, without this, professionals and paraprofessionals will be hard put to function skillfully and sensitively in their new roles in classrooms, school libraries, school counseling, school-community relations and other teaching-learning functions.

Analysis of the extent and nature of career development in current paraprofessional programming must, therefore, 

---

### TABLE 1

**A SAMPLE CAREER LATTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Illustrative Titles for Occupational Ladder^c</th>
<th>Ladders in the Field of Education^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional (Certified Staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Master Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Resource Specialist</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Certified Personnel</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofessional (Non-Certified Staff)^d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Intern or Student Professional</td>
<td>Student Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Aide III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Aide II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aide</td>
<td>Aide I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trainee</td>
<td>Trainee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a The lattice shows both steps and ladders in different fields which permit horizontal and vertical and diagonal mobility. For example, a paraprofessional might go vertically step-by-step from trainee to master teacher in the instructional field, or he might go from trainee in the instructional field diagonally step-by-step to step 8 or director in the school-community ladder.

^b The job titles suggested in the instructional ladder are comparable to job titles in each of the other four education ladders.

^c These general titles could apply to education staff as well as to staff in other human services such as health and social work. For example, in social work, job levels in ascending order, could be: case aide I, case aide II, case aide III, public welfare investigator, master of social work.

^d Some paraprofessionals are now being certified, many at the Associate of Arts degree level (associate or aide III).
come from a look at school career lattices, as well as the educational attainment of paraprofessionals today, the in-service and college training opportunities available to them and the career advancement plans offered by their school employers.

**National Background and History**

The history of paraprofessional programming is not complete in any single source, although many studies have presented brief historical summaries by way of introduction, each often highlighting different aspects. If the data on current paraprofessional programming are to be understood, interpreted and put into perspective, a more detailed history of the movement is needed. This section, therefore, will go into some detail on the national history of paraprofessional programming in the United States in the belief that such a backdrop is useful to critical reading of the data. Developments in the states in paraprofessional certification and training, too, should be studied, expanding on the Bowman summary,\(^\text{14}\) a task not undertaken in this study.

The use of paraprofessionals is not entirely new in the United States, although there are few, if any, references

---

to teacher aides in the literature before 1953. Readers, tutors, housewives and fathers are reported to have served in schools and playgrounds as volunteer paraprofessionals, but "one looks in vain," according to Bennett and Falk, "for any use of paid nonprofessional help in the classroom before the 1940's or any discussion by educators until about a decade later."¹⁵

Except of volunteer work of parents and others in schools across the nation, few major experiments with paid paraprofessionals took place before the tremendous upswing of the 1960's. The first of these, a program sponsored by the National Youth Administration (NYA) in the 1930's, trained out-of-school youth and potential dropouts and placed them in paraprofessional jobs in the human services. But only about 12 per cent of these jobs were in education,¹⁶ and when the NYA closed down in 1943 the practice continued only in the correction and health fields.

The early days: the 1950's

By the 1950's wartime manpower shortages had intensified in the schools. In fact, the Ford Foundation's newly-created Fund for the Advancement of Education


¹⁶Ibid., p. 16.
estimated in a 1955 study, *Teachers for Tomorrow*, that a half-million new teachers would be needed in the nation's schools by 1965. To help meet this need, the Fund sponsored a number of pilot projects testing various strategies to fill the teacher gap and bring new talent to the education professions.

In 1953, a joint proposal from Bay City (Michigan) Public Schools and Central Michigan College of Education (now Central Michigan University) earned a Fund grant to put "carefully selected and supervised" paraprofessionals into Bay City classrooms to free teachers from paperwork and other nonprofessional functions. In this *Cooperative Study for the Better Utilization of Teacher Competencies*, school and college staff analyzed teacher activities in Bay City classrooms, showing that teachers were spending between 21 and 69 per cent of their time on non-teaching chores. Faced with old buildings, inadequate space, increasing enrollment and shortages of teachers, the school system was looking for new and effective approaches to staff utilization.

---


18 Ibid., p. 48.
With eight college-trained housewives serving as teacher aides in a 45-student experimental elementary classroom, analysis showed that the teachers spent one-fifth more time making assignments, gained an additional hour of classroom recitation, gave 27 per cent more individual help to students, spent 48 per cent less time on routine non-teaching jobs, and provided more personal counseling to students.\(^\text{19}\)

According to the Bay City project director, all the parents interviewed believed their children liked school better with teacher aides on board, and 83 per cent thought their children learned more while 17 per cent thought they learned as much.\(^\text{20}\)

A number of studies were to bear out these findings in later years. In the 1960's in Minneapolis, paraprofessionals in the schools were found to save teachers some 17 hours a week.\(^\text{21}\) In Wisconsin, "significantly more time was spent by teachers with individual pupils" when


\(^{21}\)Ibid., p. 29.
they were paired with paraprofessionals. A Los Nietos (California) study concluded that teachers spent an additional 223 minutes a week on small group work with an aide in the classroom.

The Bay City Plan, as it came to be known, was extended to the city's secondary schools. By 1961 it had spread to some 50 other Michigan school systems and as far away as school systems in Utah, Colorado, Iowa, and Minnesota.

Other projects, financed by the Fund, followed. The Fairfield (Connecticut) project, directed cooperatively with Yale University, hired both paid and volunteer paraprofessionals to work in the schools. New York City schools, under joint Fund and Public Education Association sponsorship, began experimenting with teacher aide programs, both volunteer and paid. From 1956 to 1959, the Fund supported an Educational Testing Service (ETS) experiment using lay readers to grade papers in New Jersey and Massachusetts—an offshoot of the Bay City program that was subsequently

---

\[22\text{Ibid.}\]

\[23\text{Nelson D. Crandall, "Teacher Aides Really Aid," Changing Education Supplement to American Teacher, October, 1971, p. 15.}\]

\[24\text{Decade of Experiment, pp. 48-50.}\]

\[25\text{Ibid., p. 50.}\]
extended to 16 high schools around the nation. By 1961, the ETS experiment had spread to some 120 school systems. In 1959, the Ford Foundation also began to sponsor further development of the lay reader idea, called the Rutgers Plan, which the Fund later extended to Chicago and Detroit, under which qualified housewives worked in schools as aides in independent reading periods and programmed exercises.

Meanwhile, early experimentation with teaching teams made use of teacher aides, notably in the Lexington (Kentucky) plan, the Norwalk plan in Connecticut, in Jefferson County and in Evanston, Illinois. In the Lexington project the assignment of teacher aides to the teaching teams "reflected a decision to reinforce and relieve the teaching staff even at additional cost." In the Norwalk plan, a paraprofessional became an integral part of the teaching team with a carefully defined role in which he performed "a specified range of general, clerical and technical functions under the supervision and direction

---

26 Ibid.  27 Ibid., p. 51.  28 Ibid.


of his teaching colleagues."  

The Catskill project involving 25 rural high schools in upstate New York and the Rocky Mountain project for 23 high schools in rural Colorado--both Fund sponsored--used teacher aides as part of an effort "to make the best use of time, space, and resources" in isolated "undersized" rural high schools.  

In 1955, the National Association of Secondary School Principals interested several school systems in experimenting with various techniques for better teacher usage. With Fund for the Advancement of Education support, the group set up a Commission on the Experimental Study of the Utilization of Staff in the Secondary Schools, directed by J. Lloyd Trump. By the time the Commission disbanded in 1960, it had sponsored pilot programs in some 100 junior and senior high schools, large and small, in eleven states. They dealt with various aspects of staff utilization, many of them cooperating with nearby colleges or universities and with state education agencies.  

Other early school programs using paraprofessionals included the Philadelphia Great Cities School Improvement Project and the Pittsburgh Team Teaching Project, both

---

31 Ibid., p. 112.  
32 Decade of Experiment, p. 65.  
33 Ibid., p. 64.
started in 1960. These programs differed significantly from most of the paraprofessional programming of the early Sixties in that paraprofessionals were recruited from the community surrounding the schools rather than from the ranks of middle class college-educated housewives.\textsuperscript{34}

The aim of all of these projects was to preserve the quality of teaching in the face of severe faculty shortages, rising education costs and oversized classrooms. But the general view of their results was mixed. Critics feared that paraprofessionals in the classroom might bring a return to larger class size as well as to "rote learning and . . . a departure from facilitating broad learnings." Others wailed that "not all teachers, even good ones, can work with aides." Moreover, they added, "measuring results accurately is difficult."\textsuperscript{35}

Advocates, on the other hand, claimed paraprofessional programming was a good "temporary measure" and a fine way to recruit teachers. They believed that paraprofessionals could enrich the curriculum with "outside talent" while creating "a wholesome atmosphere" in the schools. Buttressing this belief, they pointed out that

\textsuperscript{34}Gartner, Paraprofessionals, p. 4.

"involvement of lay citizens" in the schools is "worthwhile" in and of itself. Some were able to document slightly higher student achievement with paraprofessionals in the classrooms. 36

Summarizing its efforts, the Ford Foundation called the "Bay City type of project" important because aides were "used to improve the quality of education by freeing teachers to spend their time in actual teaching" 37 rather than on routine clerical chores. Others said the Bay City Plan provided "better deployment of teachers and experimentation with staffing." 38 But teachers in many of these projects, particularly Bay City and Yale-Fairfield, feeling the brunt of low salaries in post-World War II inflation, resented the hiring of paraprofessionals and branded the experiment a way to hire "cheap teachers." 39 Indeed Bowman and Klopf point out:

Some observers believe that the resistance created among teachers by the emphasis on budgetary considerations in the Bay City experiment retarded progress in the development of auxiliary personnel in school systems for at least a decade. 40

36 Ibid. 37 Decade of Experiment, p. 51.

38 Greenberg, Review of Literature, p. 3.

39 Gartner, Paraprofessionals, p. 20.

40 Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 7.
Even as late as 1956 the resistance was still evident. When the *Journal of Teacher Education* sent a team of educational specialists into Bay City to interview classroom personnel, it concluded that aides must not be used as teacher replacements although their use "may have real value as an emergency plan to help relieve overcrowding until we get the needed teachers and classrooms."\(^{41}\)

**Toward new paraprofessional programming**

The "needed teachers" had not appeared by the mid-Sixties, and teacher shortages, particularly in elementary education, had become commonplace. By 1964, opinion in education circles on paraprofessional utilization began to reverse the views expressed in the *Journal*. By then, according to Anderson, it was "rare to find discussion of utilization of school personnel in which nonprofessionals were not considered a welcome addition."\(^{42}\)

School systems became more enthusiastic about using aides. Some reported improvements in pupil learning and an "increase in the productivity of the classroom."\(^{43}\) Others


noted improved parent participation. One early study avowed:

Teachers with aides spend more time on professional activities...[and] less time with individual pupils than do teachers without aides... But the combined individual attention given the child by the teacher and the aide exceeds the attention given the child by the teacher in an unaided room.44

By 1964 paraprofessionals in schools were handling a variety of jobs once carried on only by certified teachers. Following the early Fairfield program which had used paraprofessionals for instructional tasks, the mid-1960's saw a more wholesale shift in paraprofessional usage from housekeeping, clerical and administrative duties to "interaction with pupils in such areas as playground and cafeteria supervision, story reading, test and composition correcting, and individual and small group tutoring."45

At the same time, in the world beyond the schoolroom, another shift was taking place in paraprofessional utilization and recruitment--toward employing poor people from the surrounding neighborhood to work in the school, the local health center and in other community public services. The nation's War on Poverty had begun to spawn

44 Ibid., p. 9.

such new resources as the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) with its Project Head Start and Community Action Program (CAP) as well as programs of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA). By the end of 1965, there were about 25,000 paraprofessionals from low income areas employed in the Community Action Program, OEO's self-help arm for poor people. An additional 46,000 were brought into the nation's pre-school education programs through Project Head Start.\(^4\)

Head Start saw its role as a "national demonstration which provides local communities with the resources to develop different ways of providing developmental services to low income pre-school children."\(^5\) These services were to be directed at "emotional, intellectual, medical, nutritional, and societal" needs of poor youngsters.\(^6\) The


education program was to

...be individualized to meet the special needs of children from various racial and ethnic populations by...having staff and program resources reflective of the racial and ethnic populations of the children in the program...[and by] including parents in curriculum development and having them serve as resource persons...49

While CAP offices were being set up across the nation, Head Start projects were lodged in churches, community houses, nursery schools, public schools, and wherever poor parents were found who wanted them and could work in them. The two programs shared a common theme: the paraprofessionals hired were poor, often parents; they lived in the communities they served and they did not have traditional education credentials.

These programs, backed up by a number of early studies, suggested that non-certified people from neighborhoods surrounding the schools could contribute significantly to the teaching-learning process:

What [high school graduates and/or tutors] lacked in formal methodological training seemed to be more than compensated for by 'other' factors which operate when the 'helper' is sociologically and chronologically 'close' to the person being helped.50

Evidence was building in the early to mid-Sixties showing that "the presence of the nonprofessional can effectuate


50 Greenberg, Review of Literature, pp. 10-11.
changes in a child's self-concept as well as changes in his attitude toward school."\(^51\) Moreover, because he "understood the child's reactions in a way that the teacher never could,"\(^52\) paraprofessionals freed teachers "to work creatively"\(^53\) while providing them with important information on children.

**Conceptualizing the new paraprofessionalism**

In 1964, Klopf and Bowman, of Bank Street College of Education, conducted a study for OEO and the U.S. Office of Education, entitled "A Study of the Preparation of School Personnel for Working with Disadvantaged Children and Youth." By late 1964 and early 1965, the Bank Street team was issuing mimeographed findings of these evaluative studies of three OEO-financed teacher aide training programs operating at Arizona State University, the University of California Extension Division at Riverside and at Garland Junior College. Those papers were combined in 1966 and published as *Teacher Education in a Social Context*, a study of 59 OEO and MDTA funded programs.\(^54\)

\(^{51}\)Ibid., p. 14. \(^{52}\)Ibid., p. 11. \(^{53}\)Ibid., p. 12.

\(^{54}\)Gordon J. Klopf and Garda W. Bowman, *Teacher Education in a Social Context* (New York: Mental Health Materials Center, Inc., Bank Street College of Education, 1966), p. 7: Of these programs, 35 were MDTA summer institutes, 13 were OEO teacher education programs, nine were school system programs and three were college or university programs funded neither by MDTA nor OEO.
As a result of this study, the Bank Street team recommended exploration, evaluation and expansion of "the new paraprofession of teacher aides, teacher assistants, and family workers."\textsuperscript{55} They also suggested that teacher aides be used in higher education programs "both to assist faculty and to demonstrate the value of this paraprofession."\textsuperscript{56} To spur this use of new education personnel, Bowman and Klopf called for special training for superintendents, principals, supervisors and auxiliary personnel and for preparing teachers for "the all important new function of orchestrating adults in the classroom to meet the learning needs of pupils as diagnosed by the teachers."\textsuperscript{57}

Bowman and Klopf believed that teacher aide usage and training were the principal "innovative aspects of the program." According to them, the OEO and MDTA programs had "educational advantages" because the teacher could teach and the ratio of adults to children increased. Moreover, in contrast to the old teacher view of paraprofessionals as cheap labor, Bowman and Klopf said paraprofessional programming had "the economic advantage" of creating new jobs not "easily...automated out of existence."\textsuperscript{58} This early analysis was a step toward bringing the education and the social reform movements closer together.

\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., p. 269. \quad \textsuperscript{56}Ibid., p. 274.
\textsuperscript{57}Ibid., p. 269. \quad \textsuperscript{58}Ibid., p. 279.
The year 1965 saw publication of *New Careers for the Poor*, in which authors Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman called for one million new jobs for the poor, arguing that our nation could no longer passively neglect the poor while national needs remained unmet in a whole host of human service fields including medicine and health, education and social welfare. Riessman and Pearl suggested that the nation could supply these human services, and provide the needed incomes and status to bring the poor into the greater American society through the proper selection, employment and training of poor people.

The book by Riessman and Pearl coined the term "new careers" and gave a label to a new movement. The following year, 1966, the Congress passed the Scheuer (or New Careers) Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, pumping some $33 million into New Careers demonstration projects for the poor in 1966-67. These were to be operated out of the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Labor Department as the anti-poverty programs were operated out of OEO.

---


60 Named for Congressman James Scheuer (New York) whose 1966 proposal for a Career Opportunity Act was combined with a 1965 rural training and employment program proposed by Senator Gaylord Nelson (Wisconsin) and signed into law on November 8, 1966, as Title II, Section 205 (e) of the Economic Opportunity Act.
Programs funded through the Scheuer Amendment possessed certain characteristics, says Gartner, which made them better than earlier uplift programs for the poor. These were: the development of entry level jobs; maximum prospects for promotion and retention on the job; "a broad range of supportive services;" education and training to help people stay on the job and move upward.⁶¹ Years later, speaking in 1973 to the first American Federation of Teachers (AFT) National Paraprofessional Conference, Congressman Scheuer explained the New Careers Amendment by pointing out that people in the federal government in those years saw a desperate need for new infusion of talent into public service. Most of the programs for the poor were overcredentialed, and there was a lot of talent in the neighborhoods without credentials but with life experience, all of it unharnessed and unchannelled.⁶²

A 1966 Study of the Nonprofessional in the CAP, involving some 5,000 aides, conducted by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., for OEO, bore out this thesis. Yankelovich found that the "self-help" concept of putting poor people to work in schools and other human services was "fundamentally sound and that it promises to become a potent method for breaking the

⁶¹ Gartner, Paraprofessionals, p. 6.

poverty cycle." For in addition to simply helping poor people; the "self-help" concept "bolsters the person's sense of self-worth, thereby galvanizing his own resources." The Yankelovich study was not uncritical. It revealed that some professionals were unwilling to delegate "meaningful roles" to the nonprofessionals, located some nonprofessionals who were deemed to be too rigid, and found there were not enough men in the program. But in general, the paraprofessionals studied by Yankelovich were "enthusiastic and working hard" at what they themselves characterized as "more than just a job."

By the mid-1960's, then, two major national social thrusts were coalescing. A change-oriented education leadership was pressing for the use of new techniques, organization and technology in education. All of this would make the role of the teacher in the classroom more complex while requiring more staff in the midst of acute teacher shortage. This strictly educational need was matched on the part of the wider society with increased understanding of the often immense cultural gap between youngsters from urban and rural slums and their middle-class teachers. Moreover, there was increasing recognition that unemployment of these youngsters' parents did not mean unemployability and that, indeed, they could make a positive contribution in

63Greenberg, Review of Literature, p. 15.
64Ibid., p. 14. 65Ibid.
schools and other social services. Poverty and new careers programs, operating outside the educational establishment, were already bringing people from low income communities into neighborhood schools and other public services where jobs and upward mobility were opening up for them. Not only were these paraprofessionals helping to bridge the teacher gap, they were also assisting the educational system bridge the gap in understanding between poverty students and middle-class professionals.

**Paraprofessionalism moves into education circles**

But not until the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 did the nation's education establishment focus officially for the first time, under Title I of that Act, on what they called "compensatory education" for low income children:

...The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance...to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means...which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.66

---

Of a total budget of just under $1 billion appropriated for 1965-66, the first year of the program, $54 million was allocated for salaries to employ 73,000 teacher aides. These were 19 per cent of the 382,000 new staff hired to launch 22,000 projects in some 17,500 school districts across the nation.67

But while Title I was a job-creator for less-than-college-trained people, many of them poor, nowhere in the legislation or administrative announcements was reference made to upward mobility--career development--for paraprofessionals or, for that matter, for teachers. Title I funds were funneled through the states in the form of block grants, pumping new federal money into school systems hardly prepared to take on the community outreach functions suggested by the early successes of poverty programs.

Indeed, the early thrust of new careers and anti-poverty programs remained largely outside the nation's school systems until Bowman and Klopf in two landmark studies made the new careers concept palatable to the education establishment by applying the phrase specifically to education. First was New Careers and Roles in the

American Schools, a 1966 study conducted for OEO assessing the nature and implications of fifteen demonstration programs around the nation. This was followed by A Learning Team: Teacher and Auxiliary, written in 1967.

New Careers, they claimed, added four important new dimensions to the old NYA-Ford-funded paraprofessional models. First, said Bowman and Klopf, the new approach emphasized "the right of all persons to essential human services" along with "an increased awareness of the paucity of the existing services and extent of human needs."

Secondly, they pointed to a shift in emphasis from the dead-end jobs previously available to paraprofessionals to the concept of career development which calls for jobs and related training at each level to provide upward mobility. Thirdly, they believed that the new careers movement would create "problem-solving" roles for the poor in place of the old roles they had played as beneficiaries of social works hand-outs. Fourthly, the authors alleged that new careers provided "a more systematic approach" to paraprofessional programming and held promise for institutionalization of paraprofessionals "as a stable and integral part of public


69 Klopf, Bowman, and Joy, A Learning Team.
Education professions development

In January 1967, an informal task force, composed of Bank Street College, Howard University and NEA representatives, recommended the following to the Congress:

1) Amend Title I of ESEA to include training of paraprofessionals and cooperating professionals in all school systems funded.

2) Amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide workshops on the new role of teachers who work with paraprofessionals.

3) Amend both ESEA and the Higher Education Act to fund planning, research, demonstration and evaluation projects on the use of paraprofessionals in education.

President Johnson's 1967 Education and Health Message to Congress called for the hiring of "new kinds of school personnel--such as teacher aides." He proposed "a broader approach to training for the education professions" and "greater flexibility" for state and local education agencies "to plan for their educational manpower needs."

In recommending that Congress pass the Education Professions Development Act in 1967, the President asked that Congress "provide new authority for the training of administrators, 

70 Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 8.
teacher aides, and other education workers for schools and colleges." By June of that year, the Congress responded by adding a new Title V, often called the Education Professions Development Act, to the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The passage of the Education Professions Development Act placed the final stone in the foundation of para-professional utilization and training, making it possible finally to marry education with new careers goals. Under a very broad mandate to "improve the quality of teaching" and to provide "a broad range of high quality training and retraining opportunities, responsive to changing manpower needs," Parts B-2 and D of the Act authorized state and federal educational authorities to fund local education agency projects to hire and train teacher aides and "other non-professional personnel." EPDA received close to $116 million in 1969, its first year of funding, and by school year 1972-73 its budget was up to just over $134 million.

---


73 Ibid., p. 300. 74 Ibid., p. 306.
In recommending passage of that law both the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare stressed their interest in supporting programs for training paraprofessionals. They encouraged all educational personnel whether at the "professional or subprofessional level" to continue their training. Moreover, the committees emphasized the need to train teachers and administrators to work with paraprofessionals.\footnote{75}

The 1967 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 reflected these two recommendations. Title I, which had originally mandated neither training nor career development for paraprofessionals, was amended to require school systems to provide them with in-service training and to give "consideration" to college training as well:

Each Title I application involving the use of education aides should set forth...definite proposals for the joint training of those aides and the professional staff members with whom the aides will work... Special attention should be given to the development of the most effective ways the professional staff members and their aides can work together and of ways in which a long term training program may assist both professional staff members and aides to take on increasing responsibilities. If appropriate, consideration should be given to providing the aides with training leading

\footnote{75}Nixon, \textit{Legislation Dimensions}, p. 16.
toward teacher certification. Such training may begin with Title I funds and continue as long as the aides are employed in Title I activities. After this, other appropriate funding should be sought.  

The national mandate on joint professional-paraprofessional in-service training was honored generally throughout the nation, but the recommendation that Title I aides be eligible for college training was largely ignored by the state and local education agencies. In school year 1967-68, the last year for which Title I participant data are available, 26,000 of 63,500 teacher and library aides received some kind of in-service training. But college training was not forthcoming for Title I aides until a later, much smaller, new careers program in education came along to provide linkage money to pay for paraprofessionals' college educations.  

In 1967 Project Head Start also responded to the push for more training and career mobility. Its Supplementary Training Program was set up that year to provide college level courses and, in many cases, greater career 


78 See pp. 41-3.
mobility for Head Start aides around the nation. By school year 1968-69, some 1,000 Head Start aides were in Supplementary Training Programs out of a total of 30,000 paid paraprofessionals working in 12,000 classrooms in the year-round programs and 54,695 working in some 28,000 summer program classrooms. 79 By the 1972-73 school year, over 10,000 Head Start aides employed in full-year programs were enrolled in some 400 colleges and universities around the nation. Year-round paraprofessional ranks had grown to over 40,000 but the number serving in summer programs had dropped to about 9,000. 80

The year 1967 also saw the creation of the Follow Through program. Authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act and administered by the U.S. Office of Education, the program was directed at extending Head Start-type educational programs to the early grades in public schools. A Supplementary Training component was built in from the outset. Since 1969, close to 1,300 Follow Through employees were enrolled in 86 colleges and universities around the nation 81 of a total of about 7,000 Follow Through paraprofessionals


80 Ibid., 1972, pp. 1, 2.

working in 173 projects around the nation, with an average of two paraprofessionals in each participating classroom. This number has remained almost constant since then. 82

The Follow Through commitment to utilize and recruit low income staff, too, was clearly stated from the outset:

The development and implementation of all programs and projects [is] designed to serve the poor or low income areas with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self advancement... 83

The commitment of other education programs to utilize nonprofessional staff in the classroom—particularly community people—is less clearly documented. In fact, in the 1968 revision of Title I Criteria, it was deemed necessary to clarify the national policy by insisting that:

Use should be made of a variety of personnel other than professional classroom staff. Parents of participating children, volunteers, and persons in the community with special skills should be considered in the selection of the staff needed to provide the specified services. 84


A 1967 amendment to ESEA Title V, the state education agency aid section urged, but did not mandate:

programs...specifically designed to encourage the full and adequate utilization and acceptance of auxiliary personnel (such as teacher aides) in elementary and secondary schools on a permanent basis. 85

There is no evidence, according to Title V administrators, that this provision was supported by state education agencies across the country. Indeed, reporting procedures never required states to supply information on paraprofessional utilization. This is ironic in that the purpose of Title V was to help state education agencies improve their administrative procedures and hire additional personnel.

While there is no information on paraprofessional utilization and training under Title V since the 1967 amendment, Title III of ESEA and the New Careers Amendment added to the growing band of upwardly mobile paraprofessionals by providing for training 5,000 paraprofessionals a year from 1966 to 1970 for education. 86 Although it is difficult to determine the number of people involved, new

85 U.S., Congress, Compilation, p. 64.

careers was also given some priority under the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968. This Act looked toward increasing the utilization and training of paraprofessionals by calling for research and training in vocational education "to provide education for new and emerging careers and occupations."\(^87\)

**The Career Opportunities Program**

After two years of planning, development, model-building and demonstration under EPDA legislation, school year 1970-71 saw the full-scale launch of the first new careers program totally within the educational establishment. The $25 million-a-year Career Opportunities Program (COP), funded under Part D of EPDA, was "to improve the learning of low income children by putting low income community residents and Vietnam era veterans to work as education auxiliaries in poverty area schools, while they train toward eventual teacher certification."\(^88\)

COP's guidelines on community participation were explicit:


Participants should be residents of the area served by COP schools. Where participants are to be newly recruited to the school system, they must come from low income families. Where present employees are to be COP participants, preference must be given to those from low income backgrounds.89

As of school year 1972-73, there were close to 9,500 COP participants working in just under 3,000 schools in the nation. Some 55 per cent had been employed in such school programs as Title I, Head Start, Follow Through when they joined COP and another seven per cent had been working as paraprofessionals in other public service agencies. All were in work-study programs attending 272 colleges and universities for credit. By September 1972, 536 had graduated. Career advancement plans, called career lattices, had been established in 75 per cent of the school systems with COP programs, and special salary schedules had been developed with increments for COP participants.90

Another program funded under EPDA legislation, Part B-2 or the State Grants Program, costing about $52.5 million over the four-year period 1969 through 1972, trained almost 35,000 paraprofessionals, many in conjunction

89Career Opportunities Program Leadership Training Institute, Career Opportunities Program Project Directors Handbook (Charleston, South Carolina: University of South Carolina, 1970), p. 2.

with COP, Titles I, III and VII of ESEA, New Careers and Follow Through. Of these, 90 per cent were placed in jobs under this state-run program "of recruiting and training teachers and aides to meet critical shortage of classroom personnel."\footnote{91}

\textbf{Decline in the 1970's}

In 1970 the Public Service Careers Program was created out of the U.S. Department of Labor with funds reallocated from the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Where the legislation of the Sixties had provided for training paraprofessionals in both middle level and entry level jobs, and for upgrading those already employed, the new program did not include "job creation, mandated upgrading, role for community action agencies, and pressure for basic service system redesign."\footnote{92}

The 1971 Emergency Employment Act (EEA), called for $2.25 billion to create 140,000 public service jobs. To be triggered when unemployment rose about 4.5 per cent for three or more consecutive months, this program served no more than 2 per cent of the listed unemployed.\footnote{93} Both


\footnote{92}Gartner, Paraprofessionals, p. 9.

programs fed limited numbers of paraprofessionals into the nation's school systems, where some were even able to link their new jobs with COP training.

By 1973, it was clear that much of the paraprofessional programming funded through the federal government was slated for extinction. Manpower programs had been running at about $1.3 billion a year since 1970 on the basis of Continuing Resolutions from Congress. New appropriations were either vetoed by President Nixon or not made by the Congress in a three-year-long battle between the Administration and Congress over how to fit federally-funded job training programs for the poor into the President's revenue sharing proposals. On December 28, 1973, a $1.8 million Manpower appropriation was signed abolishing those Manpower Administration programs that helped paraprofessionals—New Careers, Operation Mainstream, the Concentrated Employment Program and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The money was to be turned over to state governments with the suggestion that these programs serve as models.94

All school paraprofessional programs, too, were in trouble. COP and B-2, for example, were not to be continued. As early as May 1972, the COP national director found it

necessary to reassure local COP project directors about
the program's viability:

Let me assure you that COP has a five year OE commit-
ment, which began with Fiscal Year 1970 (academic
year 1970-71) and terminates at the earliest at the
end of FY 75 (academic year 1974-75). This can and
should be read as a guarantee to all participants in
COP of the promised opportunity to complete their
work and study toward the bachelor's degree.95

A total COP expenditure over six years of just
under $130 million tapers off to $1.8 million for school
year 1975-76, when most COP participants will have graduated.96
After receiving $15 million in each of the first three
years of its life, B-2 was halved to $7 million in fiscal
1972 and eliminated in fiscal 1973 in spite of its legis-
lative authorization and forward-looking amendments.97

The decline was clearly evident in the spring of
1974 when the Administration went to Congress with an
education appropriations request that budgeted only $8.1
million for EPDA for school year 1975-76 to be used for
close-out activities. The EPDA budget for the previous
school year was already down to $58 million from earlier

95 Career Opportunities Program Leadership Training
Institute, Impact, I (May, 1972) 1.

96 U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Office of Education, Program: Career Opportunities, undated
memo; U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Office of Education, "Occupational, Vocational and Adult Edu-

highs of over $100 million.  

Follow Through, too, was being phased out. A memorandum sent to participating superintendents and community action agencies on July 19, 1973, read:

As you know, Follow Through is an experimental program which will begin phasing out in the 1974-75 academic year at the rate of one grade level per year. The kindergarten children, who will be entering your Follow Through project in September 1973 will, therefore, be the last group of new children to enter.  

By the time it winds down in school year 1975-76, Follow Through expenditures total an estimated $310 million since its beginning in school year 1967-68. This ran from a high of $70 million in fiscal 1970 to the estimated phase out figure of $35 million in fiscal 1975.  

Of all the school-based programs Title I alone was assured survival through June 30, 1978 when a new authorization was signed into law in August 1974. Total appropriations on this program had risen steadily from $959 million in school year 1965-66 to $1.7 billion in 1973-74. And the Administration's 1974-75 and 1975-76 budget requests

---

98 U.S., Department of H.E.W., Advice of Allotment.


totaled about $1.9 billion each year. 101

Head Start, too, appeared to prosper. Transferred from OEO to HEW's Office of Child Development in 1969, the program was slated to enjoy an increase in expenditures to $466 million in fiscal 1975, a $38 million increase. Meanwhile, HEW officials were seeking a three-year extension of the program as the expiration date of the legislation approached. 102

Organized teaching joins the bandwagon

In 1966, responding to the increasing interest in and use of paraprofessionals in schools and other public services, NEA's watchdog TEPS Commission 103 launched an 18-month study on paraprofessionals and staff differentiation, called "The Teacher and His Staff." NEA's Department of Classroom Teachers 104 followed suit in November 1966 by choosing paraprofessional utilization as the theme for a national study conference under the title, "The Classroom


103 National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, now called Instruction and Professional Development.

104 Now called Association of Classroom Teachers (ACT).
Teacher and His Supportive Staff." The groups concluded sensibly that teachers and paraprofessionals need to be trained together and separately to learn how to work with each other in their new roles in the classroom.

Training goals notwithstanding, the clearly expressed worry of organized teaching was that the entry of paraprofessionals into the classroom might lead to lessened salaries and status for teachers. By 1967, when one in five teachers in the nation worked with paraprofessionals, an NEA poll showed that nine out of ten teachers thought they were "helpful" and over half said they were "of great assistance." But while an "overwhelming proportion" wanted paraprofessionals to help with "some duties," like clerical work and grading papers, a majority said that paraprofessionals are no substitute for additional teachers. In fact, 84 percent said "they believed they would be more effective teaching the smaller classes and taking care of all non-teaching duties." Moreover, consensus was that paraprofessional programming should not take "financial priority" over the increase of professional salaries.105

As early as 1962 the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) had come out in favor of the movement, but they wanted

paraprofessionals to serve as "clerical, custodial and/or monitorial personnel to relieve teachers of such non-teaching burdens as interfere with paraprofessional obligations." By the mid-1960's AFT's New York local, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), had persuaded the New York City Board of Education to use ESEA funds to hire paraprofessionals for its More Effective School Program (MES) in order to decrease class size and provide saturation services to poor youngsters. MES made use of large numbers of paraprofessionals in order to "free teachers from non-teaching chores and make possible teacher attention to the educational needs of the children." Begun with ten schools in New York City, MES programs spread later to 27 elementary schools in New York City and in Detroit, Baltimore, Chicago, Yonkers and Cleveland—a boost to the nation's already increasing demand for paraprofessionals.

But AFT president Charles Cogen underlined the AFT position on the place of paraprofessionals in the nation's schools in 1967 by pointing out that "there is real danger" that paraprofessionals could be used "as permanent full-time
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substitutes for teachers." He continued:

If our school systems are to adopt the concept of increased use of paraprofessionals, however, it is essential that career lines be established, perhaps leading to full teacher status, if this can be done without sacrificing academic standards.109

In 1969 AFT president David Selden came up with his "20-20 vision for teachers":

No teacher should be required to teach for less than $10,000 a year, teach more than 20 students at a time, teach more than 20 classroom periods a week, or teach more than four days a week.110

The application of such a formula would obviously boost the demand for paraprofessionals. But by then the demand was already high.

That year a teacher opinion poll in Instructor indicated a large number of teachers wanted paraprofessionals and hoped for funds to get them. Yet 78 per cent insisted that aides should "never teach an entire class" while 71 per cent said they "should work with small groups" and 79 per cent wanted them to work "with individual

---


children."\textsuperscript{111}

In 1968 the UFT had gone full-tilt toward organizing paraprofessionals in New York City, on the theory that "if paraprofessionals and teachers did not act together, they could cancel each other's effectiveness."\textsuperscript{112} In undertaking the task of organizing paraprofessionals in New York City, the UFT saw that these community people could help integrate teaching staffs, strengthen school-community relations and also provide much needed personnel.

By January 1, 1970, the UFT and American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 372, District Council 37, had negotiated a payscale, based on career titles and career advancement, which raised paraprofessional salaries from $2,000 a year in 1967 to an annual range of $5,500 to $7,800 in 1971. With tuition-paid higher education opportunities and in-service training already available for New York City public school paraprofessionals, the union also negotiated benefits for paraprofessionals equal to those of teachers.\textsuperscript{113} Thus a model

\textsuperscript{111}"Should Aides Teach?" \textit{Instructor}, November, 1969, p. 43.


