The Internship in Teacher Education

By Jose Smith & Randall Souviney

Jose Smith is supervisor/ lecturer and Randall Souviney is co-director, both with the Teacher Education Program, University of California, San Diego, in La Jolla, California. *They thank Paula Levin and Hugh Mehan for their help with the design of the survey and interview protocols used in this study, Daryl Stermon for compiling program graduate statistics, and Lillie Ford and Michael McKibbin for providing internship credential data from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.*

Nearly half of beginning teachers in California leave the profession within five years of induction (CTC, 1992; Haberman, 1989). Beginning teachers give several reasons for prematurely changing careers, most frequently citing dissatisfaction, not with low salaries, but with working conditions (AACTE, 1988). Why is it so challenging to educate new teachers who are prepared to successfully meet the challenges of today's schools? In this paper, we discuss the internship in teacher education in general, and more specifically how the secondary internship credential program at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) contributes to the development and retention of secondary teachers.

On-the-Job Education

Prior to the industrial revolution, apprenticeships were generally employed when preparing neophytes for membership in critical professions. Michael W. Coy (1989, pp. xi) concluded that "apprenticeship is employed where there is implicit knowledge

to be acquired through long-term observation and experience...[relating] not only to the physical skills associated with the craft, but also to the means of structuring economic and social relationships between oneself and other practitioners, between oneself and one's clients."

The industrial revolution was introduced when machinery was invented that could perform repetitious tasks with the guidance of minimally trained people. The introduction of these machines reduced the number of apprenticeships in trades that could translate work into discrete, easy to describe components. This ultimately led to the deskilling of the workforce and the introduction of basic literacy training for workers (Coy, 1989).

Today, industry once again is attempting to employ teams of skilled workers to compete in an international market that demands more personalized products. Multipurpose machines that are able to quickly shift between types of manufactured goods are being installed by export-oriented industries. These changes have advanced the use of "quality circles," "line-level decision making," and "just-in-time" inventories, all of which require a more professional work force. These changes in market demands have renewed interest in on-the-job training for today's workers (Piore & Sabel, 1984).

The education of professionals has also included supervised practice as a critical element in the development and evaluation of complex job skills. Internships, like apprenticeships, involve novices in work with experts over an extended period. However, internships are generally associated with professions that require complex decision making skills and expertise in more than one discipline—such as physicians, veterinarians, teachers, and architects. These professions develop an extensive research literature that novices use to deduce appropriate practices. Unlike apprentices, however, interns typically work with more than one "master" who possess specialized expertise.

The Education of Teachers

Until the late 1800s, "on-the-job" training was the primary method for preparing most public school teachers in the United States, and the practice continued for many rural school districts until the mid-1900s. These efforts were not true apprenticeships, however, since novices did not work as assistants to master teachers for an extended period prior to independent teaching. Typically, an elementary teaching position would be offered to an outstanding high school graduate if an experienced teacher could not be found. The novice teacher would be "apprenticed" to the superintendent in rural areas or to the principal in larger schools. State certification was either not required or a temporary permit was issued for work within a particular district.

Retaining a position during this era depended on the local board's satisfaction with the teacher's work rather than an evaluation of performance based on accepted

professional standards. "Normal schools" were developed at the turn of the century partly to promulgate professional teaching standards (Keyser, 1977; Klausmeier, 1990).

Alternative routes for teacher certification have been authorized in many states in response to teacher shortages. Internship programs for teacher education appeared in the early 1950s to facilitate returning veterans' entry into the profession. Claremont Graduate School and Stanford University pioneered internship credential programs in California during this period.

Under pressure from urban parents and school officials, state politicians have more recently established policies that allow school districts to, once again, train their own teachers. The course work in such programs is largely designed to address immediate district needs, though the graduates ultimately receive regular teaching credentials. Nationally, over 6,000 district-recommended credentials were issued by 1991 (CTC, 1992). In the early 1990s, approximately three percent of all credentials issued in California were district-recommended. In the Los Angeles Unified School District, a significant proportion of new hires are "home grown" interns. From 1984 to 1992, that district recommended over 1,800 interns for California state credentials. By 1992, over two-thirds of the intern graduates were hired as regular teachers by the district and 90 percent of those were still teaching four years after induction (Stoddart, 1992). The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing issued approximately 250 district-based and 500 university-based intern credentials over the past three years, which represents only a small fraction of all credentials issued. Overall, about twice as many internship credentials were issued at the elementary level as at the secondary level (private communication).

