

Status Report II:

Preparation and Supervision of Paraprofessionals in Minnesota

September 2003



Teri Wallace
Institute on Community
Integration, University
of Minnesota

**Barbara Jo
Stahl**
Minnesota Department
of Education

**Sharon
Johnson**
Minnesota Department
of Education

*Preparation and Supervision of Paraprofessionals in Minnesota
2003 Status Report*

This report can be found on the Minnesota Paraprofessional Consortium Web Site at <http://www.ici2.umn.edu/para/>.

We would like to thank Bill and Cheryl Lange of Lange Consultants of Bloomington for their work on the survey and data for this report.

A special “thank you” to Mary Mead, Minnesota Department of Education, for her amazing talent for keeping data and addresses in order. We are grateful.

This survey was funded with a grant received by the MN. Department of Education from the Federal Office of Special Education Programs award entitled: Special Education - Grants to States, CFDA 84.027A.

Table of Contents

	<i>page</i>
Minnesota Statewide Paraprofessional Consortium	1
Introduction	2
Survey Design and Procedures	4
Probability Sampling	4
Proportional Stratified Sampling	4
Direct Mailings and Addressed, Pre-paid Return Envelopes	4
Number of Surveys Returned	5
Data Entry	5
Survey Results: Job Description	6
Table 1: Experience Working as a Paraprofessional	6
Table 2: Geographical Area	6
Table 3: Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week	7
Table 4: Areas In Which Paraprofessionals Work	7
Table 5: Age of Students With Whom Paraprofessionals Work	8
Table 6: Setting in Which Paraprofessionals Complete MOST Work	8
Table 7: Number of Classrooms in Which Paraprofessionals Work Daily	9
Table 8: Percent of School Day Spent on Instructional Tasks	9
Survey Results: Education and Training	10
Table 9: Type of Educational Credential Held	10
Table 10: Highest Level of Education Attained and Currently Working On	11
Table 11: Contents Areas in Which Paraprofessionals Have Had Training	12
Table 12: Contents Areas in Which Paraprofessionals Have Had Training (2000, 2003)	12
Survey Results: Planning and Supervision	13
Table 13: Job Descriptions and Annual Performance Reviews	13
Table 14: Persons Responsible for Day-to-Day Direction, Supervision, Performance Review	14
Table 15: Directions Given to Paraprofessionals	15
Table 16: Adequacy with Amount of Planning Time (without students present)	15
Table 17: Frequency of Planning Time as a Function of Adequacy of Planning Time	16
Table 18: Type of Direction Provided as a Function of Adequacy of Planning Time	16
Table 19: Planning Time as a Function of Years of Working as a Paraprofessional	16
Table 20: Planning Time as a Function of Program Area	17
Table 21: Feel like a Valued Member of the Instructional Team	17
Table 22: Valued Member of the Instructional Team as a Function of Adequacy of Planning Time	18
Survey Results: Personnel Development	19
Table 23: Opportunities Available to Develop Knowledge/Skills Specific to the Students With Whom Paraprofessionals Work	19

Table of Contents, Continued...	<i>page</i>
Table 24: Training Prepared Paraprofessionals to Understand Needs of Students	19
Table 25: Training Prepared Paraprofessionals to Follow Lesson Plans	20
Table 26: Training Prepared Paraprofessionals to Implement Follow-up Instruction	20
Table 27: Training in Various Areas as Function of Program Area in Which Paraprofessional Works	21
Table 28: NCLB Awareness and Information	21
Table 29: NCLB Awareness and Information as a Function of Program Area in Which Paraprofessional Works	22
Table 30: Work Responsibilities, Training and Direction	23
Table 31: Primary Work Responsibilities, Training and Direction	24
Highlights	25
Experience, Level of Education, Settings, Programs, Hours	25
Education and Training	25
Planning and Supervision	26
Personnel Development	27
Appendix A - Survey Instrument	

Minnesota Statewide Paraprofessional Consortium

The following members of the Minnesota Statewide Paraprofessional Consortium provided guidance in the design and development of the Paraprofessional Needs Assessment Survey.

We are thankful for their contributions.

Sally Berg	Deb Bloom	Joyce Carlson	Diane Cirksena
Jean Davis	Joyce Evenski	Lori Fildes	Penny Flansburg
Sharon Franke	Richard Herriges	Lezlie Ingvalson	Liz Johnson
Sharon Johnson	Roberta Kaufman	Emily Knight	Cathy Macdonald
Bonnie-Jean MacKay	Rick Norby	Elida Olson	Bounlieng Phommasouvanh
Joe Pershern	Sue Schlicht	Bob Schrank	Cheryl Smoot
Susan Stradtman	Lisa Talcott	Lisa Vala	Barbara Jo Stahl
Teri Wallace	Nancy Walters	Kathy Wentz	

Introduction

This report provides the results of Minnesota's most recent Statewide Paraprofessional Needs Assessment, conducted by the Minnesota Department of Education, Division of Special Education. This survey was conducted during the spring of 2003. This regular 3-year assessment provides information regarding state and local policies and practices related to paraprofessionals. Prior surveys were conducted in 1994, 1997, and 2000. In some cases, responses to similar questions are provided across these survey dates.

Since the last time this needs assessment was conducted many changes have occurred related to paraprofessionals, their training and preparation, and their supervision. For example, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (NCLB) was enacted and provides three options for paraprofessionals to meet the requirements as stated here:

- Option A. Complete at least two years of study at an institution of higher education;
- Option B. Obtain an Associate's (or higher) degree; or
- Option C. Meet a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a formal state or local academic assessment:
 - a. knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics, and
 - b. knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading readiness, writing readiness and mathematics readiness as appropriate.

These requirements have broad impact as they apply to Title I instructional paraprofessionals in targeted assistance schools and all instructional paraprofessionals regardless of funding source in Title I school-wide programs.

In addition to these changes, the Minnesota Legislature this year gave the State Board of Teaching the authority to create rules for a credential process for all instructional paraprofessionals (Minnesota Regular Session Laws 2003, Chapter 129, Article I Section 10). The Minnesota Statewide Paraprofessional Consortium, in conjunction with the Minnesota Department of Education, will be working with the State Board of Teaching in the development of this rule. Below is the language intended to guide the development of the rule.

Sec. 10. [120B.363] [**CREDENTIAL FOR EDUCATION PARAPROFESSIONALS.**]

Subdivision 1. [RULEMAKING.] The board of teaching must adopt rules to implement a statewide credential for education paraprofessionals who assist a licensed teacher in providing student instruction. Any paraprofessional holding this credential or working in a local school district after meeting a state-approved local assessment is considered to be highly qualified under federal law. Under this subdivision, the board of teaching, in consultation with the commissioner, must adopt qualitative criteria for approving local assessments that include an evaluation of a paraprofessional's knowledge of reading, writing, and math and the paraprofessional's ability to assist in the instruction of reading, writing, and math. The commissioner must approve or disapprove local assessments using these criteria. The commissioner must make the criteria available to the public.

Subd. 2. [TRAINING POSSIBILITIES.] In adopting rules under subdivision 1, the board must consider including provisions that provide training

in: students' characteristics; teaching and learning environment; academic instruction skills; student behavior; and ethical practices.