\textsuperscript{113}\textit{Ibid.}
new careers in education program was created in the New York City public school system.

In 1971, when three teachers in ten reported they worked with paraprofessionals, NEA and its Association of Classroom Teachers moved to promote paraprofessional organization, too. In suggesting that local NEA associations cannot "afford not to use paraprofessionals," NEA made clear that "the rights of teachers" must also be protected. NEA suggested that local associations help paraprofessionals "establish viable organizations of their own" as a way to ensure that auxiliary personnel are used to free teachers to perform better their primary function of teaching--and not used as a means of increasing class size, reducing the number of teachers, or cutting the salary budget.115

In 1971-72, the ACT came out for employment for paraprofessionals as long as it was "for non-teaching duties providing it does not necessitate a cutback in existing educational programs or a reduction of current teaching staff."116


Still the NEA Task Force on Paraprofessionals, meeting in early 1970, recognized that the early usage of paraprofessionals for housekeeping and clerical tasks had "expanded to include a number of responsibilities related to instruction." The Task Force correctly maintained that this new dimension of instruction-related activities does not change the classroom teacher's professional responsibility for diagnosing, prescribing, and evaluating: in fact, it enhances this responsibility.

The Task Force also emphasized the paraprofessional as "a valuable link between the school and the community."117

The realism of NEA's latest position reflected its 1971 survey which indicated that one-third of teachers polled used paraprofessionals for small group instruction and one-third for individual instruction. A substantial 62 per cent of the school systems polled indicated that paraprofessionals provided "instructional assistance to teachers," 38 per cent reported they were tutoring, 18 per cent said they gave laboratory assistance, and 8 per cent said they read themes.118

By 1973, AFT president David Selden, too, was talking about instructional roles for paraprofessionals:


"The AFT has---sought to increase the paraprofessionals' role as an instrument for effective education. Aides brought a better quality of education to the schools." But AFT's "educational policy convention," the QuEST Consortium, calling for support to paraprofessionals in their work in "individual and small group instruction," advised AFT in 1973 to "define the role of the paraprofessional narrowly on a national basis." 120

The ambivalence of NEA and AFT spokesmen on paraprofessional roles and their relationships to teachers reflects continued concern about paraprofessional inroads into teaching:

**Terminology**

Terminology in the field is unclear. Many authorities talk about teacher aides interchangeably with paraprofessionals. Still others call them subprofessionals, nonprofessionals, semi-professionals, or indeed pre-professionals. Another group has coined the phrase "new 119"Paraprofessional Power," p. 10.

professional". 121 For a time, Bank Street College tried to introduce the term "auxiliary personnel" as a generic title. But the effort failed and the NEA Task Force on Paraprofessionals came up with its own designation. Auxiliary personnel, the Task Force said, are all persons supportive to the educational process who do not need to have a professional background to assume their responsibilities, although there may be varying degrees of training, skills, or academic preparation.

Paraprofessionals were defined, they said, as "that segment of auxiliary personnel working directly with professional educators to assist them in discharging their professional duties." 122 Instructional assistants, teacher aides, social work aides and lay readers were included in the paraprofessional category, while auxiliary personnel would include transportation, building operation and food service people.

Allen and Morrison see a differentiation emerging between paraprofessionals and what they call "regular aides." They see paraprofessionals as school people with


"some academic experience [who are] working toward a degree and certification," while regular aides are those "not committed to becoming teachers professionally." 123

Rittenhouse says paraprofessionals are those whose jobs "include some functions previously performed only by teachers," activities which "are in a broad area somewhere between clerical and full professional duties." He does not employ the term paraprofessional for school personnel in such functions as hall, playground, or lunchroom duties. 124

This study will employ the word paraprofessional as the generic term to cover all staff working with children in school-based activities under the direction of teachers or ancillary staff, whether they are on a career ladder or not, and in hall, playground, and cafeteria activities. Career levels for paraprofessionals will be designated as aide, assistant, associate and intern in ascending order of responsibility. A professional is defined in this study as someone who has a Baccalaureate degree, certification in one of the education professions by one or more states and is currently working in a public school as the teacher (or librarian or counselor and so on) of record.

123 Journal of Research, p. 54.

Objectives and Organization of this Study

Before examining the findings of this study it is necessary to put a conceptual framework around the history of paraprofessional training and utilization by looking at the theoretical base in the literature. Chapter II, Some Views on Paraprofessional Programming, explores the theory as it has developed over recent decades and extracts from it some major issues of paraprofessional programming.

Chapter III, Methods and Procedures, describes the methodology of the study.

Chapter IV, V, VI, and VII detail the findings.

Objectives related to first goal: to collect base-line data about training and utilization of paraprofessionals

In Chapter IV, The Statistics of Paraprofessional Programming, the following objectives will be met: 1) to determine how many school systems enrolling 5,000 and more pupils were involved in paraprofessional programming in school years 1971-73; 2) to determine the number of paraprofessionals working in these school systems, relating these numbers to the size of professional staff and pupil enrollment; 3) to build a framework for the growth figures of the Sixties which were described in the history section above.
Objectives related to second goal: to document the nature and extent of paraprofessional institutionalization

Chapter V, Are They Part of the System, will, as its primary objective, determine the extent of institutionalization of paraprofessionals in school systems around the nation. Subobjectives are to discover the:

1) extent and quality of local support to paraprofessional programming in terms of funding, feelings, and actualhirings of certified teachers who have gone through such programs;

2) longevity of paraprofessional programs;

3) relationship between the working conditions of teachers and those of paraprofessionals, including amount of paid time worked per year, pay-scales, and such benefits as sick leave, vacation, retirement, educational grants;

4) extent of organization or unionization of paraprofessionals in the system;

5) nature of supervisors and evaluators of paraprofessionals as well as who determines personnel policy for them.

Objectives related to third goal: to document the nature and extent of opportunities for paraprofessional advancement on a career ladder and/or lattice

The principal objective of Chapter VI, Are They Making It in the System, is to determine the extent to which paraprofessional programs around the nation have taken on career development components. Subobjectives are:
1) to delineate the roles in the simplest terms of level (i.e., aide, assistant, associate, intern) and area of school responsibility (i.e., classroom, library, counseling, audio-visual, school-community or other);

2) to discover the amount and kind of college training provided;

3) to discover the amount and kind of in-service training provided;

4) to discover the criteria for advancement in the system;

5) to delineate salary and its relationship to experience and education.

Chapter VII, Responses to Open-End Question, will detail and discuss comments made by respondents in answer to both Question 19, the open-end question, and to other parts of the questionnaire.

Chapter VIII, Conclusions and Recommendations, returns to the original charge of this study. In summarizing the information and data presented earlier, and by drawing some conclusions on the evidence at hand, an effort is made to generalize about the training and utilization of para-professionals, their institutionalization and career development and, where possible, to draw recommendations and conclusions on future policy. In addition, where more study is needed in specific areas of the inquiry, further research goals are suggested.
CHAPTER II

SOME VIEWS ON PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMMING

Much of the literature on paraprofessional programming is anecdotal, descriptive and sometimes polemic. While an effort is made in this chapter to cover such literature briefly, emphasis is on the studies, reports, books and articles which focus on findings, issues, recommendations and analyses of paraprofessional programming, particularly within the context of educational reform.

Paraprofessional programming, as Chapter I has shown, grew as part of two major movements of the 1960's--the push toward reform of public education and the effort to bring the nation's poor into the mainstream of American life. The issues that emerge from the literature center on interaction between these two movements and the pros and cons expressed about them.

**Community People in the Schools**

The interplay between the two movements and their effect on paraprofessional programming can, perhaps, best be shown in the disagreement over the usefulness of community people in the schools.
The view of the education reformers

Speaking for the reformers, former COP director Anderson maintains that paraprofessionals are "a major force to unfreeze practices in the educational community."¹ Gartner and Riessman insist that paraprofessionals can change the atmosphere of schools by their very presence:

Contact with paraprofessional co-workers generally tends to increase the sensitivity of the professional to the demands of the community. In addition, the paraprofessional brings the values and needs of the consumer directly into professional practice... The paraprofessional also affects the professional by raising new and constructive questions about how the various agencies operate... He also embodies new styles of work and new ways of relating to people, which to some extent may rub off on the professional.²

Adding paraprofessionals to a school faculty, the team maintains, can make "deprofessionalized" professionals into professionals again because it:

'bumps' the whole system, disequilibrates it, and frees the professional who has been performing all sorts of functions which do not require professional understanding or preparation.³

Moreover, say Bowman and Klopf, poor community people in the classroom can serve as role models for poor youngsters who have met few successful grown-ups of their own cultures.⁴

---


³Ibid., p. 257. ⁴Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 10.
Bowman talks of "evidence of paraprofessionals' potential effectiveness in relating constructively to children and youth"—which she says "is a subtle quality impossible to identify by paper and pencil tests alone." In fact, the New Careers authors saw paraprofessionals in the demonstration projects they studied as catalytic agents in role differentiation and development for entire school staffs.

A more traditional approach is answered

Such contentions about paraprofessionalism and the community are also statements of educational reform. And they did not go unchallenged in education circles. Daniel and Laurel Tanner, then of Rutgers and Hunter College respectively, insisted in 1968 that academic achievement of low income youngsters was a direct function of teacher quality. While no one would quibble with that, the Tanners tied their proposition to a position that could do nothing but ruffle the fur of education and social reformers:

Bringing victims of a slum environment to the classroom in an instructional capacity can hardly be expected to provide stimulation and impetus toward learning. It can only be expected to reproduce in

5 Bowman and Anderson, Structured Career Development, p. 17.

6 Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 19.
the classroom the previous environment of the home and the street. Children's horizons will be limited to what they already see and know. The possibilities for their entering the mainstream of American life may be actually reduced.\(^7\)

Moreover, in contrast to the Bowman-Klopf and Riessman-Gartner view, the Tanners maintained:

The disadvantaged child has already been exposed to a number of models from a slum environment. Additional models in his life from the same kind of environment can only result in reinforcing those elements in his behavior that are characteristic of the slum dweller.\(^8\)

Suggesting that the career ladder is "unrealistic" for adults with a sixth grade education, the Tanners called instead for on-the-job training to develop "marketable skills" for work in factories, offices, shops, and construction.\(^9\)

Evidence proved the Tanners wrong. In 1970, Gartner and Johnson studied 232 new careers programs enrolling some 19,000 paraprofessionals in 162 two-and four-year colleges.\(^10\)

\(^7\) Daniel Tanner and Laurel N. Tanner, "Teacher Aide--a Job for Anyone in Our Ghetto Schools," The Teachers College Record, 69 (May, 1968), 748.

\(^8\) Ibid., p. 749.  \(^9\) Ibid., p. 748.

They found that 60 per cent of paraprofessionals in college "did as well as" and 20 per cent "did better" than regular students on coursework. Moreover, the drop-out rate was lower than that of regular students in half the colleges they looked at. At another 24 per cent of the colleges, the drop-out rate for paraprofessionals and regular students was the same.  

The hazards of community people in the schools

Other educators, like Lierheimer, raise the fear that "the paraprofessional's voice will be the community's voice and it may or may not harmonize with professional judgement." More experienced students of community relations--among them Riessman, Pearl, Gartner, Klopf and Bowman--believe that it might harmonize all too well, and thus threaten the vital community role of paraprofessionals.

Riessman and Gartner clearly see the hazards. They point to "the danger that the paraprofessional will be absorbed by the educational establishment to provide more but not reorganized or different education." Further they note "the danger that the paraprofessionals and the teachers

11 Ibid., Abstract.

12 Cooper, Differentiated Staffing, p. 71.
working with them will fail to be trained and fail to learn from each other." And finally they underscore the differences between those who would reform education and those who would change the poverty cycle: "There is danger that we would actually produce new careers for poor people but that education itself would not be improved, organized and restructured." 

Paul Kurzman calls this "the potential for formal co-optation of indigenous leaders." He charges that new careers programs cannot "change public systems from within," and maintains that the paraprofessional's inability to control decision-making, their tendency to internalize professional and agency standards, and their desire for upward mobility, are forces that can effectively neutralize their power as proponents of social action as they become absorbed into the system.

To avoid this, Bowman cautions paraprofessionals "to keep their contacts with friends and local organizations alive and vigorous," and urges that "the community...have


14 Ibid., p. 11.


faith in the integrity and continuing concern of those who accept...[school] positions" and that "school people...be sensitive to the paraprofessionals' delicate position within their own neighborhoods..." Bowman appears to place her faith in community advisory committees if they are composed of enough community leaders and parents who are employed by the school system and "if their suggestions are respected and seriously considered." 17

The value of community people in the schools

In an attempt to point up the value of using paraprofessionals from the community as one strategy for school reform, Bowman and Klopf put together a list of benefits that could be derived from paraprofessional programming which was later adapted by the Institute for Educational Development (IED) in its 1970 In-Depth Study of Paraprofessionals. The two studies argue that paraprofessional programs could be a boon to all concerned: 1) pupils will profit by getting more "individual attention;" 2) teachers will gain by being "able to manage teaching conditions" better and "thereby affect pupil achievement;" 3) principals and school administrators will benefit from a larger school staff; 4) parents and the community will gain closer

relations with the school and the "opportunity to learn child development principles in a real situation;"
5) paraprofessionals will reap "meaningful employment" which will "improve their self-respect" and "increase their education." ¹⁸

Former U.S. Deputy Education Commissioner Davies, too, saw the paraprofessional movement playing a strategic role in educational reform. In 1969, he suggested that paraprofessionals from the community would help with

a healthy re-examination of the roles of all teachers and other personnel in the schools [toward]...developing a more flexible and sensible way of utilizing time and talent in the classroom, [with] ...a considerable potential for changing and enriching and improving the curriculum. ¹⁹

While this study will touch only briefly on the subject of community in paraprofessional programming and educational reform, it cannot be over-emphasized how important this aspect of paraprofessionalism is to new careers theorists and practitioners. Such issues as cooption and competence, summarized above, require further study, demanding more hard data than is currently available.


Toward Defining Roles in the Schools

Defining the roles of professional and paraprofessional staff is another area in which there are divergent views from the educational and social reformers on the one hand and the proponents of traditional teacher education on the other. Role definition, of course, grows out of the analysis of the tasks and duties that go into teaching and learning--and the approach on this differs, too. The issues boil down to whether or not paraprofessionals can teach--or take on an instructional role--and there are cost factors that surround this.

On teaching and learning

Gage defined teaching as "any interpersonal influence aimed at changing the ways in which other persons can or will behave..."20 A few years later, Bowman and Klopfe elaborated, moving the definition forward in its implications: "Where there is no learning, there has been in fact no teaching." They continue:

Learning does not cease as the pupil leaves the classroom. Learning takes place in the street, in the alley, in the home, before the television set, in the supermarket, in the park, in the hallways, in the poolroom, and in the houses of detention for juvenile offenders. Life crackles with learning opportunities.21

---


21 Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 218.
The idea that learning is everywhere is carried a step further by English who sees teachers everywhere. They are not certified, he admits, but that is because teaching is "cloaked in mystery and shrouded in degree and certification rituals." As examples, he lists Sunday school teachers, Red Cross swimming teachers, tutors, girl scout leaders and YMCA counselors as well as "interested grandmothers who teach precocious grandchildren how to read."

He affirms:

Almost all of these non-certified teachers engage in the major acts of teaching, i.e., they diagnose, they prescribe and they apply the treatment (they teach).  

On tasks and duties

Much of the literature on paraprofessional programming reflects neither learning theories such as those sketched above nor the obvious call such theories raise for reform of teaching and teacher training. Many of those who write on paraprofessional programming do not concern themselves with teaching and learning. They do not analyze the tasks that go into these processes, then translate tasks

---

into roles and responsibilities. Instead, many writers on paraprofessional programming make lists. The literature abounds with lists of paraprofessional duties. In one study there were about 180 education job titles for paraprofessionals. NEA polled teachers in 1967 and again in 1972, then made its own lists.

There is no gainsaying the usefulness of lists for providing examples of the many tasks paraprofessionals can perform in schools and classroom. In fact, Bennett and Falk, as well as Bowman and Klopf, provide some general listings to illustrate their exhaustive discussions of
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Bennett and Falk, New Careers and Urban Schools, pp. 194-201.

Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, pp. 239-43, 246-51;
paraprofessional usage and training. However, a thoughtful critic must sense that the real issue raised by the different approaches of list-makers and new careers writers is the question of roles. In 1969, Rittenhouse summarized the prevailing view on the role of paraprofessionals:

The primary reason for using aides has been to free teachers to perform the professional functions for which they are uniquely qualified by training and experience. These functions include analyzing and diagnosing the learning needs of pupils, planning and implementing educational activities to meet those needs, and creating an atmosphere conducive to learning in the classroom. In the traditional classroom, the teacher's time is often taken up in clerical and housekeeping duties to such an extent that performance of primary functions is impaired. Some of the professional functions can be delegated with teacher supervision. However, aides should not be regarded as substitutes for teachers or as a means of giving teachers responsibility for more pupils to cut costs.29

On the instructional role

Few commentators today—whether educational reformers, educational establishment, organized teaching or new careers spokesman—would disagree with the Rittenhouse definition. What they would argue about is the large ill-defined middle area between "analyzing", "diagnosing", "planning", "implementing" on the one hand, and "clerical and housekeeping


29Rittenhouse, An Interpretive Study, p. 1.
duties" on the other. What tasks, roles, responsibilities fall into this middle area? Is there spillover both ways? Who undertakes this fuzzy area of tasks, professional or paraprofessional? Are these tasks instructional or non-instructional or both? Few writers on paraprofessional programming deal with these issues. Instead, despite evidence that instruction can come from many sources including machines and grandmothers, the argument seems to center on whether or not the paraprofessional in the classroom can (or should) play an instructional role.

Organized teaching, it has been shown in Chapter I, has come around slowly to its present view that there is some kind of instructional role for paraprofessionals in the classroom, though that role has hardly been clarified.

But many writers demur, confounding both semantics and logic by holding fast to a position that only teachers can teach. As late as 1970, for example, Shank and McElroy declared: "Aides serve teachers, either directly or indirectly, that more attention may be given pupils..."30 At about the same time, Robb pointed out that "teacher aides can supervise individuals or small groups without doing any actual instruction."31

30 Shank and McElroy, Paraprofessional or Teacher Aides, p. 3.

31 Melvin H. Robb, Teacher Assistants (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969), p. 51.
According to Catherine Brunner:

A teacher aide does not assume the role of teacher in a professional sense; but by being present and relating to children she is bound to transmit ideas, feelings, habits and skills that become part of the behavioral repertoires of children.32

And Brighton announces:

You [the paraprofessional] may not be allowed to teach children to read but you should be able to read to children and listen patiently while they read to you.33

Yet an IED study revealed that principals, teachers, parents, pupils and the paraprofessionals themselves, believed that the"most effective" paraprofessionals more often" do teach. The paraprofessional "reports significant information about the pupils to the teacher, gives direct instruction to the pupils, and plans with the teacher." That study's findings point to the conclusion that the "paraprofessional is considered most effective when she is performing rather complex, genuinely semi-professional duties rather than when she is carrying out routine tasks."34


34 Paraprofessionals Influence on Student Achievement and Attitudes and Paraprofessionals Performance Outside the Classroom-District Decentralized ESEA Title I and New York State Urban Education Projects in the New York City Schools: A Study for the Board of Education in the City of New York (New York: Institute for Educational Development, 1971), p. 12. IED studied 63 experimental and 35
The intellectual twists and turns necessary to support paraprofessional programming while insisting that only teachers can teach may account for some of the heat of the arguments raised by paraprofessional advocates. English charges harshly that "teachers may be afraid of losing their jobs because they are performing the role of teacher aide already."\textsuperscript{35} Objecting strenuously to the use of teacher aides to "liberate" a teacher, Grossman points out that such a "narrow conception" of the teacher-aide-pupil relationship
tends to officially establish the teacher as a classroom authority, the teacher's aide as the teacher's maid, and the other paraprofessionals as disciplinarians. The victim of the resulting unspoken conflicts and resentments is, of course, the pupil.\textsuperscript{36}

The cost factor

Lefkowitz touches a central nerve of the argument over instructional roles for professionals and paraprofessionals when he suggests that paraprofessional salaries will inevitably increase with inflation and higher costs.

\textsuperscript{35}English, Paraprofessionals in Schools in 2000, p. 3.

That, he points out, will make for "competition between aide and teacher for the community dollar." 37

But it may not be inflation alone that pits teachers against paraprofessionals for scarce education dollars. Another threat comes from cost-benefit analysis. In 1969, Allen pointed out that "a teacher's workload is 40 to 60 per cent clerical and...the dollars for one teacher approximately equal the dollars for about two and a half support staff people." 38

Conant bears this out in his comparison of labor costs and their relationship to instructional activity in "minority enrollment" first and fourth-grade classrooms in Portland (Oregon) Public Schools. He found that solo teachers in a five hour teaching day spent an average of 92 minutes on instruction and only 50 minutes of this in individual or small group instruction. But teachers working with aides taught an average of 109 minutes a day of which 67 minutes went for individual or small group instruction. While average hourly instructional costs in Portland amounted to $8.80 for a teacher-aide team and to


over $16 for a solo teacher, more instruction was available in the teacher-aide team set-up because, in addition to teachers' extra instructional time, paraprofessionals also taught more than professionals, a mean 129 minutes a day. Moreover, "score analysis revealed shifts in reading achievement that were linked to the new instruction and the additional resources that were expended in the compensatory program."  

Conant concluded that:

the district gained significant economies for instructional costs when aides were introduced into...instructional work. Aides were employed at one-half the labor cost of teachers and provided more than twice as much remedial instruction in language arts.  

Summing up the cost benefit data in 1973, Bloom found 70 per cent of the total operating costs of school systems around the country devoted each year to professional salaries. Meanwhile, although the annual national expenditure for public schools has increased in the past decade "from about three to almost four per cent of the gross national product," the average elementary class size has been reduced by "only three pupils." He concludes:

To achieve any fundamental reduction in an average class size, while maintaining the traditional instructional practices, would put a drain on available


manpower and raise the costs of staffing the schools beyond what the nation could afford... One of the few acceptable alternatives to this dilemma is... to develop new staffing configurations, combining the talents and ability of teachers and aides, to individualize instruction.

Viewing teaching and learning as continual processes that take place in a whole host of settings and in a variety of circumstances, as the reformers do, would surely permit paraprofessionals to take on some kind of instructional role. This would be so even if the instructional role— that is, teaching—were not so poorly defined in education literature. But in fact, since teaching is at best a nebulous concept, it is hard to make much of the traditionalists' views that paraprofessionals ought not be given instructional roles. Adding cost benefit analysis of professional and paraprofessional work to the idea that paraprofessionals can indeed teach will surely have a lot to do with assuring that paraprofessionals get instructional roles in this world of the shrinking education dollar.

_Differentiating the Roles of Professionals and Paraprofessionals_

Reform theories of learning and teaching as well as cost benefit analysis have brought many educational reformers

to experiment with the "new staffing configurations" mentioned by Bloom. They are doing this under the broad rubric of differentiated staffing--the analysis, definition and development of new roles for educational personnel.

Although this study is directed at paraprofessional programming, it is appropriate here to sketch the broad theory of differentiated staffing. Its particular application to paraprofessionals provides background for understanding of the questions and finding of this study.

The case for differentiated staffing

Allen likes to call attention to the fact that the teacher has "become a conveyor of all knowledge in an age when knowledge has drastically proliferated." In addition, the teacher is "part-time babysitter, bookkeeper, collector of lunch money, distributor of textbooks, chief clerk...secretary...psychologist, and custodian." Nonetheless, still cast in nineteenth century roles, good teachers and bad, trained teachers and beginners, "regardless of their individual expertise or special skills, are treated as interchangeable parts in the system..." All get pay raises based on in-service and graduate credits, but to achieve higher status and wages they must move out of teaching and be "removed from personal contact with students, into
an administrative position."\textsuperscript{42}

To correct this, Allen suggested--in what came to be called the Temple City (California) model--a four-tier structure in the schools to include master teacher, senior teacher, staff teacher, and associate teacher. In addition, paraprofessionals were to be "employed from eligibility lists of job applicants" and divided into three levels whose "advancement depends upon an open position." While Temple City instructional aides were able to "work with students and teachers in resource centers, learning laboratories and libraries," there was no role differentiation between the three levels. The model elaborated only on the position, responsibilities, salaries, tenure, experience and education of the differentiated professional staff.\textsuperscript{43}

At roughly the same time the differentiated staffing movement was being launched in California, Pearl and Riessman, in launching new careers, called for a "redefinition of the teaching role" which, they believed, included "too many activities." They suggested spinning off from the teacher's role five new roles--teacher aide, teacher

\textsuperscript{42}\textit{Journal of Research}, p. 52.

assistant, teacher associate, teacher and supervising teacher. 44 Not long afterwards, Klopf, Bowman and Joy expanded on this proposal:

The sovereignty of teachers in the classroom has been traditionally inviolate. Analysis of the possible reassignment of some of their functions has not been required since, obviously, they did everything that needed to be done. But now their functions are being divided among many people--specialists, consultants, volunteers, auxiliaries, parents and students--and increasingly to teaching machines as well. Each function should therefore be analyzed in terms of its objectives, its relative importance and the competencies required for its performance. Assignments need to be made on the basis of current skills with recognition that new competencies may be developed as the training program evolves.45

Differentiating paraprofessional roles

But the marriage of differentiated staffing and new careers is recent. In fact, Bowman comments:

It is ironic that the emphasis upon career development for paraprofessionals has, in fact, increased pressure for differentiated staffing for certified teachers as well. Until very recently, teachers had no opportunity for upward mobility except in school management... In the last few years, there has been increasing utilization of resource teachers and master teachers who are upwardly mobile but who have not relinquished the teaching role.46

Not until 1972 did Allen admit that so far "we have

---

44 Pearl and Riessman, Non-Professionals in Human Services, p. 57.
45 Klopf, Bowman and Joy, Learning Team, p. 42.
been concerned with differentiating teaching staffs and have not been attentive to the possibilities of differentiating nonprofessional staffs."47 He warned that as we move quickly to differentiate teaching positions--master, senior, staff, associate, and so on--and to determine the range of their more professional tasks and responsibilities, we must be careful not to think of using paraprofessionals just to perform teachers' unwanted tasks--routine chores, such as grading papers, or taxing ones, such as dispensing discipline... Moreover, we should avoid making them interchangeable parts with equivalent responsibilities, as teachers have been.48 We must, instead, says Allen, "begin to involve [paraprofessionals] in experiences relevant to their own skills and talents and to the learning growth of students."49

Like Riessman, Gartner, Bowman and Klopf, Allen looks to task analysis "to define existing roles and determine positions according to tasks in a differentiated staffing model." While we are beginning to have some general idea of the responsibilities of the master, senior, staff and associate teachers as they are being worked out, for example, in California's Temple City model, we remain confused over defining the tasks and, hence, the roles of paraprofessional and nonprofessional staff. To eliminate this confusion, we will need to consider the whole area of educational personnel development, particularly with respect to the burgeoning ranks of the paraprofessional.50

47 Journal of Research, p. 52.
48 Ibid., p. 53. 49 Ibid.
50 Ibid., p. 54.
The project Allen announced at that time, "A Task Analysis System for Educational Personnel Development" aimed to create a comprehensive system that can be used to analyze teaching and administrative tasks, to evaluate performance, to determine performance criteria, to define new staffing functions, roles and patterns, and to establish selection criteria for people in new staffing roles.51

A first phase of this project, including printouts of tasks and roles, was completed by the summer of 1973, but the lack of further funding appears to have brought it to a halt.

The reformers who were promoting differentiated staffing as well as those in favor of new careers, then, were all suggesting that there are many tasks, duties and roles to be performed in schools and classrooms. These tasks and roles, they said, have not in practice been analyzed and separated out in very many schools or school systems. In place of all teachers doing the same job for the same pay, status and upward-bound opportunities and paraprofessionals under the same kind of constraints, the reformers called for differentiation of educational personnel—including duties, roles, responsibilities, pay and

51 Ibid., pp. 54-5.
status—from the paraprofessional trainee level all the way up to master teacher and perhaps beyond.

Career Development for All

While the Allen project is incomplete, the Gartner-Riessman and Bowman-Klopf teams have suggested models for school-by-school task analysis, role definition and development as well as training. These models, discussed here under the broad heading of career development for all, are at the heart of new careers theory. They suggest, as Chapter I pointed out, that upward mobility is not just for paraprofessionals, but that it is possible—though not obligatory—for all educational personnel.

The new careers model calls for entry level jobs "in which new employees can be immediately productive" along with "planned upgrading all along the line" in specific and genuine sequential steps combined with work-study and training, so that teachers are promoted without giving up teaching and "newer" personnel "is not promoted at the expense of present personnel." 52 The new careers advocates intended that "establishment of a new career line" for paraprofessionals would "foster career development for

the total educational enterprise, with new leadership roles at various occupational levels and increased motivation for professional growth throughout the system.\textsuperscript{53} Advancement, of course, was to be "for those who have the ability and the desire, but not compulsory."\textsuperscript{54} In addition, the design permits professionals and paraprofessionals to transfer from one educational activity, or career ladder, to another.

Teaming professionals and paraprofessionals

In maintaining that the nation's schools need differentiated staff to meet the needs of "differentiated education," Bowman and Klopf suggest that professional-paraprofessional teams be developed which reflect not only differing roles or "levels of authority within the school hierarchy" but also different "life experience as well as work experience."\textsuperscript{55}

Allen expands on this theme when he emphasizes that the team concept should include "non-human learning resources" such as "computer, library, resource center, tape deck, filmloop projector"\textsuperscript{56} so that "any teacher who can be

\textsuperscript{53}Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 217.

\textsuperscript{54}Ibid. \textsuperscript{55}Ibid., p. 219.

\textsuperscript{56}Cooper, Differentiated Staffing, p. 24.
replaced by a machine [be replaced], for she might then proceed to perform in those distinctly human roles which no machine can perform at all."^57 Klopf, Bowman and Joy draw the students themselves into this learning team concept by cautioning that paraprofessionals should perform no duties that "might usefully be performed by the students."^58

The goals for such a team effort would be:

first to establish rapport and mutual trust between school, home, and child; then to create a learning environment in the school which is rich, varied and alive; next, to analyze each pupil's behavior within the environment so as to identify his needs, his interests, his anxieties, his goals--conscious and unconscious--his learning style, his modes of attacking a problem, and his apparent feelings toward self and others. The final step in the process is to restructure the environment, while providing the medly of supportive services that are needed, as the learner meshes his strivings to an educational task which is consonant with his own goals, and at the same time replete with opportunity for his growth and development. This process, to be maximally effective, must be repeated ad infinitum, with continuous feedback from analysis and incessant restructuring of the environment as new needs and new potentials are identified.

Obviously, the learning environment thus conceived is more than four walls and some equipment. It includes all that the pupil sees, hears, feels and experiences--including the people with whom he interacts. Still more obviously, the structuring of the environment to meet individual needs would be difficult, if not impossible, for one person to accomplish all alone.

^57 Ibid., p. 22.

in a classroom of 30, or even with as few as 15 pupils. 59

In this team approach to teaching and learning in the schools the teacher is key. Playing what Bowman and Klopf call "a new leadership role," the teacher "analyzes the learning and emotional needs of children," 60 diagnosing them on the basis of "his theoretical knowledge and adapt(ing) his response to individual students." 61 Then "as an orchestra leader" or coordinator,

he utilizes all available resources, both professional and nonprofessional, both human and material in a unified program designed to meet those differentiated needs. 62

Bowman and Klopf also call for joint or team planning for professionals and paraprofessionals, for although the professional makes the final decision [those] decisions are more firmly based when persons with different work experiences and life experiences have an opportunity to contribute to the strategy formation. 63

The professional's supervisory role decreases as paraprofessionals take on more responsibility, but "at any level success or failure is primarily due to the relationship

59 Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 219.
60 Ibid., p. 18.
62 Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 18.
between teacher and paraprofessional."\textsuperscript{64} However, "even at the entry level" the paraprofessionals should "perform a dual role--both sharing in the routine jobs so as to 'free the teacher to teach' and working directly with pupils under professional supervision."\textsuperscript{65} At the associate and intern level, the supervision takes the form of teacher assistance in planning and self-evaluation.

Allen emphasizes a supplementary role for paraprofessionals, pointing out that special paraprofessional talent in dancing or painting or in creating teaching materials should be utilized.\textsuperscript{66}

**The principal as educational leader**

Enlarging on their team concept, Bowman and Klopf call not only for team development for professionals and paraprofessionals, but also for administrators and other professionals so that the "team approach" can be applied "in the school as a whole and to each class situation."\textsuperscript{67} They look toward the development of the role of principals "as enablers of professional-paraprofessional teams, and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{64} Ibid., p. 12.
  \item \textsuperscript{65} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{66} Journal of Research, p. 53.
  \item \textsuperscript{67} Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 19.
\end{itemize}
as educational leaders providing the continuity for educational change." 68

So they warn paraprofessional programmers "to enlist the understanding and support of the principals...who have the task of orienting the entire school staff, the parents, the students." 69 Unless the principal provides "reinforcement" to teachers moving into their new roles, according to another author, he will exhibit "blocking behavior which impedes the movement of teachers toward autonomy." 70

This occurred in three midwestern communities which hosted eleven Teacher Corps teams, according to Watson, who studied them in 1968. A poor relationship existed between the principals and the teams, Watson said, and principals used the teacher team leaders for their own ends, thereby impeding the program even though they "would have been receptive to innovation and experimentation if they had received more information and...been consulted during the planning stages..." 71

But Eve and Peck believe that more than team training may be needed to move the principal from his perception


69 Klopf, Bowman and Joy, A Learning Team, p. 20.

70 Cooper, Differentiated Staffing, p. 111.

71 Olivero and Buffie, Educational Manpower, p. 285.
of "himself as the upper half of a subordinate-superordinate relationship" with teaching staff:

[Such] assumptions will inevitably come into direct conflict with differentiated staffing patterns which make available a vastly extended career within the classroom where senior teachers will often function in a superordinate relation to many administrators as well as to other teachers.72

Eve and Peck suggest as a remedy that paraprofessionals be utilized for some of "the traditional administrative role functions."73 For example,

an executive secretary or a person with a business background might function much more effectively as the manager of a school building than the present administrator who has used teaching as the route to this job, and the addition of such a position to the administrative staffing structure would force the principal to concentrate on the instructional leadership tasks within his school.74

Indeed, close to 80 per cent of New York Board of Education principals studied by IED acknowledged that "their own work has been affected in some way" by the paraprofessionals, and the effect most often felt was "a shift in the principals' roles." Some 70 per cent came up with "more positive feelings about their jobs" and some 50 per cent found they liked their jobs better. About 40 per cent said

72Cooper, Differentiated Staffing, p. 96.
73Ibid., p. 99. 74Ibid., p. 100.
that their jobs were "easier" and an equal per cent complained that their jobs were harder when paraprofessionals were added.  

Such differentiation and interaction between the principal and the professional-paraprofessional teaching-learning team, and the new roles that implies, presupposes an open environment in the schools where growth and development—in intellect, status and salaries—are possible for all.

Some reservations

But AFT's research director, Bhaerman, argues that upward mobility for all is an impossible dream because there are not enough jobs at the upper levels:

Only a very few teachers would reach the hallowed status of what is sometimes called the 'master teacher', or 'senior teacher'...since only a limited number of spots would be open at the top salary range. He concludes that salaries must continue to reflect education and experience as well as full or part-time service. Schmais predicts gloomily that paraprofessionals will "continue to cluster in low-level entry jobs where they will assume the

75 An In-Depth Study, p. 86.

role of a permanent underclass of the professional world." 77

Whether Schmais and other writers on paraprofessional programming are closer to the reality than the new careers proponents is in large part tested out in the findings of this study on career lattice designs, career advancement plans, hirings, salary scales and paraprofessional organizational development.

