Over the past 20 years, there has been a steady increase in the number of paraeducator personnel employed in special education, Title 1, and bilingual education programs. Currently, there are approximately 500,000 paraeducators working in the United States. Data indicates that 95 percent of paraeducators are women working for little more than minimum wage, that the role of paraeducators has shifted from clerical work to greater instructional involvement with special education students, and that job satisfaction is low among paraeducators. The availability of paraeducator training is important because of paraeducator's critical role as a member of the instructional team. The identification of 32 training programs for paraeducators across the United States revealed that 10 programs were specific to special education paraprofessionals and that only 1 program had been designed specifically for a rural setting. The most common topics covered by training programs were related to paraeducator roles and responsibilities; monitoring, assessment, and evaluation; teaming and collaboration; instruction; and behavior management. A survey of Utah special education teachers and special education paraeducators indicated the need for paraeducator training in behavior management and understanding special education students. This paper suggests that the increased use of paraeducators in rural education programs can offset limited resources in rural schools and that effective training is the key to using paraeducators in school programs. The appendix lists 32 paraeducator training programs, including date, author, and title of literature source, and contact person and address. (LP)
Paraeducators: Critical Members of the Rural Education Team

Introduction: An Overview of the Issues

There are many issues which rural school and district administrators need to consider as they review services and provisions for special education students. Among these issues is the role of the paraeducator. Over the past 20 years across the United States, there has been a steady increase in the number of paraprofessional personnel employed in education, particularly special education, Title 1 and bilingual education programs. The most recent estimate of current numbers of paraeducators in the United States is 500,000 (Pickett, 1995). Research results (e.g., Blalock, 1991; Logue, 1993; Passaro, Pickett, Latham & HongBo, 1991; Pickett, 1991) offer the following insights into some of the characteristics of this group: 1. that the majority (approx. 95%) of paraprofessionals are women working for little more than minimum wage; 2. that there has been a substantive shift from clerical and other support duties to more instructional involvement with special education students (the most common roles centering around the delivery of guided and independent practice); 3. that the trend towards increased involvement of paraprofessionals is strong and continuing; and 4. that job satisfaction is not high. Pickett (1986) has described paraeducators as:

"the fastest-growing yet most under-recognized, under-prepared and therefore under-utilized category of personnel in the service delivery system."

Another difficulty in the paraeducator situation is highlighted by data collected by Allred (1995). School Districts in Utah were asked (via personal communication) to state how many paraeducators they employed. Not only were there more than a dozen different titles under which they were employed, but they also came under the jurisdiction of several educational divisions, largely distinguished by funding, such as Title 1 or Special Education. The final estimate of the number of paraeducator positions in Utah was in the order of 8,000. This suggests that Pickett’s (1995) rational estimate of 500,000 paraeducators is very conservative. However, it also highlights the difficulties of clearly identifying and accounting for this group of employees, as any one paraeducator may cover more than one position, and therefore be employed by more than one branch of education. The number of different job titles further confuses the issue.

Should we invest in paraeducators?

Cohen, Kulik & Kulik (1982), in their synthesis of the research literature on tutoring, found a positive relationship between the level of paraprofessional training and student achievement outcomes. Hofmeister (1991) has suggested that the term ‘instructional assistant’ would now best describe the most common duties of the paraprofessional, and it has further been suggested (Steckelberg & Vasa, 1991) that up to 80% of a special education student’s time may be spent with a paraeducator rather than a
certified teacher. This establishes the paraeducator firmly as a critical member of the instructional team. Latham (1996) has also noted that paraeducators are often the constant in rural schools, as they are generally members of the local community and less likely to change schools than the certified teachers with whom they work. However, in one survey of paraeducator attitudes, 16% of the sample were planning to resign. The stated reasons in order of frequency were (a) a lack of opportunity to advance, (b) poor salary, (c) lack of benefits, (d) lack of respect, and (e) lack of administrative support. High turnover has often been identified as a major management and training problem, as well as a considerable drain on resources.