Teacher Internships

Louis Wirth (1964) observed that the most important things to understand about a culture are those that it takes for granted. Initiation into a complex society, then, involves learning the unspoken truths upon which successful behavior is ultimately measured. Beginning teachers must discover many fundamental practices that are so embedded in the professional culture that they are often intangible even to their mentors. These critical elements are generally difficult to communicate and are revealed to the novice only through reflective, direct experience (Mehan & Wood, 1975).

Several technical, social, and economic hurdles await those who wish to be professional teachers. To qualify, a novice must command a vast body of interdisciplinary knowledge, understand the practical applications of learning theory, display complex interpersonal skills, and master the social and ethical rituals that define membership in the profession. This must be accomplished in the context of a society that holds teaching in relatively low esteem, requires a costly training period, and offers limited tangible rewards (Goodlad, 1990; Klausmeier, 1990).

Public school teaching has become an increasingly complex activity. To be successful today, a professional teacher must not only be an accomplished academic instructor, but must also possess extensive knowledge of social work, counseling, and psychology. Fifteen weeks of student teaching is insufficient for most students to develop the necessary understanding of the complexities of effective practice to be independent professionals. The California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (CTC, 1994) concluded that beginning teachers were likely to feel confident and successful only if they participated in a year-long program of systematic support that included structured time working with experienced teachers and training directly related to their immediate instructional needs.

The UCSD Internship Program

The UCSD secondary internship credential program was implemented in the mid-1980s. Since the University graduated a number of scientifically skilled students and inner-city and rural schools desperately needed qualified mathematics and science teachers, the Teacher Education Program (TEP) explored ways to recruit qualified science and mathematics majors at UCSD into the teaching profession.

First of all, several credential programs throughout the country were reviewed, particularly the internship program at the Claremont Graduate School, a selective private university in Southern California. The Claremont program had successfully recruited qualified candidates over the years and its highly regarded graduates enjoyed an above average retention rate. The question remained whether UCSD could adapt this program to work successfully in a public research university.

Barbara Rogoff's (1984) notion of "guided participation" influenced the design of the UCSD program. Rather than focusing on the artifacts (*e.g.*, lesson plans and classroom management) or the individuals involved (*e.g.*, interns, supervisors, and cooperating teachers), a structure was developed that facilitated appropriate teaching-learning interactions among interns and a variety of expert personnel (Levin, 1990).

A variety of expert personnel were assigned to work with interns in both university and classroom settings, and a variety of activities were planned for both settings. In practice, the relative importance of these experts and activities varied over the two-year program as interns took on increasing responsibility for independent teaching. The university supervisor was responsible for the coordination of this transformation. Scaffolded support for practice was offered through methods instruction, field observations, and classroom coaching. Supervisors also coordinated the interactions with veteran teachers who provided opportunities for observation, tutoring, and student teaching prior to the internship. Research faculty also interacted with interns and supervisors through education foundation courses and cultural studies.

The supervisor initially instructed the first-year students called pre-interns in formal courses on teaching practices and classroom organization. They then facilitated joint projects such as curriculum reviews, lesson planning, school and community inventories, and portfolio assessment. Supervisors also provided professional assessment for pre-interns by organizing field placements, evaluating classroom performance, modeling classroom practices, and, eventually, developing a peer relationship with interns as they developed confidence and independence. Upon completion of the program, supervisors assisted graduates in securing permanent employment and facilitated involvement in professional organizations.