Training School Faculty for New Roles in Education

Bowman and Klopf; Riessman, Pearl and Gartner; Allen and others, then, look toward staff differentiation as a framework for the development of new roles in education as well as for the continued growth and development of all members of the school faculty, including paraprofessionals and student teachers. Obviously, such a conception of upward and lateral mobility implies a continuous process of training. The new careers model calls for in-service training geared to increasing each person's effectiveness at the current level and permitting each to move up as a result of the training. It also looks toward strong ties between elementary-secondary and higher education. For both in-service and academic training, according to new careerists,

77Schmais, Implementing Non-Professional Programs, p. 66.
the schools must provide released time for both professionals and paraprofessionals to upgrade themselves. Higher education, for its part, according to new careers theory, must provide academic credit for supervised work in the classroom as well as in-service training and off-campus (external) or other life experiences.

For and against a revamp of teacher education

This concept of upward growth and development through in-service and academic training, plus supervised or clinical field work, implies a whole new method of teacher preparation, alternative paths to teacher certification and beyond. The emphasis is on performance or competence rather than on credits, as opposed to traditional teacher training which, in the words of Gartner and Riessman, "maintain standards" which "are not performance-based, but rather credential-based."

Bennett and Falk call the new careers model "an attack on the entire teacher training system." For while performance criteria and objectives, work-study programming, as well as clinical or field work during college and beyond

---

78 Gartner and Riessman, "Changing the Professions," p. 272.

79 Bennett and Falk, New Careers and Urban Schools, p. 88.
are common in other areas of study, this is a recent approach for education. Gartner is correct in asserting:

It is impossible to understand the paraprofessional movement unless it is seen in relation to a whole series of new trends relating to credentialism and professionalism, including the new external degree, the concern for recurrent education, the expanded work-study programs in college, and the demand for more relevance in college courses.  

But Haskew asks how can professionals and paraprofessionals be trained when we do not have "some delineation of their respective roles, of the competencies and cognitive background necessary for each role, of the interrelationships existent as they compose an effective instructional unit." In order to "diminish the gap between what people are equipped to do and what they find themselves doing," he calls for teacher-staff operational studies in which we "try to get some empirical definitions which make sense to the practitioners and give guidance to the trainers."  

Some commentators point out other pitfalls. Wilkinson charges that "teachers fail to capitalize on the strengths and particular talents of aides" because they

---

80 Gartner, Paraprofessionals, p. x.
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don't know about them or are "threatened that the aides could do something that they could not do as well...".  

Participants in the 1968 Albuquerque Conference on Teacher Aides agreed. They pointed out that "problems" in professional-paraprofessional relationships "generally stem from a lack of understanding on the part of the teacher of how to make the best use of the aide, and lack of understanding or perhaps hesitancy on the part of the aide."  

The conferees agreed that training can improve professional and paraprofessional "attitudes which will tend to put the aide's role in proper perspective" so that everyone understands that the aide "is an integral part of the classroom format," and that teacher and aide "are partners in this business of education."  

Conferees, like almost all other commentators, wished to see teachers involved in training paraprofessionals. Others, like Rittenhouse, call for training teachers in using paraprofessionals.  

---


84 Ibid., p. 110.  

85 Rittenhouse, An Interpretive Study, p. 13.
of the professional... as critical because of his responsibility for role development: both his own role and that of the auxiliary." Since teachers supervise the paraprofessionals, they must be "centrally involved in the training process."\textsuperscript{86} Most commentators, including Bowman and Klopf, Gartner and Riessman, call for "co-training" or "team training" of professionals and paraprofessionals.\textsuperscript{87}

There appears to be an explosion in the array of teaching opportunities that are opened up by the arrival on the scene of paraprofessionals. As early as 1966, Denemark anticipated that senior teachers who are released by the use of paraprofessionals could be used to train beginning teachers.\textsuperscript{88} Bowman and Klopf, as well as Gartner and Riessman, expect experienced teachers as well as paraprofessionals to play training roles in teacher training institutions around the country.

While commentators talk about training professionals, paraprofessionals and administrators for new roles, few have faced up to the question of the reeducation of adults. Bennett and Falk lament that there is little "empirical

\textsuperscript{86} Klopf, Bowman and Joy, \textit{Learning Team}, p. 13.


\textsuperscript{88} George W. Denemark, "The Teacher and His Staff," \textit{National Education Association Journal}, 55 (December, 1966) p. 70.
evidence of the ability of adults to change in any capacity." Studies to date, according to these authors, indicate that "supposedly dramatic changes in adults...are largely superficial and that the personal genotype of the convert does not change as much as it might seem." A criminal converted to religion, they suggest, may continue his behavior by trying to con his own church.  

Bowman and Klopf are more optimistic: "One concept has been well substantiated by research: that structuring and restructuring the personality can continue throughout the life cycle."  

**Professional-paraprofessional team training**

This "continued capacity for change" is used by Bowman and Klopf in their training program for the professional-paraprofessional learning team. But, they warn, retraining adults isn't easy. Aging usually means increasing inflexibility and decreasing curiosity, the tendency "to cling to familiar modes of behavior" and a fear of "risking failure." Adults tend to respond more rigidly

---


"to the expectations of their culture or subculture, as perceived by them," and they exhibit a propensity "to reject new principles and practices which are not concretely and obviously related to their own pragmatic goals."\(^{91}\)

Such an understanding of the way adults learn leads directly to the "experiential approach"\(^{92}\) Bowman and Klopf take for the training of the professional-paraprofessional team. As early as 1966 Bowman and Klopf recognized the conflict between role definition, which was recognized as necessary for institutionalization, and role development, which was a dynamic of each classroom situation where auxiliaries were utilized. The degree of responsibilities assigned to an auxiliary depends upon the interaction of a particular teacher and a particular auxiliary operating within a given structure and responding to the special needs of individual pupils. A delicate balance seems to be required in order to provide the specificity that means security, along with the flexibility that promotes growth.\(^{93}\)

The experiential approach to learning, they assert in a later work, means team planning and working; training with administrators, ancillary staff and parents, along with didactic instruction and skill training. Two components are necessary:

- It requires small group training in which the participants are encouraged to interact more honestly and congruently with one another and also a laboratory

\(^{91}\)Ibid.  \(^{92}\)Ibid., pp. 66-89.

\(^{93}\)Bowman and Klopf, New Careers, p. 25.
approach with shared experience, feedback, reflection and guided re-enactment of experience.\textsuperscript{94}

They structure a situation where professionals and paraprofessionals are carefully teamed, where professionals volunteer to become cooperating teachers and where paraprofessionals choose the particular jobs they would like in a school. In this set-up each paraprofessional works with no more than two teachers and time is available each day for the professional-paraprofessional team to plan and review together. Professionals and paraprofessionals are trained together to develop the competencies they need and participate in separate sessions only where their competencies and/or previous training and differing roles need to be clarified.

In such a setting the Bank Street team encourages individual and small interaction group arrangements for role playing and other simulation, case studies, demonstration, "practice in real situations," "reenactment after analysis," as well as face-to-face confrontation with the trainer. The training activities can include seminars, courses, workshops, conferences, institutes. The formats vary: lectures, discussions, panels, hearings, media presentations, or simply "happenings." Individual or small

\textsuperscript{94}Klopf, Bowman and Joy, Learning Team, p. 89.
group processes, such as consultation, dialogue, encounter, confrontation, counseling, sensitivity training, reading and writing experiences, are necessary, they say, for "self exploration and development."\(^9\) Observation and feedback are a necessary part of the process and each session is built on feedback from earlier sessions. Obviously, constant evaluation of the training design is an important part of experiential learning.

In place of the didactic approach of today's teacher training with its emphasis on presenting and procedures, the Klopf-Bowman-Joy training design

starts with the assumption that most individuals will need to be helped to make changes, and it also utilizes conflicts and resistance to change as part of the focus of training.\(^6\)

But it goes even farther than that:

[it] places major emphasis upon preparing individuals to become active participants in the change process, and upon facilitating the continuous application within their work assignments of their understandings of themselves and of the conditions which promote learning.\(^7\)

Collaboration between schools and colleges

The Gartner-Riessman design for training is not very different from Bowman and Klopf's. Gartner calls for "the

\(^9\) Ibid., pp. 49-50. \(^6\) Ibid., pp. 88-9.

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 89.
integration of both systematic knowledge and skill" by "combining simulation with an experience-based or inductive curriculum." Because "theoretical training cannot be separated from practical experience" and "the mode of training must express the mode of practice sought," Gartner stresses skills or "professional or vocational courses" before the trainee gets into the liberal arts requirements which are taken first in traditional teacher training.

The early training employs role playing, simulation (frequently video-taped) and brainstorming to develop new ideas for experimentation in the classroom. The activities are "interspersed with structured classroom observation." Later paraprofessionals are introduced into actual classroom situations for 20 hours a week where they begin working with small groups, gradually taking on more and more complex tasks under the direct supervision of the classroom teacher.

At each stage, Gartner calls for feedback from teachers and aides and other paraprofessionals. "The critical use of the design," states Gartner, occurs when the participants can bring back to the college class the issues and problems he encounters in the school room, get reactions from fellow class members and

---
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the professor, perhaps try a role play to try to allow others to observe how he performed with the children and/or try out alternatives.\textsuperscript{102}

In "linking work and study" Gartner urges constant interchange and interaction between college professor and classroom teacher, permitting both teacher and professor to become partners in training the paraprofessionals.\textsuperscript{103} The classroom, therefore, becomes a laboratory or clinic and the classroom teacher the clinical professor. At the same time Gartner calls for "co-training of the cooperating teachers and the paraprofessionals,"\textsuperscript{104} although Gartner's team training is not spelled out as clearly as is the Bowman and Klopf design.

But both models call for close collaboration between school systems on the one hand and higher education on the other. And this is, perhaps, a major obstacle to widespread acceptance. Bowman and Klopf showed an early awareness of "the gap between the operational needs at the school level and the development of training resources to meet these needs," suggesting that "the response of teacher educators may be accelerated" as paraprofessional programming became better accepted.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid. \textsuperscript{103} Ibid., p. 64. \textsuperscript{104} Ibid., p. 65. \textsuperscript{105} Klopf and Bowman, New Careers, p. 208.
Still in early 1969 when Bank Street College of Education issued a Directory of Institutions of Higher Learning Offering Training Programs for Auxiliary Personnel in Education, covering school year 1968-69, the authors confessed that the field was "relatively new." Nonetheless, the Directory listed 118 two-and four-year colleges and universities in 45 states, Canada, the Canal Zone and Puerto Rico offering new careers programs in the fall of 1968 and an additional 224 that were "considering" such programs.

The following year, Olivero bemoaned the lack of articulation between schools and colleges. In his view, the development of new roles and new programs for paraprofessionals had increased the demand for training programs far beyond the staff available to provide them. "Whether the criticism is true or not," he continues,

some schoolmen believe the higher education institutions are unwilling or unable to make changes, and have decided to develop their own training programs for specialists. If something is not done soon to assure collaboration and cooperation between the districts and the universities, the present gap is likely to widen rather than to narrow.
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The findings of this study focus on educational attainment, in-service training and higher education for paraprofessionals. The current state of the art in training professionals and paraprofessionals for their new roles in education should come clearer in the light of these findings. They should also reveal whether or not school-university cooperation has improved in paraprofessional training.

**Institutionalization of Paraprofessional Programming**

New careers advocates and many who support the differentiated staffing movement insist that paraprofessionals must be a "stable and integral part"\(^{109}\) of the faculty or structure of the school where they work. This is called institutionalization of paraprofessional programming, and it is a *sina qua non* of the movement. Bowman summarizes in her 1971 study:

> Occupational tracks below the professional level that have sequential steps leading to certification should be established and they ...should be integrated into the personnel structure of the school system as a stable and accepted pattern by creating fixed line items in the budget with specific title, job descriptions, and graduated compensation and by providing

the appropriate fringe benefits, increments, sick leave, annual leave, and all other customary personnel benefits and protection.  

Allen concurs. He sees that "the talented aide may be given little to do besides cleanup" while the "incompetent aide" could be given tasks that are far too sophisticated. This danger will exist as long as we remain uncertain about the relationship between the teacher and the aide and the tasks and duties of the aide, and as long as we fail to integrate the aides into our overall staffing structures.

Bowman urges a strategy for institutionalizing paraprofessional programming, but the strategy is equivocal because it takes account neither of present tight local school budgets nor of increasing salary and negotiated terms and conditions and demands of teachers. She suggests that the needed fiscal and policy [commitment]...requires not only early and broad involvement of all sectors of the school community in the planning but also continuing analysis, feed-back, experimentation, interpretation, and reinforcement of those aspects of the program which contribute to staff productivity and ultimately to the learning and development of students.

Moreover, school administrators should

---
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review all existing and potential funding sources, including... 'hard funds,' in the current fiscal year and in projected years to insure the fact that there will be jobs available with graduated responsibilities and compensation for those who complete the required training.¹¹³

Smith explains the reason for the reformers' insistence that paraprofessional programming be institutionalized or integrated into the staff structure of the schools. Most successful educational reform projects--those in which "studies... have shown positive correlations" between teaching and learning, according to him--"are often limited in time and always circumscribed in target population." They have in fact been "experiments or demonstrations of small order." But since these demonstrations have shown some beneficial relationship between teaching and learning, Smith would like to see analysis of "some of the reasons why the experimental and demonstration results have not been carried over into institutional change."¹¹⁴

Such an exploration is clearly called for, but it is a direction not taken by this study. The intent of this investigation is to discover how far large school systems around the nation have gone in institutionalizing their paraprofessional programs. Among the indicators are those

¹¹³Ibid., p. 21.
suggested by Bowman on page 103 of this study: 1) are paraprofessionals funded through the local school budget; 2) are their fringe benefits and work periods equal to those of professionals; and 3) do they have a system of "graduated compensation" or pay increases.

**Toward Improving the Learning of Children**

The single purpose of all of this thinking and writing, of the demonstrations and the studies is to find a way to improve the chances that youngsters—all elementary and secondary school pupils—will learn enough in our public schools to prepare them for reasonably productive lives. The entire paraprofessional movement, as delineated in the 1960's—with institutionalization and career development as its components and school reorganization its mechanism—is predicated on improving the learning of children. It would accomplish this by re-defining and developing the roles of school staff and using and training low income paraprofessionals as catalysts for school reorganization and change, particularly in the urban setting, to improve pupil learning in the schools and also enhance school relations with parents and community. The latter, it is believed, may also improve pupil learning in the school and outside.
Lierheimer alleges that many school faculty members joined the paraprofessional bandwagon because it promised "a way of escaping some of the mundane chores." But, he maintains,

It's sometimes hard to see...in schools where auxiliary personnel abound, how teaching is now more effective than it was before. We have a hard enough job deciding on what constitutes an improvement in pupil growth under any circumstances, and it is particularly difficult to ascribe an improvement to a single structural change in staffing.\textsuperscript{115}

Lierheimer is right, of course. Staffing change alone cannot provide the impetus to improve our schools all across the board. Cooper, too, recognizes this point:

Merely adding or subtracting new personnel and calling it staff differentiation is tokenism. Without the concurrent changes in scheduling, curriculum and decision-making, staff differentiation is nothing new.\textsuperscript{116}

New careers proponents would agree that the introduction of paraprofessionals into the schools must be a piece of, or perhaps an impetus toward, reorganizing the schools and refocusing the roles and goals of all school faculty. In fact, Anderson and others see "the danger that the new personnel will be used simply to provide more of the same rather than utilized to serve as a dynamic force

\textsuperscript{115}Cooper, \textit{Differentiated Staffing}, pp. 69-70.

\textsuperscript{116}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 1.
for change within the system." 117

Some impact studies

The pros and cons of paraprofessional utilization notwithstanding, very little work has been done on the impact of paraprofessionals on the learning of children. Those studies that have been undertaken, according to Bowman, have looked at cognitive gains as measured by standardized achievement tests rather than at any kind of growth in the affective domain. 118

Riessman reports cognitive gains in a number of projects studied over recent years, including the tutoring program of the New York Board of Education Mobilization for Youth 119 and Indiana, Minnesota, Colorado, and New York as well as Greenburgh (New York). 120 Other paraprofessional success data are reported by Gartner for Minneapolis Public School, rural Kentucky, Palo Alto (California), Atlanta (Georgia), Arlington (Massachusetts), Hammond (Indiana), four Brooklyn ghetto schools, 50 communities in twelve mid-western states, Fennville (Michigan), the Early Childhood Stimulation through Parent Education Project in

117 Journal of Research, p. 16.
119 Journal of Research, p. 88. 120 Ibid., p. 86.
Florida, a New York City Supplementary Teaching in Advanced Reading Program, and a Georgia Head Start program.\textsuperscript{121}

Mahon reports that a study of part of a Follow Through program in Illinois revealed that teacher aides after training can teach cognitive skills in reading and math as well as regular classroom teachers.\textsuperscript{122} Pope reports that 15 parent paraprofessionals tutored 107 children under the supervision of the Division of Psychiatry of the Coney Island Hospital in New York. Utilizing achievement testing along with records on each child kept by tutors and teachers, researchers were able to ascertain:

In this group of children who had been marking time for most of their school careers, all children demonstrated progress when viewed diagnostically. In the four-month period covered by this program, every child increased his ability to attack new words. Of the 82 children who remained with the program for its duration, 34 showed between 4 and 7 months progress in reading level, and 5 children made progress ranging from 9 months to 2 years.\textsuperscript{123}

Impact studies on the relationship between teaching and learning are in their infancy and very little is as yet understood about the connection between what a teacher teaches and what the learner learns. So it is hardly

\textsuperscript{121}Gartner, Paraprofessionals, pp. 24-9.

\textsuperscript{122}James Maurice Mahon, "The Effects of Instruction by Teachers and Teacher Aides Upon Performance of Pupils in a Direct Instructional Program," (unpublished Ph.d. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971).

surprising that not a great deal of research has been done on the impact of paraprofessionals on pupil learning. Much more action research needs to be undertaken on the impact of teachers and paraprofessionals on each other and their impact, singly and as a team, on the learning of children.

Summary

In contrast to the standardized views of many writers on paraprofessionalism, the education reformers of the 1960's took a new view of the role of paraprofessionals. The learning of public school youngsters, according to this notion of reform, could be improved by reorganizing school staffs to bring in new people. Many of them would come from the community to help professionals in routine as well as instructional tasks in classrooms, school libraries, guidance and counseling and other school and social service-related activities. The roles of these paraprofessionals would have to be defined and differentiated from those of professionals. And training--both higher education and in-service--and consequent career advancement in job level, salaries and status would need to be provided for all school staff, professional as well as paraprofessional.
To be effective such restructuring of school staff would have to be institutionalized by making paraprofessionals real members of the school staff, with salaries, benefits, personnel policy and upward mobility that this would entail. The paraprofessionals would also probably be organized. The question, of course, is how much the larger school systems have been able to make this theory stick. And that is the subject of this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Overview

This study was designed to compare current practices in the training and utilization of paraprofessionals with the ideas propounded by educational reformers.

The first step in the design and execution of this investigation was to determine the number of paraprofessionals working in school systems around the country, and then to work out ratios between numbers of paraprofessionals, professionals and pupils. Step two of the design focused on institutionalization of paraprofessional programming and step three on paraprofessional career development. Steps two and three, of course, are both main thrusts of the theorists. The information was sought by categories of school enrollment and regions of the country to establish base-line data and compare them, wherever possible, with statistics on earlier years.

A questionnaire was developed, then, to obtain base-line data and to discover how far school systems around the country had come in moving toward career development and institutionalization in their paraprofessional programming.
Selection of the Study Population

At the time this study was planned, there were an estimated 18,655 school systems around the nation. An inquiry covering a population of this size would have been costly to organize and manipulate. But a sampling technique was also rejected on the grounds that the study would be more useful if it could include individual data and comments from as many large school systems as possible. The decision was made, therefore, to limit the study by school size, confining the investigation to all school systems enrolling 5,000 and more pupils. A mailing list based on school enrollment was drawn up from the Education Directory, Public School Systems which indicated that there were 1,812 school systems around the country enrolling 5,000 and more pupils.

As responses came in, 51 of these systems indicated that their enrollment had dropped below 5,000 bringing the total known population to 1,761 school systems. At the final cut-off date, September 17, 1973, 1,148 schools had returned their questionnaires—a 65 per cent response. Of

---


2Ibid., entire book.
these, 1,065 school systems—or 93 per cent—reported that they employed paraprofessionals. (See Table 2.)

This study will deal with an analysis of how these 1,065 school systems employing paraprofessionals responded to each of the questions in the survey.

**Instrumentation**

The questionnaire was designed with two considerations in mind. First, it was to be kept short; second, the questions were to be factual and public—in both cases to elicit as much data as possible from busy school administrators. The questionnaire design consisted of four pages aimed specifically at base-line data, career development and institutionalization of paraprofessional programs. The questions were randomly arranged. But all questions that could relate in any way to the three main issues were included.

The draft questionnaire was submitted to Bank Street College of Education, the funding agent for the study, and was reviewed there for content and applicability by Gordon Klopf and Garda W. Bowman. The questionnaire was then reviewed for style at the University of Massachusetts

---

3 See Content of Questionnaire, pp. 116-119.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Divisions</th>
<th>Number of School Systems Mailed To&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Respondent School Systems</th>
<th>Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Number listed in Education Directory, Public School Systems as enrolling 5,000 or more pupils minus the 51 school systems which indicated their enrollment had dropped below 5,000.

<sup>b</sup>Per Cent of number mailed to.

<sup>c</sup>Per Cent of respondents.
Field Testing

Once approved by principals of the two institutions, the questionnaire was field tested. Copies of the questionnaire were sent to superintendents and administrators of five school systems. The school systems were chosen to give an opinion-spread from large to small—and from sophisticated paraprofessional programming to a beginning paraprofessional project. Participants in this field test approved the questionnaire as it stood. The next step was to undertake the full-scale mailing.

Content of the Questionnaire

The four-page questionnaire, designed to get information on the three basic goals of the study—base-line data, paraprofessional institutionalization and career development—included such questions as the following:

Base-line data

Total professional staff size _____. (Heading.)
Total pupil enrollment _____. (Heading.)
Total paraprofessional staff size _____. (Question 3.)
Paraprofessional institutionalization

How many paraprofessionals receive salaries funded through federal _____, state _____, local tax base _____, other _____, combination _____. (Question 4.)

If federal funds were withdrawn, would your school be able to pay for the program wholly _____, partially _____, not at all _____. (Question 5.)

How many of your paraprofessionals have been hired as regular teachers after they have satisfactorily completed the requirements? _____. (Question 7.)

How many hours a week are paid for paraprofessionals _____, teachers _____ in your school system? (Question 9.)

Are the paraprofessionals in your system entitled to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sick days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid school holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid snow days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal business days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service credit for education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are your paraprofessionals organized? _____. If so, is this organization:
AFT affiliated _____ NEA _____ Independent _____.

Is the organization affiliated with your teachers' collective bargaining agent? _____ Is it separate? _____ (Question 6.)

Are your paraprofessionals supervised by anyone in addition to their cooperating teacher and principal? _____ If so, who? (title, not name) _____

Is this person (or department) also responsible for evaluating the paraprofessional? _____ If not, who is? (title, not name) _____ (Question 16.)
Who determines the personnel policy for your paraprofessionals? (Check as many as apply.)
Personnel Department of your school system
Federal Coordinator
City Civil Service
Other
(Question 18.)

Paraprofessional career development

Actual and projected number of aides, assistants, associates and interns in each of five categories of school personnel: instructional, library, audiovisual, counseling and school-community relations. (Question 8.)

How many paraprofessionals are enrolled in degree-granting work-study programs in a cooperating institution of higher education

Are regular courses made available? ___.
Or is it a special program? ___.
Is released time available for them for such study?
yes ___ no ___.
Is academic credit given for work experience?
yes ___ no ___.
Is academic credit given for in-service training?
yes ___ no ___. (Question 11.)

Is there an in-service training program for your teachers who work with paraprofessionals?
yes ___ no ___.
Is there an in-service training program for your teachers who supervise paraprofessionals?
yes ___ no ___.
Is there an in-service training program for teachers and paraprofessionals together? yes ___ no ___.
Are the training programs:
On the job _____ Both _____ Special Workshops _____ Other _____.

Is time scheduled by your schools for the professional/paraprofessional team in each classroom to plan together? yes _____ no ____. (Question 15.)

Do you have a career advancement plan for your paraprofessionals? yes _____ no ___.

What is the basis for advancement from one level to the next? (Check as many as apply.)
College credits _____
In-service training _____
Seniority _____
Job performance _____
Joint evaluation such as by cooperating teacher, principal, college supervisor, and self ____. (Question 13.)

Educational attainment of paraprofessionals:
Less than high school _____
High school or GED _____
One year of college _____
Two years of college _____
Three years of college _____
Four years of college _____ (Question 12.)

Each question in the three goal areas was designed to obtain information from school systems which would permit some determination of the extent to which they met the objectives of paraprofessional programming as stated by new careersreformers.  

---

4 See Appendix A for questionnaire.
Distribution and Return of Questionnaire

In order to maximize returns, it was decided that there would be two mailings. But time constraints put these mailings into two different school years. The first mailing, sent out on June 5th, 1972, asked for reports on school year 1971-72. The follow-up mailing, sent out on December 28th, 1972, referred to the 1972-73 school year.

By March of 1973 the percentage of responses was not yet at a desired level so a third mailing was undertaken. This time officials in state education agencies were contacted and asked to distribute the questionnaire. This course was undertaken on the assumption that they might be better able to pinpoint personnel in school systems willing and able to answer the questionnaire. This third mailing went to 47 of the 50 states between April and August 1973. The District of Columbia Board of Education and Hawaii's state-operated school system had already responded as had two out of two qualifying school systems in Nevada and two out of three in Alaska. The Panama Canal Zone, too, had already answered. The third mailing was not sent to the other outlying areas—American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands—which had not responded earlier.

California, Louisiana, and Texas education agency officials were unable to make the mailings; instead these were sent out by university and/or school people. Eleven
other state mailings were handled through an educational association.\(^5\) In many cases, the state, school and university people who made the third mailing followed up with phone calls, some with personal visits too, to elicit more responses.

Table 2 shows the regional breakdown of the 1,148 responding school systems, and their relationship by region to the total school system mailing list. It should be remembered in reviewing the Table that four regional divisions—New England, Pacific, West South Central and Mountain—had a response rate of 55 per cent or less. This may raise questions about the validity of data gleaned from these regions. But only one of these regions, New England, produced less than a 50 per cent response. Response from all the other regions was better than two-thirds.

Number and per cent returns by state will be found in Appendix C. These data show extremely high response rates—85 per cent and better—from Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, New York, West Virginia and Wisconsin. The District of Columbia, Hawaii, Nevada,

\(^5\) Appendix B shows the names and affiliations of the people who so kindly made the third mailing possible.
Vermont, and the Panama Canal Zone—all with one or a very few school systems—produced 100 per cent returns. Low returns—under 50 per cent—came from California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah. The remaining state responses came within a 50 to 85 per cent range.

**Validation**

Two validation procedures were undertaken. First, because data came in from two different school years, it was necessary to compare the data to be sure there were no great discrepancies between responses due to difference in school years reported. One validation, therefore, compared data received on school year 1971-72 with that received on school year 1972-73. (See Table 3 for the number and per cent of school systems by school year.)

Second, a systematic effort to spot-check non-respondent school systems was made six months after the state mailings had gone out to determine whether or not answers from non-respondents were dramatically different from those of respondents. This validation was conducted by telephoning a random sample of non-respondents to get answers on several questions which were compared with information given by respondents.

Eleven variables, reflecting key questions in the study, were used in both validation operations. No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Respondent School Systems</th>
<th>Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Per cent of 1,148 respondent school systems.

<sup>b</sup> Per cent of 1,065 respondent school systems employing paraprofessionals.

<sup>c</sup> Per cent of respondent school systems employing paraprofessionals by year and total.
substantive differences were found in responses for school year 1971-72 as compared to school year 1972-73, nor in non-respondents' telephone answers.  

**Treatment of the Data**

**Analysis and programming**

Once coded, keypunched and verified, the data were analyzed using one-way frequency distributions and cross-tabulations computed on the basis of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.  

Two basic subdivisions of the respondents were employed wherever possible throughout the study--enrollment categories and regional divisions. Six school enrollment categories were chosen in such a way as to distribute numbers of school systems and numbers of students as evenly as possible in each category. For example, while there are only 23 school systems in the enrollment category of 100,000 and over, that grouping has 5.6 million pupils or 28 per cent of the students covered by the study. (See Table 4A.) In general, the number of school systems ...  

---

6 See Appendix D for variables and responses for both validation procedures.

7 See Appendix E for Questionnaire Specifications and Value Labels.

decreases as the size of pupil enrollment increases for each category. The enrollment categories are: 5,000 to 7,499; 7,500 to 9,999; 10,000 to 14,999; 15,000 to 29,999; 30,000 to 99,999 and 100,000 and over.

The regional divisions are based on World Almanac groupings:

**New England**
- Maine
- New Hampshire
- Vermont
- Massachusetts
- Connecticut
- Rhode Island

**Mid-Atlantic**
- New York
- New Jersey
- Pennsylvania

**East North Central**
- Ohio
- Indiana
- Illinois
- Michigan
- Wisconsin

**West North Central**
- Minnesota
- Ohio
- Missouri
- South Dakota
- North Dakota
- Nebraska
- Kansas

**Pacific**
- Washington
- Oregon
- California
- Alaska
- Hawaii
- Panama Canal Zone

**South Atlantic**
- Delaware
- Maryland
- District of Columbia
- Virginia
- West Virginia
- North Carolina
- South Carolina
- Georgia
- Florida

**East South Central**
- Kentucky
- Tennessee
- Alabama
- Mississippi

**West South Central**
- Arkansas
- Louisiana
- Oklahoma
- Texas

---


10 The Panama Canal Zone was added to the Pacific Region because it, like Alaska and Hawaii, is not contiguous to the mainland.
Mountain
Montana
Idaho
Wyoming
Colorado
New Mexico
Arizona
Utah
Nevada

At the outset, 83 school systems that did not employ paraprofessionals were removed from the file. It should be noted that among the 1,065 remaining school systems analyzed in these data, not all responded to each question and each had an opportunity for multiple answers to some questions. Unless otherwise indicated, percentages in succeeding tables that refer to respondent school systems employing paraprofessionals are calculated for 1,065.

Two special computer programs were written for this study by the staff of the University Computing Center at the University of Massachusetts. The first program printed out systematically the school systems which responded anywhere on the questionnaire to the category "other" or to value 7 which had been used in the coding operation to designate mention of any federal program. This made it possible to compile the lists of programs, personnel titles, independent organizational names and so on that are sprinkled throughout the findings of this study.
The second program retrieved data on the numbers of paraprofessionals given by responding school systems in answering applicable parts of the questionnaire. Whereas most of the questionnaire was directed at obtaining system-wide information, and the findings therefore enumerate school systems, some questions were designed to extract information on numbers of paraprofessionals in each school system. These questions were:

How many paraprofessionals work in your school system? (Question 3.)

Of these, how many receive salaries funded through: federal government _____, state government _____, local tax base _____, other _____, combination _____. (Question 4.)

How many of your paraprofessionals have been hired as regular teachers after they have satisfactorily completed the requirement? (Question 7.)

How many individuals work as instructional teacher aide, teacher assistant, teacher associate, etcetera. (Question 8.)

How many paraprofessionals are enrolled in degree-granting work-study programs in a cooperating institution of higher education? (Question 11.)

As of school year 1971-72 (1972-73), how many paraprofessionals have completed the following schooling:

Less than high school _____ High school or GED _____

One year of college _____ Two years of college _____

Three years of college _____ Baccalaureate degree _____

(Question 12.)

The special computer program printed out these numbers and permitted comparison of data on numbers of

---

11 See Appendix A for complete question which is a blank career lattice designed to be filled in by each respondent.
paraprofessionals working in the 1,065 school systems that make up the study population, unlocking useful data that would not have been available from analysis of school systems alone.

**Coding the questionnaire**

Some of the responses to the questionnaire were ambiguous and unclear. In all cases phone calls to the appropriate school system sought to clarify the answers of administrators and to fill in information that was lacking. Where it was impossible to reach the administrator, or where the calls did not clarify the answers on the questionnaire, the response was coded "no answer." Even so, there are discrepancies between questions concerning numbers of paraprofessionals. They are the result of ambiguous and overlapping answers from respondents, and each such instance is noted in the findings chapters.

Four questions gave special coding problems, requiring considerable manual tabulation and recoding. They were:

Of these (paraprofessionals), how many receive salaries funded through: federal government ____, state government ____, local tax base ____, other ____, combination ____.
(Question 4.)

The intent of this question was to glean from respondents the number of paraprofessionals funded solely through federal, state, local and other sources and the
numbers funded through a combination of those sources. Many respondents misunderstood the combination category. Many who checked one or more federal, state, local and other funding sources, also checked combination, but many others did not. Some, who checked combination correctly, checked nothing else. It was impossible to sort out this confusion, so the answers to this question were coded as given by respondents. This accounts for the small percentage of school systems using combination funding and many of the multiple answers given.

Indicate the appropriate information for school year 1971-72 (1972-73): Title of jobs and actual and projected number of individuals. (Question 8.)

A large number of respondent school systems enumerated some or all of their paraprofessionals under the "other" category of this career lattice question simply because their job titles differed from those of the questionnaire. All 1,065 questionnaires, therefore, were coded, wherever possible, to place the job title in the correct level and ladder on the career lattice table. Chapter VII lists the wide variety of job titles that were mentioned, and shows the ladder each job title was placed into. Retained in the "other" category of actual paraprofessional jobs were the following: health; research; recreational; recreational;}

\[12\] Ibid.
cafeteria; administrative/clerical/office; security/maintenance/transportation; and other. In most instances, administrative aide appeared to be synonymous with clerical or office aide, involving no executive function. In only two instances--Title I Administrator and Head Start Coordinator--was there evidence of executive function and these are the two listed as "other." Projected paraprofessional jobs were divided into three categories: instructional, ancillary services and cafeteria/clerical/maintenance.

Do you have a career advancement plan for your paraprofessionals? What is the basis for advancement from one level to the next? (Check as many as apply.) College credits _____, in-service training _____, seniority _____, job performance _____, joint evaluation such as by cooperating teacher, principal, college supervisor, and self ____. (Question 13.)

In coding this question, answers from each of the 1,065 respondents were recorded for each of the five variables that are suggested in the questionnaire as basis for advancement. Some school systems checked more than one variable (as they were told they could do). Others left the five variables blank and were coded as no answer. Later the need arose to get more information by cross-tabulating career advancement against such other variables as job levels and salaries, so it was necessary to recode to get one variable for career advancement instead of five. That recoding was as follows: "yes" was coded if the school system entered one or more yes on the four variables,
college credits, in-service training, job performance and/or evaluation; "no" was coded if the school system entered no or any combination of no and no answer on all of the four variables listed above, as well as yes or no on the variable, seniority; "no answer" was coded when nothing was marked for any of the five variables in this question.

Please give as much information as is convenient on the payscale, both grade and in-grade steps, for paraprofessionals in your system. (Question 14.)

The salary question was deliberately phrased as an open-end question in order to get as much information as possible. But the responses came in every conceivable form. For data processing purposes, these salary data were organized as follows:

1) Pay periods--annual, monthly, daily, hourly, differentiated, no answer.

2) Salary advancement levels--static, one, two, three, four, five levels, over six levels, no answer.

3) Actual dollar range for annual, monthly, daily, hourly, no answer.

\footnote{Static salaries are defined as those which remain stationary from the entry level onward, with no opportunity for incremental increases at any time.}
The salary data were coded "no answer" when they were too vague and/or too broad for categorization. Among such answers were: "$1.82 an hour plus five per cent a year;" "salaries based on academic training and work experience;" "merit payscale;" "prevailing wages;" "established by the School Board each year;" "raised when budget permits;" "equivalent to clerical;" "civil service schedule" (with no schedule attached); "paid the same as substitutes;" "a percentage of the teachers schedule" (with no teachers schedule attached).