Hofmeister (1991) discussed the need for investment in paraeducators. He suggested giving support to schools in the development of paraeducators, to make the most cost-effective contribution possible to quality education; and support to those paraeducators wishing to progressively improve their skills. With the massive increase of human resources which paraeducators represent, we suggest that an investment in paraeducators is a timely investment in improved instruction for students. Wong (1995) has also pointed out we show how much we value personnel, when we provide training for them.

Training programs available in the US

Through a comprehensive review of the literature, and attendance at national conferences, Morgan, Hofmeister & Ashbaker (1995) identified 32 training programs for paraeducators across the United States. Ten of the programs (30%) were specific to special education paraprofessionals, although others offered training in skills which would be useful to paraeducators, whatever their designation/assignment. Only one program had been designed especially for rural settings. An analysis of the topics covered by these programs showed that while there was no topic common to all programs, the most common topic was roles and responsibilities (80%), followed by monitoring, assessment and evaluation (69%), teaming and collaboration, instruction, and management of behavior (64% each). Training topics were covered in similar proportions by the 10 special education programs.

In the research cited above, we also identified research papers which addressed paraeducator training, consisting largely of surveys of education personnel to identify suitable topics for paraeducator training. In some cases paraeducators were asked to list areas in which they felt they needed training. One Utah research survey (Likins, 1993) reported that 100% of special education paraeducators surveyed expressed the need for training in behavior management. In other cases, teachers were asked to recommend paraeducator training topics, in the light of the roles of their paraeducators and current skill levels. The most commonly occurring topics in this research were behavior management (88% of papers), followed by understanding special education students (66%).

While there was no absolute consensus on training topics appropriate for paraeducators -- understandable in the light of the wide variety of job descriptions which
that title encompasses -- the picture which emerges from the literature review is one of a growing trend towards providing training. Initiatives may have been taken on State or local levels, but the number of training programs is increasing, as is the range of topics covered. Interestingly, of the 18 states represented by the training programs identified, the majority are composed of largely rural areas, suggesting that the particular characteristics and needs of rural education have played a major role in the development of paraeducator training. (See Appendix for programs, together with contact names and addresses.)

Conclusions

Rural schools have limited resources - including personnel, money and time. The increased use of paraeducators in rural education programs can help to provide schools and students with valuable human resources. Implicit in the assignments of paraeducators to an instructional support role is the need for effective training. Many quality programs have already been developed, and the number is increasing. For those administrators wishing to make better use of human resources by offering paraeducator training programs, there is a wealth of available material. Administrators can meet many of their paraeducator training needs, and concomitantly their students' needs, by adopting and/or adapting programs already developed.
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### Appendix