Limitations of Student Teaching

The faculty felt a more realistic field experience than student teaching was needed to meet program goals. All **basic** credential programs in California require 15 weeks of student teaching. The traditional student teaching experience is essentially an abbreviated apprenticeship. Trisha Maynard and John Furlong (1993) observed that simply placing a novice in the presence of an expert teacher for 15 weeks may not be sufficient to provide the tacit knowledge and technological skills needed to be successful in today's complex classrooms. The dual allegiance of the candidate to the cooperating teacher and university supervisor defuses the focus of the apprenticeship experience.

Research on the student teaching experience suggests several potential shortcomings. For example, secondary student teachers often teach less than a full-day schedule of classes. Students are unable to experience the beginning, end, or other important phases of the school year (Berliner, 1987). The student teacher must attend to the pre-existing classroom organization, often finding it unwise to risk failure by trying to implement one's own ideas about curriculum and classroom organization. Since classroom management is typically established by the cooperating teacher during student teaching, first-year teachers often experience difficulty juggling priorities and effectively coordinating time (Bartell & Ownby, 1994). Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Margret Buchmann (1987) found that student teachers often reported "going through the motions of teaching" rather than "connecting these activities to what pupils should be learning over time." The internship offered a more realistic alternative to student teaching.

The Recruitment Advantages of Internships

Typically, students do not attend research institutions like UCSD with the intention of teaching in the public schools. Students often consider teaching as a career near the end of their undergraduate program, perhaps after serving as a tutor on campus or volunteering in a school as a public service experience. Some students decide that they prefer working with people rather than working in a laboratory, or, due to the intense competition for positions in graduate and medical schools, they

realize that their original career goal may be unrealistic.

To attract qualified undergraduate science and mathematics majors and technical professionals seeking to change careers, teacher education programs must compete with other graduate opportunities that provide financial support for candidates. Since one-year graduate credential programs are generally non-degree programs, students do not have access to fellowships to assist with their fees and living expenses. Paid internships can offer financial support for non-degree credential candidates, substantially increasing the pool of potential students.

Initial Program Planning

University-based internship programs in California are required to establish a collaborative arrangement with each district's administration and the teachers' union. Most districts first accomplished this through a side letter to the teacher's contract and eventually intern language has been integrated into many standard contracts. Such agreements stipulate the level of compensation (minimum of 87.5 percent of starting salary), the maximum appointment percent (67-100 percent), level of benefits (district health package or reimbursement for university student coverage), union membership requirements, the total number of interns to be placed each year, and the support services to be provided by the district. The first year of the USCD program, a prospectus was sent to all 25 unified and secondary school districts in San Diego County. Meetings were held with the personnel directors and the teachers' union representatives in the eight districts that responded.

The union and district administrators expressed different priorities during initial negotiations with the University. The unions responded to their constituency's concerns about assignment and transfer policy. Current teachers wanted to insure their rights of transfer to desired positions while the administration wanted to fill positions with the most qualified candidates. The primary motivation on the part of the school administrators was the potential for recruiting academically qualified interns whose performance could be assessed for a full year without continuing employment obligations. The union supported the program as an effective way to recruit more qualified candidates for difficult-to-fill positions and to provide current teachers with release-time or stipends to support intern development.

Four districts agreed to participate initially. One was an urban district with over 40 secondary schools, another a rural district with two secondary schools, and the remaining two were suburban districts with a half-dozen secondary schools. Thirteen placements were supported by state lottery funds in one of the suburban districts during the first year. The other three districts hired the remaining seven interns as part of their regular staffing allotment.

During the first year of the program, some teachers expressed skepticism of the internship model, preferring the more familiar master/student teacher relationship. In some cases, these teachers established barriers to intern success. One department

chair, for example, refused to help interns locate laboratory equipment, arranged inconvenient teaching schedules for interns, and loaded interns' classes with challenging students. In another district, the newly elected union representatives felt the program was being imposed on them by their administrators. Additional meetings with the teachers and administrators in this district led to a formal arrangement for selecting teachers to serve as intern advisors and as a representative to the University Advisory Committee. Generally, however, the teachers increasingly welcomed the interns over the years and have provided excellent support, access to instructional materials, and sage advice.