Summary

This study investigates baseline data on paraprofessional programming as well as the extent of current paraprofessional institutionalization and career development in the nation's largest school systems. To accomplish this, a questionnaire was designed, field tested and mailed to 1,812 U.S. school systems believed to enroll 5,000 and more pupils. The 1,148 returns were then coded, keypunched and verified, validated and, finally, programmed and analyzed, using enrollment categories and regional divisions wherever possible.

Of the school systems responding to the questionnaire, 1,065 reported paraprofessional programs. The remainder of this study details findings and conclusions drawn from an analysis of their responses.
CHAPTER IV

THE STATISTICS OF PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMMING

Estimates of the number of paraprofessionals in American education in the years 1969 through 1972 vary—
from a low, suggested by Olivero of 100,000\(^1\) to a Buffie and Smith high. The latter opined in a 1970 essay that "as many as one million aides might be at work in the schools by 1972."\(^2\)

In 1970 HEW came up with a new statistical system, the Consolidated Program Information Report (CPIR) which reported on participation in federally-funded programs using information gleaned from questionnaires sent to a national sample of about 1,000 school districts which are representative of the 11,000 local education agencies around the nation enrolling 300 pupils and more. The first CPIR report for school year 1969-70, released by Resource Management Corporation, revealed that 144,136 of 838,461 staff members working in federally-funded

\(^1\)Olivero and Buffie, Educational Manpower, p. 15.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 267.
programs, were education aides. \(^3\)

In school year 1971-72, the last year for which HEW figures are available, CPIR data \(^4\) indicated that there were about 44 million pupils, \(^5\) 501,000 teachers, 111,000 other professionals and 157,000 education aides \(^6\) in federally-aided programs in school systems surveyed. Just over


\(^6\)Ibid., Table 13, pagetion as yet incomplete.
100,000 education aides, according to CPIR, received some kind of in-service and/or college training at a total cost for the federal government of $19.6 million.  

Baseline Data

A total of 135,809 paraprofessionals are reported by the 1,065 school systems enrolling 5,000 or more pupils that responded to this study. This total is about one-seventh of the 997,601 professionals reported by these same school systems (see Table 4A).

The enrollment picture

It is clear from Table 4A that paraprofessional utilization is not spread evenly across the school systems under study. Instead the larger the school system the greater the proportion of paraprofessionals it employs. Over one-third of the paraprofessionals in the study are concentrated in the nation's 23 largest school systems. They represent only 2.2 per cent of the school systems but they enroll 28 per cent of the pupils covered by this study. Another 22 per cent of paraprofessionals work in the next largest 85 school systems--eight per cent of the study population--enrolling 22 per cent of the pupils. In other

7Ibid., Table 16, pagination as yet incomplete.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Category</th>
<th>School Systems</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Paraprofessionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>2,201,031</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 9,999</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>1,898,236</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>2,680,953</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3,112,338</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4,404,407</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5,629,346</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19,926,311</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Division</td>
<td>School Systems</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>640,638</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3,589,849</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>3,674,960</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1,175,486</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2,900,190</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>4,301,196</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1,122,791</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1,664,888</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>856,313</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>19,926,311</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
words, 59 per cent of the paraprofessionals work in school systems enrolling 50 per cent of the pupils covered by this study. Only 27 per cent of the paraprofessionals—a total of 36,962—work in the 802 school districts in the three lowest enrollment categories, 5,000 to 15,000 pupils, which together represent three-quarters of the school systems, but only a little over one-third of the pupils in the study.\footnote{Note that 83 additional school systems reported no paraprofessionals at all.}

Table 5A, too, shows that paraprofessional programming is related to school size. That Table reveals a consistent national average of 20 pupils for every professional, a figure that holds true at all enrollment levels from 7,500 up; and it drops only slightly to 19.3 pupils for every professional at the smaller 5,000 to 7,500 enrollments. But the ratio of pupils to paraprofessionals in each enrollment category differs widely. The number of pupils per paraprofessional jumps from 111 to one at 100,000 students-and-over to 146 to one in the next lower enrollment category, 30,000 to 100,000 pupils. That gap widens to 172 to one by the time school size gets down to 15,000 to 30,000 pupils and remains over that at every enrollment level below.
### TABLE 5A
NUMBERS OF PUPILS PER PROFESSIONAL, PUPILS PER PARAPROFESSIONAL, PROFESSIONALS PER PARAPROFESSIONAL BY ENROLLMENT CATEGORY:
1,065 SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Category</th>
<th>Pupils per Professional</th>
<th>Pupils per Paraprofessional</th>
<th>Professionals per Paraprofessional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>175.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 9,999</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>191.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>184.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>172.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>145.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>146.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5B
NUMBERS OF PUPILS PER PROFESSIONAL, PUPILS PER PARAPROFESSIONAL, PROFESSIONALS PER PARAPROFESSIONAL BY REGIONAL DIVISION:
1,065 SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Division</th>
<th>Pupils per Professional</th>
<th>Pupils per Paraprofessional</th>
<th>Professionals per Paraprofessional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>160.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>146.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>188.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>168.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>219.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>139.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>146.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translating these ratios to professional-paraprofessional relationships, Table 5A, shows six to seven professionals to every paraprofessional in the large school districts enrolling 30,000 pupils and more, while that ratio goes up to nine or ten to one at the smaller 5,000 to 30,000 enrollments. There are, as a matter of fact, two-thirds the number of professionals per paraprofessional in the highest, the 100,000 and over, pupil category than there are the lowest enrollments of 5,000 to 10,000. Clearly comparison of ratios at each enrollment level reveals that there are fewer professionals and fewer pupils per paraprofessional in the larger school systems.

The geographic distribution

The paraprofessionals in this study are also ranged unevenly across the nation. (See Table 4B.) Heavy paraprofessional utilization is clustered on the East and West Coasts and in the Great Lakes states. Highest usage by far--28 per cent of the paraprofessionals--occurs in the school systems in the urbanized sprawl of the Mid-Atlantic region which contains 19 per cent of the respondent school systems and 18 per cent of the pupils. Next highest levels of paraprofessional utilization are found in the school systems of the South Atlantic and East North Central regions, each of which employs 17 per cent of the paraprofessionals in the study and represents 18 and 19 per
cent, respectively, of the school systems that responded.

Slightly lower utilization is found in the school systems of the Pacific region—13 per cent of responding school systems—which employ some 15 per cent of the para-professional population. Paraprofessionals are less than six per cent of the faculties of respondent school systems in each of the other five regions. These findings differ from NEA reports of 1968 and 1970 which indicated that more teachers in the West had paraprofessionals than elsewhere.\(^9\)

The argument might be made that the weight of para-professional utilization in the Mid-Atlantic, East North Central and South Atlantic regions is attributable to the high response rate of those school systems. But that argument does not hold true for the Pacific, for which the response rate was in the lowest—55 per cent and under—category. Moreover, while West North Central and East South Central each had a high response rate—roughly 70 per cent—the share of the paraprofessional population from each of these regions is under six per cent.

---

\(^9\) In the text, enrollment levels will be stated using the word "to" to mean up to, but not including, the succeeding number.
Nevertheless the startling high percentage of respondents employing paraprofessionals in every region could lead to the speculation that school systems interested in paraprofessional programming were the very ones that responded to the questionnaire. With a total respondent employment rate of 93 per cent, seven regions reported that 90 per cent or more of their school systems employed paraprofessionals. Indeed, in the Pacific and Mountain regions, where the total response rate was only 54 per cent, responding school systems employing paraprofessionals amounted to just under 100 per cent. Even the New England and West South Central respondents show better than 86 per cent paraprofessional employment. (See Table 2.) However, such speculation is ruled out by the sampling of non-respondents in which 10 per cent employed paraprofessionals in their systems.

The ratio of pupils and professionals to paraprofessionals varies by region, too, while the pupil-professional ratio remains at about 20 to one in all but New England and the Mid-Atlantic where it is slightly lower. (See Table 5B.) Compared to the nearly constant 20-to-one professional-pupil ratio by region, there are great regional discrepancies when one examines numbers of pupils per paraprofessional or numbers of professionals as compared to paraprofessionals. Except in the Mid-Atlantic states,
where paraprofessional utilization runs highest, there are 140 or more pupils to every paraprofessional in respondent school systems in every nation. And 147 to one is the national ratio. In the West South Central region, the ratio goes as high as 219 to one.

Only one region, the Mid-Atlantic, has as few as five professionals to every paraprofessional. The national figure is seven professionals per paraprofessional, and in New England, the South Atlantic and West South Central states, there are as many as nine to eleven professionals to every paraprofessional.

The Growth of Paraprofessional Programming

There is clearly great growth in paraprofessional programming since the movement picked up steam in 1965-66. In 1965, according to the Fund for the Advancement of Education,¹⁰ some 5,000 paraprofessionals were working in schools across the country. By school year 1965-66 NEA found some 30,000 paid paraprofessionals working in 215 school systems enrolling 12,000 pupils and more.¹¹

¹⁰ Decade of Experiment, p. 50.

In school year 1968-69, according to NEA 673 school systems enrolling 6,000 pupils and more were employing 32,584 paraprofessionals. 12 By the spring of 1971, the number of school systems using aides had skyrocketed over 1965-66. At that time, NEA estimated that there were 235,875 paid and volunteer aides at work around the country in school systems enrolling 12,000 and more pupils, of which some 129,000 were working in systems employing paid aides only. 13 (See Table 6.)

But by school years 1971-72 and 1972-73 the growth had leveled off. This study finds just under 136,000 paid paraprofessionals in school systems enrolling 5,000 and more pupils. (See Table 4A.) Moreover, validation of the responses from the two school years showed that the percentage of school systems claiming paraprofessionals dropped off by 2.2 per cent from 94 per cent of 1971-72 respondents to 91.8 per cent of respondents in 1972-73. (See Table 3.) While all non-respondents--who were telephoned in school year 1973-74--reported paraprofessionals in their school systems, 14 four of the six reported that the numbers had

---


14 See Appendix D.
TABLE 6
FINDINGS OF EARLIER STUDIES OF PARAPROFESSIONALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School Systems Reporting</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School Systems Using Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Paid Paraprofessionals Only</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Paid and Volunteer Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Volunteer Paraprofessionals Only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teachers</td>
<td>396,028</td>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Paid Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>29,995</td>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>12,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Systems Using Paraprofessionals by Enrollment Category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment of 100,000 and Other</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000 to 24,999</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 to 11,999</td>
<td>Not Surveyed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 to 2,999</td>
<td>Not Surveyed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Systems Using Paraprofessionals by Funding Source:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source Federal Or State or Local Only</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Sixteen school systems did not indicate whether paraprofessionals were paid, volunteer or both.

This per cent would indicate that 13. per cent of the school systems said there were "no aides used." But p. 61 of the NEA Research Bulletin indicates the percentage is 14.1. The difference is accounted for by NEA research as follows: School systems enrolling 300 to 1,999 pupils were sampled, while those enrolling 12,000 to 24,999 were all listed. In combining these two groups in what NEA calls group B enrollments of 3,000 to 24,999 they used a sample of the 12,000 to 24,999 enrollment group. But in calculating "no aides used" the entire 12,000 to 24,999 list was used.

Working in school systems employing paid aides only. Data not available on paid aides working in school systems employing both paid and volunteer aides.

The difference between 799 school systems using paraprofessionals and 793 school systems reporting paraprofessionals by funding source is not explained in the study report.

School systems were allowed to report more than one funding source so column totals more than 100 per cent.
dropped considerably with the loss and/or decrease in federal monies. These percentage differences are extremely small and may be of limited importance, but they point to a leveling off of paraprofessional usage after an earlier period of great growth. (See Table 6.)

Looking at projections on paraprofessional hiring for the forthcoming year (Table 7), there is further leveling off. While 93 per cent of the school systems responding to the questionnaire reported paraprofessionals in their employ, only 46 per cent of these—a total of 491 were willing to project paraprofessional employment for the following school year. And the number they

### TABLE 7

**PROJECTING PARAPROFESSIONALS FOR FOLLOWING SCHOOL YEAR: 491 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Classification</th>
<th>School Sys. Projecting(^a)</th>
<th>Paraprofessionals Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary Services</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria, Clerical, Maintenance</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)School systems could enter any number of paraprofessionals in any level and/or ladder in which paraprofessionals were projected for the following year, so columns total more than 100 per cent. (See Chapter III, pp. 128 and 129 for explanation of this question.)
projected—74,299 paraprofessionals—is a mere 55 per cent of the paraprofessionals enumerated for school years 1971-72 and 1972-73. Although such a drop-off clearly reflects a conservatism in estimating for the future, it can be taken as further indication of a leveling off of paraprofessional programming in the 1970's.

One interesting point emerges from Table 7. Of the paraprofessionals projected 72 per cent are in the instructional ladder. Only 17 per cent of the school systems making projections call for clerical, cafeteria and maintenance aides; 93 per cent plan to hire instructional paraprofessionals and 72 per cent seek ancillary paraprofessionals. These figures would support the conjecture that the new careers philosophy, described in Chapters I and II, is reaching the schoolroom.

Summary

There are 135,809 paraprofessionals reported to be working in the 1,065 school systems in this study. Over one-third work in the nation's 23 largest school systems while only 27 per cent are in schools enrolling 5,000 to 15,000 pupils. These paraprofessionals are utilized most heavily on the East and West Coasts and in the Great Lake States with highest usage by far in the urbanized area of the Mid-Atlantic region. A comparison with NEA figures for school years 1965-66, 1968-69 and 1970-71 shows surging
growth in the nation's supply of paraprofessionals leveling off in 1971-73, the years covered by this study.
CHAPTER V

ARE THEY PART OF THE SYSTEM? PARAPROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONALIZATION

Institutionalization of paraprofessionals in the schools where they work is a critical element of educational reform strategies to improve teaching and learning in the nation's public schools. This chapter explores how much paraprofessional programming has become institutionalized around the nation. This will be determined by examining funding, hiring and personnel patterns; duration of programs; opinion; benefits and organizational development.

**Funding Patterns**

New careers theorists insist that paraprofessional programs, to be institutionalized, must be funded in large part from local tax-based budgets—often called "hard" funds. One indicator of the extent of institutionalization, therefore, is who pays for a particular program—the local taxpayers or state and federal program funds. Conventional wisdom among federal education funders has it that the federal government serves as pump-primer, funding demonstration or experimental programs—"pilots" as they are often called. If they are successful, they are taken over
in whole or in large part by state and/or local education agencies. Estimates vary on how long this process should take. But there is a good rule of thumb: local and/or state education agencies take on a substantial part of the funding by the end of a five-year federal funding cycle. It is necessary, then, to look at funding patterns for paraprofessional programs in the 1,065 school systems which make up the study population. Next would be a look at the age of these programs. Third, the data on funding should be checked out against the data on program longevity.

**Federal, state and local funding**

Table 8A shows the number and per cent of school systems and paraprofessionals by their sources of funding. The school systems were permitted to indicate multiple funding sources so they may be counted in more than one cell in this Table. Each paraprofessional, on the other hand, was counted only once under the source of his salary funds. This approach to tabulating results highlights some interesting findings.

While 64 per cent of the school systems in the study indicate that their paraprofessional programs are funded in some way through local taxes, these funds support only 29 per cent of all paraprofessionals in the study. Three out of every four school systems say they use federal funds to pay for their paraprofessional programs, but such
funds support about half the paraprofessionals in the study. 1 Although more than 25 per cent of responding school systems indicated state funding for paraprofessional programs, this aid accounts for only ten per cent of the number of paraprofessionals being studied.

Combination funding

Questionnaire answers dealing with combination funding proved too ambiguous to provide accurate figures, since many school systems checked combination funding plus one or more of federal, state, local, others. 2 In an attempt to use the information, however, all the mentions of combination funding (see Table 8B) were distributed among the appropriate categories of Table 8A and a new total obtained. These calculations permit certain conclusions to be drawn. Just under 80 per cent of the school systems in the study receive partial paraprofessional funding from federal sources, while local sources supply some funds to just over 80 per cent of school systems' paraprofessional programs. An additional 42 per cent comes from state sources. But combination funds support only 13,000 paraprofessionals or nine per cent of those in the study.

1See Appendix G for a listing of the federal programs mentioned as primary funding sources for paraprofessional programming.

2See p. 128.
TABLE 8A

FUNDING SOURCE FOR PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS:
1,065 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS;
137,588 PARAPROFESSIONALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>School Systems&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Paraprofessionals&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Column totals more than 100 per cent because school system respondents could mark more than one funding source.

<sup>b</sup>There is a discrepancy of 1,779 between this Table, which totals paraprofessionals at 137,588, and Table 3, on the Study Population, which totals 135,809 paraprofessionals. This difference occurred because the information provided by respondents was either lacking, ambiguous or inconclusive. Each paraprofessional is counted only once, so column totals 99.9 per cent.
### TABLE 8B

**DISTRIBUTION OF COMBINATION FUNDING SOURCES**
**FOR PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS: 213 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>School Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-State-Local</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-State</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Local</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-Local</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-State-Local-Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-Other</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In comparing the funding data in this study with NEA data in Table 6, a sharp rise is evident since the 1960's in the use by school systems of federal funds for paraprofessional programs. The figure increases from 26 per cent in school year 1965-66 to 65 per cent in school year 1970-71. The use of federal funds rose to 74 per cent in the large school systems during school years 1971-73. (See Table 8A.)

State or local funding rose, too, but less sharply, according to the NEA data in Table 6. It went from 26 per cent of school systems reporting in school year 1965-66 to 38 per cent in 1970-71. These data on state or local fund usage cannot be compared with the separate local and state data of this study because NEA figures do not differentiate between the two and because the samples are different.

Local versus federal funding

The patterns of fund utilization can be seen more clearly in the tabulation of responses to the question, "If federal funds were withdrawn, would your school budget be able to pay for the program?" Over one-third of 918 school systems answered this question with a categorical "no". Another 43 per cent said they could support paraprofessional programming "partially". Only one-fifth of the school systems were confident they could carry on without federal help. (See Tables 9A and 9B.)
A look at these data by enrollment category (Table 9A) reveals that a higher percentage of the smaller school systems believe they can support their paraprofessionals without federal help. Close to one-quarter of the school systems at each of the three lowest enrollment levels—that is, under 15,000 pupils—answered "yes" to that question. But there is a sharp drop at the higher enrollment levels in ability wholly to support paraprofessional programming locally—to 14 per cent of school systems enrolling 15,000 to 30,000 pupils and only about five per cent of school systems at each of the two highest enrollment categories. Over half of the school systems at each of these two highest enrollment levels say they could "partially" support paraprofessional programming without federal funds while some 43 per cent in each category indicate it would be impossible.

But it is in the school systems at the three highest enrollment categories (15,000 pupils and over) that close to three-quarters of the paraprofessionals under study are employed. Moreover, school systems in the 30,000-and-more category were found to have proportionately many more paraprofessionals per pupil than those in the medium-to-small enrollment categories. The rub is, therefore, that the very school systems that make the most use of paraprofessionals are the ones least able to support them without federal aid.
### TABLE 9A

**SCHOOL SYSTEMS ABILITY TO SUPPORT PARAPROFESSIONALS WITHOUT FEDERAL FUNDING**

**BY ENROLLMENT CATEGORIES: 918 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 9,999</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 29,099</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a* Per cent of 918 school systems which responded to the question on their ability to support paraprofessionals without federal funding.

*b* Per cent of respondent school systems in each enrollment category.
Except in the 7,500 to 10,000 enrollment category, there are more school systems that could support paraprofessional programming partially without federal help than those that would have to cut it out altogether. But at every enrollment level a dismaying 31 to 44 per cent of school systems acknowledged that paraprofessional programming without federal funding is out of the question for them.

If federal funds were withdrawn from paraprofessional programming, the southlands would be hardest hit. (See Table 9B.) In the South Atlantic, East South Central and West South Central states, 54 to 62 per cent of the school systems indicated that paraprofessional programming would have to go with the loss of federal funding. Only a shade over one-third of the school systems in each of these three regions said they could support paraprofessionals partially without federal help. These were the only regions in which "partially" was outweighed by "no" and by substantial margins.

The Pacific coast, too, would be greatly hurt. Of the school districts in that region 44 per cent would be unable to support their paraprofessionals if federal funding disappeared. In fact, under ten per cent of the school systems in the South Atlantic, West South Central and Pacific regions felt ready to support paraprofessionals without federal aid. In the East South Central states,
TABLE 9B

SCHOOL SYSTEMS ABILITY TO SUPPORT PARAPROFESSIONALS WITHOUT FEDERAL FUNDING
BY REGIONAL DIVISIONS: 918 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Location by Regional Division</th>
<th>School Sys. Respondents</th>
<th>Can Support Totally</th>
<th>Cannot Support Totally</th>
<th>Can Support Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Per cent of 918 school systems which responded to the question on their ability to support paraprofessionals without federal funding.

*b* Per cent of respondent school systems in each regional division.
only three per cent said they could.

But it is in the South Atlantic and Pacific regions where paraprofessionals utilization is particularly high. Even in the Mid-Atlantic and the East North Central states—as many as one-quarter of the school systems in each region looked to eliminating paraprofessional programming if federal funds dried up.

Paraprofessionalism appears entrenched enough in some areas of the country to survive the loss of federal funds. School systems in the Mid-Atlantic and East North Central states, along with those of the Mountain, West North Central and New England regions are strong areas in this regard. In all these regions, as well as in the Pacific, more school systems would maintain partial support for their paraprofessionals than would eliminate them in the absence of federal aid. Moreover, one-fifth to one-third of the school systems in each of these regions, except Pacific, would carry on their paraprofessional programs entirely without federal help if necessary.

**Duration of Program**

About three-quarters of the 1,026 school systems which answered the question on years of program have employed paraprofessionals for three to seven years—that is, since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other federal programs that fund
paraprofessionals. While eight per cent of the school systems under study have been able to develop paraprofessional programs since 1969, 20 per cent set up their paraprofessional programs before school year 1965-66 and four per cent of these were established before 1960. (See Table 10.)

NEA's 1967 survey, on the other hand, shows that 18 per cent of the school systems studied began their paraprofessional programs between 1930 and 1959. In the years 1960 to 1964, another 36 per cent established programs. And right after ESEA passage, in school year 1965-66, another 40 per cent got started.³

Funding patterns and duration of program

A disappointing picture emerges from cross-tabulating the data on duration of programming with that on funding patterns. (See Table 10.) Table 8A shows that three-quarters of the school districts under study support their paraprofessional programming partially through federal funding, a quarter with some state aid, just under two-thirds in part through local funds, a fifth through combination funding and about seven per cent through other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Duration in Years</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 3 Years</td>
<td>3 to 7 Years</td>
<td>8 to 12 Years</td>
<td>Over 12 Years</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Columns total more than 100 per cent because school system respondents could mark more than one funding source.*
funds. There is little, if any, change when these data are looked at in terms of the length of time the programs have been operating. The federal planners who looked to local support of successful pilots after a few years of federal pump-priming apparently looked in vain, at least in terms of the paraprofessional programming surveyed here. Indeed it is the school systems with newer programs—the small eight per cent begun since 1969—that are exceptions to the over-all data. Roughly half of them support their paraprofessional programs through both federal and local funds and 14 per cent through state funds. These percentages are lower than those for school systems with older programs, indicating probably that there is far less duplication of funding sources than in the older programs.

School systems which set up their programs between 1960 and 1965 show greater utilization of state, local and other funding sources than do the other school systems in the study. But over three-quarters of these school systems with eight-to-12 year-old programs also continue to use federal funds. More of the school systems which set up paraprofessional programs over 12 years ago use combination funding than do the school systems with newer programs.
**Hiring Patterns**

Another indication of whether or not institutionalization has taken place is the extent to which school systems have hired paraprofessionals who have gone through the necessary study and preparation to become certified teachers. Only a little over one-third of the school systems in this study have hired any paraprofessionals-turned-teacher at all. Of these, only five have hired more than a hundred each and 35 have hired ten or more each. The paucity of hirings shows up in dismaying detail in the statistic that only 2,716 paraprofessionals-turned-teacher have been hired by 398 school systems. The number of paraprofessionals who have become teachers are a mere two per cent of the total number of paraprofessionals in this study.

If hiring patterns are any indication of the extent of institutionalization, little indeed has come about.

**Opinion Patterns**

Although only about one-third of the school systems under study have hired a paltry 2,716 paraprofessionals on teacher certification, and only a fifth could finance paraprofessionals wholly if federal funds dried up, opinions on paraprofessional programming take an encouraging turn. (See Table 11.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Column totals more than 100 per cent because school system respondents could mark more than one group favoring paraprofessional programs. Relative frequencies are used which reflect only affirmative answers indicated by "yes," an "x" or a check.*
Educators in the school systems appear now to be enthusiastic supporters of the idea, in spite of their early opposition to the movement described in Chapter I. Teachers and administrators in about three-fifths of the school systems are reported to favor continued operation of paraprofessional programs even if federal funds were withdrawn and a surprising half of the school systems said their school board members--those who approve local school budgets--would also support continuation. Those who would in fact foot the bill--parents and community--were somewhat less enthusiastic, although two-fifths of the school districts said parents would be in favor and close to a third said the community would be, too. Over half the school systems reported their paraprofessionals want to continue if federal funding ends, and 32 per cent reported that students also want paraprofessionals to stay.

These data are similar to COP data which indicate high satisfaction with COP among principals, superintendents, teachers and COP aides.⁴

⁴Smith, Career Opportunities Program, p. 12.
Supervision and Evaluation

In 1967 NEA studied paraprofessionals working during the 1965-66 school year and found that teachers supervised paraprofessionals in 84 per cent of the school systems surveyed.\(^5\) More recently, according to data in this study, the cooperating teacher supervises paraprofessionals in only 50 per cent of responding school systems. Surprisingly few, only three per cent, have supervising teachers working with paraprofessionals.

In school year 1965-66, NEA found that in 74 per cent of the school systems surveyed, principals supervised paraprofessionals and in 34 per cent the paraprofessionals were supervised by assistant principals.\(^6\) This study finds that a bare two per cent of the school systems indicate that the principal, or the principal plus the teacher, supervise paraprofessionals. While this may point to an increase in teacher acceptance of paraprofessionals, and reflect their demands for greater supervision in school affairs and their own classrooms, it reflects a diminishing role for principals in paraprofessional programming.


\(^6\) Ibid.
On the other hand, central office staff appear to have moved into supervision. In 1965-66 one-quarter of the school systems surveyed indicated that paraprofessionals were supervised by central office personnel. By school years 1971-72 and 1972-73, that percentage had increased to 38 per cent, reflecting, perhaps, increased interest on the part of school systems in working with paraprofessional programming. (See Table 12.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teachers</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Teachers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Inside School b</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Outside School c</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unknown</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and Teacher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a A supervisor in this study means, simply, whoever is in charge of the paraprofessional.

b For example, ancillary professionals, department heads or supervisors working in school building where paraprofessional works.

c Professionals working system-wide or at central administration building, that is, central office staff or personnel.

7 Ibid.
When it comes to evaluating paraprofessional performance, the picture is different. Just under half of the school systems in this study claim that those who evaluate the paraprofessionals are the same as those who supervise them. In close to 40 per cent of the school systems the principal, alone and with teachers, takes on the evaluative role. In 18 per cent of these school systems it is the principal alone who evaluates the work of the paraprofessional. The evaluative role of central office staff is negligible, cited by only three per cent of the school districts. Cooperating teachers and supervising teachers are singled out as evaluators in only two per cent of the school systems. (See Table 13.)

Supervision and evaluation of paraprofessionals, then, appear to be separated in the school systems under analysis.

Many "other supervisors and evaluators" were listed specifically. In descending order of mentions they are recorded here:

Consultants, including general or resource
Director
Administrative assistant
Media director
Administrative or education supervisor
Subject area consultants or coordinators
Learning directors
Supplemental teachers
Coordinator in related fields, such as reading
Curriculum planner
Director of head of department
Federal program advisor
Director of elementary education
TABLE 13

EVALUATORS OF PARAPROFESSIONALS: 655 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same as Supervisors</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Inside School a</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Outside School b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and Teacher</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a For example, ancillary professionals, department heads or supervisors working in school buildings where paraprofessional works.

b Professionals working system-wide or at central administration building, that is, central office staff or personnel.

**Personnel Policy**

Over three-quarters of respondent school systems use their personnel departments to decide on paraprofessional personnel policies, while just over one-quarter permit these policies to be decided by federal coordinators. A mere three per cent have established paraprofessionals within civil service. (See Table 14.) This would indicate that the school systems under study have begun to move their paraprofessional programming into the mainstream
TABLE 14

DETERMINE PERSONNEL POLICY FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS:
1,065 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Centa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Department</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Coordinator</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Civil Service</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aColumn totals more than 100 per cent because school system respondents could mark more than one group determining personnel policy for paraprofessionals. Relative frequencies are used which reflect only affirmative answers indicated by "yes," an "x" or a check.

of school system personnel work. During the years of paraprofessional growth and development federal coordinators in the school systems attained greater influence over paraprofessionals than did other parts of local school bureaucracies.

Just under one-third of the school systems responding indicated that others decide personnel policy. Of these, the majority--126 school systems--said their Boards of Education or School Boards control personnel policies. Another 54 school systems reported their superintendents, with and without the Board of Education and/or staff, are responsible for paraprofessional personnel matters. And another 19 school systems indicated personnel policy is
union or association-influenced and/or negotiated. Others named specifically are listed below in descending order of number of times mentioned:

State Department of Education and Board of Education
Administrative or central staff and/or council
Department, division, Assistant Superintendent or
Director of Instruction
Principals with teachers, supervisors, department
chairmen, Board of Education, and/or federal staff
Coordinator, director, assistant director with or
without paraprofessionals, Personnel Department
(including Title I Director, State-Federal
Programs Director, Director of Work-Study Pro-
gram, Director of Non-Curriculum Aides, Director
of IPI Program)
Assistant Superintendent
Assistant Superintendents for Business, Business
Office, Business Service
Merit System, District Merit Commission
Local and state regulations
Institutions of higher education
Model Cities
School Board and Parent Advisory Council, parent
advisor groups
Cooperative development
Joint conference with classified personnel
Teacher Assistant Committee
Policy Committee (administrator, teachers, non-
instructional personnel)
Public Careers Program

The data on supervision, evaluation and personnel
handling of paraprofessionals in the school systems under
study shows increased interest on the part of central
office staff, a shift from the supervisory to an evaluative
role for principals and a new control by personnel depart-
ments. These data could be construed as positive moves
toward institutionalization of paraprofessionals in the
school systems under study because central office staffs
and personnel departments tend to play an important part in structuring school staff.

**Hours and Weeks Worked**

Another indicator of the extent of institutionalization of paraprofessionals in a school system is whether or not they are paid for the same total number of hours per day and weeks per year as teachers are. The data in our study (Table 15) show that professionals and paraprofessionals are paid for the same number of hours a week in only one-third of the school systems, while they work the same number of weeks per year in close to two-thirds of the districts. A quarter of the school systems report their paraprofessionals work from 75 to 100 per cent of the weeks that teachers put in. And in five per cent of the systems paraprofessionals put in more weeks and more hours than teachers. While one-quarter of the school systems pay their paraprofessionals for three-quarters to the same number of hours as their teachers, another quarter indicate an hourly differential that is too ambiguous to categorize.

In all paraprofessional's paid hours are equal to or greater than teacher paid hours in 39 per cent of the school systems studied. Their paid weeks are equal to or greater than those of teachers in 67 per cent of reporting school systems. This information can be compared to data
from an NEA study which found that in school year 1965-66, just under 52 per cent of the school systems surveyed had paid aides who worked more than 20 hours a week.\textsuperscript{8} There is, then, some improvement in paid paraprofessional hours since the early days of paraprofessional programming.

### TABLE 15

**COMPARISON OF TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL PAID HOURS WORKED PER DAY AND PAID WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: 1,065 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS\textsuperscript{a}**

| Comparison of Time Worked by Paras. and Teachers | Paid Hours Per Day | | Paid Weeks Per Year |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | Per Cent | Number | Per Cent |
| Paras. Less than 50 Per Cent of Teachers | 39 | 3.7 | 5 | 0.5 |
| Paras. 50 to 75 Per Cent of Teachers | 55 | 5.2 | 11 | 1.0 |
| Paras. 75 to 99 Per Cent of Teachers | 250 | 23.5 | 251 | 23.6 |
| Paras. 100 Per Cent of Teachers | 365 | 34.3 | 665 | 62.4 |
| Paras. More than Teachers | 54 | 5.1 | 51 | 4.8 |
| Data too Ambiguous to Categorize | 281 | 26.4 | 59 | 5.5 |
| No Answer | 21 | 2.0 | 23 | 2.2 |
| Total | 1,065 | 100.2 | 1,065 | 100.0 |

\textsuperscript{a}Each respondent school system compared paraprofessionals and teachers in terms both of paid hours worked per day as well as paid weeks worked per year.

\textsuperscript{8}Ibid., p. 5.
Benefits

Whether paraprofessionals get benefits comparable to teachers is another measure of institutionalization.

Of the ten benefits usually accorded teachers, three—sick days, retirement and school holidays—were offered to paraprofessionals by a majority of school systems reporting. Four-fifths of the school systems said paraprofessionals get paid sick days. About 70 per cent reported that they offered paraprofessionals retirement benefits, while about three-fifths paid them for school holidays.

Between 39 and 46 per cent of the school systems responding also indicated that paraprofessionals are entitled to personal business days, maternity leave and snow days. Only about one-third of the school systems provide paid vacations or job assurance.

About one-fifth give paraprofessionals in-service credit for education, a benefit that is crucial to new careers programming. Just under 16 per cent provide

---

9A number of school systems indicated that they were in tornado or hurricane areas, and that paid tornado or hurricane days were given. All notations of hurricane and tornado days were lumped with snow days in the coding. But since many school systems are in neither snow, nor hurricane nor tornado belts, the percentage of school systems offering that benefit does not necessarily reflect a liberal or non-liberal policy of school systems in this regard.
tuition assistance, the other benefit important to new careers programmers. Among these are seven school systems which indicated that tuition assistance comes through the Career Opportunities Program. One school system indicated that tuition assistance is available under Head Start only and another noted that Title I provides tuition assistance as long as it continues.

TABLE 16

BENEFITS PROVIDED TO PARAPROFESSIONALS BY RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>School System Respondents</th>
<th>Benefits Provided</th>
<th>Benefits Not Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Days</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Days</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity Leave</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Days</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation Days</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Assurance</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Education</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Assistance</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Percentages for each benefit are based on the number of school systems which marked a response for that particular benefit.
Are They Organized?

The vast majority of school systems in this study—three-quarters of them—report that their paraprofessionals are not organized. This must be compared with the organizational development of teachers: 70 per cent of the nation's public school teachers are organized in NEA or AFT locals. In the remaining one-quarter of the school systems under study, where paraprofessionals are organized, 18 per cent belong to independent paraprofessional organizations. AFT and NEA together account for only seven per cent with NEA affiliation ahead of AFT affiliation by five to two. (See Table 17A.)

Independent organizational affiliations mentioned by respondents, in descending order, are:

Civil Service Employees Association
Classified Employees Organization
Secretary or Clerical Association
Ohio Association of Public School Employees
AFL-CIO
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees
State-Affiliated

In the 265 school systems where paraprofessionals are organized, 62 per cent report that their paraprofessional organization is not affiliated with the teachers' organization. (See Table 17B.)

If organizational development is another step toward institutionalization—and in a teaching world where almost three-quarters of the teachers are affiliated with NEA or AFT,
### TABLE 17A

THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF PARAPROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION: 1,065 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paraprofessional Affiliation</th>
<th>Affiliation, if Organized</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFT Affiliated</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEA Affiliated</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFT Affiliated &amp; Independent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEA Affiliated &amp; Independent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Organized</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 17B

THE EXTENT TO WHICH PARAPROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE AFFILIATED WITH TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS: 265 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated with Teacher Organization</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate from Teacher Organization</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Affiliated and Separate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Affiliated nor Separate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer on Affiliation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it clearly is--the data on organizational development of paraprofessionals is disappointing. Not only are paraprofessionals organized in only one-quarter of the school systems under study, but those that are organized are mainly in independent organizations, three of which are clearly unions for non-educational personnel, and two for clericals. Moreover, the paraprofessionals who are organized do not take on the added strength from affiliation with the greater organizational movement in three-fifths of the school systems which are organized.