Subd. 3. [INITIAL TRAINING.] Within the first 60 days of supervising or working with students, a district must provide each paraprofessional with initial training in emergency procedures, confidentiality, vulnerability, reporting obligations, discipline policies, roles and responsibilities, and a building orientation.

In addition to this new legislation, it is important to acknowledge the following, which was enacted in 1998. Our last paraprofessional needs assessment survey in 2000 identified a baseline for Minnesota paraprofessionals regarding the following statute. This year we asked the same questions to see what difference might exist.

MS125A.08(b) -

- (b) For paraprofessionals employed to work in programs for students with disabilities, the school board in each district shall ensure that --
- Before or immediately upon employment, each paraprofessional develops sufficient knowledge and skills in emergency procedures, building orientation, roles and responsibilities, confidentiality, vulnerability, and reportability, among other things, to begin meeting the needs of the students with whom the paraprofessional works;
 - Annual training opportunities are available to enable the paraprofessional to continue to further develop the knowledge and skills that are specific to the students with whom the paraprofessional works, including understanding disabilities, following lesson plans, and implementing follow-up instructional procedures and activities; and
 - A district wide process obligates each paraprofessional to work under the ongoing direction of a licensed teacher and, where appropriate and possible, the supervision of a school nurse.

Through the guidance of the Minnesota Statewide Paraprofessional Consortium, core competencies for instructional paraprofessionals, specialized competencies, inventories, portfolio template, training materials, web-based training (Para eLink) and many other resources and tools have been developed to support the development of paraprofessionals. We hope you find information you can use to improve your system of personnel development to better meet the ever-changing needs of students and the paraprofessionals who work with them.

Survey Design and Procedures

The survey instrument (Appendix A) used for the needs assessment was adapted from the form used in 2000. Lange Consultants worked with the Minnesota Statewide Paraprofessional Consortium and staff from the Minnesota Department of Education to revise the survey form to reflect current needs and interests.

Paraprofessional population data for the 2001-2002 school year were provided to Lange Consultants by the Minnesota Department of Education – one file for Special Education Paraprofessionals and one file for Title I Paraprofessionals. Unduplicated record-tables for Special Education Paraprofessionals and Title I Paraprofessionals were created. Thirteen thousand four hundred ninety-seven (13,497) Special Education paraprofessionals were identified and 3,592 Title I paraprofessional were identified.

Probability Sampling

Sample populations for each of the Special Education and Title I paraprofessional groups were determined using the following probability sampling procedures:

- ◆ Sample size populations for the 95% confidence level and +/- 5% sampling error were determined for each population. It was determined that for the Special Education paraprofessionals, 374 respondents were required and for the Title I paraprofessionals, 347 respondents were required.
- ◆ A three-times over-sampling factor was used to ensure that the minimum numbers of respondents were obtained from each paraprofessional group.

Proportional Stratified Sampling

Proportional stratified sampling procedures were used to ensure representative results across the state. District enrollment was selected as the stratum for determining both paraprofessional sample populations. The following district enrollment strata were selected:

- ◆ Charter schools
- ◆ Total enrollment less than 1,000
- ◆ Total enrollment 1,000 to less than 2,000
- ◆ Total enrollment 2,000 to less than 4,000
- ◆ Total enrollment 4,000 to less than 6,000
- ◆ Total enrollment 6,000 to less than 10,000
- ◆ Total enrollment 10,000 to less than 20,000
- ◆ Total enrollment 20,000 or more

Direct Mailings and Addressed, Pre-paid Return Envelopes

Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) personnel sent survey packets directly to the mailing addressees of randomly selected Special Education and Title I paraprofessionals, employing probability sampling and proportional stratification procedures described above. The method of direct mailing was highly successful in

achieving the desired response rates. Respondents returned surveys to the Minnesota Department of Education using pre-addressed, pre-paid return envelopes provided in the survey packet.

Number of Surveys Returned

The following numbers of surveys were returned from randomly selected Special Education and from Title I paraprofessionals: (a) 726 surveys from Special Education Paraprofessionals, and (b) 531 surveys returned from Title I paraprofessionals.

The number of randomly selected, proportionally stratified surveys returned for both surveys exceeded minimum requirements for plus or minus 5% sampling error at the 95% confidence level.

Data Entry

The InterTechnologies Group of the Department of Administration of the State of Minnesota completed data entry of survey information. All numerical data were 100% verified. Upon completion of data entry, electronic files were transmitted to Lange Consultants.

Survey Results: Job Description

The results provided in this section describe information about the respondents and their job situation: years as a paraprofessional, where they work geographically in Minnesota, the number of hours they work, the type of school and number of classrooms in which they work. It also provides general information about the students with whom the paraprofessionals work, such as age and setting.

Table 1 shows the number and percent of respondents and the length of time they reported working as a paraprofessional. Eighty-one percent of the respondents (557) reported working between 4 and 15 years, while only 5% (42) paraprofessionals were in their first year.

Table 1: Experience Working as a Paraprofessional

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
This is my first year	42	5%
1-3 years	163	18%
4-9 years	317	35%
10-15 years	240	26%
More than 15 years	149	16%
Total N	911	

Table 2 provides information about the geographical area where the paraprofessionals work. The responses provide a diverse representation across Minnesota.

Table 2: Geographical Area

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Minneapolis or St. Paul	93	10%
Seven-county metropolitan area, but not Minneapolis or St. Paul	280	31%
Greater Minnesota (K-12 enrollment greater than 1,000)	234	26%
Greater Minnesota (K-12 enrollment less than 1,000)	247	28%
Other (specify)	41	5%
Total N	895	

Table 3 shows the number of hours that paraprofessionals reported working per week. Data are reported for each year the needs assessment survey was completed. There appears to be a subtle shift leading to increased hours. For example, in 1994 51% (452) of the paraprofessionals reported working from 31-40 hours a week while in 2003 63% (576) reported working that same amount of hours.

Table 3: Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week

Hours Worked Per Week	1-10 Hours	11-20 Hours	21-30 Hours	31-40 Hours
Year 2003 (N=914)	2%	8%	27%	63%
Year 2000 (N=3515)	2%	8%	30%	60%
Year 1997 (N=1823)	2%	11%	36%	50%
Year 1994 (N=886)	2%	12%	35%	51%

Table 4 provides a listing of the various areas in which the paraprofessionals work. Since paraprofessionals often work in more than one area, they were asked to choose all that apply, in other words, to choose all the areas in which they work. While the greatest numbers work in Special Education (78%, 716) and Title I (24%, 220), other areas are also represented.

Table 4: Areas In Which Paraprofessionals Work

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Special Education	716	78%
Title I	220	24%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	25	3%
Instructional Assistance Other than Title I, Special Education or Limited English Proficiency	90	10%
Media Center	34	4%
Technology	46	5%
Transition or Job Coaching	40	4%
Parent Involvement	29	3%
Health	32	3%
Other (specify)	102	11%
Total N	915	

Table 5 provides information about the age of the students with whom the paraprofessionals work. This table also reflects data from the other years during which the survey was conducted. Again, paraprofessionals were asked to indicate all that apply to their work. It is clear that the largest percentage of paraprofessionals work with elementary age students.