Intern Placement and Support

In the first year of the program, principals in two districts placed interns in part-time positions. In several cases, sections were assigned to interns to provide release-time for department chairs. In the urban district, each pair of interns shared one full-time position.

The districts appointed an advisor for each intern who was selected jointly by the University and the school. The districts compensated intern advisors in different ways. One district assigned a Mentor Teacher to each intern, another paid a stipend of three percent of base pay. Since eight to ten part-time interns were placed in the urban district, one teacher was released full-time to serve as the advisor for all district interns. This teacher worked closely with the university supervisors and participated as an adjunct instructor during the weekly seminars.

Advisors taught the same discipline as the intern and worked at the same site. Since interns had completed extensive preprofessional field experience and their intern credential allowed them to teach without direct supervision, the advisor functioned as a peer consultant rather than a traditional "master teacher." Advisors were asked to help orient the interns to the resources at the school, allow the interns to observe their classrooms, and occasionally visited the interns' classes to assist with lesson organization or classroom management.

Each intern was assigned a university supervisor who was an expert teacher in the intern's discipline. These supervisors were full-time faculty at the university and also taught instructional methods. During the year prior to the internship, the supervisors taught preprofessional courses and observed preintern field experiences. The supervisors developed a mentoring relationship with eight to 12 interns over a two-year period through formal instruction in disciplinary methods courses, supervision of various field experiences, and social interaction throughout the program. They spent considerable time in informal settings discussing their own teaching, exchanging stories about classroom lore and their professional careers. This intimate, long-term relationship between expert and novice, firmly located in ongoing practice, provided guided access to tacit knowledge about the profession which is often unavailable to beginning teachers.

Interns attended a weekly seminar on campus and took an additional professional course each quarter (reading and writing across the curriculum, multicultural education, and special education). The internship seminar served as an extension of the summer course on disciplinary-based teaching practices. During these seminars, faculty offered advanced teaching methods and the interns critiqued each other's lessons. Veteran teachers were frequent presenters in these seminars as well. By 1990, the program also provided a computer and modem for each intern so they had access at home to internet resources and the ability to easily communicate with supervisors (Souviney, Saferstein, & Chambers, 1995).

In recent years, the program introduced an English credential and added a specially designed instructional component for English language learners for all interns. Two additional districts joined the program in 1995 as well.

Participant Assessment of Program Effectiveness

Several sources of information were used to assess the effectiveness of the UCSD secondary internship credential program. A survey of current interns and graduates was undertaken and follow-up interviews conducted based on questionnaire responses. Interviews were conducted with faculty, intern advisors, and employers. Job placement and teacher-retention data was also compiled.

Intern Questionnaire Design

In 1993, program graduates since 1988 and the current 1993 interns were mailed the initial questionnaire. One English intern was included in the survey since she was the only intern in newly developed English/ESL program. The questionnaire return rate was 32 percent (n=112).

Graduates were asked to specify the courses and other program features they found most helpful as they started their teaching careers. Specifically, respondents rated program courses and field experiences according to their perception of the contribution to their success as an intern or new teacher. Graduates were also asked to rate the support provided by TEP supervisors, other university faculty, intern advisors, district administrators, department chairs, and other colleagues at their schools. Respondents were asked to indicate other experiences that should have been included or components that should have received more or less emphasis. Graduates were also asked to identify areas of ineffectiveness in their own teaching and to rate their teaching-confidence level at the completion of their internship year.

Questionnaire Results

The graduates were asked to rank the program elements according to their relative usefulness in their development as a teacher. Overall, the questionnaire responses reflected the concerns of new teachers struggling to keep order and develop successful classroom practices. The current-year interns, in particular, felt

that practice-oriented courses were more important to their teaching success than courses that focused on the theory and practice of schooling. Overall, current interns and graduates indicated that the practice-oriented components of the program were most valuable to their development as a teacher. Approximately 75 percent of the responses emphasized the importance of classroom teaching experiences and practical assignments over courses emphasizing educational theory. The emotional and clinical support provided by the university supervisors and fellow interns was cited as the next most important factor. One student summarized the internship as follows:

> It was the best of all possible worlds: (a) setting up my own classroom; (b) teaching all by myself; (c) having TEP to help me when I needed help; and (d) having interns to share experiences and ideas.