**Training programmes for paraeducators: Contact names and addresses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Contact person/address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1980 | Roberts et al. | Paraprofessionals in Vocational Education: A Handbook | Dr Don Roberts*  
Department of Education,  
Capitol Grounds,  
Little Rock, AK |
| 1981 | Glen & McCoy | Orientation to Handicapping Conditions | Sally Glen/Youlanda McCoy*  
North Carolina State University:  
Greensboro, NC 27401 |
9300 East Imperial Highway,  
Downey, CA 90242-2890 |
New Mexico State University,  
Las Cruces |
| 1984 | Kilcrease | "Ready, Set, Go!" A Model Community Resource Plan for Rural Schools | Maxine Wallender Kilcrease*  
Western Oregon State College, ED110  
345, N. Monmouth Avenue,  
Monmouth, OR 97361 |
Fayetteville State University,  
North Carolina |
Institute for Human Development,  
Arizona |
University of Minnesota-Duluth,  
2400 Oakland Avenue,  
Duluth, MN 55812 |
| 1985 | Oklahoma | Guidelines for Special Education Paraprofessionals in Oklahoma | Oklahoma State Dept of Education.*  
Oklahoma City, OK |
| 1989 | Durant et al | Paraprofessional Strand courses in the Albuquerque Public Schools | Ginger Blalock,  
Dept of Special Education,  
University of New Mexico,  
Albuquerque, NM 87112  
or Omar Durant,*  
Albuquerque Public Schools,  
Employee Resource & Renewal Center,  
Albuquerque, NM 87110 |
| 1990 | Pickett | A Training Program for Paraprofessionals working in Special Education and Related Services | Anna Lou Pickett,  
NRC for Paraprofessionals,  
CASE/CUNY, room 620,  
25 West 43rd Street  
New York NY 10036 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Program/Resource</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Chapter I Technical Assistance Center</td>
<td>Paraprofessionals in the Classroom: A Workshop Guide</td>
<td>Chapter I Technical Assistance Center. Denver. CO*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Northwest Regional Education Laboratory</td>
<td>Paraprofessional Training Manual (Chapter 1)</td>
<td>Northwest Region Educational Lab. 101 S.W. Main Street. Suite 500 Portland OR 97204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Gerlach et al</td>
<td>Strengthening the Partnership: Paraeducators and Teachers Working Together</td>
<td>Dr. Ken Gerlach, Dept. of Special Education, Pacific Lutheran University. TACOMA, Wa 98447 Tel (206) 535-7277 FAX: (206) 535-7184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Barresi et al</td>
<td>A Paraeducator Training Program and Mentoring System</td>
<td>Arlene Barresi, BOCES-1, Suffolk County. 15 Andrea Road, Holbrook, NY 11741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>The Instructional Roles of the Paraprofessional</td>
<td>Anita L. Archer/Joan Clair Puget Sound Educational Service 400 S. W. 152nd Street Burien WA 98166-2209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>California State University Long Beach (CSULB)</td>
<td>Transition Services Paraprofessional Certificate Program</td>
<td>University Extension Services, 1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach. CA 90840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Hofmeister, Ashbaker &amp; Morgan</td>
<td>The Effective Educator: A Video Training Package for Paraeducators</td>
<td>Alan Hofmeister/Betty Ashbaker/Jill Morgan CPD-Technology Utah State University LOGAN Ut 84322-6800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>International Correspondence Schools (ICS)</td>
<td>Teacher Aide Course</td>
<td>International Correspondence Schools. Center for Degree Studies, 925 Oak Street, Scranton. PA 18540-9887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Early Intervention Research Institute</td>
<td>Training in Activity-Based Interventions</td>
<td>Mark Innocenti, Early Intervention Research Institute, Utah State University, Logan UT 84322-6580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Salt Lake Community College</td>
<td>PARAEDUCATOR PROGRAM</td>
<td>Kate McConaghy Salt Lake Community College, Redwood Campus, 4600 South Redwood Road, Salt Lake City UT 84123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Program Title</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Salzberg et al.</td>
<td>Enhancing Skills of Paraprofessionals: A Video-Assisted Program</td>
<td>Dept. of Special Education Utah State University. LOGAN UT 84322-2865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Vassiliou et al.</td>
<td>North Dakota Paraprofessional Program</td>
<td>Minot State University. Box 131 Minot ND 58707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>KACC</td>
<td>KACC Paraprofessional Program</td>
<td>KACC Paraprofessional Programs. 117 S.W. 7th Street. Topkea KS 66603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Front Range</td>
<td>Paraprofessional Training Programs</td>
<td>Front Range Community College. 3645 West 112 Avenue. Westminster CO 80030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Yoakum</td>
<td>An Instructional Manual for Training Interpreter Paraprofessionals in the Assessment of Non- &amp; Limited-English Speaking Students</td>
<td>Dept. of Communicative Disorders. Utah State University. LOGAN UT 84322-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Vasa &amp; Steckelberg</td>
<td>Project PARA</td>
<td>Allen Steckelberg/Stanley Vasa. Dept. of Special Education University of Nebraska-Lincoln Lincoln NE 68583-0738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Sobocinski &amp; Anderson</td>
<td>Pre-Employment Training Program for Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Thomas Sobocinski Direct Care Training Program. 474 School Street. East Hartford CT 06108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Hutchinson Willmar</td>
<td>Educational Assistant</td>
<td>Hutchinson-Willmar Technical College Two Century Ave. Hutchinson MN 55350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This address/direction has not been verified, but is the address indicated on the article or version of the training program to hand.