Table 5: Age of Students With Whom Paraprofessionals Work

Age of Students	Birth to 5	Elementary	Middle Jr. High	High School	Transition	Others
Year 2003 (N=917)	7%	64%	29%	23%	3%	2%
Year 2000 (N=3511)	7%	66%	24%	20%	6%	2%
Year 1997 (N=1826)	5%	57%	21%	12%	2%	2%
Year 1994 (N=881)	4%	54%	24%	14%	2%	2%

In follow up to the questions about the age of the students with whom paraprofessionals work, they were also asked about the setting in which they do MOST of their work. Ninety-eight percent (898) of the respondents work in public schools and 2% (15) work in private or parochial schools. To further delineate their work environment, they were asked to choose only one of the settings in which they complete most of their work, which is listed in Table 6. Paraprofessionals in this survey most often work in elementary regular classrooms (32%) or in elementary special education classrooms (18%).

Table 6: Setting in Which Paraprofessionals Complete MOST Work

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Elementary school in a regular classroom	264	32%
Elementary school in a special education classroom	148	18%
Elementary school Title I classroom	61	7%
Middle school in a regular classroom	61	7%
Middle school in a special education classroom	55	7%
Middle school in a Title I classroom	6	1%
Secondary school in a regular classroom	45	5%
Secondary school in a special education classroom	75	9%
Health office	7	1%
Residential setting	7	1%
Other (specify)	77	9%
Total N	820	

In addition to the information in Table 6, the settings with 0% responses include: community setting (n=4), vocational setting (n=4), media center (n=4), secondary school LEP classroom (n=0), middle school LEP classroom (n=0), and elementary school LEP classroom (n=2). While we asked paraprofessionals to chose ONE setting in which they do most of their work, we also know that paraprofessionals often work in a number of classrooms and settings throughout their day. Table 7 provides information from 1997, 2000, and 2003 regarding the number of classrooms paraprofessionals reported working in on a daily basis. The numbers are very similar across the various years; there appears to be very little change. In addition to asking paraprofessionals about the number of classrooms, they were also asked about whether or not their job required them to travel to different sites. Ninety percent (821) indicated they did not need to travel to other locations for their jobs.

Table 7: Number of Classrooms in Which Paraprofessionals Work Daily

Number of Classrooms	1 Room	2 Rooms	3 Rooms	More than 3 Rooms
Year 2003 (N=910)	14%	19%	19%	48%
Year 2000 (N=3515)	22%	19%	17%	43%
Year 1997 (N=1823)	20%	15%	17%	48%

A new question was added to the survey this year, which asked about the percent of time that paraprofessionals typically spend doing instructional tasks (see Table 8). It is important to note that included in the description of “instructional tasks” was the following – working with student learning in academic areas such as reading, math, or writing or working with parents. Eighty-four percent (768) of the paraprofessionals in this survey indicated that they spent 50% or more of their day on instructional tasks.

Table 8: Percent of School Day Spent on Instructional Tasks

	# of Responses (n) % of Total N	
100%	193	21%
75-99%	445	49%
50-74%	130	14%
25-49%	66	7%
Less than 25%	58	6%
None	18	2%
Total N	910	

Survey Results: Education and Training

This section addresses the education and training reported by the paraprofessionals who completed the survey. This is an important component of the survey as it provides information about current credentials, highest level of education presently attained, current plans to continue formal education and areas in which respondents have had training. Table 9 shows the percent of respondents who reported having a credential. In fact, 68% (611) indicated they did not have a credential and most of the individuals who did report holding one (26%) did not find their credential on the list. Table 9 shows the responses to this item and respondents were asked to select all that apply since they may hold more than one credential.

Table 9: Type of Educational Credential Held

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Technical tutor license	6	1%
Special education teacher license	9	1%
General teaching license for K-6	51	6%
General teaching license for middle school	7	1%
General teaching license for secondary school	16	2%
Reading specialist certificate	5	1%
English as Second Language license	0	0%
Vocational teaching license	5	1%
Interpreter's certificate	3	0%
I do not have any credentials at this time.	611	68%
Other (specify)	237	26%
Total N	902	

Table 10 provides information on the highest level of education reported by the paraprofessionals as well as the level of education on which they are currently working. It is interesting to note that 29% (257) of the respondents reported that high school or its equivalent was their highest educational attainment, while the remaining individuals reported some involvement in higher education. However, 13% (110) have less than two years of college coursework with no degree. Seventy percent reported they are not currently in higher education though 7% indicated working on something other than what was presented as options. Nine percent of the paraprofessionals responding to the survey are currently working on their high school diploma or its equivalent.

Table 10: Highest Level of Education Attained and Currently Working On

	Highest Educational Level		Educational Level Currently Working On	
	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
GED or High School Equivalency	20	2%	7	1%
High School Diploma	237	27%	75	8%
Technical/Community College AA degree	43	5%	20	2%
Technical/Community College AS degree	8	1%	3	0%
Technical/Community College AAS degree	9	1%	5	1%
Technical/Community College Diploma	71	8%	8	1%
Technical/Community College Certificate	47	5%	19	2%
Less than 2 years of college coursework (no degree)	110	13%	--	--
Two or more years of college coursework (no degree)	98	11%	--	--
Bachelor of Arts or Science degree	158	18%	40	4%
Graduate school credits or degree	42	5%	26	3%
None	--	--	623	70%
Other (specify)	26	3%	63	7%
Total N	869		889	

While paraprofessionals enter their jobs with certain educational experiences, they also receive district sponsored training opportunities. The training topics listed in Table 11 are based on Minnesota’s Paraprofessional Legislation [MS125A.08(b)] as well as Minnesota Regular Session Laws 2003, Chapter 129, Article I Section 10, which provides for rulemaking for a credential as well as training for education paraprofessionals. These Minnesota statutes defined earlier in this report require training for paraprofessionals in these areas. Table 12 provides the topics from MS125A.08(b), which were also included in the 2000 survey, to show how responses compare with this year’s responses to the same topics. In every topic area, a greater percent of paraprofessionals in 2003 reported receiving training than did those in 2000. For example, in 2000, 67% of the paraprofessionals reported having received training in “roles and responsibilities” while in 2003, 75% reported similarly.

Noted earlier, NCLB requires that paraprofessionals have knowledge and skill in reading, writing and math. In this survey, paraprofessionals reported having had training in reading (46%, 421), writing (33%, 298), and math (43%, 388).