Graduates who had been teaching for a few years fondly remembered the internship as an opportunity to engage fully in the culture of the classroom, "The full year of interning gives you a real feel for the ups and downs of the school year." And, "I felt that teaching my internship year was my first real year of teaching."

In ranking the required courses, the ones perceived most useful were the internship practicum (the paid internship and coordinated weekly seminars focusing on the specific teaching practices) and the preinternship practicum (a series of courses that link weekly lectures and discussion sections to preprofessional classroom experiences). The structured transition from the preprofessional experience to the internship was singled out as a critical feature of the program:

> As a pre-intern, I came into classrooms where discipline had already been established. As an intern, I learned about classroom management...that can not be learned through books or lectures.

The discipline-based methods courses and the computer applications course were ranked next in importance. The disciplinary teaching-practice courses were offered during the summer session. A concurrent three week field experience was also required. The computer application course required projects that could be directly applied in the classroom. Several mathematics graduates indicated that they had been asked to lead similar staff development courses at their own schools. The remaining practice oriented courses, multicultural education, language arts, health education, and mainstreaming received lower overall ratings.

Not surprisingly, courses that provided interns with the most direct application to classroom activities were ranked highest in the survey results. Interns also reported that the level of classroom teaching responsibility concurrent with the course also contributed to their perceived usefulness of the course. As the interns took on more independent responsibility for teaching during the academic year, the courses that helped them solve immediate instruction and management problems were held in highest esteem. Discussing classroom management strategies during

summer methods classes, for example, was not perceived as useful as coaching provided in the internship seminar during the internship year.

Graduates were also asked to rate the level of support received from various personnel associated with the program. The university supervisor was considered the most helpful in facilitating guided participation among the interns and professionals involved. Site-based intern advisors and department chairs were rated next to last in terms of support value, just behind principals and other district administrators. One district released a resource teacher solely to assist UCSD interns. This resource teacher replaced site intern advisors. Her involvement was considered much more effective overall than the less formal relationship with intern advisors. The TEP staff, such as the placement coordinator and credential advisor, were also seen to play a critical role in helping interns coordinate university and school demands.

About 40 percent of the free-response comments reported that interactions with university supervisors contributed significantly to their development as teachers, 30 percent indicated that the classroom experience itself was an important element, and about 20 percent identified university course assignments as significant. Less than five percent mentioned education foundation courses as a significant factor in their development. It is noteworthy to mention that these five percent were graduates who had been teaching the longest (see section on Follow-up Interviews).

Self-assessment of Teaching Performance

Graduates were also asked to assess how well they were teaching when compared to other successful teachers at their schools. About 12 percent felt they needed general help with classroom management and instruction. About 12 percent felt they were fully prepared to teach and therefore required little additional staff development. The remaining 75 percent indicated a need for assistance in cooperative learning strategies, portfolio assessment, teaching problem solving, accessing instructional resources, making better use of State Frameworks, team teaching, or communicating with parents.

Student Recommendations

Interns and graduates were also asked to recommend changes to the program. About 30 percent requested that classroom management and discipline should be emphasized more and 15 percent noted that more time was needed working with successful teachers. Other issues recommended for attention included increased:

- Experience as the sole teacher;
- Discussion about how to start a new class;
- Contact with other interns;
- Experience working with at-risk students;
- Work with the AVID Program;
- Use of video taping and peer coaching;

- Intern collaboration on planning;
- Discussions with other interns during seminars;
- Reflection on overcoming oppressive teaching situations;
- Use of specific lab equipment;
- Motivating mathematics activities;
- Experienced teaching assistants for the preprofessional experience.

Graduates were generally confident in their ability to teach immediately upon graduation or felt that they could develop the necessary performance and organizational skills on their own. Only one respondent indicated a general lack of confidence to teach effectively upon graduation. One current intern interviewed near the end of the academic year summarized her experience as follows, "I knew what it was like to teach and it was apparent in all my job interviews."