The primitive state of organizational development among paraprofessionals in school systems around the nation takes on additional meaning when looked at from the standpoint of benefits. As shown in Table 18 the school systems that are organized consistently provide more liberal benefits. Eleven to 22 per cent more organized school systems than the unorganized systems provide each of the first eight--the more commonly accepted--benefits. Three per cent more organized than unorganized school systems grant in-service credit for education, and seven per cent more give tuition assistance. The figures here contain an obvious argument for paraprofessional organization.
TABLE 18
DO ORGANIZED PARAPROFESSIONALS GET BETTER BENEFITS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Num-Per-</td>
<td>Num-Per-</td>
<td>Num-Per-</td>
<td>Num-Per-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ber Cent</td>
<td>ber Cent</td>
<td>ber Cent</td>
<td>ber Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Days</td>
<td>981 92.1</td>
<td>781 79.6</td>
<td>554 69.9</td>
<td>223 84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>924 86.8</td>
<td>643 69.6</td>
<td>450 56.8</td>
<td>190 71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid School Holidays</td>
<td>938 88.1</td>
<td>557 59.4</td>
<td>377 47.6</td>
<td>176 66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Business Days</td>
<td>900 84.5</td>
<td>412 45.8</td>
<td>262 33.1</td>
<td>147 55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity Leave</td>
<td>894 83.9</td>
<td>360 40.3</td>
<td>226 28.5</td>
<td>132 49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Days</td>
<td>865 81.2</td>
<td>333 38.5</td>
<td>218 27.5</td>
<td>114 43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Vacation Days</td>
<td>909 85.4</td>
<td>313 34.4</td>
<td>208 26.3</td>
<td>103 38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Assurance</td>
<td>841 79.0</td>
<td>254 30.2</td>
<td>167 21.1</td>
<td>86 32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Credit for Education</td>
<td>863 81.0</td>
<td>179 20.7</td>
<td>127 16.0</td>
<td>51 19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Assistance</td>
<td>839 78.8</td>
<td>130 15.5</td>
<td>83 10.5</td>
<td>47 17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Only 1,057 school systems responded to the question on paraprofessional organization. The eight "no answers" account for the difference between 1,065 and 1,057 and the resulting minor discrepancies--four and less--between number of School Systems Providing Benefits and the sum of School Systems/Paras.Unorganized and School Systems/Paras. Organized for each benefit.

b Number of school systems reporting unorganized paraprofessionals is 792 or 74.4 per cent of respondent school systems. (See Table 17A.)

c Number of school systems reporting organized paraprofessionals is 265 or 24.9 per cent of respondent school systems. (See Table 17A.)

d Percentages for each benefit are calculated on the number of school systems which marked a response for that particular benefit.

e Percentages for each benefit are calculated on 792, the number of school systems with paraprofessionals unorganized which responded.

f Percentages for each benefit are calculated on 265, the number of school systems with paraprofessionals organized which responded.
Summary

The enthusiasm for paraprofessional programming that local educators and the community reveal in this study indicates that paraprofessional programs were successful, at least in part, in the school systems where they operated. But the study does not bear out the hope that the federal funding of successful demonstration programs will ultimately be taken over by local and state education agencies. Only one-fifth of the school systems under study could support their paraprofessionals completely if federal funds dried up and less than one-half could support them partially. Moreover, the longevity of the programs seems to have no relationship to the ability to support them.

Meanwhile, paraprofessionals in general are still being paid for less than a full school day. They are organized in only a quarter of the school systems under study. Their access to the benefits typically granted to teachers is mixed. And few paraprofessionals who have attained teacher certification have been hired by the school systems under study.

Limited signals that some institutionalization of paraprofessionals has taken place can be read from the findings that personnel policies for a majority of school systems with paraprofessionals are now being decided by the school personnel department. And for a large minority,
supervision comes from central office personnel and evaluation from principals.

But all-in-all, this study finds that paraprofessional programs under investigation here have not become an integral part of public service. Indeed if the indicators are valid, the paraprofessional programs in the school systems under study have a long way to go before they are institutionalized. Future studies must ask why.
CHAPTER VI

ARE THEY MAKING IT IN THE SYSTEM?

CAREER DEVELOPMENT

New careers in education, which featured career development or advancement, was born in the Sixties from the effort to bring community people into the public school establishment as paraprofessionals. These people from the community, many parents of youngsters in the public schools without traditional educational qualifications, were supposed to provide the added hands and hearts, the heightened sensitivities, that were to help teachers improve pupil learning in the public schools. In return they were to get jobs and incomes, plus the necessary in-service and college training, that would allow them to work productively in the schools and to rise in the school hierarchies.

But as late as 1970, Bennett and Falk were pinpointing how far short results were from that goal, suggesting that less than 10 per cent of their estimated 200,000 teacher aides employed during 1969-70 were "in anything like a new careers program."

---

1Bennett and Falk, New Careers and Urban Schools, p. 208.
To verify that opinion, this chapter will look closely at such components of career development for paraprofessionals as job levels and ladders, in-service and college training, salary and upward mobility in the 1,065 school systems under study. As a first step in this examination, educational attainment must be investigated as well as the question of whether the paraprofessionals covered in this study are low income community residents.

Educational Attainment

In analyzing community action programs around the nation in 1966, Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., found that only 25 per cent of the paraprofessionals working in those programs had less than a high school degree and 20 per cent had done some college work. He concluded that "the selection procedures had tended to 'cream off' the more educated among the poor." But programs where "a deliberate effort was made 'to attract hard core personnel...[experienced] no greater difficulty with their nonprofessionals than programs ...which had deliberately selected the community-leader type of nonprofessional.'"^2

Yankelovich was looking at paraprofessionals in health and welfare fields as well as education. When NFA looked at educational attainment of aides working in school systems in 1965-66, the selection of the better educated was even more obvious. While over a third of the school systems required no more than an elementary education, "about half of the systems [required] at least some college education...for certain paid aide positions," and 19 percent of these required college degrees. In that year paid aides were required to have a high school degree in approximately two-thirds of the school systems studied.³

With these early findings in mind, the first question to be asked is whether school systems under study in fact recruited poor people from the community and, second, if their selection mechanism did indeed choose better educated people.

As shown in Table 8A, three-quarters of the school systems in the study are supporting half the paraprofessionals through federal funds. Since nearly all federally-funded paraprofessional programs have a low income requirement for recruitment and selection,⁴ it is a fair assumption

³NEA, "Teacher Aides in Large School Systems," pp. 7-8.

that at least half the paraprofessionals in the school systems under study are low income community residents.

An investigation of the educational attainment of the paraprofessionals in this study—the half that are presumably poor and the half that may not be—reveals evidence of cream-off. In fact the data in this study show a more educated paraprofessional force than did the Yankelovitch figures of almost a decade ago.

Table 19B makes clear that one-third of the paraprofessionals in this study are not even accounted for in terms of educational attainment. Removing that number from consideration, Tables 19B and 19D disclose that 27 per cent of the remainder have had some college education, 20 per cent of these one or two years of college. Their numbers are five times greater than the six per cent of the paraprofessionals in the study who do not have high school degrees. Moreover, two-thirds of the paraprofessionals accounted for graduated from high school or earned GED's.

The data by school systems (Table 19A) show that at least half the school systems under study employ some paraprofessionals who have one or two years of college, and a surprising one-third have working for them paraprofessionals who have had three and four years of college. Only 17 per cent employ paraprofessionals who have less than a high school degree while the great majority—70 per cent—employ some paraprofessionals who are high school graduates.
or GED-holders.

Analyzing the data by enrollment categories (Table 19A) reveals that one-quarter of the school systems enrolling 100,000 pupils and more employ some paraprofessionals with less than high school degrees. As enrollments decrease that percentage drops, reaching a low of 14 per cent of the school systems enrolling less than 7,500 pupils. But the percentage of systems employing paraprofessionals without high school degrees is low, amounting to no more than five per cent at each enrollment level of all respondent school systems. About half of the school systems in each enrollment category up to 100,000 pupils employ some paraprofessionals with one or two years of college, but this percentage drops to a little over one-third of systems enrolling 100,000-and-more pupils. Similarly, between two-thirds and three-quarters of school systems enrolling up to 100,000 pupils employ some paraprofessionals with high school or GED degrees; in school systems in the 100,000-and-more enrollment category this drops to half.

A hefty proportion of school systems at every enrollment level employ paraprofessionals with three and four years of college. In fact, no less than a third of school systems at each enrollment level employ paraprofessionals who have gone through four years college. But again, the percentage of school systems whose paraprofessionals have three and four years of college is low, amounting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Enrollment Category</th>
<th>Sch. Sys. Respondents</th>
<th>No High School Degree</th>
<th>High School/ GED Only</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>Two Years College</th>
<th>Three Years College</th>
<th>Four Years College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 9,999</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Employing Paras.**

1,065 | 100.1 | 177 | 16.6 | ---- | 752 | 70.6 | ---- | 536 | 50.3 | ---- | 540 | 50.7 | ---- | 334 | 31.4 | ---- | 399 | 37.5 | ---- |

**Total Not Employing Paras.**

0 | 0.0 | 888 | 83.4 | ---- | 313 | 29.4 | ---- | 525 | 49.3 | ---- | 731 | 68.6 | ---- | 666 | 62.5 | ---- |

---

*School systems could enter the particular number of paraprofessionals in as many educational attainment cells as were applicable. Therefore, the number and per cent of respondent systems for all levels of educational attainment add up to more than 1,065 or 100 per cent.

b. Per cent of 1,065 school systems which responded to the question on educational attainment of paraprofessionals.

c. Per cent of respondent school systems in each enrollment category.
at each enrollment level, to less than nine per cent of the total except in the smallest school systems where it is up slightly to 11 per cent.

Clearly the largest proportion of school systems enrolling under 100,000 pupils employ paraprofessionals with high school degrees and/or one or two years of college. At the highest enrollment level, the distribution is more even across the six variables of educational attainment.

But the educational attainment figures by school systems are deceiving when viewed alongside figures on the 90,308 paraprofessionals whose educational levels were reported by the school systems under study. It is clear (Table 19B) that most--67 per cent--of the paraprofessionals reported in this study have high school or GED degrees. At the 100,000-plus enrollment level, three-quarters of the paraprofessionals have that degree and the percentage is never below 58 per cent at all lower enrollment levels.

About twice as many paraprofessionals at each enrollment level have had one year of college as those who have no high school degree at all, a mere six per cent of all paraprofessionals in the study. The percentage of paraprofessionals with three years of college drops off from the one-and two-year level in every enrollment category, and rises again for four years college study at all enrollments up to 100,000 pupils. But only four to seven per cent of paraprofessionals at enrollments up to 100,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paras. by Enroll. Category of School System</th>
<th>Total Paras. Reported</th>
<th>No High School Degree</th>
<th>High School/GED Only</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>Two Years College</th>
<th>Three Years College</th>
<th>Four Years College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>10,050</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>344 0.4 3.4</td>
<td>7,008 7.8 69.7</td>
<td>1,009 1.1 10.0</td>
<td>824 0.9 8.2</td>
<td>254 0.3 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>10,282</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>589 0.7 5.7</td>
<td>6,372 7.1 62.0</td>
<td>1,251 1.4 12.2</td>
<td>985 1.1 9.6</td>
<td>405 0.4 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>15,264</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1,050 1.2 7.1</td>
<td>8,834 9.8 57.9</td>
<td>2,110 2.3 13.8</td>
<td>1,624 1.8 10.6</td>
<td>664 0.7 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90,308</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>5,153 5.7</td>
<td>60,854 67.4</td>
<td>10,275 11.4</td>
<td>7,675 8.5</td>
<td>2,949 3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Per cent of 90,308 paraprofessionals whose educational attainment was reported.

b Per cent of paraprofessionals in each school system enrollment category.
are four-year-college people. In school systems with 100,000 and more pupils, the percentage of paraprofessionals with college drops from ten per cent with one year of college to four-tenths of one per cent with four years of college.

In all, however, only four per cent of the paraprofessionals under study have had four years college study, and only three per cent have had three. About one-fifth of all paraprofessionals have had one and two years of college.

While 71 per cent of the school systems in all regional divisions employ some paraprofessionals who are high school graduates, and only 17 per cent employ some paraprofessionals with less than a high school degree, the school systems of the South appear to be most insistent on high school educations. (See Table 19C.) Only 13 per cent of the school systems in each of these two regions (South Atlantic and East South Central) employ paraprofessionals without high school degrees while about four-fifths of systems in each of these regions have paraprofessionals who are high school graduates and over 60 per cent have paraprofessionals with one and two years of college. The high percentage of school systems with paraprofessionals at the high school graduate and one and two year college levels continues across the southlands into the West South Central region, where 73 per cent employ some paraprofessionals with high school or GED degrees and about 60 per cent with
### Table 19C

**Educational Attainment of Paraprofessionals in School Systems by Regional Division: 1,065 Respondent School Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Location by Regional Division</th>
<th>Sch. Sys. Respondents</th>
<th>No High School Degree</th>
<th>High School/ GED Only</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>Two Years College</th>
<th>Three Years College</th>
<th>Four Years College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a. School systems could enter the particular number of paraprofessionals in as many educational attainment cells as were applicable. Therefore, the number and per cent of respondent systems for all levels of educational attainment add up to more than 1,065 or 100 per cent.

b. Per cent of 1,065 school systems which responded to the question on educational attainment of paraprofessionals.

c. Per cent of respondent school systems in each regional division.
one and two years of college.

In the Mountain and Plains (West North Central) states, about half the school systems employ paraprofessionals with four years of college, while the smallest percentage---12 per cent---of school systems employing less-than-high-school-degreed paraprofessionals are in the West North Central states.

The educational attainment of the paraprofessionals by regional division is shown in Table 19D. The Mid-Atlantic and East North Central regions each have the highest percentage of paraprofessionals with high school or GED degrees, with the South Atlantic following thereafter. Only in the central belt of the nation (West North Central and West South Central) do fewer than 60 per cent of the paraprofessionals have less than high school-GED status.

The pattern of slightly better education paraprofessionals in the southlands (South Atlantic, East South Central and West South Central) appears to hold up, with only two or three per cent in each region holding no high school degree. This compares to six to seven per cent in all other regions. The highest percentages of paraprofessionals with one and two years of college also occur in these three regions. East South Central and West South Central also claim the highest percentages of paraprofessionals with three years of college.
### Table 19D

**Educational Attainment of Paraprofessionals Grouped by Regional Division in Which School System Located: 90,308 Paraprofessionals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paras. by Reg. Div. in which School System Located</th>
<th>Total Paras. Reported</th>
<th>No High School Degree</th>
<th>High School/ GED Only</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>Two Years College</th>
<th>Three Years College</th>
<th>Four Years College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>34,900</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>25,334</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>12,276</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8,607</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>4,807</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>7,483</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4,598</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>14,097</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9,702</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>5,717</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>3,267</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90,308</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>5,153</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>60,854</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* a: Per cent of 90,308 paraprofessionals whose educational attainment was reported.

* b: Per cent of paraprofessionals in each regional division.
About ten per cent of the paraprofessionals in both the Mountain and West North Central states have gone through four years of college—almost twice as many as in all other regions except Mid- and South Atlantic where the percentages are two and three, respectively.

The paraprofessionals working in the school systems under study are far better educated than new careerists would desire. Most have high school degrees or GED's and over one-quarter have one or two years of college.

Role Differentiation: The Career Lattice

Role definition is a crucial element of paraprofessional programming as well as of the entire panoply of programming in the education professions. Teachers, principals, central office administrators, professional ancillary staff, paraprofessionals and others are today exploring and defining the roles they play in the public schools. This process entails analyzing the responsibilities that go along with these roles and working out differentiation of roles or methods of interacting with each other and with students. This ferment has been sketched broadly in Chapters I and II.

In keeping with the purpose of this study to investigate the broad picture of paraprofessional programming around the nation, the questionnaire presented a career
lattice matrix for school systems to fill out. An effort was made to establish how many school systems had set up a career lattice or a career ladder in a single educational field, and how many paraprofessionals were to be found at various levels on the ladders. Once these data are established, it will be easy for later students of the subject to query school systems which have career lattices on such matters as job descriptions, task analysis, role definition and development.

Table 20A indicates that far and away the largest number of school systems have positioned their paraprofessionals on the aide level, the lowest rung of the career lattice. With school systems permitted as many mentions in as many cells of the table as they had paraprofessionals in different categories, there are a grand total of 2,055 aides listed, 82 per cent of the total 2,515 paraprofessional mentions in the study. Of these, greatest utilization, by far, is on the instructional ladder with 38 per cent and, next, on the library ladder with 23 per cent. In fact, almost half of all mentions of paraprofessionals at any level are on the instructional ladder and just over one-quarter are on the library ladder. Only nine per cent

---

5 See Appendix A, question 8.
### TABLE 20A

**NUMBER OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS MENTIONING CAREER LATTICE LEVELS AND LADDERS: 2,515 MENTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Instructional</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Audio-Visual</th>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>School-Community</th>
<th>Total by Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aide</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by ladder</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

SCHOOL SYSTEMS COULD ENTER THE PARTICULAR NUMBER OF PARAPROFESSIONALS IN AS MANY LEVELS AND/OR LADDERS AND/OR JOBS IN WHICH PARAPROFESSIONALS WERE WORKING. THEREFORE, THE 1,065 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS MADE A TOTAL OF 2,515 MENTIONS OF JOB LEVELS AND/OR LADDERS, ALONG WITH 344 MENTIONS OF OTHER JOBS, IN WHICH PARAPROFESSIONALS WERE EMPLOYED. THE PERCENTAGES ARE CALCULATED ON THE TOTAL NUMBER OF MENTIONS (OR RESPONSES) AND NOT ON THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS.
of mentions are in school-community relations, the area often emphasized by educational change agents and new careers theorists. In every ladder, there is a major decrease in numbers at the assistant and associate levels. While there is a slight increase in mentions of interns over associates in the instructional and counseling ladders, the intern total is only 3.3 per cent.

A look at these data in terms of paraprofessionals themselves, who were enumerated in precise numbers by the respondent school systems, reveals the gap between new careers philosophy and what school systems are actually doing. These data show that 89,440 paraprofessionals--83 per cent of all paraprofessionals included in the career lattice matrix--work at the aide level. (See Table 20B.) Adding to this the 19,672 paraprofessionals who work at an undifferentiated job level (Table 20C), there are 109,112 paraprofessionals at the aide level, 85 per cent of those whose jobs are specified. The next level of the career lattice--the assistant level--claims 14 per cent of paraprofessionals in career lattice jobs. That proportion drops to 2.4 per cent at the associate level and to under one per cent at the intern level.

Differentiation of jobs apparently has not caught on either, for this study finds 92,425--or 85 per cent of the paraprofessionals in the career lattice matrix--work on
### TABLE 20B

**NUMBER OF PARAPROFESSIONALS BY CAREER LATTICE LEVELS AND LADDERS: 108,298 PARAPROFESSIONALS MENTIONED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Instructional</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Audio-Visual</th>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>School-Community</th>
<th>Total by Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aide</td>
<td>77,297</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>12,383</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by ladder</td>
<td>92,425</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>7,169</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 20C

NUMBER OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS MENTIONING OTHER JOBS AT UNDIFFERENTIATED LEVELS AND NUMBER OF PARAPROFESSIONALS MENTIONED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Sch. Sys. Respondents&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Paraprofessionals Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Mentions</td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, Office, Clerical</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, Maintenance, Transport</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total by Jobs</strong></td>
<td><strong>344</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>School systems could enter the particular number of paraprofessionals in as many levels and/or ladders and/or jobs in which paraprofessionals were working. Therefore, the 1,065 respondent school systems made a total of 2,515 mentions of job levels and/or ladders, along with 344 mentions of other jobs, in which paraprofessionals were employed. The percentages are calculated on the total number of mentions (or responses) and not on the number of respondents.
the instructional ladder. Only 15 per cent are in library, audio-visual, counseling and school-community jobs. Moreover, the 16,491 paraprofessionals working in these potentially upward-bound school activities, along with health, research and recreation, are small in comparison with instructional paraprofessionals. In fact, that number is less than the 19,054 paraprofessionals who are in dead-end cafeteria, clerical and maintenance jobs. (See Tables 20B and 20C.)

In an effort to further explore this element of career development, this study sought to determine the number of school systems with paraprofessional differentiation in the instructional ladder, far and away the largest ladder in the study both in school system mentions and numbers of paraprofessionals. (See Table 21.) The data were disturbingly clear: 762 school systems, 72 per cent of those under study, employ aides only in their instructional track, and a mere 9 per cent have both aides and assistants. Under 3 per cent of the school systems under study employ paraprofessionals at 3 and 4 levels, 10 of these at 4 levels and 19 at 3 levels.

There is little evidence in these data that school systems have moved very far along in developing differentiated staffing patterns for their paraprofessional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>School Systems with Parallel, at Levels</th>
<th>% Sys. w/ Advancement Plans</th>
<th>% Sys. w/ No Advancement Plans</th>
<th>Number w/ Advancement Plans</th>
<th>Number w/ No Advancement Plans</th>
<th>% of Respond. w/ Advancement Plans</th>
<th>% of Respond. w/ No Advancement Plans</th>
<th>% of Advancement Plans</th>
<th>% of No Advancement Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aides, Assistants,</td>
<td>10, 0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates and Interns</td>
<td>19, 1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aides, Assistants Only</td>
<td>96, 9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aides Only</td>
<td>76.2, 71.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Combinations</td>
<td>177, 16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,065, 99.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
programs. However, it is important to note that central to new careers theory is the idea that advancement on the career lattice for paraprofessionals is not to be compulsory, that paraprofessionals are to advance as far as their abilities and desires dictate. A question to be raised, then, in any follow-up to this study is whether school systems or paraprofessionals or both were responsible for keeping job levels low.

Moreover, the variety of potentially upward-bound jobs mentioned—health, research, recreational as well as instructional, library, audio-visual, counseling and school-community—is very positive.\(^6\) This information needs to be expanded. This study uncovered job levels and/or titles assigned to some 100,000 paraprofessionals under examination. But there is no information on the actual tasks paraprofessionals perform as instructional aides, library assistants, counseling interns and so on. An in-depth analysis of tasks performed would add significantly to understanding paraprofessional programming. It should be undertaken at least in the 125 school systems which have indicated some differentiation of paraprofessional job levels in the instructional ladder.

---

\(^6\)See Chapter VII for the variety of actual job titles in each of these areas.
Salaries

Another way to look at career development is to investigate salaries paid to paraprofessionals to see if the school systems under study offer any consistent pattern of salary advancement or provisions for consistent pay increases.

As early as 1962, the American Federation of Teachers, suggesting that it wanted "to upgrade both the person and position of the paraprofessional," came out in favor of a minimum $6,500 yearly salary for them plus "pensions, health and welfare, and benefits comparable to those provided other school employees." But by school year 1965-66, paraprofessional salaries still fell far short of this goal, according to NEA's 1967 study. Table 22 shows average wages reported in that study.

Rittenhouse reported that the average pay for paraprofessionals in school year 1968-69 had gone up to about $2.00 an hour and that "the upper limit" for full-time paraprofessionals was $4,500 to $5,500 a year.

---

7 *AFT Policy Resolutions*, p. 181.

8 Rittenhouse, "An Interpretive Study*, p. 59.
### Table 22

**Salaries for Paid Paraprofessionals, 1965-66:**

161 Respondent School Systems<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Period</th>
<th>School System Respondents</th>
<th>Average Salary Per Pay Period (in dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>NEA, "Teacher Aides in Large School Systems," pp. 2, 5, 6. Note that some of the school systems had more than one type of pay period for paraprofessionals, so School System Respondents column totals more than 100 per cent.
These salary figures for paraprofessionals can be compared with salaries reported by 721 school systems in this study for school years 1971-72 and 1972-73. (See Table 23.) Average annual salaries--$5,089--have gone up slightly since Rittenhouse studied them in school year 1968-69 and the average hourly wage--$3.28--is 64 per cent higher. While the average annual salary for school years 1971-72 and 1972-73 is lower than the old AFT dream of $6,500 a year for paraprofessionals, the top annual salary paid, $9,779 is 50.4 per cent higher. While top minimum and top maximum salaries were well above earlier school years, school systems were still starting paraprofessionals at minimum wages--$1.60 an hour, $10 a day, $1,500 a year--well below the average salaries found by NEA in school year 1965-66.

Table 24 shows the per cent increase of average salaries between school year 1965-66 and the two school years under study. These increases compare favorably with the 56.7 per cent increase in average annual teacher salaries over that time--from $6,485 in school year 1965-66 to $10,164 in school year 1972-73.9

---

### TABLE 23

**SALARIES FOR PAID PARAPROFESSIONALS, 1971-73: 721 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Period</th>
<th>School Systems</th>
<th>Minimum Salary (in dollars)</th>
<th>Maximum Salary (in dollars)</th>
<th>Average Salary (in dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>7,077.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>623.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The average minimum salary was calculated from minimum salaries reported by every school system. Similarly, the average maximum salary was calculated from maximum salaries reported by every school system. Where only one salary was reported, that value was used for both maximum and minimum salaries. The average salary is calculated from average minimum and average maximum salaries.*
TABLE 24

PER CENT INCREASE IN SALARIES FOR PAID PARAPROFESSIONALS, 1965-66, 1971-73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Period</th>
<th>Average Salary Per Pay Period, 1965-66</th>
<th>Average Salary Per Pay Period, 1971-73</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$3,312.00</td>
<td>$5,089.00</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>$261.85</td>
<td>$498.25</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>$14.37</td>
<td>$19.25</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>$1.83</td>
<td>$3.28</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information provided by this document is not sufficiently detailed to establish specifically the technique used for calculating average salary. The per cent increase calculations may, therefore, reflect differences in the method of calculation.
Nonetheless teacher salaries remain low in comparison to other jobs, and average teacher and paraprofessional salary increases have been eaten into by the rise in the cost of living. Moreover, bottom salaries for paraprofessionals, both minimum and maximum, have been swept away. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the annual average consumer price index, based on 1967 dollars, rose from 94.5 in calendar year 1965 to 133.1 in calendar year 1973. This is close to a 41 per cent increase. 10

Moreover, 58 per cent of the school systems under study still pay paraprofessionals by the hour which is about a two per cent increase over 1965-66. While average hourly wages have increased a large 79.2 per cent, paraprofessionals working by the hour in the 421 school systems are by no means working full-time. Just under one-third of the school systems reporting indicated their paraprofessionals were working fewer hours than their teachers and the differences were too broad to categorize in another 27 per cent of the cases. (See Table 15.)

The daily paraprofessional wage-earners who are employed by only seven per cent of the systems and also do not necessarily work full-time, show a 34 per cent increase in average salaries, not enough to match the rise in living costs. The per cent of school systems employing paraprofessionals on an annual basis is up by four per cent to 19 per cent since 1965-66 while monthly employers are down to 16 per cent.

Differentiated salary schedules were reported by 81 other school systems. Of these, 14 indicated there were different schedules for different funding sources; 25 reported that there were different schedules for instructional as opposed to maintenance, clerical and cafeteria aides; 34 school systems showed different schedules for different ladders and 3 for different levels; 5 revealed different schedules for degreed and non-degreed paraprofessionals. Among the interesting findings in this context are that higher salaries are paid to paraprofessionals funded through COP, Model Cities, and Head Start than to others in the same school systems. Instructional paraprofessionals are paid more than maintenance, clerical and cafeteria except in five school systems under study. Library, audio-visual, counseling and school-community paraprofessionals often get higher pay than their instructional counterparts. Expectedly, degreed paraprofessionals consistently earn more than those with no degrees.
Table 25 shows the possible per cent difference between minimum and maximum salaries reported by the 721 school systems. In 169 of these school systems, 23 per cent of the total, paraprofessional salaries are static—that is, there is a fixed salary for paraprofessionals with no pay raise possible. Another 57 per cent of the school systems report that paraprofessionals can earn up to 49 per cent salary increases. About 15 per cent of the school systems say it is possible for paraprofessionals to better their salaries from 50 to 99 per cent, and 6 per cent of the school systems provide for a potential doubling of paraprofessional salaries.

But it is apparent that paraprofessionals enjoy a higher salary potential in school systems that pay annual wages. Only 12 per cent of school systems paying annual salaries put paraprofessionals on a static payscale as compared to 47 per cent of school systems paying daily wages and about one-quarter of school systems paying both monthly and hourly wages. Moreover, 21 per cent of school systems paying annually—as compared to 6 to 9 per cent of systems paying monthly, daily, and hourly salaries—claim that paraprofessionals can earn a 50 to 74 per cent pay increase. And 10 per cent of annually paying school systems—about double those paying monthly, daily and hourly—say paraprofessionals can more than double their pay.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Period</th>
<th>0 Per Cent</th>
<th>1 to 24 Per Cent</th>
<th>25 to 49 Per Cent</th>
<th>50 to 74 Per Cent</th>
<th>75 to 99 Per Cent</th>
<th>100 % and More</th>
<th>Total for ea. pay period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Using Pay Period</td>
<td>% of Res. Sys.</td>
<td>% Using Pay Period</td>
<td>% of Res. Sys.</td>
<td>% Using Pay Period</td>
<td>% of Res. Sys.</td>
<td>% Using Pay Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for each Per Cent Difference</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 36 per cent of school systems with daily paraprofessional wage-earners report that their paraprofessional employees can increase their earnings by 1 to 19 per cent, and a mere 17 per cent claim potential for greater percentage increases. Around 59 per cent of school systems that pay paraprofessionals by the hour and the month say the potential for salary increases is in the 1 to 49 per cent bracket. Well under 10 per cent of school systems paying monthly, daily or hourly wages claim higher than that 49 per cent potential.

So although average monthly and hourly wages paid by school systems under study show upwards of twice the percentage rise of annual wages over school year 1965-66, salary increase potential is nil for paraprofessionals working in one-quarter of the systems in both categories as compared to only 12 per cent of the annually-paying school systems.

Career Advancement

With little differentiation of jobs and levels between the paraprofessionals in this study, and with salary levels that have risen barely enough to cover the cost of living, it is necessary to explore the thinking of school administrators on the question of career advancement for the paraprofessionals who work in their systems.
Administrators of the 1,065 school systems were asked, therefore, to describe criteria they use for career advancement for paraprofessionals. Five possibilities were advanced in the questionnaire and school systems could indicate that they used more than one. (See Table 26A.) Close to one-third of the respondents reported that seniority, the inevitable requirement for advancement in many bureaucracies, is the basis for career advancement. Just about one-quarter said that college credits, another sacred cow especially in education bureaucracies, could help paraprofessionals move upwards.

But a surprising 28 per cent of the school systems indicated that job performance is a basis for career advancement and another 18 per cent pointed to joint evaluations such as by the cooperating teacher, principal, college supervisor and self. These data could be early indicators of some acceptance in school systems around the nation of the competency-based education movement. But the nature or definition of the competencies as well as their evaluation or measurement at the knowledge (or cognitive) level, the performance level and the consequence level (how performance affects children's learning) waits to be explored more fully before claims can safely be made.

The fact that only 13 per cent of the school systems pointed to in-service training as a means for advancement may be an indication that in-service training is becoming,
more and more, a norm for educational personnel rather than a special, incentive-based effort. Such a development would be a great leap forward in the upgrading of educational personnel.

Only three school systems indicated that other bases for career advancement were used in their systems, two of these pointing to their COP programs as special career advancement plans, and one to an EPDA program which provided a special career advancement plan for its participants.

In recoding the career advancement variable according to the formula explained in Chapter III, it was found that 45 per cent of the school systems claimed to have career advancement plans and 50 per cent said they did not. (See Table 26B.)

Looking back at Table 21, which shows job levels on the instructional ladder against the backdrop of career advancement plan information, a somewhat different picture emerges. The 10 school systems that employ paraprofessionals at the aide, assistant, associate and intern level all indicate that they have a career advancement plan. Other school systems are not sure. Five of the 19 school systems with 3 paraprofessional levels answer "no" or not at all to the career advancement question, and 41 per cent of the 96 systems with 2 paraprofessional levels are
### TABLE 26A
BASIS FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS: 1,065 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Credits</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Evaluation</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Column totals more than 100 per cent because school system respondents could mark more than one basis for career advancement.*

### TABLE 26B
CAREER ADVANCEMENT PLAN: 1,065 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Advancement Plan</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Advancement Plan</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have No Advancement Plan</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recode of Table 20A as follows: Yes = one or more yes on college credits, in-service training, job performance and/or evaluation; No = yes on seniority only and/or no on college credits, in-service training, job performance, joint evaluation; No answer = no checks at all.*
understandably unsure. But a surprising 43 per cent of school systems employing aides only indicate that they have a career advancement plan. The question is, of course: advancement where, how far and for how much additional pay?

Clearly, the subject of career advancement needs to be clarified for the school systems reporting here. Moreover, further study is needed to specify definition by individual school systems of career advancement along with the criteria and reward processes involved.

Another way to check into the status of career development in the school systems under study is to examine data on the per cent of salary differences for the 721 school systems that answered this question against their responses to the career advancement plan question. Table 27 summarizes these data.\(^{11}\) Expectedly, the figures on career advancement for the 721 school systems reporting break down similarly to those of the total 1,065 study population (Table 26B). Here, about 48 per cent of the school systems said they had advancement plans and 49 per cent, or 353 school systems, said they did not.

\(^{11}\)See Appendix I for the complete cross-tabulation tables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cent Increase</th>
<th>Have Advancement Plan</th>
<th>No Advancement Plan</th>
<th>No Answer Advancement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 % Increase</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-24 % Increase</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49 % Increase</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-74 % Increase</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-99 % Increase</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 % Plus Increase</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Appendix II for crosstabulation tables supplying frequencies; row, column and total percentages; row and column marginals for school systems paying paraprofessionals annually, monthly, daily and hourly.*
But of the 169 school systems that say their paraprofessional salaries are fixed—that is, zero increase is possible—43 claim they have a career advancement plan and another 11 did not answer the question. More of the school systems claiming a career advancement plan—193 or 56 per cent in all—report it is possible for paraprofessional salaries to increase between 1 and 49 per cent. Another 58 say paraprofessional salaries can go up as much as 74 per cent. Only 49 school systems with advancement plans say they can go higher.

The number of school systems reporting no career advancement plan cluster at the lower end of the salary hike spectrum—zero to 49 per cent possible increase—with 319 or 90 per cent of all no advancement plan systems reporting. But a surprising 12 school systems with no advancement plan claim their paraprofessionals can double their salaries and more.

Annually-paying school systems show up somewhat better on career advancement. Almost 59 per cent of the 135 school systems that pay paraprofessionals by the year appear to have career advancement plans. The percentage of school systems claiming advancement plans drops gradually from that to 52 per cent of the 118 monthly-paying school systems, 49 per cent of the 47 daily-paying systems and 43 per cent of the 421 school systems that pay by the
Salary appears to check out better than job level on the career advancement question. This could lead to the surmise that school systems around the country measure career advancement in salary more than status or job title—a speculation that could lead to another interesting study.

Higher Education for Paraprofessionals

Higher Education for paraprofessionals, as this study has indicated, is a relatively new thing. Although Bowman and Klopf; Riessman and Pearl were recommending paraprofessional involvement in higher education as early as 1965, legislative mandates and recommendations on college and university training for paraprofessionals did not come until 1967 and then they came in a rush. By fall 1968, Bank Street reported that of 118 higher education programs for paraprofessionals operational at that time 46 per cent gave academic credit for work experience, 55 per cent had work-study programs and 64 per cent had developed their programs cooperatively with school systems.

---

12 See Appendix I.

13 Klopf and Bowman, Teacher Education, p. 274.

14 Pearl and Riessman, New Careers for the Poor, p. 14.

15 Directory of Institutions, p. ii.
In 1970, the Gartner-Johnson Examination of College Programs for Paraprofessionals found that 48 per cent of the college programs they studied gave academic credit for work experience, 16 92 per cent had "job coordination with academic work" 17 and 60 per cent granted released time for study. They found, too, that 37 per cent of the programs responding conducted "separate" or special classes for paraprofessionals, 42 per cent had both "separate" and "mixed" classes, and 21 per cent of the programs had all their paraprofessionals in "mixed" or regular classes. 18 Although these studies covered a small number of institutions and students, the findings were hopeful in terms of new careers theory which placed work and study, in both elementary-secondary and higher education settings, high in the priorities of paraprofessional programming.