Table 11: Contents Areas in Which Paraprofessionals Have Had Training

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Emergency procedures	776	85%
Building orientation	506	56%
Roles/Responsibilities	687	75%
Confidentiality	748	82%
Vulnerability	361	40%
Reportability	533	59%
Individual Education Programs (IEP)	353	39%
Reading	421	46%
Math	388	43%
Writing	298	33%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	44	5%
Classroom management	325	36%
None of the above	34	4%
Other (specify)	99	11%
Total N	911	

Table 12: Content Areas in Which Paraprofessionals Have Had Training (2000, 2003)

	% of Total N 2000	% of Total N 2003
Emergency procedures	77%	85%
Building orientation	53%	56%
Roles/Responsibilities	67%	75%
Confidentiality	78%	82%
Vulnerability	30%	40%
Reportability	51%	59%
Total N	3374	911

Survey Results: Planning and Supervision

Planning and supervision are becoming increasingly important. NCLB defines “supervision” in the following way: A paraprofessional works under the direct supervision of a teacher if the teacher plans the paraprofessional’s instructional activities and evaluates the achievement of the students with whom the paraprofessional works. This section describes how paraprofessionals reported on their job descriptions, planning time, supervision, and annual performance reviews.

The percent of paraprofessionals indicating that they have a job description and have had an annual performance review in the past 12 months is listed in Table 13 for years 1994, 2000 and 2003. It appears there is little change in the way paraprofessionals responded to these questions over the years. While this year 21% (191) respondents reported they did not have a job description, another 15% (134) were not sure if they had one. This year an additional question was added about job descriptions. Paraprofessionals were asked whether or not their job descriptions accurately reflected their duties. Fifty-three percent (429) reported “yes”, 21% (175) reported “no” and 26% (211) reported that they “don’t know.” While 26% who reported that they were unsure seems high, perhaps this response is due to the numbers of paraprofessionals who did not have job descriptions or those who are unsure.

Table 13: Job Descriptions and Annual Performance Reviews

	Percent of Paraprofessionals That Reported Having a Job Description	Percent of Paraprofessionals That Reported Having an Annual Performance Review
Year 2003	64% (N=906)	51% (N=906)
Year 2000	62% (N=3361)	54% (N=3394)
Year 1994	56% (N=867)	56% (N=867)

Table 14 provides the 2003 paraprofessional responses regarding persons responsible for day-to-day direction, supervision and annual performance reviews. The responses to each of the questions are placed side by side for ease of comparison. The teacher’s responsibility appears to diminish from direction to supervision to performance review whereas the administrators’ responsibility has the opposite effect. This isn’t surprising and is what we would expect given the various roles of teachers and administrators. Perhaps the most concerning response is that 18% (156) of the paraprofessionals were not sure who was responsible for their performance review.

Table 14: Persons Responsible for Day-to-Day Direction, Supervision, Performance Reviews

	Day-to-Day Direction	Supervision	Performance Review
	% of Total N	% of Total N	% of Total N
Special educator	60%	52%	27%
General educator	15%	5%	2%
Title I teacher	8%	11%	5%
Special education administrator	5%	7%	6%
ESL/ELL/LEP teacher	1%	1%	0%
Early childhood teacher	2%	1%	1%
Early childhood administrator	0%	1%	0%
Parent coordinator	0%	0%	0%
Media specialist	0%	0%	0%
Principal/Assistant principal	4%	17%	31%
School nurse/Public health nurse	1%	0%	0%
It is not clear to me/Don't know	1%	2%	18%
Someone other than a licensed staff person is responsible for my work.	0%	—	—
Other (specify)	3%	4%	8%
Total N	859	852	863

Table 15 provides responses to an important question about what direction is provided to paraprofessionals to help them determine what they are to do. With only 64% indicating they have a job description and 51% having an annual performance review, it becomes critical that day-to-day direction is provided and meeting and planning time are available for teacher and paraprofessional teams to work together. Table 15 shows that the activities paraprofessionals reported that individuals directing their work most often do to direct their work include –

- Providing specific verbal instructions for strategies and materials to use with the students – 45% (393)
- Providing non-specific general suggestions for working with students – 22% (189)

However, 17% (145) reported that they receive “no real consistent direction” from the individual who directs their work. Fifty percent of the paraprofessionals in the survey indicated they had daily (25%), weekly (17%) or monthly (8%) planning time with the individual directing their work (without students present). While 18% reported having no planning time without students, another 31% reported they had something “other.” A scan of the written responses found that paraprofessionals and teachers often find time unscheduled time in between classes, only when new students begin, on the fly or as need arises, during teacher prep time, only a couple times a year, etc. However, 45% (404) reported that their planning time was adequate, 26% (231) reported that it was not, and 29% (258) reported that the planning time they had with the person who directed their work was sometimes adequate.

Table 15: Directions Given to Paraprofessionals

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Daily written direction or instructions	67	8%
Weekly written direction or instructions	42	5%
Specific verbal instructions for strategies and materials to use with the students	393	45%
Non-specific general suggestions for working with students	189	22%
No real consistent direction	145	17%
Other (specify)	30	3%
Total N	866	

Table 16 shows how paraprofessionals responded to the adequacy of planning time question in 1997, 2000, and 2003. It seems paraprofessionals' positive perceptions about the adequacy of the planning time continue to decrease. This decrease might be due to a number of factors. One reason might be that the paraprofessional has increased responsibilities for which he or she needs additional guidance.

Table 16: Adequacy with Amount of Planning Time (without students present)

	Percent of Paraprofessionals That Reported Having Adequate Planning Time
Year 2003	45% (N=893)
Year 2000	60% (N=3200)
Year 1997	77% (N=709)

Table 17 shows how paraprofessionals who indicated that their planning time was sufficient responded to the planning frequency question. For example, 43% of the paraprofessionals who indicated that the planning time they had with the person who directed their day-to-day work was adequate reported they had "daily" planning time. In our effort to understand the factors associated with adequate planning time, Table 18 shows how paraprofessionals who perceive that they have adequate planning time responded to the question regarding about what is provided by the person who directs their work. For example, 53% paraprofessionals indicating they had adequate planning time reported that the person directing their work provided "specific verbal instruction al for strategies and materials to use with the students."

Table 17: Frequency of Planning Time as a Function of Adequacy of Planning Time

	Frequency of Planning Time with Person who Directs Day-to-Day Work					
Adequacy of Planning Time	n	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	I do not meet.	Other (specify)
Yes	395	43%	24%	8%	7%	19%
No	225	5%	9%	6%	37%	42%
Sometimes	253	17%	15%	11%	15%	42%

Table 18: Type of Direction Provided as a Function of Adequacy of Planning Time

	Type of Direction Provided by Person who Directs Day-to-Day work						
Adequacy of Planning Time	n	Daily written direction or instructions	Weekly written direction or instructions	Specific verbal instructions for strategies and materials to use with the students	Non-specific general suggestions for working with students	No real consistent direction	Other (specify)
Yes	378	10%	7%	53%	19%	8%	2%
No	219	7%	3%	31%	24%	30%	5%
Sometimes	249	5%	3%	46%	25%	17%	4%

In an effort to better understand planning time and who gets it, we compared the planning time responses with how long paraprofessionals reported working as a paraprofessional. For example, the highest response for first year paraprofessionals was “daily” meeting time and for paraprofessionals working between 10 and 15 years was something other than the options offered. Table 19 shows how paraprofessionals working different lengths of time responded to the planning time question.