Follow-up Interviews

The results of the initial questionnaire seemed to show a shift in attitude toward program elements as graduates gained teaching experience. Current interns and beginning teachers indicated that the preprofessional field experiences, the internship, and—to a lesser extent—the methods courses were more significant in their development than the education foundation courses. The responses of graduates with more teaching experience, however, suggested an increasing reliance on the theoretical concepts and the instructional implications of research that were presented in the foundation courses.

A follow-up telephone interview was conducted with four mathematics and four science interns, divided equally between those just beginning their career and those who had been teaching for three or more years.

The graduates were first asked to describe their classrooms and how they organized their lessons. About 75 percent responded that their students worked in some form of collaborative groups and that their lessons were "student centered." Each was then asked to describe a professional problem they had experienced, how they went about resolving it, and which components of the program may have helped them successfully address the issue.

Those with more teaching experience tended to identify issues outside the day-to-day functioning of the classroom. One experienced graduate indicated that his knowledge of culture and the social organization of schooling helped him be more understanding of individual student circumstances that affect school performance. As a result, he found himself monitoring his own tendency to stereotype children and looked for more effective responses to their problems and pressures.

Another interviewee who had been teaching three years described how the required course on multicultural education continued to influence her teaching:

> The multicultural class helped me realize that all students have equal potential to learn. I hear teachers say "those Mexican kids" this and that, but I stay away from

> that mentality. And my "Mexican kids" come in expecting me to have the same attitude, I feel they are sometimes surprised that I expect so much from them.

Another experienced graduate commented about a theory course on the social organization of schools:

> In the sociology course we discussed how kids get tagged [labeled], the impact of role models, second language, under representation, upward bound and other limiting factors. I wish I could remember more from my sociology class like testing and [the effects of] instruction in the native language where initial progress was compared with later progress to show how students would catch up rapidly after a slow start.

Other experienced graduates felt that being aware of research findings helped them evaluate instructional proposals made by the administration and gave them the confidence to attempt new strategies in the classroom. This confidence also encouraged them to share their ideas with other veteran teachers.

The classroom problems reported by beginning teachers were generally related to classroom management and parent communication.

Employer Assessment of Graduates

District and school-level administrators in the four participating districts were asked to assess the performance of UCSD interns whom they hired after graduation. About half of the graduates are hired in the district where they completed their internship. Most of the remaining interns who sought positions were hired by other districts in San Diego County.

Employers uniformly praised the program graduates for their "seasoned" performance when compared to beginning teachers with only student teaching experience. Many of the recruiters who interviewed graduates for positions over the past several years reported that the UCSD interns appeared more confident and seemed better prepared for the realities of the classroom than student teachers graduating from other programs.

Principals were particularly complimentary of the two-stage preparation afforded by the preprofessional field experience and subsequent internship. Interns' subject matter competence was particularly valued. Principals felt, however, that their classroom management was not superior to other first-year teachers. Administrators perceived no differences between interns and other beginning teachers in their awareness or sensitivity to multicultural issues, an area emphasized by the UCSD program.

Three district administrators indicated that interns had taken on leadership roles within the districts, citing examples such as district curriculum committees, new program implementation, planning a new Charter school, and appointment as department chairs. Two high schools (one suburban and one inner-city) reported that the majority of the mathematics and science teachers on their faculties are now

UCSD graduate interns. At a rural high school, one graduate was singled out as the most innovative teacher in the science department. Former interns are increasingly identified as exceptional teachers by other teacher education programs as well. Many are being sought out as cooperating teachers for student teachers—in one case it was the first time a student teacher was placed in that particular science department. A principal of a large suburban high school indicated that due to the high caliber of the intern graduates, he was now willing to hire UCSD interns sight-unseen. For the past several years, the urban district cooperating with the program has offered to hire any UCSD program graduate who applied.

Table 1 shows the placement and retention rates for all graduates of the program. The five-year retention rate was 92 percent for the years 1987-92. The overall placement rate was 87 percent (defined as being offered a contract position by 1 October following graduation). Also, more than half of the graduates are assigned positions at their original intern site.