Since 26 per cent of the school systems under study here indicated that college credits can help paraprofessionals advance in their systems (see Table 26A), it is important to explore the availability and the arrangements for higher education for paraprofessionals in the 1,065 school systems under study.

16 Gartner and Johnson, Examination of College Programs, p. 9.

17 Ibid., p. 16. 18 Ibid., p. 13.
Only one-third of the school systems—335—indicated that paraprofessionals in their systems are enrolled in institutions of higher education. Moreover, a mere 25,394 paraprofessionals, less than one-sixth of those under study, were enrolled. About 69 per cent of the school systems either had no paraprofessionals in higher education study or did not know whether there were any. (See Table 28A.) The data by enrollment category (Table 28A) shows a general increase as enrollments rise in the percentage of school systems at each enrollment level that have paraprofessionals in higher education. For example, 57 per cent of school systems with 100,000 and more pupils have paraprofessionals in college, while 27 per cent of school systems with under 7,500 students have paraprofessionals in higher education.

Study of higher education for paraprofessionals in the regional divisions (Table 28B), reveals that New England and the West South Central states—regions among the lowest in response of school systems and in numbers of paraprofessionals—are the regions where the greatest proportion of school systems—two-fifths and more of each region—have paraprofessionals enrolled in higher education. In the regions with high shares of respondents, the Pacific and South Atlantic states, school systems have over one-third of their paraprofessionals in higher education.
### TABLE 28A
PARAPROFESSIONALS ENROLLED IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION BY ENROLLMENT CATEGORY: 1,065 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Category</th>
<th>Sch. Sys. Respond.</th>
<th>Paraprofessionals Are Enrolled</th>
<th>Paras. Are Not Enrolled and/or No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 9,999</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a** Per cent of 1,065 school systems which responded to question on paraprofessionals enrolled in institutions of higher education.

**b** Per cent of respondent school systems in each enrollment category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Division</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Sch. Sys. Respond.</th>
<th>Paraprofessionals Are Enrolled</th>
<th>Paras. Are Not Enrolled and/or No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>335</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>----</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Per cent of 1,065 school systems which responded to question on paraprofessionals enrolled in institutions of higher education.

b Per cent of respondent school systems in each regional division.
The Mountain states, with the lowest per cent of school system respondents, also have more than one-third of paraprofessionals in college. But only about one-quarter of those in the remaining regions have paraprofessionals enrolled.

Investigation of the arrangements open to paraprofessionals from the 335 school systems (Table 29A), produces disappointing data when compared with the findings of the Bank Street and New Careers Development Center studies. Where those studies found that 46 to 48 per cent of the institutions gave academic credit for work experience, only 11 per cent of the school systems reporting here indicate that is the case. Moreover, where Bank Street found 55 per cent of the institutions with work-study programs and New Careers found 92 per cent, only 15 per cent of the school systems under study here tell us that their paraprofessionals get academic credit for in-service and another 16 per cent said their paraprofessionals get academic credit for work and in-service. Released time for study--crucial to a program of higher education for

---

19 Directory of Institutions, p. ii; Gartner and Johnson, Examination of College Programs, p. 9.

20 Directory of Institutions, p. ii.

21 Gartner and Johnson, Examination of College Programs, p. 16.
### TABLE 29A

**ACADEMIC ARRANGEMENTS FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS ENROLLED IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION: 335 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Courses Made Available</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Program</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Regular and Special</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released Time Made Available</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Credit for Work Experience</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Credit for In-Service Training</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Credit for Work and In-Service</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School systems could check as many of the eight variables as were applicable. Percentages are based on 335.

### TABLE 29B

**ACADEMIC ARRANGEMENTS FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS NOT INDICATED AS ENROLLED IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION: 730 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Courses Made Available</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Regular and Special</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released Time Made Available</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Credit for Work Experience</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Credit for In-Service Training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Credit for Work and In-Service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School systems could check as many of the eight variables as were applicable. Percentages are based on 730 to include all school systems which answered "no" or "no answer" to the question on whether they employed paraprofessionals who were enrolled in higher education.
paraprofessionals in new careers terms—is made available in only 30 per cent of the school systems reporting here, while 60 per cent of the institutions studied by the New Careers group gave released time.\textsuperscript{22}

Over half the respondent school systems say their paraprofessionals are taking regular courses in colleges and universities, while only 21 per cent of the institutions in the New Careers study say that is so.\textsuperscript{23} Another 37 per cent of the New Careers study population provide special classes for paraprofessionals,\textsuperscript{24} while only 14 per cent of school systems in this study do so. Another 42 per cent of the New Careers,\textsuperscript{25} but only 16 per cent of this study population, made both regular and special classes available.

Differing findings between the New Careers study and this examination on the question of regular, special or combination courses for paraprofessionals is attributable to increased experience in higher education for paraprofessionals. Earlier, "sheltered" or special programs were provided for paraprofessionals who, it was thought, needed to catch up with regular college students. Experience with paraprofessionals in college—specifically in

\textsuperscript{22}\textit{Ibid.} \textsuperscript{23}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 13. \textsuperscript{24}\textit{Ibid.} \\
\textsuperscript{25}\textit{Ibid.}
Head Start and Follow Through Supplementary Training and the Career Opportunities Program--showed that paraprofessionals could hold their own with regular students. Moreover, the experience of sharing classes with regular students is now deemed to be important to the growth and development of paraprofessionals in college.

Some of the school systems which indicated they had no paraprofessionals in higher education nonetheless claimed some arrangements for paraprofessionals in higher education. Those data are contained in Table 29B for whatever interest they may be to the reader.

Chapter II pointed out that the work and study program model--with academic credit provided by the institution of higher education and released time provided by the school system--is at the heart of new careers theory. The finding that only one-third of the school systems in this study know they have paraprofessionals in higher education, and that still fewer provide new careers-type benefits than programs studied earlier, would add support to the Bennett and Falk contention mentioned at the outset of this chapter. But just how much effect new careers theory has had on higher education availability and arrangements for paraprofessionals is a subject for additional study.
In-Service Training for Paraprofessionals

While little mention was made of college training for paraprofessionals before the 1967 legislative push, in-service training was considered important before that. In the 1965-66 school year, just under half the school systems in NEA's 1967 study trained paraprofessionals in "preschool institutes" and almost three-quarters provided in-service workshops.26 Only seven per cent of the systems had "no formal training" at all, while "several systems mentioned junior college courses for teacher aides, some in institutions connected with the school system."27 About 82 per cent of the school systems said that the teachers working with the aides were the ones who were responsible for training them.

Findings of this study show that three-quarters of the school systems--a total of 796--provide formal in-service training programs for their paraprofessionals--no better and no worse than the NEA findings of almost a decade before. (See Table 30.) But almost one-quarter of the respondents--as compared to seven per cent of the respondents in the 1965-66 study--said they had no in-service training for paraprofessionals. In this question,


27Ibid.
TABLE 30

IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROVIDED FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS: 1,065 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-Service for Paraprofessionals</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Service is Provided</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service is not Provided</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as in the higher education question, responses were ambiguous. For of the 269 school systems which answered "no" or "no answer" to the question of in-service training for paraprofessionals, many answered "yes" to one or more of the arrangements listed. (See Table 31B.)

Responses from the 796 systems that clearly provided in-service training for paraprofessionals (Table 31A) indicate that almost three-quarters provide training for paraprofessionals and cooperating teachers together and 83 per cent allow time for teachers and paraprofessionals to plan together. Over 60 per cent provide training for cooperating and supervising teachers who work with paraprofessionals. Another 19 per cent provide no such training, three per cent make it available for supervising
TABLE 31A

IN-SERVICE TRAINING ARRANGEMENTS FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS AND TEACHERS: 796 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training for Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training for Supervising Teacher</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training for Cooperating and Supervising Teacher</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No In-Service Training for Either Cooperating or Supervising Teacher</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training for Paraprofessionals and Teachers Together</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are On-the-Job</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are Special Workshops</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are On-the-Job and Special Workshops</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are On-the-Job and Special Workshops plus Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are Neither</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Planning Time is Provided for Teachers and Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSchool systems could check as many of the twelve variables as were applicable. Percentages are based on 796.*
TABLE 31B

IN-SERVICE TRAINING ARRANGEMENTS FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS AND TEACHERS IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS NOT INDICATING IN-SERVICE TRAINING AVAILABLE: 269 RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMSa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training for Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training for Supervising Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training for Cooperating and Supervising Teacher</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No In-Service Training for Either Cooperating or Supervising Teacher</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training for Paraprofessionals and Teachers Together</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are On-the-Job</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are Special Workshops</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are On-the-Job and Special Workshops</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are On-the-Job and Special Workshops plus Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs are Neither</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Planning Time is Provided for Teachers and Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aSchool systems could check as many of the twelve variables as were applicable. Percentages are based on 269 to include all school systems which answered "no" or "no answer" to the question on whether they provided in-service training for paraprofessionals.
teacher only, and 17 per cent provide it just for cooperating teachers. The high percentage of school systems who train their professionals and paraprofessionals together signals a trend toward new careers thinking. Moreover, the fact that so many school systems train cooperating and supervising teachers with and without paraprofessionals indicates some progress in the staff differentiation movement toward defining and developing roles, responsibilities and relationships between different levels of educational personnel.

Most of the school systems under study—71 per cent—conduct the in-service training programs both on-the-job and in special workshops, while 9 per cent use on-the-job training alone and 16 per cent concentrate on special workshops. Seven school systems said they used other kinds of training programs but did not say what they were.

All-in-all, in-service training for paraprofessionals appears to be much better accepted and much more fully developed in the school systems under study than is college training for paraprofessionals. This point is particularly interesting in light of the information that only 13 per cent of the school systems under study consider in-service training a basis for career advancement. (See Table 26A.) In-service training may well be moving in as a regular vehicle for professional growth and development. Moreover, Olivero's fear that colleges and universities have abdicated
their responsibility\textsuperscript{28} may not be unfounded.

\textbf{Summary}

While about 45 per cent of the school systems under study said they had career advancement plans, 83 per cent of the paraprofessionals employed in these school systems were working at the aide level, the lowest on the career ladder. Indeed four-fifths of all job mentions were at the aide level, and only 29 school systems reported that they had three-and/or four-level instructional career ladders, the ladder in which 85 per cent of all paraprofessionals in the study are working.

The school systems under study appear to see career advancement reflected in salary more than job level. Paraprofessional salaries have increased about as much as teachers' since school year 1965-66, and some 57 per cent of reporting school systems say their paraprofessionals' payscale can rise from 1 to 49 per cent. Only 23 per cent were paying fixed or static salaries. Moreover, school systems paying paraprofessionals by the year are up to about one-fifth of those responding and 59 per cent of these claim career advancement plans. The annually-paid paraprofessionals appear to have more upward salary mobility

\textsuperscript{28}See Chapter II.
than those paid by the hour, the day or the month. But about 58 per cent of the school systems reporting were still paying paraprofessionals by the hour.

The basis for career advancement is job performance in 28 per cent and a joint evaluation in 18 per cent of the school systems under study. These data can be read as signaling some gains by the competency-based education movement in public schools around the nation.

While only 13 per cent of the school systems see in-service training as a basis for career advancement, three-quarters of them provide it. Of these, three-quarters train teachers and paraprofessionals together and 83 per cent provide joint planning time for teachers and paraprofessionals, important elements of new careers training designs.

In contrast, while one-quarter of the school systems in the study indicated college credits can help paraprofessionals advance, one-third claim to have paraprofessionals studying in colleges or universities. Only one-sixth of the paraprofessionals in the study are, in fact, doing so. Of the 335 school systems whose paraprofessionals are in higher education, 11 per cent say academic credit is given for work experience, 15 per cent indicate academic credit is available for in-service training, and another 16 per cent say their paraprofessionals get both. But 30 per cent
of these school systems provide released time for study.

It is possible that higher education for paraprofessionals is deemed unessential, for one-half the school systems employ paraprofessionals who already have one and two years of college. Two-thirds of the paraprofessionals employed hold high school or GED degrees and 27 per cent have had some college. The fact that the paraprofessionals in this study are better educated than new careers theory would postulate may reflect the information that no more than half the paraprofessionals in the study are low income people.

The picture of career development found in the 1,065 school systems under study here is different from the new careers model sketched in Chapters I and II. That model called for career development—combining role definition and development through college and in-service training with upward and lateral mobility—for paraprofessionals from the community surrounding the schools as well as teachers and administrators. Further study is needed on the disparity between model and reality, along with some thoughts on narrowing the gap.
CHAPTER VII

RESPONSES TO OPEN-END QUESTION

The quality of the responses to the open-end question (See Appendix A, question 19) indicates the thoughtful involvement of school administrators around the nation in paraprofessional programming. This chapter examines some of these responses, along with brochures often enclosed with them. School systems are identified only by questionnaire number in order to preserve their anonymity.

A mid-western paraprofessional coordinator, reporting on 237 paraprofessionals employed by that school system, suggested that this study and others address the following key questions:

1) How can paraprofessionals best be trained?

2) What type of advanced education should the paraprofessional seek?

3) Are college programs that stress two-year certification for paraprofessionals as education technicians unrealistic?

4) Will paraprofessionals price themselves out of the market through demands for wage increase?

5) What is a practical and fair system for recognizing years of service?

6) Should the paraprofessional jobs in schools be reserved for neighborhood people, particularly where inner-city participation is being emphasized?
7) What are the legal precedents in states and in school districts on liability of paraprofessionals?¹

Some of these matters, such as training and higher education, have been looked at in this study. Others, like the liability question and the concern for "recognizing years of service", were not. But all seven questions, it is safe to say, bear looking at in future studies of paraprofessional programming.

Meanwhile, a few other issues appeared paramount from a reading of open-end responses.

**Teachers as Paraprofessionals**

In a number of school systems, in school years 1971-72 or 1972-73, teachers and others with four-year college degrees were working as paraprofessionals. In fact, all paraprofessionals were college graduates in three school systems all located in suburban areas.² In 46 other school systems participating in the study, 10 or more of the paraprofessionals had college degrees. One of these, a southern school district,³ had a three-level career ladder in school year 1971-72 in which all 26 instructional assistants held Bachelor's degrees, while the

¹Questionnaire number 819.
²Questionnaires number 162, 826 and 977.
³Questionnaire number 150.
21 specialists had 2 years of college or business training. The remaining 11 paraprofessionals, called attendants, of whom all held high school diplomas, were on the lowest rung of the career ladder. The job description for the instructional assistants reads much like the job descriptions for teacher assistants in many school systems following the new careers approach while specialists and attendants' roles included clerical, audio-visual, media and library activities; lunchroom and corridor duty; playground and field trip supervision. The school system's handbook pointed out that paraprofessionals are needed to help teachers and specialists produce new and better materials, curricula, keep class size small, and develop joint instructional planning, operation and evaluation.

An administrator from a mid-western school system put the matter plainly:

With the surplus of people that now exists, we find that many people with teaching degrees are willing to work as teacher aides until other job opportunities open up to them.4

Another school administrator, from the West, echoed this, pointing to an "over-supply of teachers"

4Questionnaire number 77.
and relating that in the 1972-73 school year, 26 of the paraprofessionals in the system had A.B. degrees, 9 had 3 years of college, and 17 had 1 year of college. Only 29 had a high school diploma.\footnote{Questionnaire number 484}

The problem of teacher unemployment in certain subject-matter fields and geographic locations in the 1970's--and their willingness in some cases to settle for employment as paraprofessionals--might well be summed up by an irate statement from a suburban northeastern administrator whose school district employs no paraprofessionals:

Let us begin to give our attention to fully licensed, unemployed teachers who are recent graduates. If we need non-professionals help let us hire clerks, custodians, cleaners, matrons, etc.\footnote{Questionnaire number 581.}

On the other hand, two school systems pointed to the overload factor for teachers as their reasons for employing paraprofessionals. The 14 paraprofessionals working in one mid-western\footnote{Questionnaire number 44.} school district--each of whom had 30 college semester hours--relieved the overload of teachers and learning center resource directors. The 116 paraprofessionals working in a southern school system...
"make a worthy contribution to education," according to administrators, "by reducing the load of non-instructional tasks teachers must perform." All are funded through the local tax-base.  

**In-Service Versus College Training for Paraprofessionals**

Other responses suggested continuing controversy between administrators over the need for in-service as opposed to college training for paraprofessionals. One west coast school administrator reported that the 66 paraprofessionals in his system "felt on-the-job in-service more relevant than college courses." The school system responded with on-the-job training and keeps no records on higher education, though the belief was that some paraprofessionals were enrolled in a local junior college. But a southeastern school administrator reported that "in-service programs were not well received, so we implemented the policy that each paraprofessional take at least six semester hours college credits per year." This school system employed 24 Title I aides in 1972-73.  

---

8 Questionnaire number 434.  
9 Questionnaire number 102.  
10 Questionnaire number 731.
In the midwest a school district provided in-service training for 220 paraprofessionals along with cooperating and supervising teachers in federally-funded programs only.\(^{11}\) Further north a public school system employing 12 paraprofessionals with less than a high school degree and 15 with one provided in-service training for paraprofessionals, cooperating and supervising teachers, together and separately.\(^{12}\) In a neighboring state one school district employed 140 paraprofessionals, none of them in higher education. Paraprofessionals in the school systems and their cooperating teachers trained and planned together on-the-job.\(^{13}\)

In an eastern public school system, on the other hand, 154 paraprofessionals along with cooperating and supervising teachers got on-the-job special workshop training "mostly related to the [local] Community College programs."\(^{14}\) And at the other end of the country, in-service training for paraprofessionals, cooperating and supervising teachers was available only for those working

\(^{11}\) Questionnaire number 742.

\(^{12}\) Questionnaire number 936.

\(^{13}\) Questionnaire number 943.

\(^{14}\) Questionnaire number 969.
in a differentiated staffing project. But a mid-western city school system offered its 11 paraprofessionals pre-service training only. While joint planning time was available for paraprofessionals and their cooperating teachers, administrators indicated that their program was "not set up as a teacher training program." "

**Funding Paraprofessional Programs**

A few school systems worried about funding. In one mid-western public school system, the 96 paraprofessionals in school year 1971-72 were to be drastically decreased in 1972-73. A far-western school administrator answered the question on who supports paraprofessional programming with "If you mean morally, all would; if you mean financially, none would." A southern school administrator answered the same question as follows: "The [administrators, community, school board, parents, students, teachers, and paraprofessionals] would all favor such a program, but financial support would not be available here."

---

15 Questionnaire number 975.
16 Questionnaire number 947.
17 Questionnaire number 413.
18 Questionnaire number 592.
19 Questionnaire number 1078.
Roles, Responsibilities, Duties of Paraprofessionals

A number of other respondents talked specifically about paraprofessional roles and responsibilities, testifying to the breadth and scope of duties now being assigned to paraprofessionals around the nation.

A southern school system used paraprofessionals as "a vital part" of the IPI (Individually Prescribed Instruction) program.\(^{20}\) In a nearby state, a county school system used paraprofessionals to tutor slow starters in reading and in other individual and small group instructional activities supervised by classroom teachers.\(^{21}\) One mid-western community school system used 28 federally-funded and 22 locally-funded paraprofessionals in individual and small group instruction in reading, art, perceptual motor skills and physical education.\(^{22}\) Another southern system's paraprofessionals assisted teachers in remedial reading in Title I reading programs.\(^{23}\) Elsewhere in the South 28 paraprofessionals worked in one system with special reading teachers in 1971-72.\(^{24}\) New England paraprofessionals

\(^{20}\) Questionnaire number 153.

\(^{21}\) Questionnaire number 175.

\(^{22}\) Questionnaire number 319.

\(^{23}\) Questionnaire number 332.

\(^{24}\) Questionnaire number 444.
helped by "communicating school policies to the general public."  

In the mid-west, paraprofessionals helped "meet the needs of a rapidly changing urban school system" by assisting with activities designed to reinforce learning with individual students and small groups of students (mathematical drills, vocabulary drills, flash cards, independent study, spelling words, play rehearsals).

They also assisted "as special skills are evident, in the specialized areas of science, mathematics, English, music, social studies, library..." The 1,104 paraprofessionals in this city system also handled clerical work, duplicating and audio-visual machines; tapes, transparencies and dittos; art projects and supplies; the setting up of science experiments and bulletin boards, as well as play-ground, hall and cafeteria supervision.  

A far-west school district concentrated its main thrust on special education. While there was an over-all in-service training program for its 167 paraprofessionals, joint training for the professional-paraprofessional teams and joint planning time was limited to special education

---

25 Questionnaire number 630.

26 Questionnaire number 769.
teachers and paraprofessionals. Another school district in the same state employed, under negotiated contract, a total of 43 instructional aides who took on increasing duties as they moved up the ladder. In school year 1972-73, the top level paraprofessionals served as assistant teachers in the pre-school handicapped program. A county school district in the South suggested that among the positive benefits [of the paraprofessional program] are 1) the improvement of instruction in the areas of reading and mathematics in our Elementary Title I Schools, and 2) improved community relations.

An east coast school district had a special locally-financed school without walls where teachers and paraprofessionals worked as a team, requiring extensive planning time. In that school, the number of teachers had been reduced "to some extent...in order to provide a rather augmented number of paraprofessionals." A southern county school district reported that "paraprofessionals as tutors in a structured program seem to work best for us." In an eastern school district paraprofessionals were specially

---

27 Questionnaire number 870.
28 Questionnaire number 871.
29 Questionnaire number 1060.
30 Questionnaire number 388.
31 Questionnaire number 667.
trained for computer work while two mid-western public school systems put paraprofessionals to work helping teachers in non-instructional tasks.

Using a slightly different approach, an administrator in the south pointed out that the paraprofessional program cannot be pigeon-holed because "principals had wide discretion in utilizing personnel resources of their schools." The administrator continued:

If a school earns a portion of a teacher unit under our formula and wishes to convert this into instructional aides, the principal may do so at the rate of three aides for one teacher unit. After school is well underway, if we have class loads of 33 or more in grade 1 or 37 or more in grades 2-6, and if there is no way to provide additional teacher service, we provide a half-time teacher aide to this class.

One working-class suburban mid-west school system saw its paraprofessional program as both outgrowth and mainstay of its "community education philosophy." Paraprofessionals working as community aides are "crucial" because they help elementary school principals keep in touch with parents. Administrators of this school system claim that the paraprofessional program brings "wider resident participation in their schools" along with

---

32 Questionnaire number 828.

33 Questionnaire number 339 and 340.

34 Questionnaire number 626.
"increased personal growth" for residents and "documented enrichment and improvement of pupil learning." It also "improved two-way communication of school and community needs and concerns.  

Administrators in one southeastern school system believe that teaching is both a "decision-making" and a "decision-implementing process" aimed at promoting learning. They see the decision-making part of this process as the role of the professional, while the paraprofessional's role is to help implement the decisions.  

Another thoughtful view comes from administrators of a mid-west school district whose paraprofessional program pre-dates the 1950's. Their rationale for hiring paraprofessionals is that more adults are needed in the classroom to individualize learning and professionalize teaching. While emphasizing that it is the professional who must "make decisions about pupil learning needs," and then "apply the most appropriate resources [including paraprofessionals] to their resolution," these administrators point out that one "major issue is the role the school aide should play in the classroom." One thing is sure,

35 Questionnaire number 927.

36 Questionnaire number 534.
they say, and that is that as paraprofessionals take on more and more duties previously performed by teachers, there will have to be "reconsideration of acceptable ratios between certified teachers and pupils."\(^{37}\)

Paraprofessionals are indeed taking on more and more jobs that teachers used to handle as can be seen from the following listing, in descending order of number of mentions, of jobs in the "other" category of the career lattice matrix. (See Appendix A, question 8.) The jobs are categorized below as they were coded for this study. (See Tables 20A and 20C for numbers of mentions of each category.)

Other Jobs—Actual

Instructional

- Special education
- Study hall
- Reading
- Curriculum clerk/resource aide/resource room
- Mathematics
- Physical education
- Nursery/pre-school/Head Start
- Foreign language/language lab
- ESL/language laboratory
- Kindergarten (Head Start)
- Tutorial

Bilingual/foreign language
Mental health
Science
Tutors
Independent study facilitator
Laboratory
Cuban
Amity foreign language
Science laboratory
Instructional materials clerk
Learning center
Driver education

\(^{37}\) Questionnaire number 508.
KAPS program  
Project Seed  
State pilot kindergarten  
Work-study  
Career development program  
Veteran  
Vocational education  
Vocational  
Basic skills  
Basic education  
Theme reader  
Migrant

Trainable assistant  
College aide  
Team teaching  
Teacher relief  
Infant care  
Children's center  
Day care center  
Child development  
Substitute  
Early admissions  
Career education intern

Counseling

Speech  
Hearing  
Testing  
Therapy  
Visual screening  
Testing and speech therapy  
Vision and hearing technician  
Occupational specialist

Diagnosis  
Middle grade occupational  
Drug counselor  
Child attitude 0.H. School  
Institute for living  
Guidance  
Family living

School-Community

Attendance  
Visiting teacher aide  
School-community coordinator

Health

Nurse/medical/health  
Orthopedia

Dental clerk  
Nurse's aide typing clerk

Research

Computer aide  
Statistician  
Research assistant
Recreational

Activities
Free time

Cafeteria

Noon/lunch/cafeteria
Special class noon

Administrative, Clerical, Office

Office/clerical
Administrative
General/school aide
Teacher clerk
General supervisory aide
Cashier
Divisional assistant aide
Lay supervisor
P.R. clerk
Bookshop

Security, Maintenance, Transportation

Bus
Monitor
Pupil security/security guards
Building
Hall monitors/corridor guides
Transportation
Interaction and control
High school matron
Campus security
Discipline
Elementary SOS
Housekeeping
Preparation and clean up
Crisis/security
Parking lot attendant
Receptionist
Security
Children's attendant
Attendant
Locker room
Non-curricular
Non-instructional
Matron
SLD aide

Other

Title I administrator
Head Start coordinator
Other Jobs—Projected

Instructional
Special education
Study hall
ESL/language laboratory
Reading
Science laboratory
Tutors (including high school students)
Mathematics
Resource
Infant care
Amity (foreign language)
Cuban
Learning center

Basic skills
Children's center
Veteran
Career development program
Driver education
Vocational education
Independent study facilitator
Career education intern
Work-study
Physical education
Mental health

Ancillary-Counseling
Testing and speech therapy
Vision and hearing technician
Drug counselor
Occupational specialist

Diagnostic
Testing
Therapy

Ancillary-Health
Health
Dental clerk
Nurse office aide

Ancillary-Research
Statistician

Ancillary-Recreational
Playground
Activities
Other-Cafeteria

Noon/lunch/cafeteria

Other-Administrative, Clerical, Office

Clerical/office
Administrative
General/school aide
General supervisory aide

P.R. clerk
Lay supervisor
Principal office aide

Other-Security, Maintenance, Transportation

Bus
Monitor
Building
Crisis/security
Hall
Security

High school matron
Receptionist
Children's attendant
Campus security
Attendant

The Career Opportunities Program and EPDA

The Career Opportunities Program, along with its parent legislation, the Education Professionals Development Act, appeared to be most responsive to new careers ideas. Of 133 COP projects operating in the school years covered by this study, 86 responded to this study questionnaire. Of these, 38 mentioned COP specifically in response to one or more questions. (See Appendix G.) Many of these answers revealed that school systems were giving better treatment to COP paraprofessionals, probably because the closely-monitored COP funds and guidelines promoted many new careers concepts.
This finding would tend to bear out the view of COP's official **Bulletin** that COP brings together a series of program ideas found successful in earlier, more limited efforts, and seeks to demonstrate the potential in their combination and expansion. COP's efforts over the past four years offer an object lesson for the carrying out of innovational activities in education.\textsuperscript{38}

A number of "program ideas" emphasized in the responses as COP-sponsored came out of new careers theory. Of the 15 school systems reporting especially on higher education for paraprofessionals, 12 said it was available for COP participants only. Seven of these mentioned tuition assistance through COP as well. Seven mentioned that academic credit was available for work experience through COP and four said COP paraprofessionals got it for in-service training. Four school systems indicated that their COP paraprofessionals were awarded in-service credit for education and seven revealed that COP participants also got released time for study.

Moreover, of the 29 school systems indicating operational three- and four-level career ladders in the instructional area (see Table 21), 16 were school systems which had COP projects. Eight of these school systems

\textsuperscript{38} Smith, *Career Opportunities Program*, p. 1.
discussed their career ladders specifically in the open-end section or sent booklets. Six school systems with COP projects revealed they had a career ladder plan on paper, but it was not operational.

Other interesting program ideas from school systems hosting COP projects include a West coast school system. This system suggested that paraprofessionals spend four-fifths of their time working directly with students in tutoring and small group instruction, developing diagnostic profiles, in audio-visual programming and in learning centers. It also urged their use in language development and math in Title I schools. Teachers were advised to delineate duties and responsibilities clearly for their paraprofessionals and to confer frequently on lesson plans, materials and evaluation of activities.\(^{39}\)

A South Atlantic school board, seeking cheaper ways to offer good instructional programs, saw COP as a good way to provide more adults in the classroom. By school year 1971-72, 50 COP paraprofessionals of a total of 350 were receiving tuition assistance and in-service credit for education. Paraprofessionals, cooperating and supervising teachers were training together and joint

\(^{39}\)Questionnaire number 2.
planning time was allotted for the professional-paraprofessional teams. Emphasis was being placed on the learning processes rather than teaching methods by exploring jointly how best to meet the needs of pupils, including their interactions, interests, perceptions, and experiences.  

A Northwest school district suggested a different career development model. With 250 paraprofessionals in the school system, 205 of them supported by the federal government and 45 supported jointly by the state and the local tax-base, this district had developed a five-step career lattice from level I to level V, beginning with no educational requirement and moving to two years of college at level V. At levels I and II paraprofessionals were supervised directly while at the upper three levels supervision was indirect. Level I aide jobs were clerical. By level II, paraprofessionals were assisting teachers in small group and individual instruction. At level III, paraprofessionals took on school-community liaison and at level IV they participated in planning as well. At level V, with two years of college, the paraprofessionals in this school systems "select appropriate materials and activities to meet needs defined by teachers."  

40 Questionnaire number 5.

41 Questionnaire number 297.
An eastern school district employs 307 paraprofessionals, 300 of them attending a local university or a community college through COP and linking programs. With resource teachers hired by COP supervising the evaluation of paraprofessionals, evaluation was a joint function of the university, the principals, cooperating teachers, resource teachers and the trainees themselves.\footnote{Questionnaire number 436.}

A midwestern public school system employing close to 3,000 paraprofessionals, two-thirds of them funded by the federal government, had, by 1971-72, set up special guidelines for its paraprofessionals. Those who were newly-employed had to come from the area the school served, and none could be assigned to more than two different teachers in any given day or ten in a given week. Advisory committees, organized at the local school level, assisted principals in personnel matters relating to paraprofessionals. These advisory committees approved all new applications and reviewed any dismissal charges appealed within ten days. But salary was based solely on seniority.\footnote{Questionnaire number 443.}
In another midwestern public school system, some 500 paraprofessionals working come from the community where their schools were located.\textsuperscript{44}

An administrator in a southwestern school district employing close to 1,000 federal, state and locally-funded paraprofessionals wrote:

Individuals would not give financial support [to paraprofessionals but]...we feel that if federal funds were taken away, people would lend their support in an effort to get the programs.\textsuperscript{45}

Another administrator, this one from a midwestern public school system employing some 300 paraprofessionals suggested that assignments to aides sometimes is faulty because the program was new to the school system. "Time and again," he writes,

aides report wistfully that they wished they could have been used in more rewarding ways. Example: an aide who was an accomplished artist working as a hall monitor instead of with children in the classroom.

Such failures take place in the suburbs as well as in city schools "when well educated paraprofessionals and aides become dissatisfied with the limitations of their profession." Moreover, "a final major factor inhibiting

\textsuperscript{44}Questionnaire number 1107.

\textsuperscript{45}Questionnaire number 491.
a more rapid spread of the paraprofessional movement is the shortage of funds..."^{46}

In a West coast school system, the COP staff teacher and the COP coordinator provided additional supervision, tutorial assistance and career counseling to about 100 COP participants out of a total of just over 300 paraprofessionals. This was over and above the normal supervision coming from cooperating teachers and principals.\(^{47}\)

In a southeastern school system employing close to 700 paraprofessionals, experience with giving only instructional tasks to the 200 COP participants led administrators to involve more and more paraprofessionals in individual and small group instruction as well as planning. COP paraprofessionals tried out methods in the classroom, recorded them and then reported results in weekly seminars directed by a college instructor. COP participants were on differentiated staffing teams with "each member contributing the service which he could perform most effectively." A report issued by this school system recommended that in-service training be provided cooperating teachers and principals to improve their use of

---

\(^{46}\)Questionnaire number 567.

\(^{47}\)Questionnaire number 774.
paraprofessionals. It also called for an increase in the number of higher paraprofessional jobs "so that more persons who are qualified could advance on the career ladder."  

Summary

Review of open-end responses from the 1,065 school systems reported in this survey reveals that the variety of uses of paraprofessionals has expanded far beyond the duties envisaged in early writings on the subject. Career development for paraprofessionals seems to be farther along in school systems receiving federal EPDA funds than in others. But in some school systems teachers are feeling the unemployment pinch and to cope with it are taking paraprofessional jobs. The controversy continues over higher education versus in-service training for paraprofessionals. These and other questions will be addressed in Chapter VIII, the conclusion.

48 Questionnaire number 1051.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has explored the history of paraprofessional programming and examined its literature. It has also investigated actual practice in 1,065 of the nation's large school systems. Now it is appropriate to look at the implications of these findings, relating them to other aspects of educational change.

**Paraprofessionals and the Teacher Supply**

NEA estimated that in the fall of 1973 there were 139,000 more teachers than teaching job vacancies across the nation.\(^1\) But the use of such an over-all teacher surplus figure is misleading because it fails to take account of specific reported teacher shortages. In the same study, NEA found that the supply of teachers in the fall of 1973 was "low for positions in mathematics, trade-technical courses, natural and physical sciences, industrial arts, and special education."\(^2\) Another 1972 NEA study reported that 23 states

---

\(^1\)American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, "Thematic Section on Surplus of Quantity? Shortage of Quality," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXV (Fall, 1974), 200.

\(^2\)Ibid.
had "critical shortages of teachers in special assignments directed to educationally disadvantaged children."\(^3\)

Some states, according to NEA's 1973 study, were short teacher applicants in their rural schools.\(^4\) An HEW task force found teacher shortages existing "mainly in urban schools" in the fall of 1971,\(^5\) and named early childhood education, remedial reading and elementary counseling as "acute shortage fields."\(^6\) As if to support this finding, one Dean of Education averred in 1974 that "about half our communities" lack kindergartens and "preschool education is nonexistent in most parts of the country."\(^7\) The same Dean also pointed out that there is "less than one counselor for 500 students" in high schools today and "almost all [states] indicate shortages of teachers in environmental education, cultural studies, bilingual education, and adult education."\(^8\)

The 1973 NEA study points out that in the field of special education alone 215,000 more teachers are needed to


\(^4\)Journal of Teacher Education, "Thematic Section on Surplus of Quantity?", p. 200.


\(^6\)Ibid., pp. 11-12.
"allow the schools to provide appropriate instruction for the 59.7 per cent of school-age children requiring special education services who are not currently receiving them."  

An additional 18,000 teachers, the report estimates, are needed for kindergarten and nursery schools simply to "allow the enrollment in schools of the same proportion of five- and six-year-old children as the present proportion of seven-year-olds enrolled in school."  

By the summer of 1974, HEW announced grant programs to alleviate teacher shortages in special, vocational, bilingual and Indian education.  