Table 19: Planning Time as a Function of Years of Working as a Paraprofessional

	Frequency of Planning Time with Person who Directs Day-to-Day Work					
Length of Time as a Paraprofessional	n	Daily	Weekly	Month	I do not meet.	Other
This is my first year	40	30%	28%	13%	20%	10%
1-3 years	159	32%	21%	8%	11%	28%
4-9 years	311	21%	17%	9%	21%	32%
10-15 years	229	22%	17%	7%	17%	38%
More than 15 years	146	32%	12%	8%	18%	29%

Table 20 shows how paraprofessionals working in various program areas reported regarding frequency of planning time. For example, 25% of the paraprofessionals in special education report participating in planning meetings on a *daily* basis. It should be noted that paraprofessionals could have indicated that they worked in more than one program area so there could be some overlap though total number of responses to the questions suggest that there is very little, if any, overlap.

Table 20: Planning Time as a Function of Program Area

Program Area (circle all)	Frequency of Planning Time with Person who Directs Day-to-Day Work					
	n	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	I do not meet.	Other (specify)
Special Education	692	25%	17%	7%	18%	33%
Title I	215	30%	18%	11%	15%	26%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	24	25%	25%	8%	13%	29%
Instructional Assistance Other than Title I, Special Education or Limited English Proficiency	87	28%	16%	6%	20%	31%
Transition or Job Coaching	39	23%	13%	10%	21%	33%
Health	30	13%	17%	3%	17%	50%

Paraprofessionals and teachers are increasingly becoming members of instructional teams supporting students in their learning. Eighty-eight percent (88%, 797) of the paraprofessionals responding in 2003 reported they felt left like a valued member of the instructional team as illustrated in Table 21. In 2000, 81% of the paraprofessionals responded in the same way.

Table 21: Feel like a Valued Member of the Instructional Team

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Yes	797	88%
No	54	6%
Unsure	56	6%
Total N	907	

Table 22 shows how paraprofessionals responded to the question about whether or not they felt like part of the instructional team based on their response to the question about the adequacy of planning time. For example, 95% of the paraprofessionals who said that their planning time was adequate reported feeling they were valued members of the instructional team. In addition, 87% of those who felt like their planning time was adequate some of the time reported feeling like a valued member of the instructional team. Seventy-six percent (76%) of the paraprofessionals who felt their planning time was adequate also reported feeling that they were a valued member of the instructional team.

Table 22: Valued Member of the Instructional Team as a Function of Adequacy of Planning Time

Adequacy of Planning Time	Valued Member of Instructional Team			
	n	Yes	No	Unsure
Yes	399	95%	2%	3%
No	228	76%	14%	11%
Sometimes	255	87%	5%	8%

Survey Results: Personnel Development

Noted earlier federal and state policies require that personnel development opportunities be available for paraprofessionals. Also, it is very important to provide staff development opportunities to paraprofessionals as their role continues to expand and some are being asked to take on new and different tasks. Tables 23 – 26 provide responses that paraprofessional gave to questions aligned with the requirements in MS125A.08(b), which was described earlier in this report. Table 23 shows that 67% (629) of the paraprofessionals in 2003 reported they had opportunities available to them to develop knowledge and skills specific to the students with whom they work. In 2000, 65% responded similarly.

Table 23: Opportunities Available to Develop Knowledge/Skills Specific to the Students With Whom Paraprofessionals Work

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Yes	629	67%
No	84	9%
Unsure	99	10%
Opportunities are not provided	133	14%
Total N	945	

Table 24 provides paraprofessionals responses to the question about whether training was provided that prepared them to understand the needs of the students with whom they worked. Sixty-eight percent (68%) reported such opportunities were available. In 2000, the question was different and the responses cannot be compared.

Table 24: Training Prepared Paraprofessionals to Understand Needs of Students

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Yes	608	68%
No	84	9%
Unsure	87	10%
Ongoing training is not provided	117	13%
Total N	896	

Table 25 shows how paraprofessionals responded in 2003 regarding the availability of training to prepare them to follow lesson plans. The same question about lesson plans was asked in 2000 and in 2003. Forty-eight percent (48%) of the paraprofessionals in 2000 reported the ongoing training they received prepared them to follow lesson plans and 59% (525) reported similarly in 2003.

Table 25: Training Prepared Paraprofessionals to Follow Lesson Plans

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Yes	525	59%
No	123	14%
Unsure	99	11%
Ongoing training is not provided	143	16%
Total N	890	

Responses regarding whether or not the ongoing training paraprofessionals have received prepared them to implement follow-up instruction and activities for students are reported in Table 26. In 2000, 49% of the respondents reported the training has prepared them to implement follow-up instruction and activities. In 2003, 60% (535) of the paraprofessionals responded similarly.

Table 26: Training Prepared Paraprofessionals to Implement Follow-up Instruction

	# of Responses (n)	% of Total N
Yes	535	60%
No	113	13%
Unsure	113	13%
Ongoing training is not provided	133	15%
Total N	894	

Table 27 shows the percent of paraprofessionals according to each program area who reported receiving training in the various content areas. For example, 45% of the paraprofessionals working in special education compared to 23% of the paraprofessionals working in Title I reported receiving training in “Individual Education Programs (IEPs).” Whereas, 79% of the paraprofessionals working in Title I compared to 37% of those working in special education reported receiving training in “reading strategies.” It should be noted that paraprofessionals could have indicated that they worked in more than one program area so there could be some overlap though total number of responses to the questions suggest that there is very little, if any, overlap.

Table 27: Training in Various Areas as Function of Program Area in Which Paraprofessional Works

Program Areas Where Paraprofessionals Work	Content of Training														
	n	Emergency procedures	Building orientation	Roles/Responsibilities	Confidentiality	Vulnerability	Reportability	IEP	Reading	Math	Writing	Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	Classroom management	None of the above	Other (specify)
Special Education	716	86%	54%	74%	83%	43%	60%	45%	37%	34%	28%	4%	36%	4%	11%
Title I	220	82%	54%	76%	80%	27%	55%	23%	79%	73%	47%	9%	39%	1%	10%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	25	80%	48%	76%	76%	32%	60%	40%	52%	52%	44%	32%	60%	0%	4%
Other Instructional Assistance	90	83%	52%	80%	82%	42%	63%	40%	56%	48%	33%	7%	43%	6%	16%
Transition/Job Coaching	40	98%	58%	65%	88%	65%	75%	43%	38%	33%	33%	5%	40%	3%	13%
Health	32	91%	63%	88%	91%	59%	75%	59%	50%	53%	31%	13%	50%	0%	19%

New legislative requirements for paraprofessionals, through the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), were enacted in 2002. Table 28 provides some information specific to that act and paraprofessionals' awareness of it, its relationship to their position, and their need for additional information. Table 29 shows how paraprofessionals responded to these questions based on the program areas in which they work. For example, 72% of the paraprofessionals in special education reported being aware of the requirements but only 56% reported knowing the impact the requirements would have on their position. However, 86% of the Title I paraprofessionals were aware of the requirements and 80% reported knowing the impact they would have on their position. It should be noted that paraprofessionals could have indicated that they worked in more than one program area so there could be some overlap though total number of responses to the questions suggest that there is very little, if any, overlap.