Table 1
Intern Placement and Retention Rates

Year	Interns	Placed In Teaching	Taught 5 Years (Retention Rate)	Initially Taught at Intern Site
87-88	19	15 (79%)	11 (73%)	3 (20%)
88-89	17	16 (94%)	14 (88%)	7 (44%)
89-90	15	14 (93%)	13 (93%)	8 (57%)
90-91	20	18 (90%)	18 (100%)	14 (78%)
91-92	22	19 (86%)	19 (100%)	8 (42%)
92-93	19	17 (89%)	*13 (76%)	12 (71%)
93-94	26	21 (81%)	*17 (81%)	13 (62%)
94-95	28	25 (89%)	*22 (88%)	**9 (36%)
Total (%)	166	145 (87%)	75 (92%)	74 (51%)

* = Not included in Total (75) since less than five years since graduation; retention rate for 1987-92 reflects employment in June of 5th year.

** = In 1994-95, about half the interns were placed at a small, start-up "charter" school and few positions were available in the following year.

Discussion

The teaching internship at UCSD is based on an intense, two-year relationship among novices, skilled professionals who serve as university supervisors and cooperating teachers, and research faculty (TEP, 1997). Interns practice different roles in the schools and work in multiple classrooms. The supervisor plays a key

mentoring role in helping interns make sense of what they see and do by making explicit the tacit elements of professional practice.

A viable internship program requires more ongoing cooperation between institutions than does student teaching. The schools have a vested interest in the success of the interns since they are employees of the districts. To be successful, the administrators and faculties of both institutions must come to view the program a genuine collaborative effort.

Since 1993, when the survey was administered, the program has introduced an English/ESL credential option. A Culture, Language, and Academic Development (CLAD) component has been implemented for all interns to provide disciplinary-based instructional techniques for English language learners. Several University Supervisors are actively teaching a regular course in a secondary school and the Intern Advisor released by the urban district to supervise interns is also teaching components in the University seminars. The interns and faculty find that this type of collaboration between the University and the schools improves the quality of the methods instruction and increases the overall credibility of the program.

The results of this study support the use of university-based internships for teacher education. Interns and graduates credited the guided-participation facilitated by the university supervisor as the most significant single factor in their development as a teacher. The scaffolding provided by these expert teachers facilitated the development of the complex instructional skills and the tacit professional behaviors needed to be successful teachers.

The survey results indicate that current interns strongly valued the practice-oriented program components over theory courses. The immediacy of the teaching experience encouraged interns to focus on pressing instructional issues like classroom management and lesson planning. Graduates with more teaching experience, however, cited education foundation courses as an increasingly important factor in helping them make complex professional decisions in their teaching. Additional emphasis during professional preparation on the role of teacher-as-researcher could better facilitate the integration of educational theory and practice. This would also facilitate improvements in instruction and enhance leadership potential.

Over the past five years, virtually all interns who sought teaching positions have received full-time contracts. As a reflection of employer confidence, graduates are increasingly being hired as permanent teachers at their internship school. Over 90 percent of the graduates from 1987-92 remained in teaching for at least five years, compared with a 50 percent retention rate for all beginning teachers in California. Employers also reported nearly uniform satisfaction with the performance of interns during the internship year and as contract teachers.

The results of this study suggest that a program consisting of appropriate course work and a well supported internship can develop highly skilled professional teachers. The systematic use of guided-participation over an extended period is a critical factor in the successful implementation of internships in teacher education.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1988). *Training and recruiting minority teachers.* Washington, DC: AACTE.

Bartell, C. & Ownby, L. (1994). *Report on implementation of the beginning teacher support and assessment program.* Sacramento, CA: Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Berliner, D. (1987). Ways of thinking about students and classrooms by more and less experienced teachers. In Calderhead, J. (Ed.) *Exploring teachers' thinking.* London, United Kingdom: Cassell.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1992). *Alternative routes to teacher certification in California: A report to the legislature.* Sacramento, CA: Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1994). *Success for beginning teachers.* Sacramento, CA: Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Coy, M. (1989). *Apprenticeship: From theory to method and back again.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Feiman-Nemser, L. & Buchmann, M. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education? *Teacher and Teacher Education,* 3, 255-73.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Why our schools don't get better—and how they might. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 17(4), 5-21.