When looked at in these terms, the numbers involved in paraprofessional programming--136,000 paraprofessionals as compared with just under a million professionals in the nation's 1,065 largest school systems--hardly constitute a threat to job placement for teachers. While a few of the school systems under study reported teachers working as paraprofessionals (see Chapter VII), only four per cent of

7 Journal of Teacher Education, "Thematic Section on Surplus of Quantity?", p. 196.


10 Ibid.

all paraprofessionals studied had Baccalaureate degrees--and they were not necessarily certified teachers. Moreover, only 398 school systems had hired 2,716 paraprofessionals as teachers after they attained certification--merely two per cent of the total number of paraprofessionals in this study.

Moreover, as described in Chapter VII, school systems in the study revealed that paraprofessionals are filling in gaps in school staffing around the nation. According to the study data, paraprofessionals were working in bilingual, vocational and early childhood education as well as in counseling and reading--the very areas where NEA and HEW find teacher gaps. In addition, paraprofessionals in this study are concentrated in urban school systems, the very schools where high concentrations of disadvantaged youngsters exist--both teacher shortage areas reported in recent studies mentioned above.

However, when teacher supply is considered in terms of educational reform--more desirable teacher-pupil ratios or better groupings of instructional staff or extended educational services, for example--teacher abundance quickly turns into shortage; and the need for more staff, including paraprofessionals, is quickly apparent. In estimating demand for more teachers based on "the quality criterion" the above-mentioned 1973 NEA study calls for about 25,000 new
teachers to "replace 80 per cent of the teachers estimated to have less than a bachelor's degree in 1972-73."\textsuperscript{12} It estimates we need over 70,000 teachers to "allow reassignment of 90 per cent of teachers who are currently teaching full-time outside the area of their major professional preparation."\textsuperscript{13} In addition, according to NEA, about 375,000 additional teachers are essential for "reduction of overcrowded classes."\textsuperscript{14}

Speaking more generally, Mosteller and Moynihan recommend that the extra teachers now available be "deployed to new tasks."\textsuperscript{15} Some of these new tasks--for extra teachers and paraprofessionals as well--could help to individualize and humanize the classroom to enable low achievers to succeed and to make learning more personally rewarding for normal-to-high achievers. Such objectives require action in the classroom--what the English call the "activity" method, and what some American educators are now calling the "performance" or "competency-based" method. Action, talk and doing--in place of sitting, listening and note-taking--these are

\textsuperscript{12}American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, "Thematic Section on Surplus of Quantity?", p. 202.

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{i}bid. \textsuperscript{14}\textit{i}bid.

the tools of liberation, individualization and humanization.

Schools across the nation are moving in this direction by changing the physical environment of classrooms, providing alternative learning experiences inside and outside the schoolhouse, installing programmed instruction and teaching machines to perform the drudgery of drill necessary for pupil learning and drawing on the humanities, the arts and the behavioral sciences to enliven and enrich and deepen curricula. As these changes become more widespread, the solo teacher becomes more and more of an anachronism.

The tools of individualization, humanization, performance teaching and testing cannot be plied by a solo teacher. No single human being can handle such a complex effort. It must be applied by teaching teams made up of professionals, paraprofessionals, volunteers and students themselves, working with pupils and each other in classrooms and in surrounding communities as well. Schooling like this will press many professionals to be "deployed to new tasks" along with large numbers of paid and volunteer paraprofessionals to assist them.
For further study

It might prove meaningful to study the 2,716 teachers in the study who rose from paraprofessional ranks to see if their route to certification provided any teaching assets that would not have been obtained traditionally, and to see if they relate better to specific kinds of student groups and learning situations. This investigation could include such questions as:

1) Did you go through regular teacher training or a new careers-type program?

2) Do you live in the community served by the school where you work?

3) Are you teaching in the same school or school system where you worked as a paraprofessional.

4) Are any of your relationships with other staff members in your school team relationships? Are you a solo teacher?

5) Do you consider yourself as a teacher less than, more than or as successful as those who went into teaching directly?

6) Would you call your classroom traditional, open, individualized, other? Explain.

The bulk of COP participants will have graduated and obtained teacher certification in the years immediately following this study. It would be useful to survey this special group of teachers (for they, too, took the paraprofessional route to certification) to find out if they possess teaching assets or abilities which they might not have obtained had they taken the traditional route to
teaching.

**Career Development for Paraprofessionals and other Educational Personnel**

To develop teaching teams of professionals, paraprofessionals and others requires role definition and differentiation as part of a career (or staff) development program for an entire school.

Klopf, Bowman and Joy\textsuperscript{16} and others point to some definition and differentiation in teaching roles in recent years. Data in this present study reveal that the work now performed by paraprofessionals has expanded far beyond earlier expectations. Paraprofessionals are providing foreign language know-how and working with migrant children. They dispense mental health service. They facilitate independent study, assist in early childhood centers, and give driving and swimming instructions. They are working in special education, counseling and school health—drug counseling, family living and physical therapy. They are computer operators, statisticians, cashiers and public relations people. Two—a Title I Administrator and a Head Start Coordinator—function in what would commonly be called professional jobs. Many appear to be used in

\textsuperscript{16}See, for example, Klopf, Bowman and Joy, *A Learning Team*, p. 42.
remediation and reinforcement. Tutoring is an important part of their work and others assist in art and music.

But the nationwide use of a variety of differentiated staffing approaches is a long way off. And, according to the data in this study, so is the differentiation of paraprofessionals regarding job level and area of school work. Findings show that 85 per cent of the paraprofessionals under study are employed at the aide level and 85 per cent work in instruction. Moreover, only 29 school systems indicated that they had three- and four-level instructional career ladders, and an additional 96 have differentiated between instructional aides and assistants only.

The pessimism of Bhaerman and Schmais about differentiating teachers and aides, quoted in Chapter II, may not now be far wrong. Limited funding combine with the opposition of organized teaching and an apparent inability of advocates of staff differentiation to work out a satisfactory reward system (possibly because they have not worked out the specifics of competencies). These factors militate against further growth of the staff differentiation movement, including new careers for paraprofessionals.

It cannot be ruled out that paraprofessionals may not wish to move up the ladder any further, that they get pride, dignity and a feeling of status at their present levels. But at least the option to go higher must be
offered to them.

The data in this study show a lack of understanding by school systems of exactly what career development is. While 28 per cent of the school systems under study report that paraprofessionals' job performance is the basis for career advancement and 18 per cent say it is joint evaluation, there is little evidence from this report that paraprofessionals in the school systems are making career advances. Moreover, neither job performance nor evaluation are clearly spelled out. In addition, the fact that supervisors and evaluators come from different segments of school personnel complicates the matter of career advancement still further.

For further study

Some light could be shed on the subject by some important extensions of this study. Inquiries should be made of the 284 school systems that cited job performance along with the 181 school systems that cited joint evaluations as basis for paraprofessional advancement. Such an examination could follow these lines:

1) What performances are necessary at each job level?

2) What are the criteria used to measure these performances?
3) What is the reward system for achieving these performance levels?

4) What is the extent and nature of supervision of the paraprofessionals in developing these performance levels?

5) Is evaluation the same as measurement?

6) If so or if not, what are the criteria used for evaluation?

7) What is the reward system attached to the evaluation?

8) What is career advancement?

9) What kind of advancement is possible in your school system?

10) What are the specific criteria for advancement from each level?

11) What is the reward process for that advancement?

12) Are rewards based on years of service? If so, how?

In addition, an in-depth study should be made of the 29 school systems which reported three- and four-level career ladders in the instructional field—and possibly the 96 that differentiate aides and assistants as well. Further study of the jobs paraprofessionals are performing in these school systems is needed to discover the nature, quality and complexity of the actual tasks performed as well as the relationship of task to paycheck and job level. Titles, job descriptions and salary rates should be requested for each job level. Further the study should include an explanation of role definition and development (that is,
training) for each level. Information on criteria established for advancement as well as evaluation techniques would also be useful, along with data on how these levels are financially supported. The roles of cooperating and supervising teachers as well as principals, ancillary staff and central administrative staff in supervision and evaluation should also be explored in this context.

Moreover, although many scholars have advocated the desirability of staff differentiation, most arguments have been based on the logic of taking greater advantage of the diverse backgrounds, ability and preparation levels of educational personnel. Little real evidence has been gathered to show that a greater mix of educational personnel produces greater learning than with a more homogeneous staff or that one particular kind of mix is better than an other kind. Most of the differentiation has occurred as a result of incentives or through the use of outside funding. It is important, then, that an array of studies be undertaken in those places using a variety of staff, especially paraprofessionals, to see if staff differentiation of professionals, paraprofessionals and others indeed produces greater learning on the part of students.
Training of Paraprofessionals and Other Educational Personnel

The crucial part of career development is training. Career development requires sustained, sophisticated, expert training--by school systems in concert with institutions of higher education--to develop the competencies or skills that are believed necessary to teach pupils in elementary and secondary schools today.

How such training can be provided is the subject of innumerable research studies.\(^\text{17}\) It is also the subject of a number of major national demonstration programs such as the Career Opportunities Program, Head Start and Follow Through Supplementary Training, Teacher Corps, and a number of university-run programs of competency-based undergraduate teacher training. The conclusion arrived at by these theorists and practitioners alike is that school systems and teacher training institutions operating together, rather than singly, can turn out better educational personnel.

Mentioned throughout this text are the components of cooperative higher education-school system training programs for professionals and paraprofessionals. They have

become litany to researchers and practitioners involved:

1) Primary responsibility for pre-service and graduate teacher education rests with colleges and universities with close advice-and-consent from the schools along with input from the state education agency.

2) Primary responsibility for in-service education remains with the school systems with heavy input from institutions of higher education and assistance from the state education agency.

3) Adjunct faculty can provide the link, with some school teachers and administrators supervising higher education classes and some university faculty working with students in the schools.

4) Supervised clinical work--that is supervised work in elementary and secondary classrooms--carries college credit from the very beginning of the training. Adjunct faculty assist teachers in providing this clinical supervision by observing teachers-in-training in a classroom setting and providing regular clinical feedback in college classrooms.

5) The clinical supervision is strengthened and reinforced by films, tapes and other descriptors of actual classroom happenings and behaviors, by analysis and feedback from peers and possibly students, by such techniques as micro-teaching.

6) In-service training for teachers and teachers-in-training--usually together but separately when the subject matter and issues call for it--carries college and graduate credit for all who participate because it is a joint school-system-higher education activity and its purpose is to improve performance in the schools. Teachers, along with administrators and higher education faculty, should cooperate on the design.
7) Released time is provided by school systems, where undergraduates are actually working in them, for college study to acquire the knowledge or subject-matter base also necessary for teaching.

Explicit in these ideas, of course, is the search for alternative routes to teacher credentialing, routes that assure that a teaching certificate really certifies particular competencies and is based on performance criteria.

This study found a discrepancy between the model sketched above and the type of paraprofessional programming found in most of the school systems reporting. Judging from the data in this study, Olivero may be right in suggesting that school systems are taking over the training of paraprofessionals. (See Chapter II.) While three-quarters of the school systems in this study indicate they provide in-service training, only one-third of the school systems know for sure that some of their paraprofessionals are enrolled in institutions of higher education and indeed only one-sixth of the paraprofessionals in the study are enrolled. Nonetheless, more than one quarter of the school systems say that higher education will help their paraprofessionals advance and 13 per cent cite in-service training as the way to advance.

What is not revealed in this study is the kind of in-service training professionals and paraprofessionals are
getting. Neither is there information on quality, duration, direction or leadership. However, the fact that three-quarters of the school systems provide training for paraprofessionals and cooperating teachers together, and 83 per cent allow them joint planning time, show important gains for new careers training. Nonetheless, the consensus, at least among educational reformers, is that in-service training in the nation's public schools needs considerable facelifting.  

Only a limited number of paraprofessionals in this study are in higher education and the data indicate that their teacher training is fairly traditional. Only 11 per cent of the school systems report their paraprofessionals get academic credit for work experience, 15 per cent say they get it for in-service training and 16 per cent say that paraprofessionals get it for both. Higher education, it appears clear from these data, continues to train students in theory and methods, untouched and untested by the realities of elementary and secondary classrooms, awarding credits which would seem to have little relationship to actual teaching performance. The school systems are hardly

\[\text{\footnote{Ibid., pp. 109, 110, 137; Cooper, \textit{Differentiated Staffing}, pp. 97-98.}}\]
more cooperative: 30 per cent were giving released time for study, but only one-fifth gave in-service credit for education and under 16 per cent gave tuition assistance.

**For further study**

Future studies must investigate the practices in school systems and schools of education that militate against effective and cooperative staff development, both in-service, pre-service and at the graduate level. More work should be done on clarifying higher education and in-service training programs for paraprofessionals in the 335 school systems that indicate paraprofessionals are in college. Some questions that might be asked are:

1) Are the programs cooperative between public schools and higher education? If so, what are the arrangements?

2) Is there a supervised practicum? If so, how does it work?

3) Are in-service and college courses or modules related to each other?

4) Do teachers and college professors work as adjunct faculty in the cooperating schools and colleges?

5) What are the funding arrangements for these programs? That is, who supports them?

6) What competencies are emphasized? What skills training is offered? What subject-matter training is offered?
7) To what extent do these programs lead to Baccalaureate degrees and teaching credentials?

8) What is the role of the principal, the ancillary staff, the central administrative staff and college or university faculty in supervision and evaluation?

Institutionalizing Paraprofessional Programs as Part of Educational Change

There are few indications in these data that school systems under study have been able to institutionalize their paraprofessional programs. Almost half the paraprofessionals in this study are supported by federal funds, while state aid accounts for only ten per cent and local taxes for 29 per cent of paraprofessional salaries.20

It is a promising indication of institutionalization that 63 per cent of the school systems under study say they could keep their paraprofessional programs going at least in part, in the absence of federal funds. But it is disheartening to note that the school systems that employ about three-quarters of the paraprofessionals in this study (see Table 4A)—those enrolling 15,000 and more pupils—are the very ones least able to support them locally. (See Table 9A.)

20 "Other" and "combination" funding sources provide the remaining 11 per cent.
An immediate question in these times of cut-backs in education funds is this matter of funding. "How can we keep these programs going and plan and carry out more educational change strategies," say school and other education administrators, "without continued full funding?" As if in answer, Allen points out that it "is a very nice friendly hoax perpetrated upon the community by educators" that experimentation in education takes money. "It doesn't take more money to experiment," he observes, "than not to experiment." While favoring more money for education, Allen opines that "we are [not] likely to get more money until we can demonstrate our ability to use what we now have a little better."\(^{21}\)

What Allen suggests for the next decade is experimentation in reallocating resources. Such reallocation touches directly on the subject of planning. Present programs, federal, state and local, paraprofessional and other educational reform programs, need to be part of a coherent plan which responds directly to the needs that each school, its faculty and community, see as primary to

fulfilling the objectives they believe will bring them closer to the primary purpose of educating the children of that school and community.

This is not an empty statement. Most federal and state guidelines for education programs are directed at similar goals. Moreover, they are general enough so that a creative administrator who is intellectually able to integrate ideas and concepts can fit them into the comprehensive plan of his school and/or school system, if indeed there is one. Administrators of some school systems have in fact begun to do this.

Moreover, a variety of local fiscal resources are available in many communities for education of children if community participation in planning and development is honestly utilized. Recent talk of "austerity," "economy measures" and loss of school bond issues mentioned in Chapter I, must be examined. The question, of course, is whether the bond issues were voted down for lack of money or because of antipathy to school programs.

Such reallocation of funds and priorities, planning and development with community participation, takes hard decisions in suburban and rural as well as urban schools. It takes setting of goals that both educators and the community can live with. It takes hard choices: a new gymnasium or a new chemistry laboratory; more ancillary
staff or more high-quality staff development programming; new textbooks or a computerized payroll system. It takes leadership.

But little of this comprehensive planning and development seems to be going on in the nation's school systems. Instead, school programming, budgeting and administrative machinery are fragmented, poorly related to each other and without a unified, systematic plan for meeting specified objectives.

Within the paraprofessional field, programs, administrative machinery, funds and personnel are also seriously fragmented. In most school systems with a paraprofessional program, an observer will find a director for Title I, COP, Head Start, Follow-Through, ESL, and so on. Each of these directors boasts his own staff, probably his own budget line, his own set of paraprofessionals, his own administrative set-up. Often these directors do not relate to the same chain of command. They operate with different rules and procedures, often handed down from federal or state education agencies, sometimes created by themselves. It is not unusual that they don't know each other. They neither know what the other is doing nor do they work together. Moreover, regular elements of the school bureaucracy--the Research Department, for example--are frequently in the dark about what is happening in these
programs. The effect of this, obviously, is that each paraprofessional program is probably pursuing its own goals, without heed to school or school system policies and plans.

If such is the case in paraprofessional programming alone, picture the chaos in a school or school system with, say, Individualized Programmed Instruction, Competency-Based Teacher Training, Teacher Corps and a half-dozen other innovations as well.

A major cause of this confusing state of affairs is that federal and state programming and funding are also fragmented, reinforcing and promoting the fragmentation already existing in local school systems. Moreover, the federal government tends to spread the education dollar around, providing monies to states and localities on a formula basis or for political considerations.

For further study

The disappointing data on the extent of institutionalization of paraprofessional programming in the school systems under study—even while educators and the community queried in this study favor it—raise questions about why demonstration projects "have not been carried over into institutional change."\(^{22}\) Future studies will have to explore

\(^{22}\)Smith, *Career Opportunities Program*, p. 1.
this question in depth, exposing what it is in the process, the structure, or the practice that enables local school systems or colleges and universities to make or not make a particular change, like the addition of paraprofessional programming, an integral part of their systems. A corollary question would explore what conditions are necessary for institutional change to take place.

A small start might be made in exploring institutional change and the conditions necessary for it to take place in paraprofessional programming. This could be accomplished by analyzing the paraprofessional programming of the 182 school systems in this study that indicated they could support their programs locally if federal funds were withdrawn.

Some questions to be raised:

1) Are these school systems urban, suburban or rural?

2) What is the pupil enrollment?

3) How large is the paraprofessional contingent? And the professional numbers?

4) Are paraprofessionals on a career ladder in terms of job levels and graduated pay?

5) Are professionals also differentiated in the school system in some systematic manner?

6) Are the working hours and the benefits accorded to the paraprofessionals the same as for teachers?
7) What is the educational attainment of the paraprofessional?

8) Are the paraprofessionals in higher education?

9) Do professionals and paraprofessionals train together and plan together in any systematic way?

10) Are paraprofessional salaries a fixed line item in the local school budget? If not, how are they paid? If so, what process was utilized to attain this?

11) Is there a planning mechanism in these school systems which relate staff development to particular learning and program needs?

12) What roles are played by principals and central administrators?

Other Future Studies

A few other studies which might also grow out of this research are as follows:

1) Information should be developed on whether and how many paraprofessionals actually come from the community surrounding the schools where they work. What is their educational attainment, their income levels? Do they indeed reflect their community and seek to represent it—or have they been coopted by the schools where they work?

2) Data should be gathered on state developments in law and regulations on paraprofessionals along with information on state certification of paraprofessionals.

3) More study is needed on the impact of paraprofessionals on the cognitive and affective learning of children.

4) An in-depth analysis should be undertaken to explore the nature and quality of the paraprofessional programs in the 38 school systems which mentioned COP in their responses.
The primitive state of paraprofessional utilization and training mirrors many, if not all, of the programs, processes and practices that aim at change in education. But paraprofessional programming has come a long, long way since it began in 1965. Its ten years of development have brought a sophistication to the use, acceptance and conditions of employment of the 136,000 paraprofessionals studied here. This could, in the perspective of history, signal the onset of a major thrust for the 200-year-old system of American education.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON TRAINING AND UTILIZATION
OF PARAPROFESSIONALS

Bank Street College of Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, New York 10025

Name of School System ________________________________
City _______________ State _______________ Zip ____
Superintendent _______________ Telephone _______________
Pupil Enrollment _________ Total Professional Staff ______

1. Do you have paraprofessionals in your school system? ____________________________________________

2. If so, for how many years? ____________________________________________

3. How many paraprofessionals work in your school system? ____________________________________________

4. Of these, how many receive salaries funded through:

   Federal Government ___________ Other ___________
   State Government ______________ Combination ______
   Local Tax-base _______________

   If you checked combination, please explain: _______________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
5. If federal financial support were withdrawn, what groups would support continued operation of your paraprofessional program?

Administrators__________ Students__________
Community Leaders________ Teachers__________
School Board Members______ Paraprofessionals___
Parents____________________

If federal funds were withdrawn, would your school budget be able to pay for the program? Yes____ No ________
Partially____________________

6. Are your paraprofessionals organized?______________

If so, is the organization:

AFT affiliated ________ NEA affiliated ________
Independent____________________

Is the organization affiliated with your teachers' collective bargaining agent? _______________________
Is it separate? _______________________

7. How many of your paraprofessionals have been hired as regular teachers after they have satisfactorily completed the requirements? ___________________
8. Indicate the appropriate information for school year 1971-72:*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Aide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Intern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Aide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Intern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Aide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Intern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Aide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Intern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-C Aide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-C Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-C Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-C Intern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please use another page if needed)
9. The paraprofessionals in your school system are paid for ____ hours per week.
   The teachers in your school system are paid for ____ hours per week.

10. The paraprofessionals in your school system are paid for ____ week per year.
   The teachers in your school system are paid for ____ weeks per year.

11. How many paraprofessionals are enrolled in degree-granting work-study programs in a cooperating institution of higher education? __________________________
    Are regular courses made available? ________________
    Or is it a special program? _________________________
    Is released time available to them for such study? ________________________________
    Is academic credit given for work experience? ____
    Is academic credit given for in-service training? ________________________________

12. As of school year 1971-72 how many paraprofessionals have completed the following schooling?*

   Less than high school ____ Two years of college ____
   High School or G.E.D. ____ Three years of college ____
   One year of college ____ Baccalaureate Degree ____

13. Do you have a career advancement plan for your paraprofessionals? Yes ____ No ____
QUESTIONNAIRE ON TRAINING AND UTILIZATION
OF PARAPROFESSIONALS

What is the basis for advancement from one level to the next? (Check as many as apply.)

College credits
In-service training
Seniority
Job performance

Joint evaluation such as by cooperating teacher, principal, college supervisor, and self

14. Please give us as much information as is convenient on the pay-scale, both grade and in-grade steps, for paraprofessionals in your system.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. Is there an in-service training program for your paraprofessionals? Yes _________ No _________

Is there an in-service training program for your teachers who work with paraprofessionals?
Yes _________ No _________

Is there an in-service training program for your teachers who supervise paraprofessionals?
Yes _________ No _________

Is there an in-service training program for teachers and paraprofessionals together?
Yes _________ No _________

Are the training programs:

On-the-job _________ Both _________ Special workshops _________ Other _________

Is time scheduled by your schools for the professional paraprofessional team in each classroom to plan together?
Yes _________ No _________
QUESTIONNAIRE ON TRAINING AND UTILIZATION
OF PARAPROFESSIONALS

16. Are your paraprofessionals supervised by anyone in addition to their cooperating teacher and principal?

If so, who? (title, not name): _______________________

Is this person (or department) also responsible for evaluating the paraprofessionals? _______________________

If not, who is? (title, not name) _______________________

17. The paraprofessionals in your school system are entitled to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sick days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid school holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid snow days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal business days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service credit for education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Who determines the personnel policy for your paraprofessionals: (Check as many as apply.)

- Personnel Department of your school system ____________
- Federal Coordinator ____________________________________
- City Civil Service ______________________________________
- Other _________________________________________________

19. If you have any recommendations on procedures which have worked out well in your schools, please describe

*This is the questionnaire for the first mailing. Second and third mailings referred here to school year 1972-73.
APPENDIX B

NAME LIST OF THOSE WHO MADE THIRD MAILING*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Mr. John Hill</td>
<td>Alabama Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Mr. Rayburn O. Richardson</td>
<td>Arkansas Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Dr. Douglas Dopp</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Dr. Joseph Moore</td>
<td>Delaware Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Mr. Jerry Chapman</td>
<td>Florida Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Mr. Robert McCants</td>
<td>Georgia Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Dr. Harold Goff</td>
<td>Idaho Department of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Mr. Bruce D. McIntosh</td>
<td>Indiana Department of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Mr. C.D. Rogers</td>
<td>Iowa Department of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Dr. Sidney Simandle</td>
<td>Kentucky Department of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Dr. Louis Coussan</td>
<td>University of Southwestern Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Dr. Richard Sevey</td>
<td>Maine Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Dr. Ronald C. Watts</td>
<td>Maryland Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Dr. Everett Thistle</td>
<td>Massachusetts Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAME LIST OF THOSE WHO MADE THIRD MAILING*

Michigan: Mrs. Clara Jennings
Michigan Department of Education

Minnesota: Dr. Patricia J. Goralski
Minnesota Department of Education

Mississippi: Dr. Russell Crider
Mississippi Department of Education

Missouri: Mr. Jack F. Roy
Missouri Department of Education

New Hampshire: Mrs. Jacqueline Clement
New Hampshire Department of Education

New Jersey: Dr. Archie N. Chiles
New Jersey Department of Education

New Mexico: Mr. Jim Pierce
New Mexico Department of Public Instruction

New York: Mr. Robert Hayes
New York State Education Department

North Carolina: Mr. Donald G. Cottom
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Ohio: Mr. C. William Phillips
Ohio Department of Public Instruction

Oklahoma: Dr. E.H. MacDonald
Oklahoma Department of Public Instruction

Oregon: Mr. Lee G. Wells
Oregon Department of Public Instruction

Pennsylvania: Mr. Charles Eaton
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Rhode Island: Dr. Kenneth P. Mellor
Rhode Island Department of Education

South Carolina: Mr. John F. Maynard
South Carolina Department of Education

Texas: Dr. Caroline Locke
Forth Worth Public Schools
NAME LIST OF THOSE WHO MADE THIRD MAILING*

Vermont: Dr. Robert Vail
         Vermont Department of Education

Virginia: Mr. Franklin A. Cain, Jr.
         Virginia State Board of Education

Washington: Dr. Warren Burton
           Washington Department of Public Instruction

West Virginia: Dr. J. Zeb Wright
             West Virginia Department of Education

Wisconsin: Mrs. Jackie W. Johnson
          Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Wyoming:

Mr. John Chafee
Education Commission of the States

## APPENDIX C

### STUDY POPULATION AND RESPONSE RATE BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Eligible School Systems</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</th>
<th>Percent Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Number of Eligible School Systems</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Percent of Responses</td>
<td>Number of Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Percent Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Number of Eligible School Systems</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Percent of Responses</td>
<td>Number of Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Percent of Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Number of Eligible School Systems</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Percent of Responses</td>
<td>Number of Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Percent of Respondents Employing Paraprofessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Zone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D-1

### VALIDATION DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value Labels</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Validation Sample of Non-Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>1971-1972b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 7</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 to 12</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suplocy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nohired Parasorg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFT &amp; Indep.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEA &amp; Indep.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noinhe Paratrng</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VALIDATION DATA
Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value Labels</th>
<th>Totala</th>
<th>1971-1972b</th>
<th>1972-1973c</th>
<th>Validation Sample of Non-Respondentsd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasupv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooper Teacher</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Teacher</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inside Bldg.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside Bldg.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Unknown Principal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal and Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supv. Teacher</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooper Teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inside Bldg.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside Bldg.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal and Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a_n = 1,148; \ b_n = 486; \ c_n = 662; \ d_n = 6\]
APPENDIX D-2

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SURVEY

1) Are there paras in your school system? yes___ no___ (parasch)
2) If so, for how many years? under 3___ 3 to 7___ 8 to 12___ over 12___ NA___ (noyrs)
3) If federal funds withdrawn, support locally? yes___ no___ partially___ NA___ (suplocly)
4) Paras hired as regular teachers after completing requirements? ___ (nohired)
5) Are your paras organized? no___ yes___ AFT___ NEA___ AFT & Indep___ NEA & Indep___ Indep___ (parasorg)
6) Paras enrolled in institutions of higher learning? yes___ no___ (noinihe)
7) Paras get in-service training? yes___ no___ (paratrng)
8) Besides cooperating teacher who supervises paras? no___ team leader___ other inside bldg___ other outside bldg___ other unknown___ principal___ principal & teacher___ no answer___ (parasupv)
9) Who evaluates paras? same as supervisor___ team leader___ other inside bldg___ other outside bldg___ other unknown___ principal___ cooperating teacher___ principal & teacher___ no answer___ (paraeval)
10) Career Advancement Plan--basis is
(caradv) college credits__
in-service training__
seniority__
job performance__
joint eval such as by
coop. teacher, principal,
college supervisor &
self__

Name of school system_____________________________________

City and State_____________________________________________

Telephone_________________________________________________

Person interviewed_________________________________________
### APPENDIX E

**QUESTIONNAIRE SPECIFICATIONS AND VALUE LABELS**

#### Card 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-04</td>
<td>Identification number of school system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>West North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>East South Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>West South Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Panama Canal Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Questionnaire Specifications and Value Labels

#### Card 1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 07-13  | Pupil enrollment of school system  
                         | 1 - 5,000 to 7,499  
                         | 2 - 7,500 to 9,999  
                         | 3 - 10,000 to 14,999  
                         | 4 - 15,000 to 29,999  
                         | 5 - 30,000 to 99,999  
                         | 6 - 100,000 and over |
| 14-18  | Number of professional staff in school system |
| 19     | Paraprofessionals in school system  
                         | 0 - yes  
                         | 1 - no |
| 20     | Duration of paraprofessional program in school system  
                         | 0 - under three years  
                         | 1 - three to seven years  
                         | 2 - eight to twelve years  
                         | 3 - over twelve years  
                         | 8 - other  
                         | 9 - no answer |
| 51     | Explain combination funding, if combination is checked  
                         | 0 - federal/state/local  
                         | 1 - federal/state  
                         | 2 - state/local  
                         | 3 - federal/local  
                         | 4 - federal/state/local/other  
                         | 9 - no answer |
| 52     | Without federal support, administrators would favor continuation  
                         | 0 - yes  
                         | 1 - no  
                         | 8 - other  
                         | 9 - no answer |
| 53     | Without federal support, students would favor continuation  
                         | 0 - yes  
                         | 1 - no  
                         | 8 - other  
<pre><code>                     | 9 - no answer |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 54     | Without federal support, community leaders would favor continuation  
|        | 0 - yes  
|        | 1 - no  
|        | 8 - other  
|        | 9 - no answer  
| 55     | Without federal support, teachers would favor continuation  
|        | 0 - yes  
|        | 1 - no  
|        | 8 - other  
|        | 9 - no answer  
| 56     | Without federal support, school board would favor continuation  
|        | 0 - yes  
|        | 1 - no  
|        | 8 - other  
|        | 9 - no answer  
| 57     | Without federal support, paraprofessionals would favor continuation  
|        | 0 - yes  
|        | 1 - no  
|        | 8 - other  
|        | 9 - no answer  
| 58     | Without federal support, parents would favor continuation  
|        | 0 - yes  
|        | 1 - no  
|        | 8 - other  
|        | 9 - no answer  
| 59     | If federal funds were withdrawn, school budget would be able to pay for the program  
|        | 0 - yes  
|        | 1 - no  
|        | 2 - partially  
|        | 8 - other  
|        | 9 - no answer  |
### Questionnaire Specifications and Value Labels

**Card 1 Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Paraprofessionals organized in association or union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - American Federation of Teachers (AFT) affiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - National Education Association (NEA) affiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - AFT and Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - NEA and Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Paraprofessional organization affiliated with teacher organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-64</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals hired as regular teachers after satisfactorily completing the requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Card 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-80</td>
<td>Identification number of school system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUESTIONNAIRE SPECIFICATIONS AND VALUE LABELS

#### Card 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Paraprofessionals paid hours as compared with teachers' paid hours</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0- paras 100 per cent of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1- paras 75-99 per cent of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- paras 50-75 per cent of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- paras less than 50 per cent of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- paras more than teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- paras more than teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6- paras more than teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7- no answer**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8- too ambiguous to categorize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9- no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Paraprofessional paid weeks as compared with teachers' paid weeks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0- paras 100 per cent of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1- paras 75-99 per cent of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- paras 50-75 per cent of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- paras less than 50 per cent of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- paras more than teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- paras more than teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6- paras more than teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7- no answer**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8- too ambiguous to categorize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9- no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td><strong>Number of paraprofessionals enrolled in degree-granting work-study programs in cooperating institutions of higher education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Regular courses or special programs made available</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0- regular courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1- no regular courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- special programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8- other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9- no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>Released time available for such study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0- yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1- no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9- no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Specifications and value labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Academic credit for work experience and/or in-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - in-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - both experience and in-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>The basis for career advancement is college credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The basis for career advancement is in-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>The basis for career advancement is seniority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>The basis for career advancement is job performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Card 4 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>The basis for career advancement is joint evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>In-service training for paraprofessionals in the school system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>In-service training for cooperating and/or supervising teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - cooperating teachers only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - supervising teachers only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - both cooperating and supervising teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>In-service training for teachers and paraprofessionals together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>The training programs are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - on-the-job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - special workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - both on-the-job and special workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - both and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - both and other**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Specifications and value labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 58     | Time scheduled for professional/paraprofessional team planning in each classroom  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
7 - yes**  
9 - no answer |
| 59     | Paraprofessionals supervised by anyone in addition to their cooperating teachers and principals  
0 - other inside school building***  
1 - no  
2 - supervising teachers  
3 - other inside school building  
4 - other outside school building but in system  
5 - other unknown  
6 - principal  
7 - principal and teacher  
9 - no answer |
| 60     | Same person or department also responsible for evaluation of paraprofessionals  
0 - other inside school building***  
1 - yes  
2 - supervising teachers  
3 - other inside school building  
4 - other outside school building but in system  
5 - other unknown  
6 - principals  
7 - teachers and principals  
8 - cooperating teachers  
9 - no answer |
| 61     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to sick days  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
9 - no answer |
| 62     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to vacation days  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
9 - no answer |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 63     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to paid school holidays  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
9 - no answer |
| 64     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to paid snow days  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
9 - no answer |
| 65     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to personal business days  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
9 - no answer |
| 66     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to maternity leave  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
9 - no answer |
| 67     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to retirement  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
9 - no answer |
| 68     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to in-service credit for education  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
9 - no answer |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 69     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to tuition assistance  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
9 - no answer |
| 70     | The paraprofessionals are entitled to job assurance  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
2 - no answer*  
3 - no answer |
| 71     | The personnel department determines personnel policy for paraprofessionals  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
7 - no answer**  
9 - no answer |
| 72     | The federal coordinator determines personnel policy for paraprofessionals  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
7 - no answer**  
9 - no answer |
| 73     | The city civil service determines personnel policy for paraprofessionals  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
7 - no answer**  
9 - no answer |
| 74     | Others determine personnel policy for paraprofessionals  
0 - yes  
1 - no  
7 - no answer**  
9 - no answer |
QUESTIONNAIRE SPECIFICATIONS AND VALUE LABELS

Card 4 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 75     | Recommendations and comments on paraprofessional programming  
|        | 0 - yes (includes brochures attached, mention of federal programs)  
|        | 1 - no |
| 76     | Card 4 |
| 77-80  | Identification number of school system |

Card 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-04</td>
<td>Identification number of school system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-09</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessional staff in school system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals funded through federal government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals funded through state government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals funded through local tax base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals funded through other sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals funded through combination of sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-38</td>
<td>Actual number of teacher aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-42</td>
<td>Actual number of teacher assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-46</td>
<td>Actual number of teacher associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-50</td>
<td>Actual number of teacher interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-54</td>
<td>Actual number of library aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-58</td>
<td>Actual number of library assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Specifications and value labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-62</td>
<td>Actual number of library associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-66</td>
<td>Actual number of library interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-70</td>
<td>Actual number of audio-visual aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-74</td>
<td>Actual number of audio-visual assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Card 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-80</td>
<td>Identification number of school system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Card 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-04</td>
<td>Actual number of audio-visual associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-08</td>
<td>Actual number of audio-visual interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-12</td>
<td>Actual number of counseling aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Actual number of counseling assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>Actual number of counseling associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Actual number of counseling interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>Actual number of school community aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>Actual number of school community assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>Actual number of school community associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-40</td>
<td>Actual number of school community interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-44</td>
<td>Actual number of health aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>Actual number of research aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-52</td>
<td>Actual number of recreational aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-56</td>
<td>Actual number of cafeteria aides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Specifications and Value Labels

Card 6 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57-60</td>
<td>Actual number of administrative, office, clerical aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-64</td>
<td>Actual number of security, maintenance, transportation aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-68</td>
<td>Actual number of other paraprofessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-72</td>
<td>Actual number of paraprofessionals used as substitute teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 73     | Baccalaureate degree required to work as paraprofessional  
|        | 0 - yes  
|        | 1 - no  
|        | 9 - no answer |
| 76     | Card 6 |
| 77-80  | Identification number of school system |

Card 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-05</td>
<td>Projected number instructional paraprofessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-10</td>
<td>Projected number ancillary paraprofessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Projected number clerical, food, maintenance paraprofessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals with less than high school education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals with two years higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-28</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals with high school education or GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals with three years higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Specifications and value labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals with one year higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-40</td>
<td>Number of paraprofessionals with Baccalaureate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>annual salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>monthly salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>daily salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>hourly salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>differentiated salary schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Salary advancement levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>static salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>two-level salary schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>three-level salary schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>four-level salary schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>five-level salary schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>six-level salary schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>over six-level salary schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>no answer (no levels indicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-46</td>
<td>Minimum annual salary: dollars per year coded as dollar amount without decimal point, for example, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-50</td>
<td>Maximum annual salary: dollars per year coded as dollar amount without decimal point, for example, 4650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-53</td>
<td>Minimum monthly salary: dollars per month coded as dollar amounts without decimal point, for example, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-56</td>
<td>Maximum monthly salary: dollars per month coded as dollar amounts without decimal point, for example, 360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONNAIRE SPECIFICATIONS AND VALUE LABELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Specifications and value labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57-58</td>
<td>Minimum daily salary: dollars per day coded as dollar amount without decimal point, for example, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>Maximum daily salary: dollars per day coded as dollar amount without decimal point, for example, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-63</td>
<td>Minimum hourly salary: dollars per hour coded as dollar amount without decimal point, for example, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-66</td>
<td>Maximum hourly salary: dollars per hour coded as dollar amount without decimal point, for example, 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Card 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-80</td>
<td>Identification number of school system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Originally coded to mean "qualified in any way," but qualifications indicated in actual answers proved to amount to a "no answer" or a "no" except where reference was made to a federal program. Answers indicating federal program involvement anywhere on the questionnaire were coded "yes" in question 19 -- card 4, column 75. Therefore, value 2 on these answers became superfluous and was read as "no answer."