Table 28: NCLB Awareness and Information

NCLB	Yes	No
▪ Are you aware of the paraprofessional requirements in the Title I/No Child Left Behind federal legislation? (N=907)	74% (674)	26% (233)
▪ Are you aware how the paraprofessional requirements in the Title I/No Child Left Behind federal legislation impact your position? (N=903)	60% (544)	40% (359)
▪ Do you need more information about the Title I/No Child Left Behind federal legislation? (N=900)	58% (520)	42% (380)

Table 29: NCLB Awareness and Information as a Function of Program Area in Which Paraprofessional Works

	Paraprofessional Requirements in Title I/NCLB –	
	Awareness of Requirements	Know Impact on Position
	Yes	Yes
Program Area in which Paraprofessional Works		
Special Education	72%	56%
Title I	86%	80%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	67%	61%
Instructional Assistance Other than Title I, Special Education or Limited English Proficiency	73%	64%
Transition or Job Coaching	78%	58%
Health	84%	72%

The information in Table 30 pulls it all together. Paraprofessionals were asked about some key work responsibilities, if they received training in the area, if the training was adequate and whether they perform the task with direction or independently. While it seems that the paraprofessionals responding to the survey answered each question somewhat independently, we have prepared an additional table that bases one response on another. Table 31 provides information about how paraprofessionals responded to questions regarding training and direction for tasks they considered “primary” work responsibilities. For example, 54% (474) paraprofessionals indicated that they “modify or adapt classroom curriculum. In this case, 55% (256) reported that they had received training to modify and adapt curriculum and 51% (242) indicated that they receive direction in performing this task.

Table 31 shows some important findings. Consider item #14, which is “assist in the instruction of reading, writing, and/or math.” Ninety percent (90%) of the respondents reported that this is a primary work task for them, which includes 807 paraprofessionals. Of that 807, 66% (533) reported that they had received training for this task; and 54% (436) indicated that they receive direction when providing instruction. However, this also means that 34% (274) did not receive training and 46% (371) do not receive direction. The information in Table 31 is particularly important as it shows, in some cases, where expectations may not be aligned with training and supervision.

Table 30: Work Responsibilities, Training and Direction

A. Work Responsibility	B. Is this a PRIMARY PART of your work?		C. Did you receive training in this area?		D. Was the Training adequate?		E. Do you perform this work?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR**	IND*
1. Share school programs with parents	72 8%	808 99%	70 9%	670 91%	73 19%	310 81%	149 5.5%	123 4.5%
2. Assign grades	63 7%	825 93%	61 9%	638 91%	65 17%	326 83%	128 62%	80 38%
3. Score other than true/false or multiple choice tests and	189 21%	697 79%	138 20%	537 80%	146 35%	271 65%	151 50%	150 50%
4. Modify or adapt classroom curriculum	474 54%	411 46%	286 38%	461 62%	257 50%	262 50%	277 55%	229 45%
5. Design individualized instructional plans for students	197 22%	685 78%	141 21%	528 79%	134 32%	280 68%	180 59%	127 41%
6. Design and prepare students' instructional activities	335 38%	541 62%	221 31%	481 69%	198 43%	262 57%	214 54%	183 46%
7. Transport students to and from school	58 6%	835 94%	60 10%	540 90%	60 17%	290 83%	72 49%	74 51%
8. Perform health procedures	154 17%	740 83%	187 30%	440 70%	170 41%	247 59%	103 45%	126 55%
9. Perform job coaching	95 11%	779 89%	67 11%	537 89%	64 19%	277 81%	74 48%	79 52%
10. Participate in IEP meetings	263 30%	627 70%	149 22%	517 78%	145 36%	260 64%	232 76%	74 24%
11. Assist in activities of daily living	336 38%	541 62%	211 31%	460 69%	206 47%	237 53%	147 43%	191 57%
12. Perform behavior management procedures	612 70%	267 30%	499 65%	263 35%	393 65%	215 35%	305 58%	223 42%
13. Act as a translator	36 4%	847 96%	21 4%	567 96%	23 7%	298 93%	65 57%	49 43%
14. Assist in the instruction of reading, writing, and/or math	807 90%	88 10%	503 63%	300 37%	451 71%	187 29%	351 54%	297 46%
15. Assist with classroom management	611 69%	271 31%	376 50%	370 50%	340 61%	216 39%	329 63%	192 37%
16. Assist in the media center	162 18%	725 82%	93 15%	529 85%	89 24%	284 76%	102 48%	110 52%
17. Provide computer lab assistance	367 42%	511 58%	217 32%	455 68%	176 39%	273 61%	171 48%	189 53%
18. Provide one-on-one tutoring	628 71%	262 29%	361 48%	389 52%	339 60%	222 40%	231 44%	300 56%
19. Conduct parent involvement/training activities	33 4%	853 96%	45 8%	539 92%	46 14%	286 86%	70 63%	41 37%
20. Provide LEP instruction	27 3%	850 97%	27 5%	555 95%	25 8%	297 92%	60 59%	41 41%

Column E: ** with Direction (DIR)
* Independently (IND)

Table 31: Primary Work Responsibilities, Training and Direction

Work Responsibility	Primary	Received Training	Receive Direction
1. Share school programs with parents	8% (72)	45% (30)	45% (30)
2. Assign grades	7% (63)	59% (37)	44% (28)
3. Score other than true/false or multiple choice tests and assignments	21% (189)	56% (106)	40% (76)
4. Modify or adapt classroom curriculum	54% (474)	55% (261)	51% (242)
5. Design individualized instructional plans for students	22% (197)	58% (114)	46% (91)
6. Design and prepare students' instructional activities	38% (335)	60% (201)	47% (157)
7. Transport students to and from school	6% (58)	67% (39)	29% (17)
8. Perform health procedures	17% (154)	86% (1332)	41% (63)
9. Perform job coaching	11% (95)	60% (57)	36% (34)
10. Participate in IEP meetings	30% (263)	46% (121)	78% (205)
11. Assist in activities of daily living	38% (336)	60% (202)	41% (138)
12. Perform behavior management procedures	70% (612)	81% (496)	56% (343)
13. Act as a translator	4% (36)	50% (18)	45% (16)
14. Assist in the instruction of reading, writing, and/or math	90% (807)	66% (533)	54% (436)
15. Assist with classroom management	69% (611)	63% (385)	63% (385)
16. Assist in the media center	18% (162)	46% (75)	43% (70)
17. Provide computer lab assistance	42% (367)	54% (198)	45% (165)
18. Provide one-on-one tutoring	71% (628)	60% (377)	42% (264)
19. Conduct parent involvement/training activities	4% (33)	70% (23)	58% (19)
20. Provide LEP instruction	3% (27)	62% (17)	52% (14)

Highlights

The purpose of this section is to provide some highlights from the survey results. Our attempt is to point out some key findings, either those that should continue or perhaps some things that should change. Please be sure to consult the table referenced with the note to ensure you get the entire picture provided by the data.