Haberman, M. (1989). More minority teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan.* 70(10), 771-76.

Keyser, R. (1977). Becoming a teacher: Reenacting yesterday today for use tomorrow. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. McMaster University, Ontario.

Klausmeier, R. (1990). Four decades of calls for reform of teacher education: The 1950s through the 1980s. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 17(4), 23-64.

Levin, P. (1990). Culturally contextualized apprenticeship: Teaching and learning through helping in Hawaiian families. *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition,* 12(2), 80-86.

Maynard, T. & Furlong, J. (1993). Learning to teach and models of mentoring. In McIntyre, D., Hagger, H. & Wilkin, M. (Eds.) *Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education,* 69-85.

Mehan, H., & Wood, H. (1975). *The reality of ethnomethodology.* New York: Academic Press.

Piore, M., & Sabel, C. (1984). *The second industrial divide: Possibilities for prosperity.* New York: Basic Books.

Rogoff, B. (1990) *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context.* New York: Oxford.

Souviney, R., Saferstein, B. & Chambers, E. (1995) InternNet: Network communication and teacher development. *The Journal of Computing and Teacher Education,* 11(4).

Stoddart, T. (1992), Los Angeles Unified intern program: Recruiting and preparing teachers for an urban context. *Peabody Journal of Education,* 67(3), 84-122.

Teacher Education Program. (1997). Description of UCSD credential programs. *Teacher Resource Server,* http://www-tep.ucsd.edu.

Wirth, L. (1964). *On cities and social life.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Officials of the California Council on the Education of Teachers, 1945-Present

Presidents:

1945-46 - Frank N. Freeman, University of California, Berkeley
1946-47 - Frank W. Thomas, Fresno State College
1947-48 - Lucien B. Kinney, Stanford University
1948-49 - Osman R. Hull, University of Southern California
1949-51 - J. Paul Leonard, San Francisco State College
1951-53 - Peter L. Spencer, Claremont Graduate School
1953-55 - Arnold F. Joyal, Fresno State College
1955-57 - Larry L. Jones, Watsonville School District
1957-59 - William E. Brownell, University of California, Berkeley
1959-61 - Darrel J. Finnegan, Loyola University
1961-63 - Glenn Kendall, Chico State College
1963-65 - Wendell E. Cannon, University of Southern California
1965-67 - James C. Stone, University of California, Berkeley
1967-69 - William E. Sweeney, San Jose State College
1969-71 - Manfred H. Schrupp, San Diego State College
1971-74 - John A. Nelson, California State University, Long Beach
1974-76 - Dorothy S. Blackmore, California State Department of Education
1976-78 - Douglas L. Minnis, University of California, Davis
1978-80 - Claire E. Pelton, Los Altos High School District
1980-82 - Alvin H. Thompson, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
1982-84 - James W. Cusick, California State University, Fullerton
1984-86 - Philip T. Fitch, Point Loma Nazarene College
1986-88 - Dennis S. Tierney, California State University, Fullerton
1988-90 - David Wampler, University of California, Davis
1990-92 - Carolyn Cogan, University of California, Santa Barbara
1992-94 - Gerald J. Brunetti, St. Mary's College
1994-96 - Grace E. Grant, Dominican College of San Rafael
1996- - Elaine C. Johnson, California Federation of Teachers

Executive Secretaries:

1948-56 - James C. Stone
1956-69 - Carl E. Larson
1969-80 - James W. Cusick
1980-90 - James R. Hoffner
1991- David Wampler

Journal Editors:

1972-73 - Robert L. Terrell
1974-75 - Douglas L. Minnis and Jan Cross
1975-77 - Douglas L. Minnis
1977-78 - Joseph W. Beard
1978-86 - James C. Stone
1987- Alan H. Jones