** In early efforts to code all answers which referred to federal programs, value 7 was assigned to indicate this. But this value was eliminated part way through the coding process when it was found more valuable to code federal involvement referred to in any question under question 19 -- card 4, column 75. In all cases, value 7 meant hand tabulation and was recorded appropriately.

*** Early coding error. Values 0 and 3 are the same.
APPENDIX F

DETAILS ON SALARY CODING

Salary Pay Periods

The pay periods utilized in this study are annual, monthly, daily, hourly and differentiated. Only ten school systems indicated a weekly schedule, and one a bi-monthly pay schedule. These were translated into hourly wages, unless one or another of the following rules prevailed.

Where salary rates were given in two or more forms, for example daily and annual, the salary schedule used was most reflective of the hours and weeks worked, as indicated in questions nine and ten. If the data on hours and weeks worked were no guide, the first rate given was used. Where salary increments for different levels of paraprofessionals began at an hourly rate and then moved to annual, weekly, or monthly rates after a period of years or as a result of additional years of education, the salary rate was translated to an hourly basis in order to get a range that could be measured. This occurred in three cases.

In fifteen cases where salaries were overlapping, and where, for example, aides and assistants were paid on a
DETAILS ON SALARY CODING

weekly basis and associates on an annual basis, salaries were translated into the most likely pay periods based on hours and weeks worked, the data found in questions nine and ten.

Differentiated Salary Schedules

Eighty-one school systems reported differentiated salary schedules which were tabulated manually as follows:

1) Different schedules for different funding sources--14 school systems;

2) Different schedules for instructional as opposed to maintenance, clerical, and cafeteria aides--25 school systems;

3) Different schedules for different ladders--34 school systems;

4) Different schedules for different levels--4 school systems;

5) Different schedules for degreed and non-degreed--5 school systems.
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Salary Advancement Levels

Static salaries are defined as salaries that remain stationary from the entry level onward, with no opportunity for increments at any time. School systems giving only one salary figure are placed in this category. Of those school systems reporting their salary range, eighty-one specifically indicated by number that there were two, three, or more salary steps. But they did not specify whether these steps were career levels providing upward mobility based on job performance or educational attainment or simply on length of service. Because this information was unclear, these school systems were included in the totals at whatever level they indicated. Where it was clear that salary advancement level was based on years of service alone, the cases were coded "static." There were 129 school systems that indicated more than six salary levels, but with minimal change in salary. These appeared to be "static" cases and were coded that way.
DETAILS ON SALARY CODING

Actual Dollar Range

Where aides, assistants, associates and interns had specifically different schedules but their salaries overlapped, the range, minimum aide salary to maximum intern salary, was used. In the same way, where schedules were different for different levels of education but were still overlapping, the range ran from minimum high school requirement salaries to maximum college requirement salaries.

Moreover, where distinct salary schedules were listed for different job titles—for example, clerical, teacher aide or library aide—but there were no paraprofessionals listed in one or more of these categories, use was made only of the schedule covering the category of paraprofessional listed under actual job titles in the career lattice question (question 8). Similarly, where a salary schedule gave a range up through the intern level, but only aides were listed in the career lattice data (question 8), the top and bottom of the range was used at the level at which paraprofessionals were reported to be working.
APPENDIX G

NUMBER OF RESPONDENT SCHOOL SYSTEMS MENTIONING
FEDERALLY-FUNDED PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs Mentioned</th>
<th>Number of School Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Opportunities Program</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Professions Development Act</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEA Title I</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEA Title III</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEA Title VII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Employment Act</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency School Assistance Program</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Through</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Cities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Careers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Act</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Task Inventory for the Instructional Aide

I. Instructional Tasks

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Supervise seatwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Supervise cleanup time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Arrange and supervise indoor games on rainy days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Prepare and supervise work areas such as mixing paints, spreading drop cloths, arranging materials for accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Supervising learning stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Orient new students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Administer teacher made tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Assist in maintaining behavioral standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Assist students in library research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Tutor students under the teacher's direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Assist with individual instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Assist with small group instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Assist with large group instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Supervise the class if the teacher must leave for a few minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>Conduct educational games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>Present dictation to individuals or a group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>Supervise pupils who remain after school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Non-Instructional Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>Telephone parents about routine matters as directed by the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.</td>
<td>Telephone parents to verify notes requesting that children leave school early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Under direction, telephone parents to pick up a sick or hurt child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w.</td>
<td>Become familiar with the school handbook to facilitate proper use of the school plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Housekeeping Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Maintain learning stations and interest centers such as the library and bulletin boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Display pupil work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Assist in maintenance of an orderly and clean classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Collect and display pictures, objects, and models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Distribute books and supplies to children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Distribute and collect specific materials for lessons such as writing paper, art paper, and supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Requisition supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Assist in maintaining safety standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Administer first aid for minor hurts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL

JOB DESCRIPTIONS

j. Assist children with their clothing when appropriate

k.

IV. Clerical Tasks

u. Type and duplicate scripts for plays and skits

v. Prepare flash cards

w. Assist with the preparation of charts

x. Assist in preparation of instructional devices, games, and booklets

y. Assist in preparation of visual aids: posters, slides, transparencies, etc.

aa.

bb.

c.

d.

Comments by Teacher:

Signature of Teacher

The teacher has explained this report to me.

Date

Signature of Paraprofessional

Note: This form is to be completed in triplicate. The original is to be sent to the Paraprofessional Coordinator at the Compensatory Education Office, the second copy to be retained by the school, and the third copy given to the paraprofessional.
CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL
JOB DESCRIPTIONS

BREVARD COUNTY (FLORIDA) SCHOOL BOARD

Suggested Tasks for Teacher Aides

This list suggests a wide range of activities consistent with State Board of Education Regulations in which teacher aides may prove helpful to classroom teachers. The list is by no means all inclusive, but it will serve to suggest the scope and range of the teacher aide's role.

I. Clerical

1. Collecting lunch and milk money.

2. Collecting money for class pictures, field trips, etc.

3. Filing correspondence and other reports in children's records.

4. Sending for free and/or inexpensive classroom materials.

5. Maintaining pupils' cumulative records for school and district files.


8. Keeping records of class schedules.

9. Keeping records of books children have read.


11. Managing classroom libraries.
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12. Setting up and maintaining seating charts.
13. Typing teacher correspondence to parents.
14. Typing, duplicating, and collating instructional materials.
15. Typing and duplicating class newspapers.
16. Duplicating students' writings and other work.
17. Typing and duplicating scripts for plays and skits.
18. Keeping and maintaining a folder of representative work for each pupil.
19. Filing resource materials for various teaching units.
20. Compiling information for teacher reports.
21. Setting up appointments for parent-teacher conferences.

II. Housekeeping

22. Preparing and supervising pupil work areas.
23. Mixing paints for art instruction, putting down drop cloths, etc.
25. Supervising pupil cleanup time.
27. Maintaining orderly arrangement of the classroom.
28. Preparing and serving refreshments at snack time, and cleaning up afterwards.
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29. Helping to arrange interesting and inviting corners for learning; science or recreational reading areas, investigate areas.

III. Non-Instructional

30. Gathering supplementary books and materials for instruction.

31. Proofreading the class newspaper.

32. Distributing books and supplies.

33. Collecting homework and test papers.

34. Building up resource collections.

35. Obtaining special materials for science or other projects.

36. Helping supervise students in the playground or cafeteria.

37. Supervising the loading and unloading of school buses.

38. Monitoring the classroom when the teacher has to leave it for brief periods.

39. Arranging and supervising indoor games on rainy days.

40. Checking out library books in central library for pupils and/or the teacher.

41. Assist in making arrangements for field trips; securing parental permission forms.

42. Making arrangements for special classroom resource speakers.

43. Displaying pupil work.

44. Helping children with their clothing.
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45. Supervising club meetings.

46. Assisting committees engaged in special projects, constructing, researching, or experimenting.

47. Helping in the preparation of assembly plays and programs.

48. Setting up special classroom exhibits.

49. Accompanying a child to the office, nurse's room, etc.

50. Caring for preschool children during parent-teacher conferences, lectures, and other events.

51. Helping the teacher supervise students on field trips.

52. Running errands.

IV. Audio-Visual Assistance

53. Ordering and returning films, filmstrips, and other A-V materials.

54. Procuring and returning A-V equipment.

55. Setting up and operating overhead projectors, slide viewers, and other instructional equipment.

56. Typing introductions to give children background for viewing A-V materials.

V. Instruction-Related

57. Correcting standardized and informal objective tests and preparing pupil profiles.

58. Correcting homework and workbooks, noting and reporting weak areas.
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59. Preparing instructional materials--cutouts, flash cards, charts, transparencies, etc.

60. Collecting and arranging displays for teaching purposes.

61. Re-teaching a small class group about a simple understanding, skill, or appreciation.

62. Tutoring individual children--the bright or slow learners.

63. Repeating lessons for slow learners.

64. Helping pupils who were absent to get caught up with the rest of the class.

65. Assisting children with written compositions--especially with spelling, punctuation, and grammar.

66. Listening to the children's oral reading.

67. Assisting the teacher in special demonstrations in science, art, etc.

68. Providing accompaniment in music classes.

69. Reading and storytelling.

70. Helping pupils find reference materials.

71. Reading, spelling, or vocabulary lists.

72. Putting written and number work on the blackboard.

73. Assisting in drill work with word, phrase, and number flash cards.

74. Supervising children staying after school.

75. Assisting and checking pupils in seat work.
Model for Differentiated Staffing of Paraprofessional Staff
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Proposed Differentiated Staffing and Pay for Paraprofessionals

All paraprofessional aides should have some of the following knowledges, skills, and abilities:

1. Good general intelligence
2. Ability to establish good relationships with children
3. Familiarity with classroom routine
4. Good background or knowledge in clerical aptitude
5. Resourcefulness in conducting activities indirectly related to the teaching process
6. Neat personal appearance
7. Ability to maintain discipline
8. Tack
9. Courtesty
10. Good judgment
11. Good physical condition

The acceptable training and experiences of a paraprofessional should be graduation from high school supplemented by additional experience and knowledge in a particular field where specialized duties are involved; or any equivalent combination of experience and training.
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LEVEL I: TEACHER TRAINEE

Pay Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Basis</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Annual Increments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Sept. 1971</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 1972</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 1973</td>
<td>$2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites for Level I: No formal academic requirements needed.

General Functions:

1. Assist the teacher in necessary clerical work and perform related duties as required
2. Act as a liaison between school and community
3. Perceptively observe interaction within the classroom
4. Observe curriculum operation
5. Observe the function of the school as part of the community

Illustrative Functions:

1. Work closely with and under the immediate direction of the classroom teacher
2. Assist the classroom teacher to reinforce learning by working with individual students in need of additional assistance
3. Operate audio-visual equipment
4. Take attendance
5. Greet pupils upon arrival at school
6. Duplicate classroom materials
7. Correct objective-type papers
8. Make and use flash cards
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9. Listen to pupils read
10. Arrange interest centers
11. Supervise small groups of children

Responsibility:

All duties assigned by her supervisor. The skills of General Aide are limited. The teacher must discover her talents and skills, and determine how to utilize them. The responsibility level of the General Aide will expand as the aide becomes more proficient and experienced.

Transfer Possibilities:

1. Lateral mobility to Counselor Aide (A) is possible when an opening is available. The School Aide I level is considered to be an exploratory level as well as an entry-training level.

2. Upward mobility to Teacher Aide can be attained through participation in training programs and by meeting the prerequisites for Teacher Aide II.
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LEVEL II: TEACHER AIDE

Pay Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Basis</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Annual Increments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Sept. 1971</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 1972</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites for Level II: One year of college credit; one year of successful evaluation and experience as a General Aide and high school diploma or G.E.D.

General Functions:

1. All functions of General Aide

2. Assume a closer working relationship with the teacher and with children individually and in groups

Illustrative Functions:

1. Assist in administering and correcting objective tests

2. Help children develop independent skills (writing, reading)

3. Assist in developing an effective multi-media program

4. Help to administer enrichment activities

5. Collect lunch money and prepare report for office

6. Set up appointments and conference for parents with teachers

7. Compile resource materials for the teacher
Responsibility:

All duties assigned by the supervisor. Through experience and training Teacher Aide will have developed new skills and will be much more aware of the needs in the classroom. The trend is toward increased responsibility with groups of students.

Transfer Possibilities:

1. Lateral mobility to a counselor aide is possible if an opening is available without loss of classification.

2. Upward mobility to Instructor Aide is possible when prerequisites for this position are met.
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LEVEL III: INSTRUCTOR AIDE

Pay Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Basis</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Annual Increments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Sept. 1971</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 1972</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 1973</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites for Level III: Two years of college credit and at least one year's successful evaluation and experience as a teacher aide.

General Functions:

1. All the duties of Teacher Aide
2. Assist the teacher in all areas of classroom activity
3. Assist the teacher in educational planning
4. Assist the teacher in program evaluations

Illustrative Functions:

1. Perform instructional activities as prescribed by the teacher
2. Work with children who need additional tutoring
3. Work with small groups while the teacher is working with the larger class group
4. Assist in the preparation of instructional materials
5. Develop display and bulletin boards with the aid of the children
Responsibility:

All duties assigned by the supervisor. The instructor Aide is expected to assist the teacher in all areas of work. While the Instructor Aide will remain under the immediate direction of the classroom teacher, she should be able to assume an expanded role commensurate with her experience. This greater and more direct involvement in the learning process should be reflected by a greater awareness and a more personal committal to the general principles underlying the philosophy of urban education.

Transfer Possibilities:

1. Lateral mobility to a counselor aide is restricted to only those individuals who have the required prerequisites when an opening is available.

2. Upward mobility to Instructional Assistant is possible when the prerequisites for this position are met.
CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL
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LEVEL IV: INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANT

Pay Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Basis</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Annual Increments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1971</td>
<td>$2.90</td>
<td>$2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1972</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1973</td>
<td>$3.10</td>
<td>$3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisites for Level IV: Three years of college credit and at least two years of successful evaluation and experience as a teacher aide.

General Functions:

1. All the duties of Instructor Aide
2. Assume supervisory responsibilities given by the cooperating teacher
3. Be an integral part in the planning of all educational programs
4. Assume other general supervisory duties

Illustrative Functions:

1. Carry out directed tasks
2. Participate in parent-teacher conferences
3. Assist and encourage children in independent study
4. Participate in daily and long range class planning with colleagues

Responsibility:

All duties prescribed by the supervisor. While it is necessary to continue to operate procedurally under the direction of the classroom teacher, the Instructional
Assistant should be given greater opportunity to function with maximal freedom and minimal constraints.

Transfer Possibilities:

1. Lateral mobility to counselor aide is restricted to those individuals who have the required prerequisites for this position.

2. Upward mobility to the professional staff is possible when positions are available and when prescribed prerequisites are met.
Original Career Ladder

- AIDE I - WORK & TRAINING
  - UNIVERSITY WORK
  - SKILL TRAINING
  - ADULT BASIC ED.
  - 1 YEAR EXP.

- AIDE II - WORK & TRAINING
  - UNIVERSITY WORK
  - SKILL TRAINING
  - ADULT BASIC ED.
  - 1 YEAR EXP.

- NEW PROGRAMS
  - PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

- PROFESSIONAL STAFF

- NEW

- NEW CONCEPTS

- NEW POPULATION FROM MTRCH TO RECRUIT

- UNIVERSITY WORK

- SKILL TRAINING

- ON-THE-JOB TRNG.

- 1 YEAR EXP.

- PROFESSIONAL STAFF

- NEW

- NEW SCHOOL STAFFING

- OPEN ENTRY COMMUNITY

- MINNEAPOLIS (MINNESOTA) PUBLIC SCHOOLS
CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL
JOB DESCRIPTIONS

NEWARK (NEW JERSEY) BOARD OF EDUCATION

Proposed Job Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
<th>Teacher Aide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY</td>
<td>Academic Instruction of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUTY LOCATION</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Perform such additional duties and activities as are consistent with but not included with those listed below.

2. Conduct flash card drills, individual and small groups, using materials prepared by the teacher or commercially. Examples of content are phonic association, number facts, word drills, spelling, colors, geometric forms.

3. Given a list of content and teacher directions, make flash cards.

4. Read teacher-selected stories to children, or select and read stories from teacher library.

5. Play games with children using commercial materials such as games, devices, books, charts.

7. Make games and puzzles under teacher direction.

8. Design or create own variations of games.

9. Using manuscript, make vocabulary cards, charts, flash cards.

10. Using professional magazines and other sources, find materials and make games.

11. Help to locate community resource persons, for example, carpenters to show their skills and craftwork, merchants to show marketing, nurses, etc.

12. Transcribe in manuscript, children's stories from tapes made by children.

13. Teach children names of materials used in classwork (paper of various kinds, tools, materials) where and how to store and get them.


15. Show children use of (1) tools such as scissors, pencil, crayon, paint brush, (2) dressing procedures such as bow-tying, zippering, fastening, buttoning.

16. Show children various ways of working with materials such as crayons, plasticene clay, paint, etc., to achieve different effects.

17. Supervise block play by spot-checking to see if blocks are too high, improperly balanced; children are cooperatively sharing blocks and area.
18. Teach use of large equipment and supervise for safety such as slides, see-saws, sand boxes, tricycles.

19. Listen to small reading groups making note of needed corrections.


21. Assist children with their written expressions by listening to children's own way of expressing, supplying words as needed to help child express thoughts, recording children's words on experience charts.

22. Tutor children as needed by giving on-the-spot correction and demonstration such as (1) looking for and correcting errors, (2) showing correct response by demonstration and example, (3) making up or giving several opportunities for child to respond and receive additional correction or praise, (4) letting child continue on his own.

23. Conduct vocabulary drills with materials prepared by the teacher or by self such as asking children to supply missing words in sentences, or supply meanings or words written on board or charts.

24. Assist with reading comprehension under teacher direction by asking simple, direct questions, the answers to which are obvious in content being read.
25. Conduct practice routines in speech training following speech therapists' and teacher's instructions for cases of lisping, faulty initial consonants, mispronunciations.


27. Show children proper use of math and reading aides; how to take advantage of these aides in their work.

28. Answer children's "How-do-I-do-this?" questions by repeating teacher's model for directions, by showing other examples.

29. Quietly move around the classroom, scan from side or rear, while teacher instructs, to quietly direct children who are not paying attention.

30. Supervise workbook activity while teacher instructs by seeing if children are on the right page, are using correct responses, are following teacher directions.

31. Provide media assistance during initial instruction; on teacher's signal, such as showing slides, films, etc.

32. Notify teacher if pupils make excessive errors.

33. Notify teacher if pupils fail to do work assigned.

34. Recommend to teacher and occasionally to children additional work-sheets for follow-up activities.
CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL

JOB DESCRIPTIONS

35. With respect to class trips, teach day of week on which trip will be taken in relation to other days of the week; teach date and day of the month on the calendar, review time for departure and return on the clock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SERVICE</th>
<th>SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL GUIDANCE OF CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>Playground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DUTY LOCATION   | Playground                           |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perform such additional duties and activities as are consistent with but not included with those listed below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Handle accidents by moving to the scene, comforting child, clearing the scene, sending for nurse, teacher or principal as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Listen and given individual guidance to children who appear troubled, are crying, anxious, or unusually over-joyed, and need to express their emotions to someone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Break up disorderly conduct by moving to the scene, separating children, re-assigning children to other areas and activities, sending for assistance as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adjudicate conflicts between children by listening to sides, suggesting a compromise, making a fair judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrate games by assembling children in groups, giving directions, showing examples, having other children show how, correcting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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practice responses.

7. Organize teams for group play by assembling groups, assigning children to teams, formations and areas.

8. Initiate acceptable playground behavior patterns by modeling correct behavior, discussing reasons why with children.

9. Supervise all playground activities by moving around to different areas.

10. Obtain, distribute and account for school playground equipment.

11. Guide children on playgrounds to observe rules and regulations relative to safety by adjusting playing behavior of children in accordance with desirable models, necessary rules.

12. Assist children to leave playground on time by signaling and quietly assembling children for leaving playground by walking.

DUTY LOCATION

Cafeteria

DESCRIPTION OF CAFETERIAL DUTIES

1. Perform such additional duties and activities as are consistent with but not included with those listed below.

2. Conduct or accompany children to cafeteria.

3. Assist children with trays as needed by helping to lead and carry trays, getting trays, utensils and food.
CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL
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4. Assist children with eating foods unfamiliar to them by encouraging them to sample new foods.

5. Assist children in handling some foods by cutting meats as needed, showing how to hold bonded meats.

6. Supervise all activities in cafeteria by moving around, scanning and searching.

7. Guide children in developing acceptable eating habits such as table manners, correct use of utensils, use of napkin.

PREPARING THE ENVIRONMENT FOR ACTIVITY

1. Perform such additional duties and activities as are consistent with but not included with those listed below.

2. Remove any obstacles or obstructions to safety.


4. Assume responsibility for clean table, desks, floors and walls.

5. Supervise monitors who help in cleaning up by assigning duties showing how, etc.
6. Repackage commercial materials for easier and clearer access by children.

7. Arrange learning materials on shelves (1) for clarity of perception by children (2) according to level of difficulty for children.

8. Given material, set up or re-arrange bulletin boards.

9. Maintain the classroom's supplies and materials for instructional activities by periodically checking to see that enough books, supplies, tables, chairs are on hand.

---

**TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY**

**DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES**

**Processing Data, Producing Materials and Operating Machines**

1. Ditto and/or mimeograph materials.

2. Collect bank-money envelopes.

3. Return money-envelopes to school office or designated person.

4. Distribute A-V materials and equipment.

5. Operate machines which service the school such as mimeograph, ditto, filmstrip, movie projector, overhead projector, tape recorder, record player, T.V., radio.

6. Arrange, keep records of, and supervise bookshelves and materials in closets.
**CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARaprofessional job descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES</th>
<th>OTHER LOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Guidance (Community Relations)</td>
<td>1. Speak to individual parents and parent groups.</td>
<td>Supervise bus loading and unloading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Speak to community groups as part of school-community events and activities.</td>
<td>Maintain orderly pupil behavior in halls, on stairways and on sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Participate in school staff meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Participate in meetings with teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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POSITION TITLE
Assistant Teacher

TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY
Academic Instruction of Children

DUTY LOCATION
Classroom

DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES

1. Perform such additional duties and activities as are consistent with but not included with those listed below.

2. Plan and teach assigned lessons in some subjects under teacher supervision.

3. Construct and administer short quizzes in teacher-specified areas to test limited amount of content covering short learning periods.

4. Group children for instruction in some subject area.

5. Prepare group work in some subject areas.

6. Develop auditorium programs with small groups or entire class on occasion using professionally prepared guides or occasionally original material.

7. Assist with auditorium programs and performance by stage-setting, supervising waiting groups, helping select performers.

8. Help the teacher locate resource materials for a specific topic.
9. Inform teacher of resource materials which are available for instruction

10. Locate or on occasion design materials to be used by the teacher for initial instruction.

11. Inform teacher of children having difficulty in following initial instruction.

12. Bring children's questions needing further development to the teacher's attention during initial instruction.

13. Identify pupils in need of remedial work.

14. Help pupils needing assistance with classwork or homework by answering questions, assessing deficiencies, giving on-the-spot tutoring.

15. Correct tests by marking number correct or incorrect by using a given correction guide.

16. Recording numerical results on cumulative cards in scholarship books, on office record sheets.

17. Conduct activities for correcting deficiencies revealed in diagnostic tests.

18. Design worksheets for specified subject areas to correct specified deficiencies, such as arithmetic examples, spelling words, vocabulary development.
CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL

JOB DESCRIPTIONS

19. Design and make flash cards that extend children's skills.

20. Design and make charts.

21. Locate resource materials on a given topic.

22. Design and make resource materials for a given topic.

23. Design and conduct additional activities for pupils who finish assignments before others.

24. Prepare questions to check for understanding as a follow-up after initial learning activity.

25. Transcribe children's stories from tapes made by the children for later reading.

26. Assist children with creative writing by listening to children's own language, supplying words, supplying correct spelling, etc.

27. Design and conduct vocabulary skills.

28. Design and conduct phonic and other symbol-sound association drills.

29. Discuss stories read following original guidelines.

30. Correct written work for spelling and grammar.

31. Design and prepare drill material in specified subject areas.
32. Organize games which provide training in math, spelling, phonics.

33. Assist pupils in finding resource materials, in conducting independent children's research.

34. Suggest resource material for pupils to use.

35. Lead discussions following teacher's direction.

36. Accept responsibility for bringing some specified pupils up to teacher-specified criteria in certain subjects.

37. Test individual pupils as assigned by teacher to be sure they have reached teacher-specified criteria using test material supplied by the teacher.

38. Inform teacher that specific test material is available for use.

39. Administer tests under teacher supervision and supervise children working on tests.

40. With respect to trips, (1) teach children features of place to be visited and (2) plan and conduct summary activities at conclusion of trips such as writing letters, stories, illustrations.

41. Participate in curriculum revision.
### CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL JOB DESCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Duty Location</th>
<th>Description of Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social-Emotional Guidance of Children | Classroom, Playground, Cafeteria, Halls | 1. Perform such additional duties and activities as are consistent with but not included with those listed below. Continue to perform all duties listed for teacher aides.  
2. Assist authorized personnel to organize children for fire drill dismissal.  
3. Initiate and demonstrate games on playground.  
4. Initiate and supervise acceptable behavior in all duty locations.  
5. Take care of disruptive behavior by separating participants, counseling, suggesting solutions to children.  
6. Listen to problems of children who want to articulate then counsel as needed.  
7. Recommend children needing help of specialists to the teacher. |
CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL

JOB DESCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Preparing the Environment for Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES</td>
<td>1. Arrange furniture in relation to kind of groups or individual instruction taking place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Assemble reference materials so that they are easily accessible for use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Set up displays for activity corners and areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Design activity areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Adjust furniture to children's comfort (height of chairs and tables, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Processing Data, Producing Materials, Operating Machines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES</td>
<td>1. Select and display children's work on bulletin boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Enter marks prepared by the teacher in scholarship books and on report cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Enter attendance on attendance slips submitted to attendance officers preparatory to latter's home visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Complete nurse's cards for pupils needing health attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Complete specified school forms as directed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAREER LATTICE DESIGNS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL JOB DESCRIPTIONS

TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY

Adult Guidance (Community Relations)

DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES

1. Address community organizations and groups on school matters.
2. Participate on school and community committees.

OTHER LOCATIONS

Supervise bus loading and unloading.

Maintain orderly pupil behavior in halls, on stairways, and on sidewalks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
<th>Associate Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY</td>
<td>Academic Instruction of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUTY LOCATION</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES</td>
<td>1. Perform such additional duties and activities as are consistent with but not included with those listed below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Perform as a team teacher under teacher direction, in designing, planning and conducting the essentials of most learning activities in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Introduce imaginative and appealing educational displays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Interpret curriculum guides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Initiate instruction based on curriculum guides for most areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Write long-range and unit plans for assigned subjects by specifying objectives, materials, procedures, and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Teach from original and/or prepared units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Keep informed of and use educational publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. For assigned areas of responsibility, develop, introduce and evaluate new, imaginative, original, innovative techniques or procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Prepare and teach lessons to small groups and entire class for most subject areas.

11. Prepare children to take all types of tests: standardized, teacher-made.

12. Design and make various subject area tests.

13. Administer and score all types of tests for assigned areas.

14. Use test data in recommending or assigning lessons and materials for follow-up remediation or enrichment.

15. With respect to trips, plan with children the food and other items to be taken on trip, appropriate clothing, proper behavior, expected learnings, etc.

Social-Emotional Guidance of Children

Classroom, Playground, Halls, Cafeteria

1. Perform such additional duties and activities as are consistent with but not included with those listed below.

2. Assume complete charge of all non-academic behavior (social-emotional behavior) for all children in all duty locations. Initiate, structure, and maintain acceptable behavior for all activities which
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emphasize social interactions among children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Continue to perform all duties listed for teacher aides and assistant teachers in this category, until such time as other paraprofessionals can be added to relieve associate teachers of these duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing the Environment for Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Assume and share responsibility for providing healthful, comfortable and functional classroom climate; lighting, ventilation, bulletin boards, chalkboards, display and interest areas, furniture, floors, shelves, closets, supplies, texts, wall hangings, plants, aquariums, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processing Data, Producing Materials, Operating Machines (for the classroom to which the Associate is assigned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Select and order new publications, library books, pictures, museum materials for assigned subject areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Select and display materials relevant to assigned instructional program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Create original devices, games, charts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Adult Guidance (Community Relations)**

**TYPE OF SERVICE CATEGORY**

**DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES**

1. Participate on various improvement oriented committees seeking school and neighborhood improvements such as cleanliness, facilities, safety, etc.

2. With permission of the principal, arrange for community leaders and specialists to address school staff.

3. Be informed about community social agencies and suggest their services to parents who express need or interest.

4. On occasion at the discretion of the principal, the Associate may relieve the teacher of duties for the purpose of attending training sessions.

**OTHER LOCATIONS**

Supervise bus loading and unloading.

Maintain orderly pupil behavior in halls, on stairways and on sidewalks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Projected Career Lattice</th>
<th>Educational Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Subjects</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual</td>
<td>Instructional Assistant Librarian*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Services Guidance</th>
<th>Instructional Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Instructional Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 College Credits; 1 yr Associate</td>
<td>Educational Communications Associate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auxiliary Trainer</th>
<th>Family Associate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>Associate Job Corps, Adv. Job Corps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Revised Projected* Career Lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional</th>
<th>Social Services Guidance</th>
<th>Audio-Visual</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Business Subjects</th>
<th>Educational Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Assistant High School Diploma</td>
<td>Family Associate</td>
<td>Educational Communications Assistant</td>
<td>Library Assistant*</td>
<td>Secretary Assistant*</td>
<td>Parent Program Ass't High School Diploma; live in community to be serviced; one semester of paid experience as a Family Assistant or 1/2 yr experience in a community program or one full yr of non-paid service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Aide No educational requirement; Ability to read and write English.</td>
<td>Family Worker</td>
<td>Educational Communications Aide</td>
<td>Library Aide</td>
<td>Secretary Aide*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Projected job titles
APPENDIX I

CAREER ADVANCEMENT BY PERCENT SALARY INCREASE TABLES

The sample cross-tabulation table on the next page explains the format used in the following tables which cover Career Advancement Plan by Percent Salary Increase for school systems paying professionals annually, monthly, daily and hourly. The output was produced by the SPSS computer program described in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences by Norman H. Nie, Dale H. Bent and C. Hadlai Hull.

The first cell figure is the number of cases or school systems in that cell, which represents all school systems at a given level of one variable (in this example the variable is "no career advancement plan") that also occur in a given level of another variable (in this case, "one to 24 percent Increase"). There are, then, in our example, 17 school systems reporting one to 24 percent salary increases but no career advancement plan. The second figure in the cell is the percentage of the row (in this case, 'no") total. That is, 17 is 32.7 percent of all school systems reporting no career advancement plan. The third figure in the cell is the percentage of the column...
## Career Advancement by Percent

### Salary Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Advancement Plan</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Sample Cross-Tabulation Table</th>
<th>TOT PCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>0 % Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 930

- **COLUMN TOTAL**: Column total for 1-24% increase
- **PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES**: Percent of total cases or school systems
- **TOTAL PERCENT**: Total percent of cases or school systems reported
CAREER ADVANCEMENT BY PERCENT

SALARY INCREASE TABLES

(in this case, "one to 24 percent Increase") total.
That is, 17 is 43.6 percent of all school systems reporting
one to 24 percent salary increases. The last figure in
the cell is the percentage of total cases or school systems.
In our example, 17 is 12.6 percent of 135 or all school
systems reporting.

In addition to cell frequency; row, column and total
percentages, the cross-tabulation tables contain two numbers
in the margin of each row and column. These numbers
represent, respectively, the total for that row or column
and the percentage that total makes up of the total cases
or school systems reported in the table. In the example,
39 is the total number of school systems reporting one to
24 percent salary increase, and that number is 28.9 percent
of the 135 school systems reporting. The total case number
of 135 is the number of school systems on which all marginals
are based.
### CAREER ADVANCEMENT BY PERCENT

#### SALARY INCREASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Advancement Plan</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Annual Pay Period</th>
<th>ROWN TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>1 25.0</td>
<td>1 25.0</td>
<td>1 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>11 21.2</td>
<td>17 32.7</td>
<td>14 26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4 5.1</td>
<td>21 26.6</td>
<td>18 22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>16 11.9</td>
<td>39 28.9</td>
<td>33 24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 930
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT ROW PCT</th>
<th>Monthly Pay Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>0 % Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Advance-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 947
## Career Advancement by Percent

### Salary Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Daily Pay Period</th>
<th>0% Increase</th>
<th>1-24% Increase</th>
<th>25-49% Increase</th>
<th>50-74% Increase</th>
<th>75-99% Increase</th>
<th>100% Plus Increase</th>
<th>ROW TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 1018
### Career Advancement by Percent

**Salary Increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Column Pct</th>
<th>Total Pct</th>
<th>0% Increase</th>
<th>1-24% Increase</th>
<th>25-49% Increase</th>
<th>50-74% Increase</th>
<th>75-99% Increase</th>
<th>100% Plus Increase</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Advancement Plan</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 644
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