Experience, Level of Education, Settings, Programs, Hours

- There seems to be a trend toward an increase in the number of hours paraprofessionals reported working from 1994 to 2003 (Table 3).
- By far the greatest number of paraprofessionals reported working in Elementary schools: 32% in regular classroom and 18% in a special education classroom (Table 6).
- Paraprofessionals continue to report working in multiple classrooms with 48% indicating they work in more than 3 classrooms each day (Table 7).
- More than eighty percent of the paraprofessionals in this survey reported spending at least half of their day on instructional tasks (Table 8). And, seventy percent reported spending 75% of more of their day on instructional tasks (Table 8).

Education and Training

- Most paraprofessionals do not hold any type of credential (Table 9).
- Twenty-nine percent (29%) of the respondents reported that high school or its equivalent was their highest educational attainment, while the remaining individuals reported some involvement in higher education. However, 13% have less than two years of college coursework with no degree (Table 10).
- Seventy percent (70%) reported they are not currently in higher education though 7% indicated working on something other than what was presented as options (Table 10).
- Nine percent (9%) of the paraprofessionals responding to the survey are currently working on their high school diploma or its equivalent (Table 10).
- Paraprofessionals reported having received training in reading (46%), writing (33%), and math (43%) (Table 11).
- In every case, a higher percent of paraprofessionals in 2003 reported having received training in the 6 content areas listed in MS125A.08 (b) than they did in 2000 (Table 12).

Planning and Supervision

- Paraprofessionals were asked whether or not their job descriptions accurately reflected their duties. Fifty-three percent (429) reported “yes”, 21% (175) reported “no” and 26% (211) reported that they “don’t know.”
- Sixty-four percent (64%) of the paraprofessionals reported having a job description and only half reported having an annual performance review (Table 13).
- Paraprofessionals listed the following positions as those most often responsible for **day-to-day direction**: special educator (60%), general educator (15%), and Title I teacher (8%) (Table 14).
- Paraprofessionals listed the following positions as those most often responsible for **supervision**: special educator (52%), principal/assistant principal (17%), and Title I teacher (11%), (Table 14).
- Paraprofessionals listed the following positions as those most often responsible for **doing performance reviews**: principal/assistant principal (31%) and special educator (27%). Eighteen percent (18%) reported not knowing who was responsible for their performance review (Table 14).
- While 17% of the paraprofessionals reported that they received “no real consistent direction” from the people intended to provide day-to-day direction in their work with students; 67% reported receiving specific or non-specific instructions/suggestions for their work (Table 15).
- The percent of paraprofessionals that reported the planning time they had with the teachers that direct their day-to-day work was adequate (45%) was far lower than that reported in 1997 (77%) (Table 16).
- Paraprofessionals who felt their planning time was adequate reported most often that they had daily (43%) and weekly (24%) planning time with the person who directed their day-to-day work (Table 17). Whereas, only 14% of the paraprofessionals who reported that their planning time was not adequate, reported daily and weekly planning time (Table 17).
- Paraprofessionals who felt their planning time was adequate reported most often that they had received specific verbal instructions for strategies and materials to use with students (53%) (Table 18). In addition, of those who felt their planning time was adequate 8% reported that they received “no real consistent direction” compared to 30% of those who did not feel they received adequate planning time (Table 18).
- Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the paraprofessionals reported that they feel like a valued member of the instructional team (Table 21).

- Ninety-five percent (95%) paraprofessionals who felt their planning time was adequate reported that they felt like valued members of the instructional team (Table 22). Whereas, 76% of the paraprofessionals who reported that they did not have adequate planning time felt like valued members of the team (Table 22).

Personnel Development

Data related to personnel development are dispersed throughout this report and included in various sections listed above. A couple of additional points are listed below.

- Seventy-four percent (74%) of the paraprofessionals reported that they were aware of the NCLB's paraprofessional requirements; 60% indicated that they understood the law's relationship to their position, and 58% felt they needed additional information (Table 28).
- Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the paraprofessionals reported having opportunities available to them to develop knowledge and skills specific to the students with whom they work (Table 23).
- Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the paraprofessionals reported having training that prepared them to understand that needs of the students with whom they work (Table 24).
- Forty-eight percent (48%) of the paraprofessionals reported having training that prepared them to follow lesson plans (Table 25).
- Sixty percent (60%) of the paraprofessionals reported having training that prepared them to implement follow-up instruction (Table 26).
- Training in certain content areas can depend some on the program area in which a paraprofessional works. For example, 45% of the paraprofessionals working in special education compared to 23% of the paraprofessionals working in Title I reported receiving training in "Individual Education Programs (IEPs)." Whereas, 79% of the paraprofessionals working in Title I compared to 37% of those working in special education reported receiving training in "reading strategies."

Appendix A - Survey Instrument

Paraprofessional Survey
2002-2003 School Year



Thank you in advance for giving us feedback

Barbara Jo Stahl
MN Department of Children, Families & Learning
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55113
Phone: 651-582-8883
Email: barbara.stahl@state.mn.us

Job Description

Q1 How long have you worked as a paraprofessional? (Circle one)

- a This is my first year
- b 1-3 years
- c 4-9 years
- d 10-15 years
- e More than 15 years

Q2 What area best describes where you work? (Circle one)

- a Minneapolis or St. Paul
- b Seven-county metropolitan area, but not Minneapolis or St. Paul
- c Greater Minnesota (K-12 enrollment greater than 1,000)
- d Greater Minnesota (K-12 enrollment less than 1,000)
- e Other (specify)

Q3 How many hours per week, on average, do you work in your paraprofessional position? (Circle one)

- a 1-10 hours per week
- b 11-20 hours per week
- c 21-30 hours per week
- d 31-40 hours per week

Q4 In which of the following areas do you work as a paraprofessional? (Circle ALL that apply)

- a Special Education
- b Title I
- c Limited English Proficiency (LEP)
- d Instructional Assistance Other than Title I, Special Education or Limited English Proficiency
- e Media Center
- f Technology
- g Transition or Job Coaching
- h Parent Involvement
- i Health
- j Other (specify)

Q5 What age level (s) are the children and youth with whom you work? (Circle ALL that apply)

- a Birth through age 5
- b Elementary
- c Middle school/Junior high school
- d High school
- e Transition (ages after high school through age 21)
- f Other (specify)

Annual Paraprofessional Survey 2002-2003 School Year

Job Description

- Q6 In what type of setting do you do **MOST** of your paraprofessional work? (Circle one)
- a Elementary school in a regular classroom
 - b Elementary school in a special education classroom
 - c Elementary school Title I classroom
 - d Elementary school Limited English Proficiency classroom
 - e Middle school in a regular classroom
 - f Middle school in a special education classroom
 - g Middle school in a Title I classroom
 - h Middle school in a Limited English Proficiency classroom
 - i Secondary school in a regular classroom
 - j Secondary school in a special education classroom
 - k Secondary school in a Limited English Proficiency classroom
 - l Health office
 - m Media center
 - n Vocational setting
 - o Residential setting
 - p Community setting
 - Other (specify)

- Q7 Do you **PRIMARILY** provide paraprofessional services in a public school or private/parochial school? (Circle one)
- a Public school
 - b Private or parochial school
- Q8 During a typical day, in how many classrooms or work locations do you work? (Circle one)
- a One
 - b Two
 - c Three
 - d More than three
- Q9 During a typical day, does your job require you to travel to different work sites? (Circle one)
- a Yes
 - b No
- Q10 How much of your school day is typically spent doing instructional tasks (i.e., working with student learning in academic areas such as reading, math, or writing, or working with parents)? (Circle one)
- a 100%
 - b 75-99%
 - c 50-74%
 - d 25-49%
 - e Less than 25%
 - f None

Annual Paraprofessional Survey 2002-2003 School Year

Education And Training

Q11 What type of educational credentials do you have? (Circle **ALL** that apply)

- a Technical tutor license
- b Special education teacher license
- c General teaching license for K-6
- d General teaching license for middle school
- e General teaching license for secondary school
- f Reading specialist certificate
- g English as Second Language license
- h Vocational teaching license
- i Interpreter's certificate
- j I do not have any credentials at this time.
- k Other (specify)

Q12 What is the highest level of education you have attained? (Circle one)

- a GED or High School Equivalency
- b High school diploma
- c Technical/Community College AA degree
- d Technical/Community College AS degree
- e Technical/Community College AAS degree
- f Technical/Community College diploma
- g Technical/Community College certificate
- h Less than two years of college coursework (no degree)
- i Two or more years of college coursework (no degree)
- j Bachelor of Arts or Science degree
- k Graduate school credits or degree
Other (specify)

Q13 On which educational credential are you **CURRENTLY** working?

- a GED or High School Equivalency
- b High school diploma
- c Technical/Community College AA degree
- d Technical/Community College AS degree
- e Technical/Community College AAS degree
- f Technical/Community College diploma
- g Technical/Community College certificate
- h Bachelor of Arts or Science degree
- i Graduate school degree
- j None
- k Other (specify)

Q14 In which of the following areas have you had training? (Circle **ALL** that apply)

- a Emergency procedures
- b Building orientation
- c Roles/Responsibilities
- d Confidentiality
- e Vulnerability
- f Reportability
- g Individual Education Programs (IEP)
- h Reading
- i Math
- j Writing
- k Limited English Proficiency (LEP)
Classroom management
None of the above
Other (specify)

Annual Paraprofessional Survey 2002-2003 School Year

Planning And Supervision

Q15 Do you have a written job description? (Circle one)

- a Yes
- b No
- c Don't know

Q16 Does your written job description accurately reflect your duties? (Circle one)

- a Yes
- b No
- c Don't know

Q17 Which licensed staff person is **PRIMARILY** responsible for directing the work you do with students? (Circle one)

- a Special educator
- b General educator
- c Title I teacher
- d Special education administrator
- e ESL/ELL/LEP teacher
- f Early childhood teacher
- g Early childhood administrator
- h Parent coordinator
- i Media specialist
- k Principal/Assistant principal
- l School nurse/Public health nurse
- m It is not clear to me.
- n Someone other than a licensed staff person is responsible for my work.
- o Other (specify) _____

Q18 How often do you have designated planning time (without students present) with the person who directs your work? (Circle one)

- a Daily
- b Weekly
- c Monthly
- d I do not meet with a licensed staff person.
- e Other (specify) _____

Q19 Which of the following does the person who directs your work **MOST** often provide? (Circle one)

- a Daily written direction or instructions
- b Weekly written direction or instructions
- c Specific verbal instructions for strategies and materials to use with the students
- d Non-specific general suggestions for working with students
- e No real consistent direction
- f Other (specify) _____

Q20 Is the amount of time allocated to meet and plan with the licensed staff person adequate for performing your duties? (Circle one)

- a Yes
- b No
- c Sometimes

Annual Paraprofessional Survey 2002-2003 School Year

Planning And Supervision

Q21 Have you had an annual performance review in the past 12 months? (Circle one)

- a Yes
- b No

Q22 Who is responsible for your annual performance review? (Circle one)

- a Special educator
 - b General educator
 - c Title I teacher
 - d Special education administrator
 - e ESL/ELL/LEP teacher
 - f Early childhood teacher
 - g Early childhood administrator
 - h Parent coordinator
 - i Media specialist
 - k Principal/Assistant Principal
 - l School nurse
 - m I don't know.
 - n Other (specify)
- _____

Q23 Who supervises your position? (Circle one)

- a Special educator
 - b General educator
 - c Title I teacher
 - d Special education administrator
 - e ESL/ELL/LEP teacher
 - f Early childhood teacher
 - g Early childhood administrator
 - h Parent coordinator
 - i Media specialist
 - k Principal/Assistant Principal
 - l School nurse
 - m I don't know.
 - n Other (specify)
- _____

Q24 Overall, do you feel you have **had the opportunity to further develop the knowledge and skills** that are specific to the students with whom you work? (Circle one)

- a Yes
- b No
- c Unsure
- d Opportunities are not provided

Q25 Has the ongoing training you have received **prepared you to understand the needs** of the students with whom you work? (Circle one)

- a Yes
- b No
- c Unsure
- d Ongoing training is not provided

Q26 Has the ongoing training you have received **prepared you to follow lesson plans** for the students with whom you work? (Circle one)

- a Yes
- b No
- c Unsure
- d Ongoing training is not provided

Q27 Has the ongoing training you have received prepared you to **implement follow-up instructional and activities** for the students with whom you work? (Circle one)

- a Yes
- b No
- c Unsure
- d Ongoing training is not provided

Q28 Do you feel that you are a **valued part of the instructional team?**

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q29 Are you aware of the **paraprofessional requirements in the Title I/No Child Left Behind federal legislation?** (Circle one)

- Yes
- No

Q30 Are you aware how the **paraprofessional requirements in the Title I/No Child Left Behind federal legislation** impact your position? (Circle one)

- Yes
- No

Annual Paraprofessional Survey 2002-2003 School Year

Q31 Do you need more information about the
**Title I/No Child Left Behind federal
legislation?** (Circle one)

Yes
No

Any other comments?

Annual Paraprofessional Survey 2002-2003 School Year

For each WORK RESPONSIBILITY, please respond either **Yes** or **No** to questions B, C, and D, and for question E, please respond either **DIR** (with direction) or **IND** (independently).

A. WORK RESPONSIBILITY	B. Is this a PRIMARY PART of your work?		C. Did you receive training in this area?		D. Was the Training adequate?		E. Do you perform this work? * with direction (DIR) * Independently (IND)	
1. Share school programs with parents	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
2. Assign grades	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
3. Score other than true/false or multiple choice tests and assignments	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
4. Modify or adapt classroom curriculum	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
5. Design individualized instructional plans for students	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
6. Design and prepare students' instructional activities	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
7. Transport students to and from school	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
8. Perform health procedures	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
9. Perform job coaching	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
10. Participate in IEP meetings	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
11. Assist in activities of daily living	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
12. Perform behavior management procedures	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
13. Act as a translator	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
14. Assist in the instruction of reading, writing, and/or math	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
15. Assist with classroom management	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
16. Assist in the media center	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
17. Provide computer lab assistance	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
18. Provide one-on-one tutoring	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
19. Conduct parent involvement/training activities	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND
20. Provide LEP instruction	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DIR	IND

Annual Paraprofessional Survey 2002-2003 School Year